



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, May 19, 2019
REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

6:10 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

AW: Summarizes the proceedings for the subcommittee and members of the public.

Roll Call:

Members present:

Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Debby Knight (DK), George Lattimer (GL), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Laurie Phillips (LP), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM)

Members not present:

Petr Krysl (PK), Kristin Camper (KC), Erin Baker (EB), Kris Kopensky (KK), Melanie Cohn (MC)

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy. Business seat 1 (previously held by John Bassler) is to be filled with one of the three UCPG Business 1 members.

City Staff:

Katie Witherspoon (KW) – University CPU Project Manager, Planning Department

Presenters:

Rajeev Bhatia – Dyett and Bhatia -- (RB).

Diego Velasco – Citythinkers – (DV). On the call but not presenting.

Gabriella Folina – Dyett & Bhatia – (GF). On the call but not presenting.

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein	(BB)
Nancy Groves	(NG)
Deanna Ratnikova	(DR)
Diane Ahern	(DA)
Justine Murray	(JuM)

Louis Rodolico	(LR)
David Campbell	(DC)
Alyssa Helper	(AH)
Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Janay Kruger	(JK)
Public member	(Public)

6:02 CALL THE METING TO ORDER – Andy Wiese, Subcommittee Chair

Andy Wiese called the meeting to order.

6:05 ROLL CALL AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Andy Wiese called the roll; see above.

Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes for this meeting.

6:09 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

LR: Lou Rodolico gave a public comment. Text to be added.

BB: Barry Bernstein gave a public comment. See the appendix.

6:13 SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT

RC: The concerns from south UC on safety are important. He recommended a subcommittee on safety as part of the CPUS that might be able to come up with some ideas that address community concerns.

Tait Galloway (TG): One of the aspects of mobility in the plan update is land use alternatives; these are shared with police and fire to solicit feedback, including responsibilities. We will specifically discuss this as part of “public facilities and safety” at a future meeting.

AW: When will this discussion take place?

KW: Mid next year, prior to the EIR.

AW: Does not favor a subcommittee for this topic.

RC: South UC folks should send suggestions to the City on safety.

AW: Agreed.

6:20 Item 1—Information Item: Project Status Update -- Katie Witherspoon

KW: Gave the project status update for past CPUS meetings. *Note: See powerpoint presentation from May Meeting located here: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/university/subcommittee-university-documents>*

KW: Tonight we will discuss the focus areas and take feedback from the subcommittee members and members of the public. The feedback will guide staff going forward.

6:25 Item 2—Information Item: University Focus Areas – Rajeev Bhatia, Dyett and Bhatia

Rajeev Bhatia (RB): Reviewed Community Plan Area (CPA) demographics:

Year	2020	2050 (projection)
Jobs	80K	185K
Housing	35K	82K

LP: Commented on how people work and how changes in densities might occur going forward.

RB: Even if we maintain 2.25 jobs/housing unit, just accommodating the growth would require a large number of housing units to be built. The housing requirement is regional rather than specific to the UC Plan Area.

AW: We have not received confirmation on how good the projections are. The requirements are troubling and we will confirm the figures later.

JS: One follow up to LP: there is one enormous housing complex at UCSD due completion immediately. The goal is to house all students for the first two years and many graduate students. She noticed a large number of vacancies in the community recently, and new construction at UCSD will continue to sustain this housing trend.

RB: The UCSD LRDP still projects a large number of new students and staff, so the housing built will not “last”.

AD: Wants the group to know that UCSD has reached out to TG and KW to make sure the housing number is accurate. The LRDP projects 44,200 students with a 64,000 total population.

GL: In consideration for the residential/non-residential mix, how does the almost total residential character of Clairemont and La Jolla figure in?

RB: We still need to look at housing and jobs to try to balance things out.

GL: The issue is that tech and research needs a critical mass, so north UC needs more housing but we need to consider a regional approach.

RB: Discussion about Focus Area 2 [FA2] (primarily the Campus Pointe area).

RB: Described the buildings in FA2. This is an employment center with limited housing opportunities. There are some residences along Genesee that could have higher density. FA2 is envisioned as mostly jobs.

AW: Are there discussion questions?

RB: Opportunities for jobs and housing? There are density max values and FAR max values for this area.

AW: What vision do the CPUS members have for the area?

TG: Mixed use/residential is allowed.

LP: Supports the notion that this area is largely industrial oriented. Residential along Genesee will be exposed to the Trolley; this is not attractive for residential [due to noise].

DK: None of the Campus Pointe area is within walking area to a trolley stop. Same is true with Towne Center Drive. It's not really accessible to transit. The land is steep slopes, MHPA, and has edge effects that limit density of all kinds. This is a difference between the current plan and the new plan: many land use restrictions have been added. We have acres of surface parking lots but the land is not always easy to use.

JS: Developing denser, high rise development is going to be problematic. There are better opportunities along Nobel, for example. Is there a La Jolla Country Day School expansion in the works?

AW: There are opportunities in maybe 50 acres of parking lots. We need to maximize the prime industrial uses for this land. If prime industrial uses are not the best uses, we should have a discussion about this, and about using the land for open space and canyon access.

TG: Clarify that restriction in density for APZ2 but that transition areas outside APZ2 areas are property by property.

RB: Height is not really the limit in APZ1.

AW: Need to quantify the opportunities in this area. Is it 40%, 30%, 90%?

RB: No clean answer. FAR applies, and there are employee/acre limitations.

AW: We need to know how close to the limits we are.

JS: Who would be most interested in housing out there? There are three hospitals out, 4 if you count Scripps Green. What would be the housing demand from them?

NG: Huge parking areas are opportunities. Alexandria might be convinced to run shuttles to the Trolley stops.

Neil Hyytinen: The transition zone is a place of opportunity. You don't have the same airport restrictions as in the APZ2.

AW: How desirable is it to have Mixed Use? Keep it as is?

DK: Since the area is not walking distance to the trolley, it makes sense to focus on industrial uses. It's also useful to consider that parking lots may also be used for non-natural habitat.

JK: Three or four years ago we were brainstorming on how to increase housing. Employers could use their parking lots to build employee-based housing.

RB: Focus area 3 discussion. This is primarily the UTC core area.

RB: Fewer airport related restrictions. Most of the area is within walking distance to transit. Some infill may be possible. It could be an employment-mixed-use area. How much flexibility would be provided? Can we go super high in height?

TG: Still some height limitations depending on the runway orientation and parcel. Buildings may be a little higher than now, but not hugely higher.

KR: The area at the southwest corner of La Jolla Village Drive and Genesee Avenue is marked as undeveloped, whereas the Monte Vista development is being built on it now.

RB: Noted.

DK: There are three additional high rise residential buildings to be completed. We know from SANDAG that housing is mostly high rise luxury – this area does not provide moderate income housing. We will have more students over time so we'll be adding residences for students, not workers. There is no more space to build new parks, so maybe adding a park is a good idea when demolishing a building.

MJ Tichasek: Concerned about traffic in the Nobel area.

AW: Are there uses we should be considering?

KJ: The area is very hard to navigate. It's hard to imagine adding more housing to the area.

KW: It's getting close to the end of the meeting time. Can we do a one hour meeting on, say, June 2 or similar?

KW: This looks like it works for all.

GL: One more comment. From Regents and Genesee north, the CCRs control the height limit of 30% of maximum, and it's necessary to get 100% participation to change.

AW: Are there restrictions on use?

GL: The zoning has been amended from science research to school and church from time to time.

AW: Is there contact between the CCR group and the City?

GL: Individually, case by case, cases are walked around the group.

LR: There is a call for more services that residents need.

AW: If more housing is developed, you need services as well.

AW: Residents will come to FA3 due to UCSD housing. Can take advantage of this to figure out how the east side of Regents (north of La Jolla Village Drive) will develop. He's not afraid of density, but of car-centric uses.

KW: Will send out information for an early June date and time. We will look at FA 4, 5, and 1.

7:38 Meeting adjourned.