



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, September 17, 2019

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

Roll Call:

Members present:

Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Debby Knight (DK), Melanie Cohn (MC), 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), Andie Hosch (AH), Kristin Camper (KC).

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy.

City Staff:

Dan Monroe (DM)

Dyett & Bhatia:

Rajiv (DBR)

Gabriella: (DBG)

Some members of the public are identified below as:

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

6:19 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes in Andie's place for this meeting.

Changes to minutes for 7/16 CPUS:

Genesee was added to the list of class 4 cycle tracks by community.
Added final wording of the Vision Statement to the final action item (#1):

"A diverse and dynamic community with renowned higher education, healthcare, scientific

research and technology institutions and businesses connected through a robust multi-modal transportation network to a vibrant mixed-use urban core and varied residential neighborhoods, which protects its unique natural habitat and canyon systems. The community includes distinctive neighborhoods on either side of Rose Canyon. The northern portion is envisioned as a center of education, employment, and healthcare with multi-family and single family residences, as well as regional and neighborhood shopping. The southern portion is envisioned as primarily single family neighborhoods, parks, local shopping, some multi-family housing, and a business park.”

Motion to approve the minutes for the CPUS meeting on July 16, 2019 by GL, with KR second:

Yes 9 (Including Chair)
No 0
Abst. 4 (RRW)(JB)(JM)(AD).

6:15 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Barry Bernstein:

Refreshments? Child care? Our responsibility to have these things.

HM: Comments on the Regents Road Bridge. (Comments appended). Comment on how density is defined for “under-developed” areas in UCP.

DA: Comments on the University City Parks Council. Comments appended.

JS: Protected bike lane on Beech street downtown is very beautiful; might this work for Nobel? Echoed BB views on child care.

JuM: Introduced herself as Barbara Bry’s new community representative.

6:23 Item 1 INFO ITEM – Recap of progress to date

DM summarized the past few months of the Plan Update Subcommittee’s activity.

6:30 Item 2 INFO ITEM – Online Survey Report (Dyett & Bhatia)

There were 1607 participants in the survey.

There is a booklet summarizing the responses to the survey printed by Planning:

DBR: Connection to the area, age, preference.

DBG: Went through the responses.

DBG: Park survey – location and amenities.

BB: Was safety asked?

DBR: Only bicycles, not evacuation.

DBG: Big response on including Sorrento Valley Coaster Station, access across Rose Canyon.

JS: Redevelopment of Costa Verde, new layout of La Jolla Village Square access are not contemplated in the survey, and a disaster for bicycles and pedestrians.

DM: Costa Verde is not such a big impact on survey, can’t speak to LVSQ just now.

DBR: These two will not be ignored.

- DM: Aware of issues; the projects will be measured against the old plan. But new plan will incorporate the CV and LVSQ projects as a worst case scenario in case the projects go forth as proposed.
- Carol: Note the Governor Drive & Regents/Genesee areas marked in the survey for commercial development. What is really planned for Genesee & Governor? Many schools are in the area.
- DM: No specifics yet for the land use, but will be addressed with further discussions.
- Peter: Any survey questions on the Rose Canyon area, evacuation plans, emergency vehicle access.
- DM: Current plan identifies fire station locations and the new plan will also address this as well.
- DBR: State requires fire safety studies as part of the EIR.
- Ruth: On the question of fire safety, as a canyon property owner the city has not done much.
- Aaron: Thanks for the easy to understand survey results. Better surveying of UCSD community is desirable.
- DK: Affordable housing has an actual definition. But most people don't know what this is when they respond to surveys.

6:50 Item 3 INFO ITEM – Land Use Focus Area Identification (Dyett & Bhatia)

- DBR: Consider Miramar restrictive use easements. Over 65DB CNEL maps define residential and school exclusion areas.
- DBR: APZS need to be considered for the community plan.
- BB: Community has noise issues.
- DBR: MHCP: 90% of the MHCP area must be protected.
- DBR: Ran through open space, schools, single family, multi-family condo, multifamily rental. Need to update each "type" map to reflect current development and housing types.
- DBR: The result is a composite map of all constraints of current use which might permit new uses in the revised plan.

Break for inspection of the maps introduced above so the community can critique the maps. Many Post-its were placed on the maps showing areas needing correction.

- AW: This is the time to make first order corrections to the map.
- JS: What is underutilized?
- DBR: Answer: intensity of building development intersected with land valuation.
- JS: Are there discussions with commercial owners not directly involved in the plan update process.
- DM: Definitely. There may be discussions outside the committee.
- DMR: Not necessary to capture every detail.
- DM: There is no specific number of units to add with new plan.
- GL: How is density in other areas of the city factored into what the city wants for UC?
- DM: Want to add density and growth, but not focus it here. If there are opportunities we want to take advantage of them, particularly in conjunction with the trolley.
- AW: If there is no number, how do we know when we are done? Is there a range or goal? There are numbers in other areas.
- DBR: Numbers for other areas do come from studies. We know it has to be a good number because of the investment in transit.

- DM: This is the first step in identifying the focus areas. Claremont was asked to supply a number and identify where it is to go. We are doing a different kind of analysis and will come up with the target based on the analysis.
- DK: Discussed the replacement of moderate income rental housing with luxury housing; this does not produce “reasonable” housing for the area.
- DBR: The state requires a housing element update. The city is starting this now.
- JS: Mission valley plan is pretty big.
- DiM: Maybe a more limited plan would be desirable. Counting on all of this infrastructure to work.
- KR: Hamstrung by the nature of the current housing. We can’t meet targets if we are just restricted to rental housing.
- DM: Considering more kinds mixed developments.
- HM: Our infrastructure is largely built and we need to consider general population growth – many people will not be able to afford to live here, pushing them to farther areas and making commutes worse.
- LP: VCs no longer require start ups to move to Bay Area, so we need to make sure we create housing that meets the needs for good talent in the tech space.
- JB: Granny flats?
- DM: DSD will grant AHUs ministerial.
- KM: The City wants density as a payback for the Trolley. He does not see where there will be a lot of housing here. UCSD build out will change our housing situation dramatically.
- Carol Peterson: We have difficult topography. Grids make things easier; we don’t have it.
- CN: A comment on the number of units to add and how this will figure into overall SANDAG/City goals. We don’t want to be in a situation where arbitrary changes are made in the plan that is otherwise carefully constructed and supported by solid analysis.
- AW: Appreciates the thoughtful comments and input to the plan.

8:58 Adjourned.