

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
University Town Center – Forum Hall
Executive Committee Monthly Meeting – Tuesday, November 12, 2013
Minutes (Draft)

Directors present: Janay Kruger (JK) (Chair), Meagan Beale (MB) (Vice-Chair), Kris Kopensky (KK) (Secretary), Andrew Wiese (AW), Nancy Groves (NG), John Bassler (JB), Caryl Lees Witie (CW), Nan Madden (NM), Pat Wilson (PW), Sam L. Greening (SG), Ash Nasser (AN), George Lattimer (GL), Marilyn Dupree (MD), Petr Krysl (PK), Lynne Guidoboni (LG), Ryan Perry (RP), Bruce Rainey (BR), Jason Moorhead (JM), Kyle Heiskala (KH), Robert Clossin (RC) (for Anu Delouri), and Kristin Camper (KC).

Directors absent: None.

1. **Call Meeting to Order** – Janay Kruger at 6:06 PM
2. **Pledge of Allegiance.**
3. **Agenda Adoption –**
 - a. Eastgate Techology Park item continued until January
Motion: Motion to approve as amended by MD and seconded by PW.
Vote: Unanimous, motion passed.
4. **Agenda Adoption**
 - a. PW recommended several grammatical errors that were discussed and noted
Motion: Motion to approve as amended by NG and seconded by RP.
Vote: 14 for, three abstentions (MD, BR, PK), motion passed.
5. **Announcements** – Janay Kruger (Chair)
 - a. Medical marijuana going to City Council vote. Some zones would affect north UC
 - b. Stanley park foundation to raise money, amending their development plan
 - a. Replace lawn and turf with a theater type of facility
 - b. Park Department states that it does not have to be reviewed by UCPG
 - c. Next meeting is December 5th at 7:00 PM at Stanley park
 - d. Looking for volunteers to join her, NG volunteered
 - c. Right turn lane at Miramar to Eastgte Mall which will take \$1.7M of FBA funds
 - a. The condemnation has been approved
 - b. It is not a finished item as the property owner is likely to oppose
6. **SDPD-**
 - a. Introductions
 - b. Commercial burglary on the rise, small businesses, window smashes, going in and taking cash out of the register
 - c. Bicycle thefts are common occurrences in the area
 - d. Sexual assault a few weeks ago
 - a. Suspect was hiding in the parking garage
 - b. Assaulted one female, possibly two other occurrences
 - c. Please be watchful for anyone lurking or loitering in a parking garage
 - e. PK: The PD charges a commercial property for investigating? A: They are charged for a false alarm, this discourages the owner from allowing the police to be alerted as they want to avoid the fee
 - f. PK: What are your thoughts on nextdoor.com? A: It's a social media forum that focuses on your neighborhood. We are seeing it being used for crime reporting and safety
7. GL: Several months ago you instituted a bicycle patrol, was that successful and are you still doing it? A: The two bike team members patrol on bike and vehicle. Hard to measure success of prevention. They are not dedicated to prevention only
8. **UCSD– RC**

- a. UCSD founders celebration is this Thursday and Friday celebrating 53rd anniversary
 - b. Project updates
 - c. Center for Novel Therapeutics moving to an EIR
 - d. **MB is now present for Voting**
 - e. JK: We think you are out of traffic trips. Second it competes with the community. A: This is not funded by UCSD, a third party will develop. It will be available to outside developers
 - f. GL: Is this part of the 500k sf project that is part of the general plan? A: Yes
- 9. Membership Report – John Bassler**
- a. Attendance sheet available
 - b. Review of membership policy and election requirements
- 10. Councilperson Sherri Lightner Office – Greg Parkington**
- a. V-calm on Lipmann, on schedule for install in the next few weeks
 - b. Bike network master plan to come to the council December 9th
 - c. Boards and commissions looking for volunteers, anyone interested contact Mel
 - d. Internship opportunities available, from HS to graduates, contact Mel
 - e. Looking for feedback on food truck regulations that allows them to operate on private property
 - f. KH: Bike master plan was prepared in 2011? What has happened since? A: There was an EIR and it has been sent out for comment
- 11. Supervisor Dave Roberts- Absent**
- 12. State Senator Marty Block – Absent**
- 13. Assemblywoman Toni Atkins – Absent**
- 14. 52nd District, Congressman Scott Peters- Absent**
- 15. MCAS Miramar – Kristin Camper**
- a. No update
- 16. Planning Department – Dan Monroe**
- a. Available for questions
- 17. Public Comment –**
- a. None
- 18. Action Item: La Jolla Commons III PTS 324553 Process 5, CPA, PDP, VTM to amend Planned Dev. Permit 252591 Sustainable Expedite Program/ Remove Residential Uses - Bhavesh Parikh and Sean Tobias - Hines**
- a. EIR addendum was completed and resolved issues with City
 - b. The EIR is not out for review, asking will this be an issue for vote?
 - c. JK: Review of EIR process and what is being asked
 - d. AW: What has been best practice? A: We can go either way
 - e. PK: Is the action to remove residential or replace and add office and hotel?
- Motion:** Motion to vote on whether or not to vote by KH, seconded by RP.
PK: Thinks it makes more sense to hear the project
- Motion tabled by KH**
- f. Review of project
 - a. PDP amendment sent
 - b. Proposed office and or hotel use
 - c. Traffic service is not impacted
 - d. New entitlement could be 224k sf office or 264 key hotel or 175 key hotel and 140k sf of office
 - e. Design is now square vs. rectangular
 - f. Planning for 10k sf of restaurant
 - g. PK: LEED certification of this tower? A: We don't know what level it is, but we are dedicated to pushing sustainability
 - h. RP: What's the allowable percentage that is retail? A: There isn't, it is an accessory use, the same as any office building

- i. PK: Could you give us trip numbers? A: Office, -29, hotel – 12, office/hotel -12, peak times increase slightly in office or office hotel combo
- j. PK: How do you calc the restaurant? A: Trips are calculated as office as it is an accessory use
- k. BR: Max height? A: Roughly 200 ft
- l. JB: Further conversation on trips
- m. GL: You're assuring us that the City has no significant issues or objections? A: Yes, Laura Black with the City was present and concurred that there are no issues
- n. GL: What were the three or four key issues that were brought up? A: Traffic study, one was engineering and storm water draw down time, had to resolve calculations, last was greenhouse gas analysis as it pertains to current standards. Laura Black concurred
- o. GL: Are you proposing bringing final design back to this committee? A: I would like the architecture to be approved tonight, unless there is a major issue or a deal breaker we would like support for the project
- p. GL: I understand that, so you are looking for project approval? A: Yes, we would like to not have architectural review to be a condition of the approval. If you approve tonight we are happy to review the direction we are going in when a decision is made
- q. JK: I think it would be nice for you to share as a courtesy call once the decision is made.

Motion: tabled motion withdrawn.

- r. GL: Typically we wait for a report but this group has been here several times, the City has told us they have reviewed the project and comments, and the group has agreed to come back

Motion: Motion to approve the removal of residential requirement and approve preliminary design by GL and seconded by JB. MB: Suggested addition to the motion to reserve the right to retract if there are significant changes. GL agreed to amend his motion, seconded by JB

Vote: 16 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention, motion passed.

19. Action Item: Coast Bike Rail Trail Plan, Select Preferred Alternative (s) - Abi

Payasded City of San Diego, Lane MacKenzie Real Estate Assets, City of San Diego

- a. Working group selected three out of seven options
- b. Community: What happened was that the consultants recommended moving forward 3 options, the working group had suggested 5 options. A: I disagree, there were 4, we dropped one as it was similar
- c. Review of project and three selected options
- d. Next steps
 - a. Workshop in December or January
 - b. Final report to council
 - c. Funding
 - d. EIR
 - e. Construction if funded
 - f. PK: It may be worthwhile to correct the original statement, the public workshop suggested route 2 and the other three routes would be studied. Alternative 4 is not subsumed by these three routes.
 - g. AW: You are saying that several segments of routes will be evaluated or routes? A: The EIR has not been approved so I can't speak to it, however I recommend that we look at these segments so that we can make the best decision. Can you tell me why you changed the process at the end? A: Not

changing the process, just explaining it in a different way. As PK suggests this doesn't include all four routes, so what your saying is not true

- h. PW: I was at the last meeting, my notes indicated that UCSD supported route 2,5,7,4,6 based on matrix and scoring would move forward. There was a suggestion to go through La Jolla Colony. I am on that board and the board opposed that. You have since eliminated the route. Do you agree? A: Preferably not, alternative 7 is private land owned by La Jolla Colony
- i. Discussion on loss of parking on Regents Road
- j. PW: How many spots? A: On Valencia there is an easement on the lower trail, parking eliminated where there are two lanes, and the third lane can be eliminated in some areas. Loss of 50 spaces. PW: There are a lot of people affected by loss of parking
- k. MB: I can not imagine why this wouldn't go through the UCSD campus
- l. RC: Not opposed to it coming through UCSD, there is a lot of bus and super loop traffic on Gilman
- m. AN: Logic behind route 7 and paving open space? Discussion on original purpose of path
- n. PK: JK, can you review how Caltrans found the money to fund the I-5 Genesee interchange and bike path? JK: Explanation of how Caltrans worked with SANDAG to value engineer
- o. KH: Alternative 2 and 4 are the only viable options
- p. BR: Given grade of Rosell canyon what is the plan? A: To effectively construct Rosell we would have to zig-zag
- q. AW: Review of how much it has been studied versus how it is being presented, as if it hasn't been studied. The route 2 was selected as 30% more viable than any alternate
- r. community: Encouraging considering an option east of the 5 to allow for commuting from UCSD
- s. community: There is not enough info to make a decision on the alternatives to eliminate some
- t. community: Rail line is usable, it should be considered, show of hands in favor of option 9
- u. community: Safety is biggest concern, supporting all three options at this point
- v. community: Support for alternative 2
- w. community: Concerned on the lack of information provided in order to make a decision
- x. community: How wide is the path at Rosell? A: Preferred is 14' existing path is 10'
- y. community: Support of option 9
- z. community: In support of 2 and removal of 5,6, and 7
- aa. community: Support of studying all three
- bb. community: Support of 2 and removal of 5,6, and 7
- cc. KH: I recognize the intent of the rail trail but want the trail to consider demand

Motion: Motion to urge the city to adopt alternative 2 and in addition remove 5,6, and 7 as well as include route 4 for the EIR by AW and seconded by PK.

Vote: Unanimous, motion passed.

20. Adjourn – 9:06 PM

Submitted by:

Kristopher J. Kopensky, Secretary
University Community Planning Group