

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

Overview

On Wednesday, April 28, 2010, the Community Plan Update Advisory Committee (CPUAC) held its third meeting. The following information summarizes the:

1. Meeting process
2. Meeting agenda
3. Meeting comments

1. Meeting Process

Per the Brown Act (open meetings), the meeting was publicly noticed and open to public attendance and comment. 20 CPUAC members attended; in total, the CPUAC has 32 members. 18 members of the community at-large attended. The room was arranged so that the CPUAC members were seated at rows of tables. The community at-large was seated at rows of chairs. The room arrangement recognized the formal role of the CPUAC to sustain the public discussion throughout the community plan update process.

City Staff facilitated the meeting and gave a presentation that included a review of the agenda, recap of the CPUAC Meeting #3, changes to the overall project schedule and presentations of the Conservation and the Land Use Community Plan Elements. Throughout the meeting, comments were charted on large sheets of paper that were displayed on easels. These charted comments summarized the ideas that were shared during the meeting and are summarized in this document.

2. Meeting Agenda:

The meeting was organized into these parts:

- Welcome and Introduction
- Review of agenda
- General Announcements and Public Comment
- Presentation and Discussion of Land Use Elements
- Presentation and Discussion of Conservation Element
- Mapping of Areas of Transition and Stability

The bulk of the meeting was dedicated to the presentations of the Land Use Element and Conservation Element and the community mapping exercise to identify areas of stability and transition. The community members reported out at the end of the meeting about their mapping exercise.

3. Meeting Comments:

Throughout the meeting, participants were able to comment on the meeting's agenda topics. Their comments were charted by one outreach team member. The following pages provide a summary of the comments received as well as the requests or action items that City Staff will track and add throughout the CPUAC process. These comments are summarized in the following order:

1. Welcome and Introduction

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4

Wednesday, April 28, 2010

2. Announcements & Public Comment
 3. Presentation & Discussion of General Plan Topics
 - a. Conservation Element:
 1. Presentation
 2. Public Discussion
 - b. Land Use & Community Planning Element:
 1. Presentation
 2. Public discussion
 4. Community Mapping Exercise and Report Out
 5. Adjournment
-
1. Welcome & Introduction
 - a. *(portion not recorded)*
 2. Announcements & Public Comment
 - a. Public:
 - i. In your timeline you didn't mention community planning group review. I'm guessing that during the EIR process, the community-planning group will get a chance to make their recommendation.
 - ii. A lot of groups did not know about the Open Mic event. It would great if an announcement would go out before the event.
 - iii. There are various issues with community cabs. Uptown planners are on their 4th proposal for streetcars. University Heights is pushing a proposal for [inaudible] on Mystic Park. There's going to be a discussion on density. We would like these discussions to be filtered through the planning staffs for them to review.
 - iv. Please respect the fact there are six communities in Uptown. We want to avoid one community making demands that affect the other communities, without the other community having input. It's led to friction in the past.
 3. Presentation and Discussion of General Plan Topics
 - a. Conservation Element – Bernie Turgeon, City Planning
 - i. Purpose-To become an international model of sustainable development and conservation. To provide for the long-term conservation and sustainable management of the rich natural resources that help define the City's identity, contribute to its economy and improve its quality of life.
 - ii. Definitions
 1. Conservation-the planned management, preservation and wise utilization of natural resources and landscapes.
 2. Sustainable development-development which respects the balance and relationship between economy, ecology and equity.
 - iii. Why conserve? Over the long term, conservation is the most cost-effective strategy to ensure that there will be a reliable supply of the resources that are needed now and in the future.
 - iv. What resources? Resources (land, water, air, biodiversity, minerals, natural minerals, recyclables, topography, views, energy) are highly valued in San Diego. Conservation is human kind's relationship to the

natural environment. We need to understand the benefits conferred by that relationship. These benefit all people and future generations. There is a sense of equity in conservation and sustainable development.

v. Initiatives

1. Lots going on for conservation at the city, regional and state levels.
2. In the city of San Diego (CiSD), conservation crosses departments to serve an environmental and economic benefit.
3. The CiSD is addressing climate change and conservation as a part of the community plan update. They are participating with SANDAG on the Regional Climate Action Plan Strategy.
4. The CiSD's main jurisdictional responsibility is with its land use planning authority and the reduction of vehicular miles traveled. That's what we can focus on through the planning update: getting people out of cars.
 - a. The community plan update can target pedestrian/bicycle improvement, traffic signal synchronization, neighborhood power generation and other measures to curb emissions.
5. Energy Policy Initiative Center-run out of USD. It's putting together a greenhouse gas inventory and policy guide.

vi. Policies

1. Reduce CiSD's carbon footprint. To do so, we must reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled.
2. Reduce construction and demolition waste in accordance with Public Facilities Element, Policy PF-I-2, or by renovating buildings, rather than constructing new buildings where feasible.
 - a. Retrofitting existing buildings to modern standards, including energy efficiency.
 - b. Adaptive reuse use of historical buildings can have a benefit on landfill waste as well as energy use.
3. Design and build energy efficient buildings where feasible using "green" technology and principles such as...innovative site design and building orientation that address sun-shade patterns, prevailing winds, landscape and sunscreens and use of energy self-generation with renewable technologies.
 - a. General plan strategy happens on a city wide level, but there's an opportunity to look at community specific implementation.
4. Reduce the San Diego Urban Heat Island, heat reflections from paving and other sources. We can reduce this by:
 - a. Planting trees and other vegetation to provide shade and cool air temperatures. In particular, properly position trees to shade buildings, air conditioning units and parking lots.
 - b. Reducing heat build up in parking lots through increased shading or use of cool paving materials.

5. Biological Diversity
 - a. Preserve natural habitats pursuant to the MSCP (Multiple Species Conservation Program), preserve rare plants and animals to the maximum extent practicable and manage all city-owned native habitats to ensure their long-term biological viability.
 - i. There is a possibility of looking at resources within canyons and provide management direction during the community plan update.
 - ii. Things to consider: urban runoff and the presence of invasive species.
6. Open Space and Landform Preservation
 - a. A more detailed explanation was given at March 20th workshop.
 - b. Canyons are a key factor in identifying landform.
 - c. Things to consider: identification of view corridors, compatibility of development along canyons and interface with Balboa Park.
 - d. Maximize the incorporation of trails and greenways linking local and regional open space and recreational areas into the planning and development review process.
 - i. There is a large need for greenways, particularly within the central portion of the community and as a way to establish more links to the canyons and Balboa Park.
 - ii. A continuous tree canopy can make a big difference.
7. Coastal Resources
 - a. Implement watershed management practices designed to reduce runoff and improve the quality of runoff discharge into coastal waters.
 - b. Encourage conservation measures and water recycling programs that eliminate or discourage wasteful uses of water.
 - c. Some of this community's runoff ends up in the San Diego Bay, which is regulated by various city and state agencies.
8. Urban Runoff Management
 - a. Manage floodplains to address their multi-purpose use, including natural drainage, habitat preservation and open space and passive recreation, while also protecting public health and safety.
 - b. Stormwater Curb Extensions-retrofit streets from auto use to green infrastructure. Curb extensions capture water runoff and infiltrate it into the soil. They also capture most of the runoff before it reaches the storm drains. Curb extensions also offer an aesthetic benefit.
9. Air quality

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- a. Preserve and plant trees and vegetation that are consistent with habitat and water conservation policies and that absorb carbon dioxide and pollutants. A healthy urban forestry has a direct benefit to air quality.
10. Urban Forestry
 - a. Develop, nurture and protect a sustainable urban/community forest.
 - b. Include community street tree master plans in community plans.
 - c. CiSD has over 230,000 city-owned street trees.
 - d. Trees help define community character, are a good urban design technique and help frame streets.
11. Some things to do:
 - a. Identify walking and bicycling improvements as alternatives to the automobile.
 - b. Identify historic resources to promote retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings.
 - c. Develop a trails plan.
 - d. Identify view corridors.
 - e. Develop a street tree master plan.
 - f. Identify measures to capture and improve the quality of urban runoff.
- vii. Public Comment and Discussion
 1. Public Comment #1:
 - a. I just read a survey of air quality and ozone pollution. San Diego ranked in the top ten in the country. Let's keep this in mind while we plan. Our air may look clean but it's "terrible."
 2. Public Comment #2:
 - a. The street tree master plan needs to be broader to include the whole parkway. There should be a policy to retrofit irrigation. My community has no control of the parkway.
 - b. Is the Energy Policy Initiative Center's (USD) study a citywide study?
City: I believe it's regional.
 3. Public Comment #3:
 - a. I'd like us to be doing more storm water management.
 - b. We need more information on our storm water drains and where they go.
 - c. How's the storm water management currently occurring?
City: A request for information on how storm water prevention is occurring in your area?
 4. Public Comment #4:
 - a. If we go past Stage 2 in water restrictions that needs to be accounted for with development.
 5. Public Comment #5:
 - a. Thought the presentation was great.

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- b. I liked the idea of the storm drain curb extensions. Two areas where they could be placed are: 5th and University and 5th and Washington.
 - c. Also, lots of trees have fallen due to recent storms. Are they a priority?
City: So, addressing immediate concerns versus the long-term?
6. Public Comment #6:
- a. What are the plans for bike paths?
City: My understanding is there's a city-wide bike plan? Yes. There's a bicycle master plan. They're having an open house. I believe that's May 20th. The draft plan is out. We're going to take the results of that plan and that will inform the community plan. That's a separate plan so we encourage you to participate in that open house.
City: Do you know where the meeting is?
City: I believe the Hall of Champions.
7. Public Comment #7:
- a. On the idea of adaptive reuse of retrofitting buildings, the greenest building is the one already built. Because the energy efficiency of a new building is wiped out by the action of tearing down the old building and building a new one. I'd like to focus on that.
8. Public Comment #8:
- a. The master plan for the CiSD storm management wants to turn drains into flood control channels and remove vegetation.
 - b. The bike master plan focuses on 4th and 5th, maybe 6th would be a better option.
9. Public Comment #9:
- a. Where do the references to policy come from?
City: They come from the conservation element of the general plan. The general plan is on the CDs on the AC binders.
 - b. Public: Were we supposed to react to the policies? To the "Things To Do?"
City: These are suggested actions we need to do as we develop the community plan update.
Public: Those are suggestions?
City: It's certainly not inclusive or absolute.
Public: So this is what development is suggested?
City: We certainly want your response now and as we go through the process.
 - c. City: Are there any reactions to the "Things To Do" slide?
Public: There are general resources that already exist that we can incorporate into these ideas. We do not need to start from scratch.

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

10. Public Comment #10:

- a. Regarding a street tree master plan, is there one already in place? Or are we starting from scratch?

City: Some things we are starting from ground zero, other things we are building off existing plans.

Public: Can you change the slide to say “Things we have” and “Things we need to start fresh”?

City: I just want to clarify, the master plans are for the city but the controlling plan for implementation is the community plan. When we look at master plans, we look to see if those policies are still prudent for our community or we should change that policy. If the community plan differs from the master plan, we will amend the master plan down the line. But if they do differ, it's the community plan that controls.

11. Public Comment #11:

- a. We can incentivize new development by changing out areas that are water intensive for ones that are more arid approach.

12. Public Comment #12:

- a. Under the “Things To Do,” we should add public transportation to walking and bicycling improvements as alternatives to the automobile.

b. Land Use and Community Planning Element – Marlon Pangiliinan, City Planning

- i. City: I'm going to follow Bernie's outline and not get into too many specifics. I'll focus on Land Use and how it's pertinent to planning. I would suggest reviewing the policies. The current list of policies is the most up-to-date from the CiSD.

ii. City of Villages Strategy

1. This strategy focuses growth into mixed-use activity centers that are pedestrian-friendly, centers of community, linked to the regional transit system.
 - a. This fits well with the CiSD plan to reduce green house emissions by limiting the number of vehicle miles traveled.
2. This strategy draws upon strengths of San Diego's natural environment, neighborhoods, commercial centers, institutions and employment centers.
3. It focuses on long-term economic, environmental and social health of the CiSD and its many communities.
4. Recognizes distinctive neighborhoods and open spaces.
5. The update had specific direction to:
 - a. Identify villages and suitable mixed-use village development sites that will complement existing community fabric or help achieve a desired community character. This will all be done through input gathered by the community planning groups.

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- b. Conduct environmental review and focused study during the community plan update process of potential village locations to determine if locations are appropriate.
- 6. Hierarchy of Village Types and Mixed-Use Locations
 - a. Downtown-administrative, legal, cultural and entertainment center of the region.
 - b. Subregional Employment Areas-major employment and/or commercial districts with adjacent multi-family uses (ie, Mission Valley, Morena, Sorrento Mesa).
 - c. Urban Village Centers-higher density/intensity areas located subregional employment, characterized by a cluster of more intensive employment residential, regional and subregional commercial uses that maximize walkability and support transit.
 - d. Community and Neighborhood Village Centers-can be found and located in almost every community with local-serving commercial, office and multi-family residential uses. They are typically located within older communities. These centers are prevalent in our communities. Some have already been identified, but through the community plan these will be formally recognized. These centers are pedestrian and transit oriented and range in size. Will we want to identify more centers? We will have this opportunity to do this through the Charette process.
- iii. General Plan and Land Use Categories
 - 1. Helps bridge the gap between community plans and the general plan.
 - 2. Discusses bringing consistency to land use designations while maintaining diversity of plan land uses.
 - 3. Previously we had 160 land use designations. In the general plan process, we distilled them down to 30 recommended land use designations.
 - 4. Community has the opportunity to specify the density ranges.
- iv. Consistency
 - 1. Discusses the need for consistency between zoning and land use policy for effective and successful general and community plans. I know we've had a problem with this in the past with ministerial projects that have not had the opportunity for public comment.
 - 2. Goals:
 - a. Zoning concurrent with plan updates and amendments to ensure consistency with land use designations.
 - b. Zones or development regulations that better implement updated plans.
- v. Community Planning
 - 1. This is an essential element.

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

2. Discusses community plans as significant and vital components of the General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element.
 3. Due to the CiSD's diverse nature, the structure of community planning is necessary in order to provide detailed land use designations and community-specific land use policy recommendations.
 4. Community plans are to be updated regularly with public input, the provision of public facilities, and with recommendations that are understandable and implementable.
 5. Specific directions in the general plan update:
 - a. Prepare community plans to address specific aspects of the community and site-specific recommendations, while creating a plan with achievable goals.
 - b. The community plan is a vehicle for implementing state law pertaining to the provision of housing opportunities.
 - c. The community plan needs to preserve or improve housing capacity of residential land use to ensure compliance with city, regional planning goals.
 6. City: I'm going to bring in Susan Baldwin, a Regional Housing Planner with SANDAG, to explain the regional housing demand and how it's developed.
 7. City:
 - a. SANDAG has a housing responsibility to work with the state to determine regional housing needs for the County of San Diego. They must also allocate the needs to each jurisdiction.
 - b. Within each jurisdiction, we must allocate according to income levels. There are four levels: very low, low, moderate and above moderate.
 - c. Each jurisdiction prepares a housing element, updated every 5 years (that will change to every 8 years). Cities will then identify available sites to take care of the regional housing need, numbers they received from SANDAG. SANDAG has a lengthy process to determine those numbers. For very low and low income levels, jurisdictions need to make enough land zoned for 30 dwelling units per acre or more.
 - d. SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan along with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment looks at different plans to meet green house gas emission targets that California assigns to each region. We don't have targets yet. We'll be getting a draft in June and the final targets in September. We will use land use patterns, transportation network, transportation demand management measures (ie, carpooling, telecommuting) and other measures (ramp metering, tolling, HOV lanes) to help hit those emission targets.
- vi. Public Comment and Discussion

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

1. Public Comment #1:

- a. The CiSD General Plan had 80,000 housing units potential in excess of the SANDAG projection. Is there an update figure?

City: I don't know what the CiSD's housing element stated regarding the number of units.

City: I think it's closer to 90,000 units. SANDAG projects to 2050. In the forecast there's about 1 million more people county wide over the next 30 years.

City: And about 300,000 housing units.

City: Our share is about 45% if you take it proportionally. On the regional level, to preserve open space in the backcountry, the CiSD is taking on more development. That's something we're required to do. We feel we have enough capacity for a couple housing element cycles. To meet 2050 numbers, that's everything built to max, which isn't realistic. This is all a part of that long ranging planning process.

2. Public Comment #2:

- a. How did land uses go from 160 to 30?

City: That was something that happened before I started in the General Plan section. My understanding was that staff took all the community plans in the city and listed all different land use designations there were. Then they were placed in categories (ie, commercial, multi family residential, single family). That's how we distilled them to about 30. We then broke them out into density ranges. It was a systematic process.

City: One of the reasons that was done was because in the 44 communities in CiSD a lot of communities were saying pretty much the same land use but using a different term. It was causing a lot of confusion, so we're trying to normalize it.

3. Public Comment #3:

- a. Although the '89 plan was fairly visionary, there were several areas the CiSD used from that very plan. One thing the plan did not capture was form-based land use. One of my big fears in the Hillcrest community is that it's really dying on the vine. There are a lot of vacancies, but also there are things falling off the buildings. We're in a sea of strip malls from Date Street to Park. I count 20.

City: Are you linking form-based code to that?

Public: Yes. I think there's a way to change that.

Because my big fear is that District 3 turns into a redevelopment area. I mean they're trying to do that downtown [inaudible] in the rest of East Village. And then there are a lot of eminent domain issues. I don't

think this community wants to go that route and if we don't promote good land use issues then there's the problem of it turning into that because no one would want to invest in a mandatory 60 foot height. That's just backwards thinking.

City: To your first point, you're experiencing an economic decline and better form-based code would help fix that problem?

Public: It's beyond the economic decline. It's literally disintegrating because there's no investment. Little Italy is getting a lot. A lot of other communities are getting a lot. That's my point. If we don't use our land use code right no one will want to invest in this community because it would be too restrictive.

City: Your second point?

- b. Public: I think we need to think about living where you work. Talking about Hillcrest, there are a lot of offices where you can ride to work, bike to work, walk to work. One of the good things about our original community plan was a [inaudible], you put the density along the corridors and leave the single-family neighborhoods alone. I think we need to look at work/live zoning codes or more offices in the residential, especially Hillcrest.

City: Bill are you going to say something to that?

City: We've got it noted.

4. Public Comment #4:

- a. In the gross projection of 2050, of that one million, how much of that is from natural growth in California versus immigration? Because the way that I hear it now, our growth is coming from births, not human migration.

City: Two-thirds is a natural increase.

Public: So if all of stayed here and no one else came in, that's where we would have to house our families.

City: And a big growth is in the 65 and older category.

- b. Public: I would like to comment. What Susan is saying is correct. But I would like to point out what Professor Richard Karstens, former chair of the USD Economic Department, has said: the fact is right but the conclusion is misleading. SANDAG looks at the net difference of births minus deaths and the net difference of people moving out of here versus moving in. If you look at the figures, there are four times as many people moving here as are born here. You are correct, but the interpretation is highly misleading.

Public: I would like to add on to that. I've looked at SANDAG's projections and for the last five years we've had either stagnant population or lost population. The basis for the projection is that there is always a boom

after a bust and somewhere down the line we are going to be increasing our population. That remains to be seen. I think it was stated correctly. I think at least half of that new population growth will be senior citizens, which will take special type housing. One thing that Tom did not mention were how many people who are born here and move elsewhere and that's one of Mr. Karsten's major issues. The City of Villages says that we will have villages throughout the CiSD and they're each going to take population density. A few people thought 30 people per acre was high. In Hillcrest and the medical complex, the average population per acre was 49! We have one of the highest population bases in the CiSD and that needs to be taken in consideration. For example, Mission Beach has one of the highest population densities and I think we can all agree you're not going to be able to put much more population there. I think in Uptown were in a situation where our facilities are so burdened that other communities will need to pick up the slack. City: You said 30 persons per acre. The state's definition is 30 dwelling units per acre. So that would be typically 60-90 people per acre depending on if they're single family or multi family. It would probably closer to 60 people per acre.

Public: Throughout the CiSD the population density was 24. We have roughly twice the density of other areas.

City: Are you talking about all of Hillcrest or just a particular portion?

Public: I don't know the other figures. But Bankers Hill has a high density, it's significantly high in University Heights and Mission Hills.

5. Public Comment #5:

- a. I think SANDAG's numbers to all of this is critical. There needs to be confidence put into the numbers before there is willingness to accept this density. What I'd like to know is: historically how accurate have these numbers been? Because I don't feel that I have confidence in these numbers. Also, in Hillcrest there are a lot buildings grandfathered in at high density without parking. That creates a problem of accepting more density with parking. This grandfathers in a lot development because no one wants to change something with high density with no parking. Even though it needs to be redeveloped. It's a contradiction, we have the density but we don't have the facilities or the parking to go with it.

City: So we need to have a little more information about these numbers?

Public: I want to see that historically these numbers are working.

Public: I want to correct myself Bill. Dwelling units per acre you were correct. 49 dwelling units per acre in Uptown, compared to 24 in the others.

City: We can have a follow-up about SANDAG's numbers. Actually, Susan can talk about their historical accuracy.

City: You may want more information. But the historical accuracy of SANDAG's work has been excellent-less than 1% difference in what has actually taken place from the standpoint of population growth. Our most recent forecast really takes into account the downturn in the economy. We use to project 1 million population growth in 2020, then 2030 now it's 2050. We've really reflected changes in our region in our forecast.

Public: What ever number you come up with, we need to work on that number so we can have enough resources for them, enough water for them, enough electricity for them. I think if we have that kind of population growth coming that's the first puzzle piece the city needs to work on before you start taking away the quality of life away from these neighborhoods.

Public: As a mathematician, I just can't justify. You just told me you were within one percent and then you told me you change a million over three periods 2020 to 2050. How can you be accurate to 1% when you change a million over a 30-year period? That's why there is skepticism in the room. I want people to rally behind the numbers, but when you make that kind of statement I can't believe it.

City: Let's slow down the pace of the question.

Public: How do you justify your numbers?

City: I'm not our resident demographer, but we do these forecasts every four years. So when we do these forecasts we do a lot of research of the state level, the national level, on the local level of what is going on from an economic standpoint, a births over deaths standpoint.

Public: It's a simple question. You said you were 1% accurate and you said you were off by one million.

City: I think what Susan is saying is every four years we look at our assumptions and our assumptions might change.

Public: I want an accurate number. You can't be 1% accurate and be 1 million off over a 30-year period.

City: Year by year that number can be off. But on that historical trend that number is fairly accurate. Part of it is that they do adjust it every four years, taking into account demographic trends, economic trends, things like that. I think what we will do is ask SANDAG's demographer to make a presentation. About the forecast, it is reviewed by some of the top demographers in the state, from UC Berkeley, USC and others. Rather than us trying to give you the answer, we'll bring in the demographer.

6. Public Comment #6:

a. What is the current cycle we are planning for?
Because I know the plan goes to 2050, but I don't think we need to add that into our plan.

b. Is there any legal requirement that requires a specific density be placed in Uptown?

City: The general plan horizon is around 20 years. Under SB-375 and consistency with the SANDAG regional forecast and state law, they are required to look out to 2050. Is that right? Excuse, me. It's 2035 and are modeling out to 2050. As a region, we have to have our land use plans be in coordination with that 2035 date. General plans we tend to update every 20 years or so. It's usually 20-25 years it actually happens. The way we look at our community plans under the general plan is to update the community plan every 5 years if we can. We'll see if the city can maintain that kind of schedule on the community plan. The housing element is updated every 8 years to coincide with the regional transportation planning as well. You have these different cycles that are required on a regional level and a city level. If we don't meet these targets on a city level or if SANDAG doesn't meet them on a regional level, it can affect infrastructure funding we get from the state. Also, if it's determined we aren't meeting our housing number or aren't planning adequately for our housing number, the state can force us to take on more density. We'd rather shape that than have the state force us to do it. Also, it's not just a question of the numbers, the state looks at our ability to deliver the numbers in the plan. That is probably where we are the weakest: where we might have the numbers, we have a lot of constraints in delivering the numbers in plans for various reasons. So that's one of the things they focused on. We had an affordable housing organization sue us on the last housing element.

Public: On the General Plan?

City: No, the housing element. Which is part of the General Plan, but done separately. So the housing element was sued by the housing advocates for not having enough proactive capacity for affordable housing in the city. As a General Plan policy, which is adopted and the basis for the program EIR, it calls for each community to maintain or increase the number of units they have in the community plan. Now that's a policy and we take the policy seriously. However, it's a policy that can be considered. It doesn't require each community increase it. If they reduce density in one area of the community, it is our job to replace units elsewhere in the community. We look at all of that city-wide. So, we have that flexibility to consider decreasing the current density in one area of community but find replacement housing capacity in another community. That's one of the things that can be considered as a part of this.

7. Public Comment #7:

- a. The growth estimates for the past 10 years have been way off. We haven't grown like we were estimated to grow. We have a ton of housing and very little of that is affordable. We're spending all this time discussing how to put in more housing but we're spending very little time on quality of life of the community.

City: So that demographer coming out would be helpful to that first point?

Public: I guess. They're not going to tell us that we're going to have 1 million more people by 2020.

City: By 2040.

8. Public Comment #8:

- a. My understanding on SB-375 is that it puts requirements on regional and local planning groups. But the statute states that it does not override local land use decisions.

City: That's correct.

- b. Public: Secondly, my understanding on the General Plan is that the city defers to community plans on issues of density. Which gets to your point, are there legal requirements for us to accept more density? My answer is, No. My question is: Do we want more? My answer is, No. Unless someone can show us that there is adequate infrastructure to support it there should be none. I think that's perfectly legitimate policy and that's my opinion.

City: If I understand correctly, density can stay the same, shift or increase?

City: Correct.

City: You can also decide to move it around.

Public: The point is: do we have the flexibility to move it around?

City: Yes. As a community, you have some options.

9. Public Comment #9:

- a. Just to clarify your last statement, when people come to these types of meetings and say, 'You're going to have to get used to density.' That's not a true statement. Correct? If communities are satisfied with its level of density then they do not have to take more density.

City: It's the planned density.

Public: Any more planned density.

City: You can move it around.

Public: Because people come into these meetings and said they're going to tell us where to take more density because you're going to have to. That's not a true statement. Correct?

City: Do you have to? No.

Public: It's one of the statutes.

10. Public Comment #10:

- a. I live south of University on Vermont Street. Hillcrest would be a very boring place if we didn't put Uptown there and Ralphs and Trader Joe's and the shops there and Hillcrest Cinemas and all the places that we love about Hillcrest. I vote against the idea that we are completely opposed to more density. I agree there are structure issues and historic buildings and things we want to preserve. There is a lot shock around and a lot of crap (laughter) around us. I hope we have the imagination to say: 'Wow, what makes Hillcrest great today. Why do we have a huge parking lot at the DMV that's not serving anything? What can we do with that to make it more exciting? We need more parking for our businesses.'

City: That's an excellent segue to the mapping phase.

11. Public Comment #11:

- a. The money for infrastructure comes from redevelopment.

City: Partly. We'll have a whole discussion about facility financing later on in this process. We're running out of time and need to get to the exercise.

4. Community Mapping Exercise

- a. City: This is the first run at it and it's going to be reviewed by you all at the Charette process. But to figure out where to focus our efforts, we want to map and identify areas of stability and transition within the community. Areas of stability and transition are not judgmental about which way it should transition or whether it's good or bad being stable. For example, some communities of stability are areas that are in deed stable and should stay the

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- same. Other communities say that they are stable, but we would like them to change--we don't like the way they are. Areas in transition are areas that are changing over the last ten years but for different reasons. One might be because of physical change, either up or down. There might be economic changes. Before the recession, you saw a lot of economic pressure to develop and anticipate over the long run when the economy recovers, there's going to be extra economic pressure and that needs to be shaped. There are cultural changes. For example, Mission Hills. There is stability in terms of building stock. Because people like Mission Hills, people tend to age in place in Mission Hills. The demographics seemed to change towards more families growing there with young children versus 20-30 years ago. That's a change in demographics even though there was no physical change. A good example is in college towns. Every four years you have turnover but it's the same type of folks--that's stable even though there's a change in population.
- b. City: We'd like to do this exercise. It's an approach to tackle the issue of: how do you plan for a large community? There is nothing that is set in stone. Over the next couple of weeks, we will refine the process.
 - c. City: What we want to do is break apart these tables and add another table to spread out a map onto. Each group will get a member of the city and the design team. We will bring you the maps and pens. We want to integrate the public and the advisory committee so everyone has a chance to contribute. We'll have about 20 minutes for the exercise. You can prioritize your ideas and we'll do a report out afterwards to close out the meeting.
 - d. (Exercise commences)
 - e. Public Group #1:
 - i. Our group noticed there are some very stable, physical environments like University Heights, the greater Mission Hills area, Marsten Hills, southern University Heights. We identify a very stable cultural, gay community all the way from North Park all the way through Hillcrest. Someone commented that it seemed to be moving economically through the East. Also, it seems this area seems to be going through a change demographically--young families selling out to professional, new families are coming in. There are probably more kids coming in because the population was really aging. I don't know if that's part of the college syndrome. There was a strong feeling all of our economic corridors-University Avenue, Washington-are going through economic change. We see change in the spaces, the uses, trying to figure out who we're going to be next. You hear that a lot at the associations and discussions. We have a similar change going on on 4th and 5th down to lower Bankers Hill: a physical change and a lot density coming in. We see a lot of this in lower Bankers Hill. You have a historic building and a law office and an SRO. You don't really know where it's going. The types of stores and restaurants are changing. Then there is the part in between, the Hillcrest area/Laurel and Park, where it's in transition and there's nothing there. You can walk past Laurel and Park and it's very dark and vacant and then you hit Pennsylvania and it picks back up. It's an aging population demographically in Hillcrest. There are many more kids moving in to University Heights, but that might be a part of that natural turnover.

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4

Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- ii. City: Can you locate that aging area?
- iii. Public Group #1: That's University Heights. As everyone aged, there were no kids there. Then you started seeing more kids. Caltrans work needs work/bike path. We're just trying to say that there is an opportunity while Caltrans work was going on to try to get a more natural path from the park to Hillcrest without having to go out on 6th Avenue. There are also opportunities along the 163 behind those properties. We also identified this area here as going through economic change. The newspaper pointed out a hole in the proposal for the marine base and special changes to the airport that could have a huge impact in what will go on here.
- f. Public Group #2:
 - i. Our group is mostly from the Mission Hills area or hospital area. Our comments pretty much focus on those two areas. We didn't really focus on Bankers Hill, Hillcrest or University Heights. For the area of Washington north to the hospital area, it was noted that UCSD might have a need to increase housing. Although, it's a question whether the housing would be appropriate for the hospital based on the pricing in that area. Definitely, a need for increase in transportation to UCSD. We also noted the built environment around UCSD would be changing. It's the same thing for the built environment on Washington between Dove and 1st Avenue because of plans to redevelop the grocery stores, the new library and maybe more commercial buildings. The commercial buildings/the built environment along Washington, east of Dove, are probably in transition.
 - ii. I'm from UCSD. In regards to growth, our last long-range development plan was dated until 2009. We don't have a long long-range development plan or something to be working on. In terms of growth, I would not say we are definitely going to grow or we are growing. In our last planning meeting, they said we would grow a certain amount but we have not hit those maximum numbers.
 - iii. It was pointed out on 3rd Avenue that a lot of historic buildings have been lost. There's a desire for some stability in that area. We noted the north and south Mission Hills, with the exception of Reynard, is pretty much stable. In terms of growth environment, the housing stock is pretty stable. I don't really know if the demographics have been changing with younger families coming in. In terms of built environment, it's been pretty stable. We have a couple business regions along West Lewis and down on the 5 Points area that are commercial areas that serve the residential areas. We feel these areas are very stable. They've been commercial areas since the area was developed. Businesses have turned over a little bit, but the built environment has stayed the same. There is a desire for more stability in parts of the Hillcrest area that we've been losing historic properties. We've identified a lot of areas that are stable, but what about additions? I'll tell you any time there's an addition the neighbors go ballistic. It causes a lot of angst in the community, especially when they add second story, granny flats.
 - iv. City: Is it because of the addition itself or the design?

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- v. Public Group #2: No. I think it's the addition. You have these narrow 50-foot wide lots and when you add a second level it practically kills the neighbors shade. That's what I see.
- vi. Here's a related issue to that. We have a lot of infill things. We'll have someone build something. They'll go through the permit process. Neighbors will get involved, there are setbacks, they ask for various things. Then things are prescribed and the house is built. Years later, they go back and make changes. Apparently, the CiSD permit process doesn't look back at what was done 5 years ago (which was approved by the city and the neighbors) and the permit just goes through.
- vii. I'd like to add on to the point about the quality of additions and some of the things they can engender in the future. When people make these additions, owners will rent out the addition. This leads to more parts of the house (the garage) being converted illegally for more housing, to make more money. That reduces parking and increases density.
- viii. City: Do you see this in a particular area?
- ix. Public Group #2: I see this a lot in University Heights. In areas that are not strongly single family residential--Lincoln, Cleveland, Maryland. My main concern is parking. Just drive around. Places where there is no parking--that's where it's going on. It's actually pitting neighbor against neighbor.
- g. Public Group #3:
 - i. Established neighborhoods are pretty stable. Over the last 20 years, there hasn't been any building. There's a couple zoned MR-1000 that have been the really big activity. That's been going on in Park West and Bankers Hill area. The reason we circled the hospital areas is because there is some building going on but we do not have any control of that. The University Heights area is currently stable. We have the economic hit inside the built environment--indicating it's as stable as the built environment. The transitions should be the corridors of: Washington, University and some of Robinson all the way down to 1st, 4th 5th and 6th (excluding some really nice historical homes on 2nd and 3rd), 5 Points and Reynard Way. What can we do to get more quality housing, maybe that's where more affordable housing goes. Economically, this corridor all the way through 5th is unstable. One day you'll see a sign for a business, the next you'll see a vacancy. This is all up 4th and 5th. Obviously on 5th between Robinson and University, we thought that was in transition. The DMV isn't transitional because they're proposing a project with the housing. Then economically, for the hospitals, Mercy's building a huge addition, then they just put up a parking lot on 5th.
- h. Public Group #4:
 - i. We just did Bankers Hill. I do want to address one issue that needs to be addressed in the plan update. Traditionally, we have taken about 60% of all the growth in Uptown. I've heard from other communities that when a new big building gets put in: 'That belongs in Bankers Hill.' Traditionally, all the funds, including the parking meter funds,

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

seem to go North. If I was someone who was coming from the outside and looking at the big picture, I'd be looking at the airport and realizing that the airport overlay goes through about 2/3rds of this community. For safety reasons, I would say to put the density up here. I agree with everyone that we have too much density in Uptown. I hope that we support other communities and, I hope, that other communities will support us. As far as our current plan, perhaps it's one of the best in Uptown. The reason I say that is the airport issue was addressed at the time of original plan. We have several transitional zones. 6th, 5th and the west side of 4th these are already areas picked for higher density. There are lot of projects already being planned along there. Some of them are over 55 feet. This is a discretionary zone. We call this an economic area. We'd really like to see nice restaurants, nice businesses and office space. We'd like to make this a beautiful corridor that would compliment the park. So, this is an area of transition that is happening now. Coming from Bankers Hill, we see this as an area where our future commercial area-that's transitional. Below Juniper, we have an interesting situation. It's in the airport overlay zone. Most things are height restricted to roughly 40-feet. There are some beautiful older buildings that are there. There are some buildings that can be rehabbed and some that can be replaced. The advantage to this zone for housing is that it can be work force housing for people downtown. You have a lot of old apartment buildings that are single family and a lot of multi unit housing. We think that should be built upon. This is something that is transitional because it can be rehabbed. Likewise, we have this one area over here that is [inaudible]. Along Reynard is transitional. There are a lot of old houses that need to be renewed. There are two areas we think are stable. 1) East 4th down to Chris Canyon: a lot of historic structures, a lot of single-family neighborhoods and a lot of canyons. The canyons do not have much access. City fire regulations recommend keeping these types of areas low density. This area has been proposed for historic districts and conservation districts. 2) Central area: the area is stable because it's already built out. There are high-rises throughout this area. There are still airport issues that won't allow much more development to go in there now. Something that we really need is a grocery store. Hopefully, we can get a farmer's market and turn this into the central area for Bankers Hill. That's what we're looking at: mass areas of stability, respect for the historic structures along this area, if no one wants the curtain wall we'll have high-rises along 6th. That's what we've been pretty successful with. If you go down 6th north of Laurel, there's a lot of historic structures. We've gotten quite a few designated over the past few years. The idea is not to have modern stuff next to historic. 5th Avenue: I think offices and restaurants would be good. In terms of demographics, when I first moved in to Bankers Hill, that whole area was kind of a secret area. In the last 20 years, I have seen it become very modern and seen a lot more young adults in the area. But I don't think this neighborhood has a lot of young

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

families with children because it's a lot multi family existing structures. So it's interesting to see an influx of young adults in addition to the older people. We have a lot of senior housing with more slated to be increased. It's borderline stodgy, but it's moving into a more exciting area. At the same time, it's a little different vibe because there are a lot of beautiful single-family areas. We need offices and more high-end retail so people can live and work in this area. To reduce this, the bifurcation of those transportation corridors really impacts our access to park on the east side and west side. There are ways that we can direct traffic with signage to get people off 4th, 5th and 6th and over to the freeways. Something needs to be done to reduce the traffic impact. Already stop signs have been added and they haven't made much of a difference. It's truly a wonderful walking community. This truly is a wonderful pedestrian access. The orientation should be west-east. We spent three-four years fighting to get basic stop signs. The impacts have been amazing. The accident rate dramatically falls. The assumption is: this is a corridor we want to keep the buses moving. These aren't typically used for buses, except one commuter bus goes through. 13 million people use Balboa Park. The whole point of this neighborhood is the orientation downtown, workforce, pedestrianism and the interaction with Balboa Park. This is not a corridor you can move a lot people through, particularly when you get gridlock up in Hillcrest. I don't know of any feasible fixes to that road system that isn't going to continue that gridlock. Our neighborhood is very impacted by Balboa Park. Something needs to be done to accommodate those people going to Balboa Park. They need somewhere to park other than the streets of our community. Another point, the battle over paid parking versus non-paid parking. To keep workforce housing down, a lot of the older buildings do not have onsite parking. For those people to survive and continue, they're going to have to have a place to park on the streets. In an older neighborhood you have older houses, one of the things for older residential units is you have to provide as much outside parking as possible.

- i. Public:
 - i. When people are saying that these areas appear stable or there's not a lot of building going on it's because they're not hiring architects or getting building permits. In my neighborhood, there is a lot of illegal building going on.
- j. Public:
 - i. A couple of people said that Reynard Way was in transition. I question that. Hasn't it pretty much been that way for a while now? I say it's pretty stable.
 - ii. Public: But, what if there is an economic recovery? And it's here? You have to plan for that.
 - iii. Public: That's not what the question was. The question was: 'What is it right now?'
 - iv. Public: For plan purposes, it should be a transition zone for the future.
- k. Public:

Uptown
Community Plan Update

Meeting #4
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

- i. When building infill, the buildings are huge and loom over. There's got to be a better way to design this.

5. Adjournment

- a. City: That's the end of our meeting. We'll see you all in a month!

DRAFT