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Introduction & Overview

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The City of San Diego is in the process of updating the University Community Plan. Community plans work in concert with the City's General Plan to guide growth and development in San Diego's 52 community planning areas. Community plans describe the community's vision and identify strategies for enhancing existing assets and managing change. They establish goals and policies, implement strategies, and inform local decision-making and investment.

1.2 COMMUNITY PLAN PURPOSE AND PROCESS

Community plans also provide parcel-level land use designations to be implemented through corresponding zoning and tailored policies that address issues of importance to the community. Community plans play a key role in helping the City to meet its Climate Action Plan (CAP) targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by planning for an urban form conducive to alternative modes of transportation.

The current University Community Plan was originally adopted in 1987 and has undergone several amendments to address changing conditions.

The Community Plan Update (CPU) will:

• Establish an updated vision and key objectives that align with community priorities;
• Analyze current land use designations and changes in demographics;
• Evaluate demand for housing and development while accounting for climate change and environmental impacts;
• Factor in the extension of the Blue Line Trolley service to University and other transit connections; and
• Ensure that Community Plan policies and recommendations remain consistent with the General Plan, citywide, and regional policies.

For more information on the CPU, please visit www.PlanUniversity.org

1.3 REPORT OVERVIEW

The basis of this report is to provide a summary of outreach conducted in coordination with, and the subsequent results of, the Choose Your Future! engagement platform. The following sections are provided within this report:

SECTION 2: OUTREACH SUMMARY
This section provides an overview of the outreach and engagement conducted through this effort, including an overview of the types of outreach and materials utilized.

SECTION 3: ENGAGEMENT PLATFORM
This section summarizes the online engagement platform, Choose Your Future!, and provides examples of the information provided therein.

SECTION 4: FOCUS AREAS OF CHANGE
This section presents the five focus areas of change and the two-to-three land use options provided within the online engagement platform.

SECTION 5: RESULTS SUMMARY
This section details the results from the online engagement platform, including respondent demographic information and overall results of the focus area land use options.
2 Outreach Summary

2.1 OVERVIEW

Throughout the months of September, October, and November 2021, the University Community Plan Update project team conducted extensive community outreach and engagement in coordination with the launch of the interactive, online engagement platform, Choose Your Future!

From October 1st, 2021 to November 8th, 2021, this non-scientific, online survey was live on the Plan University project website (www.PlanUniversity.org) and provided an opportunity for stakeholders to select options for land uses in five focus areas of the University Community, as identified through the CPU process.

The goal of this effort was to receive representative feedback from the University Community on proposed land use options within five primary areas of change (focus areas). Through this engagement process, over 2,600 respondents completed the survey.

Furthermore, the University CPU Project Team conducted over 23 tabling events, 6 days of canvassing, 30 office hours, two virtual workshops, two virtual open houses, and five newsletter distributions resulting in over 22,500 homes reached through this effort.

This section of the report provides an overview of the extensive outreach conducted by the project team which led to increased representation and feedback as compared to previous engagement efforts.
2.2 STUDENT ART CONTEST

In early 2021, the University CPU project team hosted a Student Art Contest where students at all eight schools across the University Community Plan Area (CPA) were asked to submit artwork that reflected what the University Community meant to them.

More than 40 students from Curie, Doyle, and Spreckles Elementary, Mission Bay Montessori, and University City High submitted their artwork and two winners were selected to have their artwork printed on University CPU project totebags. Six additional winners were chosen to have their artwork printed on University CPU project stickers. All items were included in the in-person community outreach conducted in October 2021.

Thank you to all of the student artists that shared what University meant to you!

Figure 3: Student Art Contest runners-up, artwork on stickers

Figure 4: Student Art Contest Winner, 2021, Art by Aitous

Figure 5: Student Art Contest Winner, 2021, Art by Mila

Figure 6: Student Art Submissions
2.3 CANVASSING

During the month of October 2021, the University CPU project team conducted six days of door-to-door canvassing with doorhangers, shown in Figure 8. Doorhangers alerted residents to the ongoing outreach efforts for the University CPU, including the Choose Your Future! engagement platform and the two virtual open houses. Canvassing the University Community allowed the project team to reach residents who weren’t yet aware of the planning effort currently underway.

To reach as many homes as possible, the project team also worked with property managers and homeowners’ associations to distribute materials to residents in their preferred medium. Where doorhangers were not the preferred method, digital flyers were sent directly to residents from their property managers on behalf of the CPU.

2.4 BUS SHELTER ADVERTISING

The University Community is served by several MTS bus routes, including the SuperLoop Rapid, which circulates throughout the Community and is one of the most utilized bus routes within the City of San Diego. To reach transit commuters, the project team utilized transit station advertising at the following four transit stations:

- Nobel Drive & La Jolla Village Square
- Lebon Drive & Palmilla Drive
- Executive Drive & Executive Way
- Towne Centre Drive & Nobel Drive
2.5 COMMUNITY TABLING

Throughout the month of October, the project team conducted more than 20 tabling events within the University Community. These in-person events allowed the project team to meet and engage with University residents, employees, and visitors. Those interested in learning more about the University CPU and wanting to provide their feedback could talk to the project team and take the survey on the spot. To facilitate this effort, a paper version of the survey was utilized. This option allowed more interaction and engagement with survey-takers, many of whom had questions throughout the process.

During the tabling events, student art contest project totebags and stickers were provided to survey respondents, along with an individually wrapped cookie of their choice. After over 12 months of virtual engagement, this in-person effort was a welcome opportunity for the University Community to engage in the process.

The following is a sample of locations where the project team tabled during the month of October:

- October 12th: Tabled at Doyle Recreation Center
- October 12th: Tabled at University Community Library
- October 13th: Tabled at Nobel Athletic Fields
- October 14th: Tabled at University Community Library
- October 14th: Tabled at Westfield UTC Mall
- October 16th: Tabled at North University Community Library
- October 16th: Tabled at Westfield UTC Mall
- October 18th: Tabled at GradLabs
- October 18th: Tabled at Standley Recreation Center
- October 19th: Tabled at GradLabs
- October 21st: Tabled at South University Community Library
- October 22nd: Tabled at Westfield UTC
- October 23rd: Tabled at North University Community Library
- October 27th: Tabled at Nobel Athletic Fields
- October 29th: Tabled at Westfield UTC
- October 29th: Tabled at La Jolla Crossroads
- October 30th: Tabled at Doyle Recreation Center
- October 30th: Tabled at North University Community Library
2.6 SURVEY DROPBOXES

While the online engagement platform was the primary location to submit feedback via the online survey, the project team recognized that not all residents have access to, or use, the internet. Therefore, to encourage broad and representative feedback, paper copies of the survey were located at five locations within the University Community for the duration of the online engagement platform.

Survey dropboxes, business cards, and flyers were also included at each location to bring awareness to the planning effort. Several residents used this option to submit their survey responses, which were then recorded by the project team and included in the final results.

2.7 SOCIAL MEDIA

A social media engagement strategy was also employed through this process in an effort to reach online and digital users. The social media campaign included advertisements to users within the University Community zip code areas on Facebook and Instagram platforms.

Social media was also utilized to post and share from the City of San Diego’s Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn accounts. These postings were then shared by community partners and stakeholders, leading to increased awareness by those that follow the City of San Diego and other community partner media sites.
2.8 PARTNER OUTREACH

Community partnerships are necessary to facilitate representative feedback in any community planning process. The success of this effort could not have been possible without the engagement from residents and community partners such as the University City Community Association, Councilmember Joe LaCava and staff, the Asian Business Association of San Diego, the University of California San Diego, San Diego Unified School District faculty and staff, residential property managers and associations, and several community leaders.

With the assistance of community partners, the project team was able to share the online engagement platform far and wide across the University Community.
2.9 OTHER OUTREACH EFFORTS

In addition to the outreach activities previously described in this report, the project team conducted several other outreach efforts with the goal of gaining broad and representative feedback. These additional efforts included outreach through the University CPU project newsletter, project flyers distributed around the Community, press and media releases to increase awareness, a robust project website to serve as a homepage for all efforts, project videos to convey complex information verbally and visually, Peachjar flyer distribution to parents and guardians of University Community students, and several virtual events including two virtual open houses utilizing an interactive digital platform.

Over the course of the online engagement platform being live, the project team sent five newsletters to the University CPU interested participant’s distribution list. This list includes just under 2,000 interested stakeholders.

The project team produced six videos for the outreach effort, including one overview video and five focus area specific videos. This effort allowed survey respondents to learn important information about the University CPA and the planning process, including the opportunity to hear directly from the project team about the vision for each focus area. The inclusion of videos helped the project team reach visual and auditory learners alike.

Along with social media outreach and engagement, the project team worked with the Department of Communications to publish a press release for media distribution. This effort helped garner further awareness of the planning process.

Another important method of outreach was utilizing San Diego Unified School District’s Peachjar platform, which sends digital flyers to all registered parents and guardians. This effort resulted in a reach of over 5,000 deliveries of the project flyer, shown below.

The project team also hosted two virtual open houses and two project workshops, coupled with multiple meetings and presentations to interested stakeholders. The virtual open houses included project discipline tables such as land use, urban design, mobility, environmental, public realm, public space, and conservation planning. Participants were able to stop by anytime during the open house and speak directly with the project team.
Throughout the engagement process, the primary location to collect feedback was through the online engagement platform, Choose Your Future! This platform presented land use options developed by the project team for each of the five focus areas, allowed respondents to explore details, imagery, and impact outcomes of each option, and collected feedback on preferred options. The platform was also intended to be used interchangeably between a desktop computer or cellular phone with ease. A brief overview of the platform is as follows:

INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION
The platform provided introductory information and an overview video of the planning process and Community Plan Area.

OVERVIEW OF FOCUS AREAS
The platform provided an overview of all five focus areas. Within the map-based platform, respondents could also toggle on and off the following layers, where applicable: Coastal Height Limit, Proposed Bike Lanes, MCAS Miramar Airport Overlay Zones, Focus Areas, and Transit Priority Areas. Respondents were also able to zoom in and out on the platform to see an aerial map.

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL
The platform asked respondents to place a pin near where they live, work, or go to school. Most respondents utilized this feature, but demographic information at the end of the survey also identified respondents’ connection to the University Community and zip code.

FIVE FOCUS AREA PAGES
There were five focus area pages within the platform. Within each focus area page, an overview video and two to three options were provided along imagery and renderings of potential build-out under each scenario, which were accessible by clicking on the green bar as shown below.

Furthermore, each focus area page also provided draft metrics associated with the proposed options, which included information regarding number of added housing units, jobs, employment square feet, and additional environmental and mobility impact metrics.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS
The final page of the online engagement platform included demographic questions relating to race, ethnicity, age, zip code, connection to the University Community (resident, employee, student, etc.), and how long the respondent has lived or worked in the community. Respondents could select ‘I prefer to self-identify’ or ‘I prefer not to say.’
Focus Areas of Change

4.1 OVERVIEW

The first step in the development of land use alternatives was to identify focus areas, which are primary areas of change within the community. The planning team conducted an opportunity sites analysis that was presented to community stakeholders for input and review and resulted in the creation of the five focus areas shown in Figure 21. Each focus area highlighted on the map is representative of a different opportunity area within the community. These focus areas include:

- **North Torrey Pines Employment Center**: An employment center with the opportunity for place-making, employee amenities, and increased connectivity.
- **Campus Point & Towne Centre Employment Village**: An employment center with opportunity for employee amenities, increased connectivity to transit (trolley stations), and increased residential density or residential mixed use along Genesee Avenue.
- **UTC Transit Village**: An employment mixed use area (transit-oriented development) with the greatest increase in density. Defined by enhanced public realm and access to transit. Reduction in superblocks and surface parking through infill development.
- **Nobel Campus Transit Village**: An employment mixed use area and creation of a “Main Street” feel throughout existing shopping center development. Infill development within shopping centers. Development oriented to the Nobel Transit Center. Increased Connectivity between east (higher density mixed use) and west (lower density mixed use) portions of Focus Area.
- **Governor Community Village**: A lower density mixed use area with infill development in the business center (no residential) and shopping centers (possibility for residential).
The North Torrey Pines Employment Center Focus Area is located in the northern portion of the University Community. The area is a prime employment center with over 5,000 jobs primarily in the healthcare, life sciences, and biotechnology industry. The area is located just east of the Torrey Pines Golf Course and Scripps, and just north of UCSD and the Salk Institute. The area is located within a Transit Priority Area and is accessible by bus.

The vision for this area is to enhance the employment center through placemaking, employee amenities, and increased connectivity. This area is significantly constrained with development limited by the Coastal Height Limit, which restricts development to no higher than 30 feet, and the MCAS Miramar Accident Potential and Transition Zones, which limit density to 50 and 300 persons per acre, respectively.

**NORTH TORREY PINES EMPLOYMENT CENTER**

**FOCUS AREA 1**

The North Torrey Pines Employment Center Focus Area is located in the northern portion of the University Community. The area is a prime employment center with over 5,000 jobs primarily in the healthcare, life sciences, and biotechnology industry. The area is located just east of the Torrey Pines Golf Course and Scripps, and just north of UCSD and the Salk Institute. The area is located within a Transit Priority Area and is accessible by bus.

The vision for this area is to enhance the employment center through placemaking, employee amenities, and increased connectivity. This area is significantly constrained with development limited by the Coastal Height Limit, which restricts development to no higher than 30 feet, and the MCAS Miramar Accident Potential and Transition Zones, which limit density to 50 and 300 persons per acre, respectively.

**Option A**

The North Torrey Pines area is to remain a prime employment center. Through this option, urban design guidelines would encourage the orientation of development towards North Torrey Pines Road and connections between campuses to facilitate shared amenity use.

**Option B**

The North Torrey Pines area is to remain a prime employment center. Through this option, urban design guidelines would encourage the development of campus-oriented typologies with internal, employee-serving amenities.

**Total Jobs:** 7,500

**Total Homes:** 0

**Total Jobs:** 7,500

**Total Homes:** 0

Note: All metrics are based on initial findings, are draft, and subject to change upon further analysis.
The Campus Point & Towne Centre Employment Village Focus Area is located just north of the core of the community, along Campus Point Drive and Towne Centre Drive, and is a prime employment center with over 12,000 jobs and just over 250 housing units along Genesee Avenue.

The area also includes Eastgate Mini Park #1 and #2 and is located just north of the Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park. The area is located within a Transit Priority Area and is accessible by transit, including the future Voigt Drive Trolley Station and bus stops along Eastgate Mall.

The vision for this area is to support the employment center while also creating an opportunity for increased access to transit and the inclusion of residential mixed-use to create an employment village. The primary constraints within this area are the MCAS Miramar Accident Potential Zone and Transition Zone.

### Option A
Mixed-use development along Campus Point Drive and Towne Centre Drive. As an Urban Employment Village, this area would remain primarily employment-serving, but would locate housing and other employee-serving amenities near jobs.

- **Total Jobs:** 17,500
- **Total Homes:** 8,500

### Option B
Mixed-use along Campus Point Drive, which is closest to the Voigt Drive Trolley Station. As an Urban Employment Village, this area would remain primarily employment-serving, but would locate housing and other employee-serving amenities near jobs.

- **Total Jobs:** 22,500
- **Total Homes:** 3,500

### Option C
Campus Point Drive and Towne Centre Drive to remain employment-serving uses with no collocation of housing with jobs.

- **Total Jobs:** 25,000
- **Total Homes:** 1,000

---

Note: All metrics are based on initial findings, are draft, and subject to change upon further analysis.
The UTC Transit Village Focus Area is located in the core of the University Community and is within a Transit Priority Area. The area is accessible by transit including the Executive Drive Trolley Station and the UTC Trolley Station located at the UTC Transit Center. The area includes over 1,200 housing units and 10,000 jobs and is home to large employers, visitor destinations, and regional destinations, including the UTC Mall.

The area also includes Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park; is adjacent to Doyle Elementary School and Community Park; and is just north of University City High School and Nobel Athletic Area and Library.

The vision for this area is to create a high-density, mixed-use transit village that is supportive of jobs, housing, and the creation of a pedestrian-oriented transit district. The primary constraint within this focus area is the Federal Aviation Administration height notification requirement.

Option A
A mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that is well-served by transit, bike infrastructure, and public amenities. This option provides the highest density of mixed-use development with both jobs and housing.

**Total Jobs:** 50,000  **Total Homes:** 35,000

Option B
A mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that is well-served by transit, bike infrastructure, and public amenities. This option provides a high density of mixed-use development with both jobs and housing.

**Total Jobs:** 40,000  **Total Homes:** 25,000

Option C
A mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that is well-served by transit, bike infrastructure, and public amenities. This option provides a medium-high density of mixed-use development with both jobs and housing.

**Total Jobs:** 40,000  **Total Homes:** 14,000

Note: All metrics are based on initial findings, are draft, and subject to change upon further analysis.
The Nobel Campus Transit Village Focus Area is located in the western portion of the University Community, just south of UCSD, and is within a Transit Priority Area. The area includes 150 housing units and 5,000 jobs, and is home to several shopping centers, visitor destinations, and the future Nobel Drive Trolley Station.

The western portion of the focus area is located a half-mile north of Villa La Jolla Park. The eastern portion of the focus area is adjacent to Doyle Community Park and Elementary School and the proposed Regents Road linear park, with access to Rose Canyon to the south.

The vision for this area is to create a mixed-use village that is supportive of the transit station and includes enhanced amenities for residents, visitors, and members of the UCSD community. A major constraining factor of this area west of Interstate-5 is the Coastal Height Limit, which restricts development to no higher than 30 feet.

**Option A**
A mixed-use village serving the UCSD campus and surrounding community through infill development. This option provides a higher density of mixed-use development with heights outside of the local Coastal Height Limit.

- Total Jobs: 19,000
- Total Homes: 11,000

**Option B**
A mixed-use village serving the UCSD campus and surrounding community through infill development. This option provides a medium-high density of mixed-use development with heights outside of the local Coastal Height Limit.

- Total Jobs: 18,000
- Total Homes: 6,000

**Option C**
A mixed-use village serving the UCSD campus and surrounding community through infill development. This option provides a medium-low density of mixed-use development with heights inside of the local Coastal Height Limit.

- Total Jobs: 9,000
- Total Homes: 3,500

Note: All metrics are based on initial findings, are draft, and subject to change upon further analysis.
GOVERNOR COMMUNITY VILLAGE

The Governor Community Village Focus Area is located in the southern portion of the University Community, south of Rose Canyon Open Space Park. The focus area includes two shopping centers: UC Marketplace (Sprouts) to the west and the University Square (Vons) shopping center to the east. The area does not include housing, but does include just over 500 jobs and is accessible by bus.

The area is surrounded by low-density residential; is located near Spreckels and Marie Curie Elementary Schools, Standley Middle School, Standley Park and Recreation Center, the University Community Branch Library; and is just south of University City High School.

The vision for this focus area is to create a mixed-use community village with infill development within the shopping centers and the inclusion of multi-family residential. The goal is not to replace the existing retail, but to include infill development within the site.

Option A
Option A envisions infill development within the shopping centers to include medium-density, mixed-use residential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Jobs: 2,000</th>
<th>Total Homes: 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Vons Shopping Center
Sprouts Shopping Center

Option B
Option B envisions infill development within the shopping centers to include medium to low-density mixed-use residential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Jobs: 1,000</th>
<th>Total Homes: 750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Von’s Shopping Center
Sprouts Shopping Center

Note: All metrics are based on initial findings, are draft, and subject to change upon further analysis.
5 Results Summary

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Community engagement is a fundamental part of the community planning process. It’s an exciting opportunity for residents, employees, and visitors of the area to give feedback on ways their community can be more connected, sustainable, and economically vibrant.

Through this engagement process, many University Community residents, employees, students, and visitors submitted their feedback on the proposed land use options and over 2,600 respondents completed the Choose Your Future! survey.

Page 36 of this report provides an outreach results summary and illustrates the number of respondents and their age, race and ethnicity, connection to the community, and zip code.

Furthermore, as has been discussed previously in this report, the University CPU Project Team conducted over 23 tabling events, 6 days of canvassing, 30 office hours, two virtual workshops, two virtual open houses, and five newsletter distributions resulting in over 22,500 homes reached through this effort.
OUTREACH RESULTS SUMMARY

This outreach results summary provides an overview of the results of the in-person outreach and Choose Your Future! platform. Detailed information for each focus area and response summary follows within the next pages of this report.

Survey Results Summary

Respondent Connection to the Community*

Respondent Zip Code

Respondent Race & Ethnicity

Respondent Age

Panel A: This outreach results summary provides an overview of the results of the in-person outreach and Choose Your Future! platform. Detailed information for each focus area and response summary follows within the next pages of the report.

Panel B: Survey Results Summary

Panel C: Respondent Connection to the Community*

Panel D: Respondent Zip Code

Panel E: Respondent Race & Ethnicity

Panel F: Respondent Age
5.2 RESPONDENTS: HOME
Respondents were asked to place pins on the map, indicating where they lived in the University Community Plan Area. Over 1,500 pins were placed on the map. Figure 23 illustrates the location of these pins and Figure 24 illustrates the intensity of response rate by location.

5.3 RESPONDENTS: WORK
Respondents were asked to place pins on the map, indicating where they worked in the University Community Plan Area. Over 924 pins were placed on the map. Figure 25 illustrates the location of these pins and Figure 26 illustrates the intensity of response rate by location.
5.4 RESPONDENTS: SCHOOL

Respondents were asked to place pins on the map, indicating where they go to school in the University Community Plan Area. Over 550 pins were placed on the map. Figure 27 illustrates the location of these pins and Figure 28 illustrates the intensity of response rate by location.

Figure 27: Respondent School Location Pins

Figure 28: Intensity of Response Rate (School)
5.5 RESULTS: NORTH TORREY PINES
EMPLOYMENT CENTER

The North Torrey Pines Employment Center Focus Area is located in the northernmost portion of the University Community and primarily serves as an employment center.

5.6.1 RESULTS BY OPTION CHOICE

The results of the Engagement Platform indicate a preference for Option A: Science and Technology. Although both options result in similar buildout of jobs and square feet, the options differed in design guidelines which illustrate the type of growth preferred in the area. As mentioned previously, due to existing constraints, this area is not a candidate for additional housing.

Respondents were asked the following question, but were not required to make a selection. Instead, respondents could share more about their vision for the Focus Area in the box provided. Comment themes are reported on page 44. Further details about each option choice are listed on page 24.

QUESTION POSED: PLEASE GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT NORTH TORREY PINES EMPLOYMENT CENTER BELOW:

Choose the option that is CLOSEST to your vision for North Torrey Pines Employment Center...

• Option A: Science & Technology Park
• Option B: Science & Technology Park

Tell us about your vision for North Torrey Pines Employment Center... (What would you change? What would you keep?)

Option A envisions the North Torrey Pines area to remain a prime employment center. Through this option, urban design guidelines would encourage the orientation of development towards North Torrey Pines Road and connections between campuses to facilitate shared amenity use:

• Estimated Jobs Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 7,560 jobs
• Estimated Homes Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 0 homes

Figure 29: Buildout Model Rendering of Option A.

Results by Respondent Connection to Community

Results by Respondent Age

Results by Respondent Race & Ethnicity

Results by Respondent Time Living or Working in Community

Overall Results by Option Choice

Renderings are for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute a development project.
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5.6.2 COMMENT THEMES: NORTH TORREY PINES EMPLOYMENT CENTER

A diverse number of opinions regarding the future of the North Torrey Pines Employment Center were also shared through a total of 219 written comments. Key themes from these comments follow.

LAND USE

- Generally, the North Torrey Pines Employment Center provides a logical extension of the campus-like environment from UC San Diego and neighboring research facilities. (17 comments)
- Increasing the mix of uses and nearby housing opportunities, especially for students and employees, is an important priority. (25 comments)
- Several individuals were opposed to any change to the area or expressed a desire to keep changes as minimal as possible. (35 comments)

MOBILITY & ACCESS

- Traffic congestion is a key concern, especially during peak commute periods. (21 comments)
- Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connectivity is an important priority. There is a desire for improved facilities especially along Torrey Pines Road. (19 comments)

URBAN DESIGN

- Development should be set back from open space areas and minimize disturbances to nearby canyons. (18 comments)
- Building heights should be kept low due to the flight path Transition Zone and proximity to the Torrey Pines State Reserve. (5 comments)

INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, & AMENITIES

- Shared and employee-serving amenities are important to reduce vehicle trips and create a lively experience of the area. Desired amenities include dining, retail, fitness facilities, green spaces, and trails. (39 comments)
5.6 RESULTS: CAMPUS POINT & TOWNE CENTRE EMPLOYMENT VILLAGE

The Campus Point & Towne Centre Village Focus Area is primarily employment serving with some residential along Genesee Avenue.

5.6.1 RESULTS BY OPTION CHOICE

The Results of the Engagement Platform indicate a preference for Option A: Science and Technology + Urban Employment Village. This option includes collocation of jobs and housing at both Campus Point Drive and Towne Centre Drive, with greater inclusion of employee-serving amenities.

Respondents were asked the following question, but were not required to make a selection. Instead, respondents could share more about their vision for the Focus Area in the box provided. Comment themes are reported on page 48. Further details about each option choice are listed on page 26.

Overall Results by Option Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,731

Results by Respondent Connection to Community

- Resident
- Property Owner
- Business Owner
- Employee University
- Student
- University Student
- High School Student

Results by Respondent Zip Code

- 92037
- 92121
- 92122
- Other

Results by Respondent Race & Ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Black or African American
- Native American or Alaska Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Other

Results by Respondent Time Living or Working in Community

- More than 20 years
- 16-20
- 13-15
- 9-10
- 5-9
- Less than 1 year

Overall Results by Option Choice

**QUESTIONPOSED:** PLEASE GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE CAMPUS POINT & TOWNE CENTRE EMPLOYMENT VILLAGE BELOW:

Choose the option that is CLOSEST to your vision for Campus Point & Towne Centre Employment Village:

- Option A: Science & Technology Park + Urban Employment Village at Campus Point and Towne Centre
- Option B: Science & Technology Park + Urban Employment Village at Campus Point
- Option C: Science & Technology Park

Tell us about your vision for Campus Point & Towne Centre Employment Village... (What would you change? What would you keep?)

Option A envisions the inclusion of mixed-use development along Campus Point Drive and Towne Centre Drive. As an Urban Employment Village, this area would remain primarily employment-serving, but would locate housing and other employee-serving amenities near jobs. Areas within the Accident Potential Zone II would remain employment-serving uses (Science & Technology Park). This option also includes increased residential densities along Genesee Avenue and mixed-use development at the corner of Genesee and Eastgate Mall.

- Estimated Jobs Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 17,500 jobs
- Estimated Homes Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 8,500 homes

Figure 30: Buildout Model Rendering of Option A

And renderings are for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute a development project.
5.6.2 COMMENT THEMES: CAMPUS POINT & TOWNE CENTRE EMPLOYMENT VILLAGE

A diverse number of opinions regarding the future of the Campus Point & Town Centre Employment Village were also shared through a total of 265 written comments. Key themes from these comments follow.

**LAND USE**

- Improving the jobs/housing balance in the area is important. Generally, the colocation of jobs and housing in the Campus Point & Town Centre Employment Village area is a positive change that can reduce commute times, improve traffic congestion, and provide opportunities to work and live near transit. (43 comments)
- Increasing the housing supply is a key priority. Additional housing is a positive change that allows more people to live next to high-quality amenities and job opportunities to the overall benefit of the region. (45 comments)
- Affordable and inclusive housing options are also important. Units should be available to meet the needs of families, employees, and students. (30 comments)
- A mix of uses and services should also be provided to meet daily needs. (12 comments)
- Several individuals are opposed to any change to the area or have a desire to keep changes as minimal as possible. (38 comments)
- A few individuals expressed concerns regarding the colocation of housing and jobs and the presence of housing in the flight path Transition Zone. (5 comments related to co-location concerns; 9 comments related to flight path/height concerns)

**MOBILITY & ACCESS**

- Traffic congestion and parking availability are key concerns. (35 comments)
- Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connectivity is an important priority to alleviate traffic issues and improve safety. (18 comments)
- First mile/last mile improvements are needed to access public transit. New transit facilities should also be considered to support future growth. (27 comments)

**URBAN DESIGN**

- Green spaces and street trees should be present throughout the area. (6 comments)
- Development should be set back from open space areas and minimize disturbances to nearby canyons. (17 comments)

**INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, & AMENITIES**

- Adequate infrastructure is important to support the future growth of the area. Of particular interest are parks, schools, and libraries. (15 comments)
5.7 RESULTS: UTC TRANSIT VILLAGE

The UTC Transit Village Focus Area is located within the core of the community and includes employment and residential uses.

5.7.1 RESULTS BY OPTION CHOICE

The Results of the Engagement Platform indicate a preference for Option A: Urban Transit Village. This option allows the highest mixed-use density centered nearest to the Executive Drive Trolley Station and UTC Transit Center. This option also includes increased residential densities throughout the focus area and the concept for a pedestrian promenade along Executive Drive.

Respondents were asked the following question, but were not required to make a selection. Instead, respondents could share more about their vision for the Focus Area in the box provided. Comment themes are reported on page 52. Further details about each option choice are listed on page 28.

**QUESTION POSED:** PLEASE GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE UTC TRANSIT VILLAGE BELOW:

Choose the option that is CLOSEST to your vision for UTC Transit Village.

- **Option A: Urban Transit Village**
- **Option B: Urban Transit Village**
- **Option C: Urban Transit Village**

Tell us about your vision for UTC Transit Village... (What would you change? What would you keep?)

Option A envisions the future of the UTC core as a dense, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that is well served by transit, bike infrastructure, and public amenities. This option provides the highest density of mixed-use development with the integration of both jobs and housing. The Urban Transit Village land use is supportive of residential and/or employment mixed-use development. This option also includes some residential development within Renaissance Towne Centre.

- **Estimated Jobs Under Maximum Buildout of Option:**
  - Option A: 50,000 jobs
- **Estimated Homes Under Maximum Buildout of Option:**
  - Option A: 35,000 homes

---

**Results by Respondent Connection to Community**

- **Results by Respondent Race & Ethnicity**
  - White
  - Black or African American
  - Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
  - Asian
  - Native American or Alaska Native
  - All Other

- **Results by Respondent Age**
  - 18-29
  - 30-39
  - 40-49
  - 50-59
  - 60-69
  - 70-79
  - 80+

- **Results by Respondent Time Living or Working in Community**
  - Less than 1 year
  - 1-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - More than 20 years

---

**Overall Results by Option Choice**

- **Option A:** 50.1%
- **Option B:** 21.3%
- **Option C:** 28.6%

**Results by Respondent Zip Code**

- 92037
- 92121
- 92122
- Other

**Results by Respondent Time Living or Working in Community**

- Less than 1 year
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- More than 20 years

---

**Figure 31: Buildout Model Rendering of Option A**

Renderings are for illustrative purposes only and are not indicative of a development project.
5.7.2 COMMENT THEMES: UTC TRANSIT VILLAGE

A diverse number of opinions regarding the future of the UTC Transit Village were also shared through a total of 371 written comments. Key themes from these comments follow.

**LAND USE**

• The UTC Transit Village area has a variety of resources, including shopping and transit, that make it an ideal location for higher density housing. (32 comments)
• Increasing the housing supply is a key priority. Additional housing is a positive change that allows more people to live next to high-quality amenities and job opportunities to the overall benefit of the region. (102 comments)
• Affordable and inclusive housing options are also important. Units should be available to meet the needs of families, employees, and students. (28 comments)
• The area has existing regional-serving uses. A greater mix of neighborhood-serving uses should also be provided to meet daily needs. (18 comments)
• Several individuals are opposed to any change to the area or have a desire to keep changes as minimal as possible. (48 comments)

**MOBILITY & ACCESS**

• Traffic congestion and parking availability are key concerns. (69 comments)
• Major roads are currently wide with fast-moving traffic. There is a need for traffic calming. (12 comments)
• Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connectivity is an important priority to alleviate traffic issues and improve safety. Generally, there is a desire for protected facilities. (62 comments)
• First mile/last mile improvements are needed to access public transit. New transit facilities should also be considered to support future growth. (37 comments)

**URBAN DESIGN**

• Pedestrian promenades, linear greenways, and other green spaces would be positive additions to the area. Landscaping and lighting are also important considerations. (27 comments)
• General design suggestions include reducing super blocks, minimizing the visual prominence of surface parking, and creating an active ground floor. (31 comments)

**INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, & AMENITIES**

• Adequate infrastructure is important to support the future growth of the area. Of particular interest are parks, schools, and libraries. (37 comments)
• Providing open spaces and minimizing disturbances to nearby canyons are also important considerations. (5 comments)
5.8 RESULTS: NOBEL CAMPUS TRANSIT VILLAGE

The Nobel Campus Transit Village Focus Area is located just south of the UCSD campus and includes retail, residential, and commercial.

5.8.1 RESULTS BY OPTION CHOICE

The results of the Engagement Platform indicate a preference for Option A: Urban Transit Village. This option allows the highest mixed-use density centered nearest to the Nobel Drive Trolley Station. Furthermore, this option allows greater mixed-use density east of I-5, north and south of Nobel Drive, and lower-density mixed-use within the Vons Shopping Center along Regents Road.

Respondents were asked the following question, but were not required to make a selection. Instead, respondents could share more about their vision for the Focus Area in the box provided. Comment themes are reported on page 56. Further details about each option choice are listed on page 30.

Option A envisions this focus area as a mixed-use village serving the UCSD campus and surrounding community through infill development to enhance the shopping centers. This option provides a higher density of mixed-use development with heights outside of the local Coastal Height Limit. The Urban Transit Village land use is supportive of residential and/or employment mixed-use development. Please note this Community Plan Update is reviewing densities both with and without the height limit in this focus area. The local Coastal Height Limit is only amended by a vote of the people and is not affected by this Plan Update.

- Estimated Jobs Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 19,000 jobs
- Estimated Homes Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 11,000 homes

Figure 32: Buildout Model Rendering of Option A

Overall Results by Option Choice

Results by Respondent Connection to Community

Results by Respondent Age

Results by Respondent Race & Ethnicity

Results by Respondent Zip Code

Results by Respondent Time Living or Working in Community

Figure 12: Buildout Model Rendering of Option A
A diverse number of opinions regarding the future of the Nobel Campus Transit Village were also shared through a total of 409 written comments. Key themes from these comments follow.

**LAND USE**

- The Nobel Campus Transit Village has a variety of resources, including transit access, proximity to UC San Diego, and a variety of retail options, that make the area a prime location for future housing. (68 comments)
- Increasing the housing supply is an important priority. Additional housing would be a positive change that would allow more people to live next to high-quality amenities and job opportunities to the overall benefit of the region. (117 comments)
- Affordable and inclusive housing options are also important. Units should be available to meet the needs of families, employees, and students. (52 comments)
- Several individuals were opposed to any change to the area or expressed a desire to keep changes as minimal as possible. (44 comments)

**MOBILITY & ACCESS**

- Traffic congestion and parking availability are key concerns. (68 comments)
- Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connectivity is an important priority to alleviate traffic issues and improve safety. There is a desire for protected facilities and traffic calming, especially along Nobel Drive, Villa La Jolla Drive, and La Jolla Village Drive. (52 comments)
- First mile/last mile improvements are needed to access public transit. New transit facilities should also be considered to support future growth. (30 comments)

**URBAN DESIGN**

- General design suggestions include creating a pedestrian-oriented environment with an active ground floor. Green spaces and street trees should be present throughout the area. Landscaping and lighting are important considerations. (25 comments)
- Some individuals expressed a desire to maintain the existing Coastal Height Limit. Others expressed acceptance for increased height in the future. (31 comments to maintain limit; 20 comments to increase limit)

**INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, & AMENITIES**

- Adequate infrastructure is important to support the future growth of the area. Of particular interest are parks, schools, and libraries. (41 comments)
- Providing open spaces and minimizing disturbances to nearby canyons are also important considerations. (14 comments)
5.9 RESULTS: GOVERNOR COMMUNITY VILLAGE

The Governor Community Village Focus Area is located in South University, south of Rose Canyon, and includes two community serving shopping centers and one business park.

5.9.1 RESULTS BY OPTION CHOICE

The results of the Engagement Platform indicate a preference for Option A: Community Village.

Respondents were asked the following question, but were not required to make a selection. Instead, respondents could share more about their vision for the Focus Area in the box provided. Comment themes are reported on page 60. Further details about each option choice are listed on page 32.

**QUESTIONS POSED: PLEASE GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE GOVERNOR COMMUNITY VILLAGE BELOW.**

Choose the option that is Closest to your vision for Governor Community Village.
- Option A: Community Village
- Option B: Neighborhood Village

Tell us about your vision for Governor Community Village... (What would you change? What would you keep?)

**Renderings are for illustrative purposes ONLY and do not constitute a development project.**

Option A envisions infill development within the shopping centers to include medium-density, mixed-use residential. The renderings below depict both shopping centers identified in this focus area: the Vons shopping center at Governor Drive and Genesee Avenue and the Sprouts shopping center at Governor Drive and Regents Road.

- Estimated Jobs Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 2,000 jobs
- Estimated Homes Under Maximum Buildout of Option: 1,000 homes
A diverse number of opinions regarding the future of the Governor Community Village were also shared through a total of 589 written comments. Key themes from these comments follow:

**LAND USE**

- The Governor Community Village has a variety of resources, including shopping, schools, and transit access. (46 comments)
- Increasing the housing supply is an important priority. Additional housing would be a positive change that would allow more people to live next to high-quality amenities and job opportunities to the overall benefit of the region. (121 comments)
- Affordable and inclusive housing options are also important. Units should be available to meet the needs of families, employees, and students. (51 comments)
- There is a desire to continue expanding the mix of uses, including retail options and services, available to meet the needs of the community. Providing spaces for small businesses is also important. (66 comments)
- Several individuals were opposed to any change to the area or expressed a desire to keep changes as minimal as possible. (112 comments)

**MOBILITY & ACCESS**

- Traffic congestion is a key concern, especially at the intersection of Governor Drive and Genesee Avenue and during school pick-up and drop-off times. (128 comments)
- Parking availability is another key concern. Participants expressed that not all trips can be made without a car. (72 comments)
- There is a desire for safer bicycle and pedestrian facilities, especially to and from schools. Improving multi-modal access to destinations can help to alleviate traffic congestion, as well. (88 comments)

**URBAN DESIGN**

- General design suggestions include modernizing existing shopping centers and incorporate outdoor dining and gathering spaces. Buildings should also be pedestrian-oriented. (30 comments)
- Landscaping and lighting are important considerations. There is a desire for street trees and green spaces throughout the neighborhood. Provide access to outdoor areas to gather and socialize. (16 comments)
- Provide transitions to taller, multi-level buildings. (8 comments)
- Blend parking in with the community context and reduce its visual prominence. (8 comments)

**INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKS, OPEN SPACE, & AMENITIES**

- Adequate infrastructure is important to support the future growth of the area. Of particular interest are parks, schools, and libraries. (61 comments)
- Providing open spaces and minimizing disturbances to nearby canyons are also important considerations. (13 comments)
6.1 OVERVIEW OF NEXT STEPS

Feedback collected from the Online Engagement Platform will be used in the creation of proposed land use scenarios. The proposed land use scenarios will be presented at a subsequent University Community Plan Update Subcommittee (UCPUS) meeting. More information on meetings can be found at [www.planuniversity.org/meetings](http://www.planuniversity.org/meetings).

Following the initial presentation to the UCPUS, the project team will hold a Planning Commission workshop on the status of the project and the proposed land use scenarios. Next, the project team will again present to the UCPUS and will seek a recommendation on a preferred and alternative scenario to be voted on by the University Community Planning Group at their next meeting.

Please subscribe to the University CPU newsletter at [www.planuniversity.org/contact](http://www.planuniversity.org/contact) for more information and news regarding the community plan update.
The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Northeast option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC. It would be great to see mid-density housing/mixed-use development near the southern edge of this region, although this may face constraints from the trolley stops to one or two (or 3) central areas in this space, which would greatly increase the odds of folks comming by transit. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC. Mostly empty. The trolley will be mostly empty. Your development plans mean more people, traffic, noise pollution, stress, rash, etc. Who is paying for all of this development?

This area is also important for connectivity between north San Diego and Del Mar, Solana Beach, and Encinitas. Efforts should be made to increase bicycle safety, pedestrian connectivity, and bus speed in this area.

I have no preference in this area. Both options are too spread out and will discourage easy transportation and walking.

I have no preference in this area. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC. Mostly empty. The trolley will be mostly empty. Your development plans mean more people, traffic, noise pollution, stress, rash, etc. Who is paying for all of this development?

This area is also important for connectivity between north San Diego and Del Mar, Solana Beach, and Encinitas. Efforts should be made to increase bicycle safety, pedestrian connectivity, and bus speed in this area.

Like envisioned in Option A, the North Torrey Pines Employment Center should seek to orient development towards Torrey Pines Road and encourage shared amenity use. As noted in the detailed metrics, this vision could encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation amongst workers in the area. Also, the North Torrey Pines Employment Center should emphasize enhanced connections with surrounding area, including connecting Point Loma’s South-Beach-Coaster Station and the Campus Point focus area, to further promote walkability, bikeability, and transit use. Consideration of an aerial tramway, gondola, or funicular should be included in the plan in addition to the designated trail to the canyon below.

Option B looks like a better place to work.

Option A has more potential to encourage commuting by bike and to create livier environments. While Option A focuses on connecting job centers via bicycle amenities, it could also include an emphasis on local amenities at each site thereby including the best of both worlds. Option B is missing this opportunity for connectivity between employment centers. Also, while these areas primarily operate during the day, it is possible that in the future they could be used for evening/weekend events, such as large-scale concerts, dance festivals, and Comic-Con style Walsh events. The absence of housing eliminates concerns of disturbing nearby residents. Option A is superior for it’s ability to adapt and accommodate a wider range of enhancements.

Option A builds street walls that define the streetscape in a more traditional manner, like many of the most loved parts of historic cities. If done right, it would provide the best way to ensure the quality of the area.

Option A sounds more conducive to the free flow of ideas, which will hopefully we’ve even more biotechnology development and reduce the impact of defense innovation on the North Torrey Pines Road:

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

Option B seems like it would be more centralized and minimize “last mile” issues for public transportation and traffic.

Disturbing nearby residents. Option A is superior for it’s ability to adapt and accommodate a wider range of enhancements.

Traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC. Mostly empty. The trolley will be mostly empty. Your development plans mean more people, traffic, noise pollution, stress, rash, etc. Who is paying for all of this development?

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.

Neither option represents the sort of radical changes that will be needed to solve our housing crisis.

Currently, no outside public utilities this area, public services in this area should reduce congestion in other areas.

This area should provide housing in order to meet climate goals we need to provide people with housing options where they work to eliminate unnecessary vehicle trips. The traffic will be terrible. The trolley won’t make much of a difference. People don’t want to ride around with the homeless. Take a look at the buses across UC.

The vision of shared amenities while intersecting seems unlikely since many of these campuses are highly restricted for security purposes. Why weren’t the hotels across the street included in the focus area? This area is highly restricted for increased density due to the right path, the sensitive canyon rims, etc. This area has limited public utilities and increased density will increase traffic and carbon emissions.
Neither. Traffic is already a nightmare right there.

More jobs available would bring greater resources to the university community years behind.

Nothing more to add

As much nature as possible, emphasizing native plants along walkways and outside buildings"

Make it easy for people to meet in person

Permeable surfaces of parking lots to allow recharge of ground water?

Solar canopies over parking lots

Electric car fast charging stations

Shuttles: mini-bus

Enhance quiet

Use bird-safe glass

NO ANSWER!! KEEP ALL THIS IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!!!!!!

opportunities and services in these jobs would be better accommodated for student use.

Development without surpassing 70 feet if possible. Preservation of natural habitats is a major priority. This area borders less developed land, and habitat

Maybe add some retail in here that college students and employees might enjoy.

the same building. Nobody comes to this area for "employee-serving amenities", it's not practical with the kind of industries populate this area.

than continuing to overbuild, an emphasis should be placed on making distance working and learning the norm and on the re-wilding / re-greening of overbuilt

have its own renewable sources of electricity and outlaw natural gas connections.

There is room for additional high density housing in this area.

hours. Limited supply of convenience store and gas station increase car usage (driving time) to the grocery stores to buy any small items or fill up the tank. increase

Please provide additional Gas station. There is no competition between gas stations in the area, which causes increase in gas price, and inconvenient operation

residents. They don't.

more employees in the area and make it an even hour. Like all of the other proposals, please explain how any they add any value or quality of life to existing

It already has taken up to 45 minutes to drive 5 miles to an appointment at the Anderson Outpatient Center on North Torrey Pines. Let's throw in a couple thousand

EMX. Given this difference, it is not clear that the data for public choice are accurate (or off by how much)."

FAs. Survey ranges were produced on the basis of RMX zone buildout, whereas PD is evaluating an unknown (and potentially large) share of future land uses as

Overall comment: I am concerned that numbers for hsg and commercial do not accurately reflect the approach that Plng Dept is using to develop land use for the

Lack of discussion of how height limit affects these choices is odd. Addl missing info necessary for informed choice.

No more building!

No comment.

Neither! Genessee & 5 is already a mess in the morning and afternoon. It makes no sense to put even more jobs in this area.

None of the options

Shame on you!

Clearly all of these areas have been and continue to be in the crosshairs of greedy developers who care only for future profits to the detriment of existing residents. Shock

Neither of these parks is suitable.

Neither of these areas have been and continue to be in the crosshairs of greedy developers who care only for future profits to the detriment of existing residents. Shame

Neither of the options

No new building

No new housing

neither!

None of the options above should be allowed. There is too much traffic and congestion, too much noise in the area as it is. The area is over

permitted by law to allow recharge of ground water?

Make it easy for people to meet in person

As much nature as possible, emphasizing native plants along walkways and outside buildings"
The maps are confusing because they are not on the same scale. Both my husband and I used to work in this area, but have opted to work south of where we live because of the traffic.

---

**less development than option B**

---

**Keep open spaces in mind. Make sure all forms of transit coincide. Make bicycle paths safe.**

---

**Stage development; preserve quality of life.**

---

**Good**

---

**Keep buildings and active development farther from the canyon.**

---

**Connected employment areas to encourage walkability and possible use of mass transit.**

---

**Integration with UCSD**

---

**North Torrey Pines Rd.** Both options solve the housing issue while the density issue is already hit by Torrey Pines Green. Introducing more jobs into this area with no regard for traffic - N Torrey Pines Rd and Genesee Ave are already nightmarish to commute along at rush hour. Introducing more people (what looks like 75,000 more single occupancy vehicles) into this area with no adjacent housing or increased transit infrastructure is irresponsible and irresponsible.

---

**Ample green space.**

---

**Shared amenity use seems sensible to encourage a greater diversity of companies. Also, it does make sense to have a lot of redundancy in amenities in the same area.**

---

**I need more information to understand the differences between these two plans. They appear to be quite similar and I do not have a solid grasp of knowledge of the uses of the employers in that area.**

---

**I don't understand the difference between these two options.**

---

**I am imagining the campus orientation rather than road orientation would cut down on driving, but otherwise these feel pretty similar**

---

**If you are going to try and add jobs without adding local businesses and amenities for the employees, you will just increase daytime traffic when people use their breaks to go buy lunch, run errands, go to the gym, etc. The plan that includes those amenities makes more sense here.**

---

**My choice is B. Keep North Torrey Pines Rd. Beautiful and less congested with man-made structures.**

---

**Stay away from the golf course!!!**

---

**I'm imagining the campus orientation rather than road orientation would cut down on driving, but otherwise these feel pretty similar**

---

**The maps are confusing because they are not on the same scale. Both my husband and I used to work in this area, but have opted to work south of where we live because of the traffic.**

---

**I oppose both of these in that they would increase the number of commuters and the rush hour traffic as well as likely lead to petitions to waive the CHL.**

---

**Not a lot you can do in this area, but since this area already features “campus-like” companies, you might as well continue in that direction. There’s little to gain by focusing on Torrey Pines Rd.**

---

**Mike the one circular building**

---

**This is a hard call because the connectivity on the west side of Torrey Pines Rd would help overall connectivity within the job center; however, the open space in option B is so important for habitat in the region.**

---

**This transition zone sets the feeling going to Torrey Pines reserve. Aesthetically, not building up the road and keeping industry more hidden is preferable**

---

**Focus on jobs**

---

**Keep the roadway clear. This is right near the ocean and the hospital, and should not be impacted with noise, pollution, and traffic.**

---

**I selected Option A, but neither one is a great option. This area is already very well designed for the biotech industry. You could add housing to the area, but it would need to be a very small piece of the puzzle.**

---

**I selected Option B, but neither one is ideal. This area is already very well designed for the biotech industry. You could add housing to the area, but it would be a very small piece of the puzzle.**

---

**Needs housing and parking.**

---

**Don’t let garden communities develop this area, they are bad at management.**

---

**Sharing amenities**

---

**North Torrey Pines Rd is pretty inhospitable to pedestrians and cyclists right now, so any development of the employer center should prioritize enhancing existing North Torrey Pines Rd and focus on sharing amenities. Option A increases employment in the region, so I vote for that.**

---

**Employee-serving amenities**

---

**Having everything as one walk would be super cool and nice**

---

**North Torrey Pines Rd/Highway 101 is already a high-speed road. Significant physical traffic calming would be needed to reduce speeds enough for cross traffic to become viable. Increased driveways and access points along the road without traffic calming increase its chances of becoming a seeded and clogged with bicyclists in the bike lane.**

---

**However, if you invest the money into proper traffic calming, separated dedicated bicycle paths, and ROUNDABOUTS at intersections, I could see this working. The major current problems are the high-speed on- and off-ramps to the intersection Callan Road that creates the high speed traffic bursts. However, I do not see a large return investment for either Option A and would prefer the money invested elsewhere. This is already an isolated area that makes it car dependent.**

---

**Enclosed, private campuses (option B) isolate people from the real world and of live away outsiders, I prefer option A.**

---

**I don't support any of these options**

---

**Option A appears to have more shared open space and amenities. Hard to tell the difference here. I hope the open spaces and amenities will be open to the public.**

---

**There seems to be very little difference between options except for where development is concentrated - I prefer new development be concentrated off of N Torrey Pines Rd. I am sure there are reasons not to include housing. I do not. However, I favor any development that does not include all some housing.**

---

**Option B looks like it will create a better atmosphere for workers to have a place to enjoy the outdoors, while not being directly exposed to daily traffic from the streets. The differences between A and B don’t seem to be large enough to create drastic job opportunity differences.**

---

**This transition zone sets the feeling going to Torrey Pines reserve. Aesthetically, not building up the road and keeping industry more hidden is preferable**

---

**Focus on jobs**

---

**Keep the roadway clear. This is right near the ocean and the hospital, and should not be impacted with noise, pollution, and traffic.**

---

**I selected Option A, but neither one is a great option. This area is already very well designed for the biotech industry. You could add housing to the area, but it would need to be a very small piece of the puzzle.**

---

**I selected Option B, but neither one is ideal. This area is already very well designed for the biotech industry. You could add housing to the area, but it would be a very small piece of the puzzle.**

---

**Needs housing and parking.**

---

**Don’t let garden communities develop this area, they are bad at management.**

---

**Sharing amenities**

---

**North Torrey Pines Rd is pretty inhospitable to pedestrians and cyclists right now, so any development of the employer center should prioritize enhancing existing North Torrey Pines Rd and focus on sharing amenities. Option A increases employment in the region, so I vote for that.**

---

**Employee-serving amenities**
I like the idea of the connection between campuses to facilitate shared amenity use.

Shared makes sense. It's better for collaboration.

Where is the housing here? You want to add jobs so add the housing to go with it!

I also think it would be good to add a separated bike lane/path connecting this area to high density housing and trolley stops of University City. Maybe a rapid bus line down Torrey Pines could work too? Thought must be put into providing alternative transportation options to the Science and Tech park, because under current

I also like jogging in the area, so I like the large sidewalk connecting the different businesses along the stretch, which would make a great running route!

I am a UC San Diego Student who bike-commutes frequently on Torrey Pines road. I like option A because I like the rendering with the separated bike lane.

Better density.

Away from Main Road is better.

Shared amenities with connected class 1 trails make sense. Please have a better class 1 connection to the nearest trolley stop.

Better density.

Keep this area consistent with its natural surroundings (e.g. Torrey Pines State Park).

Keep some housing in this area.

I like the campus design here as it draws in larger companies to fill the spaces. This could be prime for Google or other large Silicon Valley companies to establish a

I don't think so. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there. You can't fix the housing that was created up there.

I worked at Scripps Green in the 80s. It WAS one the nicest areas and quite scenic. I always brought visitors up there. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there - if you wanted LA why didn't you move there?

North Torrey Pines Road is already heavily developed. Scrub Outpatient, Hospital and Radiology Centers cannot be relocated.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience's of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants.

I would like to see native species used in any plantings due to the proximity to wild spaces and the invasive nature of many non-native species. I would also like to see a mix of native plants and the invasive nature of many non-native species.

Build better bike infrastructure.

I also think it would be good to add a separated bike lane/path connecting this area to high density housing and trolley stops of University City. Maybe a rapid bus line down Torrey Pines could work too? Thought must be put into providing alternative transportation options to the Science and Tech park, because under current circumstances, I think 5,000 more jobs equals 8,000 more cars.

I also agree with parking lot entrances access on N Torrey Pines Road.

Better density.

I would like to see native species used in any plantings due to the proximity to wild spaces and the invasive nature of many non-native species. I would also like to see a mix of native plants and the invasive nature of many non-native species.

I think the campus-oriented approach would help to alleviate the feeling of building up a location close to a sensitive environmental area (the coast).

Keep this area consistent with its natural surroundings (e.g. Torrey Pines State Park).

I worked at Scripps Green in the 80s. It WAS one the nicest areas and quite scenic. I always brought visitors up there. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there - if you wanted LA why didn't you move there?

There is very little difference between these two plans... Would reduce traffic if there were MORE residential structures that workers could live in, close to work, which would facilitate use of bicycles, and add some retail amenities for the residents, dog park. Traffic there already congested.

I think the campus-oriented approach would help to alleviate the feeling of building up a location close to a sensitive environmental area (the coast).

I also think it would be good to add a separated bike lane/path connecting this area to high density housing and trolley stops of University City. Maybe a rapid bus line down Torrey Pines could work too? Thought must be put into providing alternative transportation options to the Science and Tech park, because under current circumstances, I think 5,000 more jobs equals 8,000 more cars.

I also agree with parking lot entrances access on N Torrey Pines Road.

I also like jogging in the area, so I like the large sidewalk connecting the different businesses along the stretch, which would make a great running route!

I am a UC San Diego Student who bike-commutes frequently on Torrey Pines road. I like option A because I like the rendering with the separated bike lane.

Better density.

Away from Main Road is better.

Shared amenities with connected class 1 trails make sense. Please have a better class 1 connection to the nearest trolley stop.

Option B is too separated

I like the shared amenity use, and including North Torrey pines road may also include make it more bike friendly?

Not much to choose here.

Please increase shuttle service from the trolley stops to the north Torrey Pines Employment Center. This will dramatically increase commuting via public transit as

I don't think so. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there. That being said, shared amenity use and connections between campuses should be encouraged to avoid unnecessary trips. Pedestrian connectivity inside this area should be prioritized, rather than it, but we need parking too.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience's of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience's of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants.

I worked at Scripps Green in the 80s. It WAS one the nicest areas and quite scenic. I always brought visitors up there. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there - if you wanted LA why didn't you move there?

North Torrey Pines Road is already heavily developed. Scrub Outpatient, Hospital and Radiology Centers cannot be relocated.

I worked at Scripps Green in the 80s. It WAS one the nicest areas and quite scenic. I always brought visitors up there. You can't fix the Calamity you have created up there - if you wanted LA why didn't you move there?

I think the campus-oriented approach would help to alleviate the feeling of building up a location close to a sensitive environmental area (the coast).

I also agree with parking lot entrances access on N Torrey Pines Road.

Better density.
With these options create enough connectivity to UCSB and housing options. We need better walking, active transportation, and public transit connections to make this area come alive with activity and connectivity to university & nature (state park) versus only a large road to support rush-hour. There should be transit infrastructure build from train station in Sorrento Valley & trolley (maybe gondola) so that a much larger share of workforce can come to work without a car.

Transition office parks to NEIGHBORHOODS and housing. Complete all originally planned roads before any expansion.

Build more on the existing infrastructure in the area and then add new infrastructure. People should be able to walk or shuttle from their workplace to the trolley. This is also needed for all areas near the trolley in the UC area. Create small shuttles - hopefully electric powered - to encourage trolley use.

Solar canopies over parking lots

Electric car fast charging stations

Shuttle bus around campus, perhaps on demand

Pedestrian walkways

Enhance quiet: Quiet road surfaces. Reduce building noise from AC. Trees.

Build more in San Clemente Canyon - not the ritzy town centre drive. Make the support for the trolley use convenient. People should be able to walk or shuttle from their workplace to the trolley. This is also needed for all areas near the trolley in the UC area. Create small shuttles - hopefully electric powered - to encourage trolley use.

More bike lanes

Include green space.

More affordable housing. More transit options.

We don't need addition 'business parks'. We need housing in these areas-and shops/retail and INFRASTRUCTURE beyond a rail line.

More bike lanes

More place more within the constraints of flightpath—but also retail. As most of us are opting 'work from home' not only as a Covid safety issue—but a

Transition office parks to NEIGHBORHOODS and housing. Complete all originally planned roads before any expansion.

The proposed development on Town Centre Drive is a substantial distance from the Trolley stops. It would seem that development should be focused more on the

Build more in San Clemente Canyon - not the ritzy town centre drive. Make the support for the trolley use convenient. People should be able to walk or shuttle from their workplace to the trolley. This is also needed for all areas near the trolley in the UC area. Create small shuttles - hopefully electric powered - to encourage trolley use.

Solar canopies over parking lots

Electric car fast charging stations

Shuttle bus around campus, perhaps on demand

Pedestrian walkways

Enhance quiet: Quiet road surfaces. Reduce building noise from AC. Trees.

Build more in San Clemente Canyon - not the ritzy town centre drive. Make the support for the trolley use convenient. People should be able to walk or shuttle from their workplace to the trolley. This is also needed for all areas near the trolley in the UC area. Create small shuttles - hopefully electric powered - to encourage trolley use.

Solar canopies over parking lots

Electric car fast charging stations

Shuttle bus around campus, perhaps on demand

Pedestrian walkways

Enhance quiet: Quiet road surfaces. Reduce building noise from AC. Trees.
I like how things aren’t too far and they cool nice as one

This is close to the trolley, and housing should be focused.

As a UC San Diego student and as a resident, I support option A, since it provides the most new housing. I love the rendering that includes a spacious area with trees, and a separated bike lane. That would be a place I would love to hang out.

Due to the Bay Area plan, Chapter 45 would be a step in the direction of Palo Alto or Mountain View, with jobs/housing ratios of 3.34 and 2.58 respectively, where essentially only wealthy people can buy a place. I would like University City to remain affordable to students, and in my mind, that means increasing housing at least as fast as the increasing number of jobs. How would a student looking for an apartment compete with a tech worker making 6 figures?

I am deeply concerned that the plans presented here do not provide for commensurate improvements in, or protections for, open spaces (Rose Canyon), parks, traffic/tranist (e.g., bike lanes, pedestrian and cyclist safety), and affordable housing. These must be explicitly addressed before a plan can be chosen, because the plans are incomplete.

It’s good to provide opportunities for employment especially for college students.

Campus Plan and Town Centre Drive should be for employment and not residential. The apartments along Genesee should NOT be medium-high - scale them back.

Those apartment buildings are too close to the trolley station. This area is adjacent to the UTC Focus Area. We need to see these two areas together - they cannot be judged independently of each other. For both Campus Point and Town Centre development, it needs to be done in a way that pulls buildings and hardwoods away from the canyon rims and conserves the canyon. Roselle Canyon contains high quality MSOF habitat, and it connects to an important remaining wildlife corridor under the 805 to Carroll Canyon.

I don’t support any of these plans.

In favor of A due to more housing availability. Please ensure plenty of parking and lighting so people can get safely home at night.

I prefer option B because it adds some urban employment village, but keeps most residential housing out of the NAS Miramar transition zone. If the existing industry is not enough, we must look elsewhere for high density.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

Adding real transit options along corridors where employees live would help decrease the obscene traffic congestion we had pre-pandemic and are likely to see.

I think because it is already used for important places of employment, we shouldn’t change that, but the addition of housing would be really good.

I would be more in favor of putting in this area if we are able to have high density housing. The current region adds little to the overall UCSD campus, and the addition of this area to the campus could be highly beneficial.

I’m not crazy about the idea of adding large amounts of extra business traffic around the hospitals.

I would keep the technology park.

Decisions on lower housing and higher jobs in this area given the flight path and flight safety concerns, but if jobs are high and housing isn’t, where are you adding

I’m not sure how much residential space can be added without impacting the canyon.

Again, height limits are needed so that the area doesn’t become too densified and maintain an open feel.

Walking and biking. Again, height limits are needed so that the area doesn’t become too densified and maintain an open feel.

I prefer option A because it adds some Urban employment village, but keeps most residential housing out of the NAS Miramar transition zone. If the existing industry is not enough, we must look elsewhere for high density.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I think because it is already used for important places of employment, we shouldn’t change that, but the addition of housing would be really good.

I would keep the technology park.

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.

I would like more parking and more details on safety in the flight path. But I'd also like to see how all of these plans work in combination with each other. I like

I'm the most torn about this one since there are trade-offs between housing and jobs. I chose the one with more housing but ultimately if there is enough

I would keep the technology park.
I am against increases in density because the highway infrastructural traffic cannot handle it. It takes 15 minutes to get from south UC to the UTC20 campus and there are too many traffic lights along Genesee to the north. Traffic at peak hours is intolerable, esp with the transits stationed around it. Village Drive and the new highways that have been added in the last 10 years. Regents Road Bridge would compensate for some of the traffic snarls and would provide more safety with an extra evacuation route in case of wildfire or earthquake damage to older bridges and freeway overpasses. Right now Genesee is THE only north through south route for residents, while the eastern access is now greatly improved. There are no traffic considerations in any of your redevelopment plans, which is unconscionable.

Take these criteria, as the need for more residential space would collide with uneven city space. An increase in housing and jobs would be positive, maybe even helping develop the surrounding area for the university's benefit. I live in this area. I'm in favor of smart development that would enable people to live closer to their jobs. But due to restrictions from the MCAS, high density development and walk-ability was not achievable. Could we get rid of the MCAS and develop along there - Miramar Road? The MCAS creates a lot of noise pollution. Right now there is not enough housing for all the people who work & study in the UTC area, leaving many to commute from downtown SD on 5 or 9. This creates traffic jams and ghastly commutes. The UTC area needs a lot of new development that needs in urban areas with denser housing (e.g. in downtown SD) rather than putting more jobs in UTC when most of the housing is 10+ miles away.

Try to balance the numbers of houses and new jobs. Making it too industrial will be bad and a waste of resources and land.

I am against colocation of housing in the areas that were mentioned: The proximity of UTC20 makes it a prime location for housing that would serve the students and employees of the campus.

None of these villages is suitable.

Don't let garden communities develop this area, they are bad at management. More housing! No more housing development!

I am against high density housing in all of these options. It provides the best mix of jobs and housing, if more parks are added and if Fire Department permits the appropriate fire response.

I believe Option B achieves the most suitable balance for this part of the UCPA, providing room for growth on both residential corridors and employment areas.

I am interested in the most amount of housing development possible, therefore I chose Option A.

None of the options above should be allowed. There is too much traffic and congestion, too much noise in the area. The area is over populated. I am against increases in density because the highway infrastructure cannot handle it... It takes 15 minutes to get from south UC to the UTC20 campus and there are too many traffic lights along Genesee to the north. Traffic at peak hours is intolerable, esp with the transits stationed around it. Village Drive and the new highways that have been added in the last 10 years. Regents Road Bridge would compensate for some of the traffic snarls and would provide more safety with an extra evacuation route in case of wildfire or earthquake damage to older bridges and freeway overpasses. Right now Genesee is THE only north through south route for residents, while the eastern access is now greatly improved. There are no traffic considerations in any of your redevelopment plans, which is unconscionable.

None of the above. No comment.

No comment.

No more housing development!

DONT WANT THIS FOR UC!! MONEY, MONEY IS ALL YOU WANT SO YOU CAN FILL YOUR COFFERS WITH PROPERTY TAXES. ONCE AGAIN...BUILD IN YOUR NECK OF THE WOODS. I PERSONALITY DO NOT WANT ANY CONSTRUCTION TO DESTROY OUR LAND, CANYONS AND YET THE CITY IS INCREASING THE NUMBER OF WOODED AREAS WHERE IS THE WATER COMING FROM? ARE ALL THESE NEW BUILDINGS GOING TO SOLAR AS THEY ARE NEW BUILDING? NO...I DON'T WANT THIS KIND OF DENSITY IN OUR VICINITY. YOU ALL WANT SO MUCH WATER YOU CAN FILL YOUR COFFERS WITH PROPERTY TAXES. No change, leave it as is. None of the options above should be allowed. There is too much traffic and congestion, too much noise in the area. The area is over populated. I am against increases in density because the highway infrastructure cannot handle it... It takes 15 minutes to get from south UC to the UTC20 campus and there are too many traffic lights along Genesee to the north. Traffic at peak hours is intolerable, esp with the transits stationed around it. Village Drive and the new highways that have been added in the last 10 years. Regents Road Bridge would compensate for some of the traffic snarls and would provide more safety with an extra evacuation route in case of wildfire or earthquake damage to older bridges and freeway overpasses. Right now Genesee is THE only north through south route for residents, while the eastern access is now greatly improved. There are no traffic considerations in any of your redevelopment plans, which is unconscionable.

None of the options above should be allowed. There is too much traffic and congestion, too much noise in the area. The area is over populated. I am against increases in density because the highway infrastructure cannot handle it... It takes 15 minutes to get from south UC to the UTC20 campus and there are too many traffic lights along Genesee to the north. Traffic at peak hours is intolerable, esp with the transits stationed around it. Village Drive and the new highways that have been added in the last 10 years. Regents Road Bridge would compensate for some of the traffic snarls and would provide more safety with an extra evacuation route in case of wildfire or earthquake damage to older bridges and freeway overpasses. Right now Genesee is THE only north through south route for residents, while the eastern access is now greatly improved. There are no traffic considerations in any of your redevelopment plans, which is unconscionable.

No comment.

No more housing development!

The proximity of UTC20 makes it a prime location for housing that would serve the students and employees of the campus.

None of the above. No comment.

No new housing.

I believe Option B achieves the most suitable balance for this part of the UCPA, providing room for growth on both residential corridors and employment areas. Less parking more housing especially near the trolley stop. I believe Option B achieves the most suitable balance for this part of the UCPA, providing room for growth on both residential corridors and employment areas.
Getting more people to live near where they work is important. This option presents the highest number of housing units in the area, but the lowest number of safety zones. There also needs to be an emphasis on allowing safe bicycle transit to the areas further from trolley and bus transit.

Increased density and integration of housing is critical. Mixed use high density developments should be maximized particularly in those areas unrestricted by the canyon. The Campus Point and Towne Centre areas are one of the last areas to increase the availability of clean life science and technology jobs. We need this flexibility!

Poor transit ridership projections: more cars, more GHG emissions; this fails to meet City's Climate Action Plan goals.

No guaranteed funding for expanded rec centers, libraries, protected bike lanes on Genesee and Nobel.

Less development. If I wanted to live in LA, I would live in LA.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?

Please provide additional Gas station. There is no competition between gas stations in the area, which causes increase in gas price, and inconvenient operation hours. Limited supply of convenience store and gas station increase car usage (driving time) to the grocery stores to buy any small items or fill up the tank.

We certainly need more housing in this area and access to the 5 to the South Bay is not practical as it is too far from "neighborhood services" and therefore will require cars and more traffic. Plus, both locations have a "cul de sac" problem in connection with safety issues.

Some more acceptable.

You would not develop unhealthy areas and instead focus efforts on solving the housing crisis by building affordable (not microware) public housing that is not for profit. More safe bike paths (not adjacent to cars) would be nice.

There is a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density. There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

People drive cars in this area. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

The considerable industry in this area with residential development of significant degree unless parking is assured and provided/required for multi-residential housing so there is no conflict between workers and residents, or competition for parking.

I believe the inclusion of housing adjacent to employment makes the best sense and I would balance any development that adds new jobs with housing for those jobs.

Our protected natural habitats like Rose Canyon. There is a real need for accessible housing close to the UCSD campus.

Vigorously protect Rose Canyon. Greatly expand trolley transport options (on green/electric vehicles). Increased and protected cycling lanes and firm encouragement of cycling to work. More charging options for electric vehicles. Ensure planting of native plants, trees, shrubs, grasses, flowers, etc.

Finding out about this because we happen to be on an email list. Otherwise, we would be ignorant as to what's afoot like the vast majority of people who live in University City. All of these high density ideas are terrible and will make our quality of life much worse.

Where is the money for all of this coming from? If taxpayer money, shouldn't people be informed as to where their tax dollars are going? My household is only from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy?

We need more jobs and living space in this area, and there's a need to restore the Rose Canyon watershed for water quality and wildlife. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? I would oppose any development that adds new jobs with housing for those jobs.

Yes. Nothing in this proposal makes an even trade to the local community for the damage of moving 20,000 people through it.

This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There are a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?

More housing: less jobs is exactly what I want.

Don't develop unhealthy areas and instead focus efforts on solving the housing crisis by building affordable (not microware) public housing that is not for profit. More safe bike paths (not adjacent to cars) would be nice.

There is a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

People drive cars in this area. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?

More housing: less jobs is exactly what I want.

Don't develop unhealthy areas and instead focus efforts on solving the housing crisis by building affordable (not microware) public housing that is not for profit. More safe bike paths (not adjacent to cars) would be nice.

There is a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

People drive cars in this area. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?

More housing: less jobs is exactly what I want.

Don't develop unhealthy areas and instead focus efforts on solving the housing crisis by building affordable (not microware) public housing that is not for profit. More safe bike paths (not adjacent to cars) would be nice.

There is a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

People drive cars in this area. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?

More housing: less jobs is exactly what I want.

Don't develop unhealthy areas and instead focus efforts on solving the housing crisis by building affordable (not microware) public housing that is not for profit. More safe bike paths (not adjacent to cars) would be nice.

There is a university and three schools in near proximity to this site, and yet you want to include increasing density through this plan. Since the potential danger from the Miramar military base is acknowledged, why would you even consider placing children and workers in the path of another potential tragedy? This area is NOT well served by the trolley so it will increase traffic if density is increased. The areas along campus point and towne center are also single ingress/egress areas that are dangerous in a wildfire situation, and are surrounded by canyons. These areas are NOT prime for increased density.

There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

People drive cars in this area. The surface roads are insufficient to handle the traffic. Where will people park their cars? There is insufficient transit to support the increased density.

If I have to choose one it would be C. Another crowded area with a lot of traffic. Why add to the problem?
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We don't know what more housing and traffic. Apple campus to the Chick-fil-A barely 4000ft across the 805 come with prohibitive detours of 25-30min cycling or 1-2h of walking.

While redeveloping this area it may be worth considering a transit option between Sorrento Valley and the zone west of the 805 that is less car centric (e.g. bicycle path and shuttle). Balanced home and job growth would be preferable challenges traffic and safety in a natural disaster.

I hope to see the Voight trolley station increase train commuters.

If you add housing, there needs to be walking paths, big paths and a parks added to enhance the livability of the residential area. This option seems to be the right balance of housing and jobs for that area.  Additionally, there should be consideration for a community park in the planned area, there is so much nearby for them to access and new shops can take advantage of both a lunch and evening crowd.

These homes need to be affordable!!! They should be for the employees of UCSD and UCSD Health, so no luxury appartments.

This option seems like the best of both worlds.

More housing is needed in the UTC area, and this would help fulfill that need. This housing would also be close to transit, which would encourage transit use.

More housing

Keep high density housing and lowest greenhouse gas emissions.

Job centers paired with transit based housing, higher density housing options will promote smart growth that will revile this area with services, talent and jobs and encourage alternate mobility options for people who live and work in our community.

It does not make sense to not colocate housing and work. People should be able to walk or bike to cycle in a reasonable amount of time if they desire. I think there should be even more housing added than option A proposes.

Increased housing density.

I would like more affordable housing in this region.

I would like more affordable housing.

I think we need to include more housing where more and can increase density in places with no or low density housing first.

I think it is important to co-locate housing and job sites. But I recognize the Accident Potential Zone complicates that a bit in this area. Overall I like the idea of making better use of this area for residential and commercial purposes in tandem.

Housing is the number one priority.

Higher on homes and lower on jobs. Good mix!

Genesee can support additional traffic as can I-5 interchange.

During times of housing crisis, we should prioritize housing with option A.

Build Housing to sell to citizens. No more rent!
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Genesee can support additional traffic as can I-5 interchange.
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If you add housing, there needs to be walking paths, big paths and a parks added to enhance the livability of the residential area. This option seems to be the right balance of housing and jobs for that area.  Additionally, there should be consideration for a community park in the planned area, there is so much nearby for them to access and new shops can take advantage of both a lunch and evening crowd.

These homes need to be affordable!!! They should be for the employees of UCSD and UCSD Health, so no luxury appartments.

This option seems like the best of both worlds.

More housing on Towne Centre R. sounds like a great idea. Would be great to have mixed-use so there are places to shop/eat.

Increased housing density.

More low income housing. Do not want to see increased Employment. Already dense enough work and living wise. More open spaces.

No change

No changes please. Keep as is.

Please just stop building things up. There is no contingency for increased traffic or other quality of life issues that residents face on a daily basis.

No changes.

The ADT’s are already maxing out the roads what will be done to mitigate that and what will be added infrastructure to support the employment population.

Please stop adding high density housing. It takes 20 to 30 minutes, depending on time of day, to go from South UC to our doctors at UCSD. Why does University City have to accept such overcrowding. Quality of life here is horrible.

Option C because it supports the most jobs. This is a great area to work, not necessarily a great area to live.

Once again, minimal difference between the 3 options. None are good.

No more development.

Most people do not want to live at their place of employment. Add parking for cars.

More bike/walking.

Let’s keep the canyons and natural spaces as they are.

Less traffic. It’s good the way it is now, with employment buildings but not so much housing/residential.

Improve local public transport options for local neighborhoods to reduce traffic flow in this area. The trolley is simply not accessible for most outlying residents and an area is required for travel.

If possible, I'd bring the east and west side closer together.

If possible, I'd bring the east and west side closer together.

I prefer options that maintain the existing term mom and pop businesses and do not increase housing density.

I prefer no building but you don't offer that option to choose.

I prefer no building but you don't offer that option to choose.

I picture it as more employment than housing. There will be a tremendous amount of housing infilling the other areas so it will not need more. Again, where are the parking arrangements? Even small parks would soften the look of the proposed industrial park look and feel.

I like the inclusion of parks. Genesee is already super busy.

I am opposed to building residential units in the flight plan. This is not the place for families. It will be noisy and dangerous.

Highest number of jobs.
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I like the inclusion of parks. Genesee is already super busy.

I am opposed to building residential units in the flight plan. This is not the place for families. It will be noisy and dangerous.

Highest number of jobs.
I think keeping open spaces and having the transit close to this area is enough to upkeep with the job demands. I don’t think there is a need for more in this area by taking away spaces that allow communities to interact with each other.

Yamnaco needs a better pedestrian infrastructure. With the increase in sales nationally and specifically in Southern California and San Diego, are there any community planning infrastructure dedicated to accommodate the increase in cycling traffic? More safer bike lanes away from traffic please.

Employee serving amenities should include parks and dog parks and ample parking.

None of the above. Inflou on inflou on inflout. Never stops, and where is the water coming from?

Again, quality of life gone.

---

**UTC TRANSIT VILLAGE**

*housing should be focused on the EMPTY business offices NORTH OF La Jolla village Dr. More bike lanes*

**PLEASE FOCUS on pedestrian option and NOT ON PEDESTRIAN FAMILY OPTIONS. More shops/restaurants along base of buildings to enhance the neighborhood.*

Currently, UTC is desperately in need of new housing. Trying to rent a room or apartment there is extremely expensive, and more housing will help alleviate that. Plus, putting high density into areas where people can walk to amenities is super helpful for people and will also reduce the amount of cars on the road and improve the overall health and well-being of both the area and the people living there.

**Build better bike infrastructure. More medium-density housing.**

hanging in areas where people can walk to amenities is super helpful for people and will also reduce the amount of cars on the road and improve the overall health

Traffic in this area has already increased substantially with the updates/additions to the mall and surrounding areas. With these proposed developments, that area will be equivalent to living in Los Angeles—impossibly difficult and congested. They would have a huge impact on the environment.

While the claims about making these designs pedestrian and cyclist friendly makes me happy, there’d be a lot of work to be done to make it a reality. Protected (and enforced) bike lanes would be a wonderful start. I’ll be honest, I choose Option B over Option A because Option A looks too much like a downtown. I want there to be more opportunities for people to live in San Diego and University City specifically, but I personally think Option A would be kind of a miserable place to show up and live.

Be sure to include green space. Housing must be affordable.

Again, overbuilding DOES not improve quality of life.

*any plan must include adequate infrastructure*

That includes schools, parks, libraries, commercial property and parking on both street and in private business and housing units. Just because there will be both employment and housing in the location doesn’t mean all employees will live within walking distance or easy to use public transportation.

Existing open areas such as Rose, and San Clemente Canyon must be protected as recreation and having trees to help control Carbon Dioxide.

Bike transit is a joke. Are you going to ride a bicycle with groceries? Less than 2% of commuters are by bicycle and that number will not increase no matter how much MONEY SANDAG spends on dedicated bike paths. SANDAG is taking money which should be spent on widening I-5, I-8, I-15 and I-805 and wasting it on a trolley that does not serve neighborhoods...how are you going to take the Trolley to work and then walk three miles to get to your house; each parking place at the new Balboa trolley station cost $50,000 each! It’s an outrageous waste of taxpayer money. The SANDAG CEO, a failed transplant from LA, is responsible for this misguided boondoggle.

As much housing as possible and as little parking as possible.
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I am a 3rd-year civil engineering student at UCSD. Rents are really high, so I support option A to increase housing supply. I am particularly excited by the rendering of the new transit village. It’s too close to Rose Canyon MSCP habitat. High buildings with night lighting would have a negative impact. Plus being so close to Rose Canyon would lead to increased negative human impacts on Rose Canyon and the MSCP. Also, that parcel is bounded by a steep drop off into a riparian area on its west side. For all UTC options there needs to be green park space where people can take kids to let them run around. Consideration of what makes a good place for families with kids to live has been left out of the concepts for all focus areas that add residential. Nothing in the concepts is geared to making this a community where families with kids would want to live.

I live in an area directly adjacent to the proposed UTC transit village area. My biggest personal complaint is that the area isn’t especially friendly or interesting for walking or biking. I support Option C over Option B and Option A. We need more housing, but PLEASE ensure there is sufficient parking & lighting for people to get safely home at night.

I think the plan to increase housing supply will be effective than the existing bus system in absorbing thousands of resident commuters as well as thousands of commuters from other areas.

In any case, this area is very similar to the area surrounding Nobel, in that it is already dense, and it sits along the new transit line. So, while Option A is dense, it would add the most homes and jobs to the area. The FAA could be notified, and the height limit should not be an issue for Miramar.

I am against all three options A, B and C.

I am a 3rd-year civil engineering student at UCSD. Rents are really high, so I support option A to increase housing supply. I am particularly excited by the rendering of the new transit village. It’s too close to Rose Canyon MSCP habitat. High buildings with night lighting would have a negative impact. Plus being so close to Rose Canyon would lead to increased negative human impacts on Rose Canyon and the MSCP. Also, that parcel is bounded by a steep drop off into a riparian area on its west side. For all UTC options there needs to be green park space where people can take kids to let them run around. Consideration of what makes a good place for families with kids to live has been left out of the concepts for all focus areas that add residential. Nothing in the concepts is geared to making this a community where families with kids would want to live.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants. This area is very similar to the area surrounding Nobel, in that it is already dense, and it sits along the new transit line. To, while Option A is fairly dense, it would add the most homes and jobs to the area. The FAA could be notified, and the height limit should not be an issue for Miramar.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants. This area is very similar to the area surrounding Nobel, in that it is already dense, and it sits along the new transit line. To, while Option A is fairly dense, it would add the most homes and jobs to the area. The FAA could be notified, and the height limit should not be an issue for Miramar.

I’m not in favor of ANY of these options given how bad rush hour traffic already is in this area. I do not believe that the new transit systems will be very effective at reducing traffic congestion compared to the existing bus system in absorbing thousands of resident commuters as well as thousands of commuters from other areas.

I live in an area directly adjacent to the proposed UTC transit village area. My biggest personal complaint is that the area isn’t especially friendly or interesting for walking or biking. I support Option C over Option B and Option A. We need more housing, but PLEASE ensure there is sufficient parking & lighting for people to get safely home at night.

I think the plan to increase housing supply will be effective than the existing bus system in absorbing thousands of resident commuters as well as thousands of commuters from other areas.
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Don’t let garden communities develop this area, they are bad at management.

More housing!!!

More transit, more jobs in the urban setting

Given how close this is to UTC and UCSD, the city should lean into this Option A and build something that resembles a second downtown.

None of these villages is suitable.

None of these villages is suitable.

None of the above.

None of these villages is suitable.

None of the options

None of the above.

None of the options

No new changes keep the same

No new changes keep the same

No more cars on the road. People must be able to pay for housing in areas where they work.
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I like how the area looks currently. The concern is about housing, even though currently there are housing units they are too overpriced and lack security. How do you aim to tackle that issue with increase in housing units in the area? La Jolla Village Drive is always busy/crowded and very noisy for the apartments that are on the side of the road. My apartment is one of those and I can tell you how unbearably noisy it can get. With the increase in housing and jobs and then the rail transit - how do you plan to decongest this road?

Again this is a traffic corridor and any development has to be concerned with dealing with traffic.

I currently drive through UC Village three times a week, and I am not sure if walking the road and possibly create less issues for parking that can occur there. However, I think this may also create more walking traffic in the mall. If this was to happen, I think that the shipping area would also expand its presence as well. I particularly like the idea of a rail transit center where the density is increased in density where the current use density apartments to be located.

The UTC area has already become unmanageable with the recent expansions - it already feels more like New York City than San Diego. I am skeptical that planning will include adequate consideration of the needs of children and teens.

Please provide additional Gas station. There is no competition between gas stations in the area, which causes increase in gas price, and inconvenient operation afterthought.

Please add more emphasis on green space. Public rooftops. Public park.

Again, I am in support of more housing. More shade on streets, more seating, more public bathrooms especially around transit.

UTC is already an urban center and will remain that way. Adding more housing, jobs and transit access will UTC to become even more of a vibrant center and alter your vision is awful and the options are terrible. The area is already too crowded with too much noise and traffic. Thanks for ruining things even further.

I would like to see UC Village area change and that is why I support this vision. I think your vision is awful and the options are terrible. The area is already too crowded with too much noise and traffic. Thanks for ruining things even further.

I am very supportive of a pedestrian-oriented environment in this area, with the addition of cycling infrastructure. It would do well to maintain a village feel rather than a more high-rise city feel. Use of Westfield UTC to transit should be encouraged over use by car.

Again - better bike and pedestrian access around the area - the "last mile" is a must including connection again to Rose Canyon to the south, UCSD and medical campuses. The UTC area has already become unmanageable with the recent expansions - it already feels more like New York City than San Diego.

We need lots of housing. We don't need more retail/office/retail bringing nonresidential traffic into UTC. I want dense housing but not that much mixed use. I'd like the housing of option A but the jobs of Option B.

Utterly protect Rose Canyon. Greatly expand city transport options (on green/electric vehicles). Increased and protected cycling lanes and firm encouragement of cycling and walking as a means of transport, especially for work. More charging options for electric vehicles. Ensure planting of native plants - trees, shrubs, flowers.

Again - better bike and pedestrian access around the area - the "last mile" is a must including connection again to Rose Canyon to the south, UCSD and medical campuses.

I notice that people from nearby neighborhoods are asking for more retail. I would like the shopping center to be able to attract more people from the surrounding area and farther to avoid the area.

This area is categorized by more recent development already in line with higher density and with transit access. If it would be great throughout all the areas to have lower price limit to accommodate neighborhood electric vehicles for those who wish to forgo having a car but might need to get back and forth to the shopping center with minimal loss.

This is not a "village" and should not be called one. With more residents need more public parks. Need to plan for what occurs if retail shopping essential goes online. I would like the retail center to have more walkability but also have the ability to have more parking for larger shopping trips.

We need lots of housing. We don't need more retail/jobs/offices bringing nonresidential traffic into UC. I want dense housing but not that much mixed use. I'd like the housing of option A but the jobs of Option B.

The UTC area has already become unmanageable with the recent expansions - it already feels more like New York City than San Diego. I am skeptical that planning will include adequate consideration of the needs of children and teens.

Please provide additional Gas station. There is no competition between gas stations in the area, which causes increase in gas price, and inconvenient operation afterthought.

Please add more emphasis on green space. Public rooftops. Public park.

Again, I am in support of more housing. More shade on streets, more seating, more public bathrooms especially around transit.

UTC is already an urban center and will remain that way. Adding more housing, jobs and transit access will UTC to become even more of a vibrant center and alter your vision is awful and the options are terrible. The area is already too crowded with too much noise and traffic. Thanks for ruining things even further.

I would like to see UC Village area change and that is why I support this vision. I think your vision is awful and the options are terrible. The area is already too crowded with too much noise and traffic. Thanks for ruining things even further.

I am very supportive of a pedestrian-oriented environment in this area, with the addition of cycling infrastructure. It would do well to maintain a village feel rather than a more high-rise city feel. Use of Westfield UTC to transit should be encouraged over use by car.

Again - better bike and pedestrian access around the area - the "last mile" is a must including connection again to Rose Canyon to the south, UCSD and medical campuses. The UTC area has already become unmanageable with the recent expansions - it already feels more like New York City than San Diego.

We need lots of housing. We don't need more retail/office/retail bringing nonresidential traffic into UTC. I want dense housing but not that much mixed use. I'd like the housing of option A but the jobs of Option B.

Utterly protect Rose Canyon. Greatly expand city transport options (on green/electric vehicles). Increased and protected cycling lanes and firm encouragement of cycling and walking as a means of transport, especially for work. More charging options for electric vehicles. Ensure planting of native plants - trees, shrubs, flowers.

Again - better bike and pedestrian access around the area - the "last mile" is a must including connection again to Rose Canyon to the south, UCSD and medical campuses.
In general, I like living in UTC because it is close to my job and has lots of stuff within walking distance. Would love to buy a house in the future if I can.

More housing is better. Mid-density housing to avoid heavy traffic and crowdedness but still providing many places to live.

Again with the new trolley station we can’t afford not to build more housing here!

Would love the walking nature format open street format of option b in option a. Would be a welcomed part of the UTC infrastructure. Bike infrastructure to improve air quality. I’m particularly excited by Option A’s stronger focus on making a pedestrian and public transit friendly village.

UTC is already a high-density area. Best to bite the bullet now and make it more so, rather than sticking one’s head in the sand and hoping the need for more housing never arrives.

This area is very similar to the area surrounding Nobel: it is already dense and it sits along the new transit line. While Option A is dense, it would add a significant number of homes and jobs to the area. The FAA could be notified and the height limit should not be an issue for Miramar.

This plan is destructive to the community. The expansion of UTC mall is more than enough for this area.

Walkable neighbourhoods that are affordable and safe are necessary.

In order to meet our housing and climate goals, UTC village should become a place where people from all economic classes can live and work.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoped also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for the health of the children.

In order to get the kids to the trolley station and other key bus routes we need a safe bike and pedestrian network. So more biking and walking is essential for any sort of meaningful density increase here.

This area desperately needs more affordable housing and better transit and bike infrastructure.

Why not have an option keeping it as it presently exists?

We should maximize the number of housing units near trolley stops.

Proximity to large job center, transit, and shopping, make this a great area to increase density and make this a more pedestrian oriented neighborhood.

The more housing, jobs, and businesses in this area, the better. There are currently no good options for many students living in this area for shopping and getting around - mixing it up and lifting restrictions will be crucial.

I would like much more affordable housing and some transit options here.

More density and more transit is better for the climate and better for living without a car.

We need more housing units:

- Keep high density, more jobs, options for entertainment, green space
- More housing near transit is better. Higher density of housing will create a dynamic urban community which will support area businesses attract employees who want to spend less time commuting
- More density = more homes = more access to public transit service. More buildings = more bus riders = more riders per bus stop = less traffic.

There are only four major transit corridors in San Diego. One is UTC. One is on the east side of the city. UTC is already the highest density area in all the other corridors.

Would love to see more business development around the new trolley station and other key bus routes but actually could do it. I see the real purpose of the area from the demand for affordable housing in the UTC area makes UTC village a perfect place for students to live.

UTC is a growing neighborhood, so I wholeheartedly vote for Option A, which adds the most housing as well as adds critical bikeability and walkability infrastructure. This option also decreases community emissions the most, especially compared to the current state of emissions, which is necessary to stay in line with city and county climate action plans.

This area is very similar to the area surrounding Nobel: it is already dense and it sits along the new transit line. While Option A is dense, it would add a significant number of homes and jobs to the area. The FAA could be notified and the height limit should not be an issue for Miramar.

I think it’s already dense, so the lowest amount of change would be the best.

I don’t want commercial south of Nobel

This is a growing neighborhood, so I wholeheartedly vote for Option A, which adds the most housing as well as adds critical bikeability and walkability infrastructure.

I think it’s already dense, so the lowest amount of change would be the best.

I don’t want commercial south of Nobel.

Walkable neighbourhoods that are affordable and safe are necessary.

More density and more transit is better for the climate and better for living without a car.

Building more in this area is counterproductive. The traffic in this area is already unworkable. I used to work at the UC and could either walk, ride my bike, or drive. I drove to work never more than 1-2 miles, take my bike, walk to work or ride my bike to work. It’s quick but felt unsafe due to traffic on Mira Mesa and La Jolla Village Drive, but driving could take 45 minutes to travel 1.5 miles. Please don’t add cars to this area. Because that’s the point: if you can’t keep more of the cars off the road from this point forward, the whole area is not a good area.

More jobs. Where are the developing roads and automobile infrastructure? I was expecting to see some parking structures for the employees.

There is a need for focus on low cost housing to target the transit center to allow students to commute to the university and reduce car use on our roads.

With more housing and jobs, need adequate parking and street safety. Furthermore, the housing should be affordable for students who will most likely be living in cars.

This plan is transformative to the community. The expansion of UTC mall is more than enough for this area.

This area desperately needs more affordable housing and better transit and bike infrastructure.

A more interesting area which is critical for any sort of development is the City College area. It is the heart of San Diego’s public higher education and is home to 50,000 students. It would be wonderful if everyone who wanted to live near the trolley station and other key bus routes could actually do it! I really like the use of the area NorthEast of the trolley station which is currently a very green area. It would be wonderful if this could be developed.

If you can’t create a thriving university region. It makes me really happy to see changes being made, even if I will likely not live in the area when they are ready to be enjoyed.
If you want UTC to be San Diego’s other downtown then you should create a lively community there. That coupled with the housing issues facing San Diego will help

Again, nervous about so many cars commuting, hope that the choice is to live nearby and walk or ride bike when possible to avoid further gridlock on Genesee

We’ve got enough traffic and density as it is.

housing crisis?

There should be better biking connections between these redevelopment areas to live nearby because there just aren’t many places! I think the highest density option will help people the most and make the most lives better.

This area has so much potential to feel like a real city and be a great place to live. Westfield UTC is a super nice mall because of its walkability and easy access to

Prefer to have higher density and more housing in close proximity to the new Mid Coast Trolley.

Ideally, this neighborhood would have streets of actual (not merely de jure) speeds of 35mph or less that are as well lit as the Mesa Nuevo grad housing complex.”

in the near-future.

construct and meet much resistance. Installing better lighting and traffic calming measures can likely be done much more quickly, and thus should be the the focus

In the short term, adequate street lighting and traffic enforcement are paramount. Ped-like bike infrastructure seen in most of these plans will take a long time to

courting disaster.

lighting is supplied by car headlight beams) and cars are regularly speeding at 70mph. By day, it is hostile environment for cyclists, and those who ride at night are

This place sucks to live if you don’t have a car plz make it not suck :)

not sure how the types of residences are determined (rental units vs purchased homes). Ideally, it’d be great to have a larger percentage of the units built be

of Option A, as it seems to increase housing density as well as preserve, if not enhance, the community aspect of the neighborhood. My only concern is that I’m

Wow Option A is wonderfully exciting. Does it make sense for the trolley line to stop at UTC? Seems like a connection to South UC would help a lot.

I voted on all options. However the last one mile of public transportation needs to be solved. How do you get to the trolley stations from south west and south east where the future would allow in the last mile only.

I wish there was more accessible night life in UTC. I currently feel the need to go to other neighborhoods which is a shame because they are not close to home and

Mix of upscale, casual, family-friendly, and natural spaces. Connected via bike-friendly paths. More bus access, particularly west-east. Less car blight by having

of upscale, casual, family-friendly, and natural spaces. Connected via bike-friendly paths. More bus access, particularly west-east. Less car blight by having park

of upscale, casual, family-friendly, and natural spaces. Connected via bike-friendly paths. More bus access, particularly west-east. Less car blight by having park

parking that are held behind central spaces. Accessible and aesthetic from the street rather than a seemingly impermeable perimeter. Community

trash facilities, dog parks, bike repair stations, exercise stations, recreational parks, etc. child play areas), Landscaping that supports

infrastructure/resources (daycare facilities, parks, dog parks, bike repair stations, exercise stations, recreational parks, etc. child play areas), Landscaping that supports
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infrastructure/resources (daycare facilities, parks, dog parks, bike repair stations, exercise stations, recreational parks, etc. child play areas), Landscaping that supports

infrastructure/resources (daycare facilities, parks, dog parks, bike repair stations, exercise stations, recreational parks, etc. child play areas), Landscaping that supports
Traffic on the 805 in this area is already very bad during afternoon rush hour. Adding more office space will exacerbate the issues. More housing is needed in this area to support the existing office uses to limit commuting and traffic.

Long stretches of La Jolla Village Dr. currently feel quite pedestrian-unfriendly due to the high traffic volume, b) the lack of shade trees and c) the noise and air quality etc that come with (a) and (b). Planning for that could have quite an impact on the livability of the area.

Many people commute to this area and will continue to do so, due to high cost of living. Adding dense luxury housing will not solve the housing problems.

This area is already quite impacted and I don’t think increased density alone makes sense.

There is no plan to increase parks or open space, only increase density.

I think it is unrealistic to think people are going to get jobs where they can walk to. And based on what has occurred so far these will be very expensive housing developments. All of the new developments are greatest density with all of these plans favor more density, packing people into smaller and smaller spaces. Where is option D for a reduction in utilized space on campus was for student residents.

I prefer no building but you don't offer that option

Keep the green space. Don’t overbuild for the roads and infrastructure.

Add parking.

More bike accessible.

Include increased residential development along Nobel Drive in Urban Transit Village

Until traffic flow is improved on Genesee Avenue there should be no increase in density. Improved bus service to local neighborhoods may help to reduce traffic.

While Option D does not reach its levels of job and housing creation, it’s less dense and more inviting.

I support options that maintain the existing low cost and run businesses and do not increase housing density.

I prefer no building but you don’t offer that option.

All options are hitting in very dense areas. There should be more room allowed for parks as residents need places to enjoy the outdoors. Living in the middle of high traffic is so damaging to mental and physical health.

While high density near the trolley station at UTC is important we need more parks in this area so that people don’t have to cross high way like surface streets to reach a park with their kids and have to walk their dogs. We also need to connect all the green belts that run thru these developments so people can travel on them instead of them being cut off.

These options slightly contradict each other with the placement of buildings, which made it difficult to select an option. The Costa Verde Shopping Center area along Genesee Avenue and Nobel Drive is already very dense.

These options slightly contradict each other with the placement of buildings, which made it difficult to select an option. The Costa Verde Shopping Center area along Genesee Avenue and Nobel Drive is already very dense.

This is an area that is already significantly built out. Pre-COVID traffic on 805 was a standstill and it could take 45 minutes to go from UTC Thornton to Governor Dr. I do not support this for people who are not used to congested traffic.

I oppose all three plans due to density and traffic impacts.

Executive drive needs to have vehicle traffic. If vehicle traffic is eliminated, east gate will get way too busy. I live in La Jolla Mesa estates. I watched a sub committee of the Board of Regents meeting and Elagado’s comments about Eastgate not being busy is a false statement. Traffic traffic along Eastgate is MUCH busier than it was 10 years ago. It seems it got busier when the new hospital was built and all the new building at USD. One can only wish that the traffic will be alleviated with the trolley.

None of these are appropriate.

I will never understand how and why planners believe that everyone is going to use bikes and walk and uses buses to justify these proposals with traffic centers. This is another terrible plan for the people who are not used to congested traffic. It is selfish to ask the residents to walk and not deal with the endless traffic issues. We already have enough traffic issues.

I will never understand how and why planners believe that everyone is going to use bikes and walk and uses buses to justify these proposals with traffic centers. This is another terrible plan for the people who are not used to congested traffic. It is selfish to ask the residents to walk and not deal with the endless traffic issues. We already have enough traffic issues.

Any increase in density, including the bike lanes, connected to the trolley and bike lanes will have no impact on those travelers. If density in this area is increased vehicle capacity need increased as well. There was nothing about increasing the capacity for the trolley and bike lanes.

Connect metro transit to governor drive

No, once again. Please be part of no change which would be a fresh platform. We don’t need to fill this area any more. Move out East where there’s room.

Connect metro transit to governor drive

No, once again. Please be part of no change which would be a fresh platform. We don’t need to fill this area any more. Move out East where there’s room.

Connect metro transit to governor drive

No, once again. Please be part of no change which would be a fresh platform. We don’t need to fill this area any more. Move out East where there’s room.

Connect metro transit to governor drive

No, once again. Please be part of no change which would be a fresh platform. We don’t need to fill this area any more. Move out East where there’s room.

None, will turn into a homeless dump and make traffic along Genesee unbearable.

I think the plans are counting on how the public’s use of mass transit; it’s a huge waste and failure downtown; a place for homeless people and high crime.

I oppose all three plans due to density and to the impacts.

The public needs to feel safe taking public transportation before any decision is made based on people actually doing it.

This is an area that is already significantly built out. Pre-COVID traffic on 805 was a standstill and it could take 45 minutes to go from UTC Thornton to Governor Dr. I do not support this for people who are not used to congested traffic.

Traffic along Eastgate is MUCH busier than it was 10 years ago. It seems it got busier when the new hospital was built and all the new building at USD. One can only wish that the traffic will be alleviated with the trolley.

None of these are appropriate.

I will never understand how and why planners believe that everyone is going to use bikes and walk and uses buses to justify these proposals with traffic centers. This is another terrible plan for the people who are not used to congested traffic. It is selfish to ask the residents to walk and not deal with the endless traffic issues. We already have enough traffic issues.

None of these are appropriate.

I will never understand how and why planners believe that everyone is going to use bikes and walk and uses buses to justify these proposals with traffic centers. This is another terrible plan for the people who are not used to congested traffic. It is selfish to ask the residents to walk and not deal with the endless traffic issues. We already have enough traffic issues.

None of these are appropriate.

I will never understand how and why planners believe that everyone is going to use bikes and walk and uses buses to justify these proposals with traffic centers. This is another terrible plan for the people who are not used to congested traffic. It is selfish to ask the residents to walk and not deal with the endless traffic issues. We already have enough traffic issues.
Please do not build high rise apartments inside mall property (specifically old Sears auto shop). The traffic congestion will be unbearable.

Minimize density.

I don't see how you can add housing without accounting for more cars. San Diego is 20+ years from being a place where everyone takes public transit town. Big new bridge on the East Side of La Jolla Village Drive.

We badly need safer pedestrian street crossings at the intersection of La Jolla Village Drive and Towne Centre Drive. It is extremely dangerous even though during normal workdays probably hundreds of people walk across La Jolla Village Drive. This is a dangerous situation because not many students have access to a car for commuting. It also saves carbon emissions when it's less car-centric.

Let's make the Golden Triangle the second downtown and make it pedestrian/alternate transportation friendly.

I don't care about the Coastal Height Limit, we are not that close to the beach. I'll keep bringing this up because University City's pedestrian or cyclist friendly neighborhood is not happening, just make sure there are additional bus stops and routes to support this new development will be right near the trolley, but people need to reach the station to use the trolley. Also, the trolley doesn't support everyone's needs, so either fill that place with buses or find a way for people to walk and bike safely.

Include as much green space as possible, do not make a concrete jungle.

FUND NOT INTENTIONALLY CHOOSE ANY OPTION AND COULDN'T DELETE! Again, more impacts on transportation and DO NOT EXCEED HEIGHT LIMITS. We don't want a downtown being built here!

Traffic in this area is already difficult. These propositions would worsen it and have a negative impact on the environment, especially being so close to natural areas for people to walk and bike safely.

I don't care about the Coastal Height Limit, we are not that close to the beach. I'll keep bringing this up because University City's pedestrian or cyclist friendly neighborhood is not happening, just make sure there are additional bus stops and routes to support this new development will be right near the trolley, but people need to reach the station to use the trolley. Also, the trolley doesn't support everyone's needs, so either fill that place with buses or find a way for people to walk and bike safely.

Include as much green space as possible, do not make a concrete jungle.

FUND NOT INTENTIONALLY CHOOSE ANY OPTION AND COULDN'T DELETE! Again, more impacts on transportation and DO NOT EXCEED HEIGHT LIMITS. We don't want a downtown being built here!

Traffic in this area is already difficult. These propositions would worsen it and have a negative impact on the environment, especially being so close to natural areas for people to walk and bike safely.

I don't care about the Coastal Height Limit, we are not that close to the beach. I'll keep bringing this up because University City’s pedestrian or cyclist friendly neighborhood is not happening, just make sure there are additional bus stops and routes to support this new development will be right near the trolley, but people need to reach the station to use the trolley. Also, the trolley doesn't support everyone's needs, so either fill that place with buses or find a way for people to walk and bike safely.

Include as much green space as possible, do not make a concrete jungle.

FUND NOT INTENTIONALLY CHOOSE ANY OPTION AND COULDN'T DELETE! Again, more impacts on transportation and DO NOT EXCEED HEIGHT LIMITS. We don't want a downtown being built here!

Traffic in this area is already difficult. These propositions would worsen it and have a negative impact on the environment, especially being so close to natural areas for people to walk and bike safely.
The Urban Transit Village would transform the Nobel Campus Transit area into a high density area near a major transit line. This would provide much needed new housing units and jobs. Increasing development would also increase walkability of the area as well as provide housing for UCSD students.

In many cases, this transformation appears to be an inaccurate trade-off. Mode share is little changed, but Option A/B bring fewer trips and GHG than existing — despite addition of substantial auto-related ADT/GHG ratios e.g. 8 auto passengers per trip. Changing to B brings approximately 70% larger than existing.

I am deeply concerned that the plans presented here do not provide for adequate improvements in or, protections for open spaces (Rise Canyon Parks, traffic/transit e.g., bike lanes, pedestrian and cyclist safety), and affordable housing. These must be explicitly addressed before a plan can be chosen, because the plans are incomplete.

Since this area is right next to campus, a neighborhood low-density area would best achieve suitable housing for students as well as provide space for the shopping center. This area should have a focus on housing but there needs to be an actual significant green space PARK. People need expanses of green to walk in, sit in, take a break. To do this, significant reduction in the number of vehicles in this area is needed. Remember the 100' footprint rule. Option D is a place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than a commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

We should definitely get rid of the coastal height limit in this area. There is a big ridge between this area and the coast, so no one has coastal views that need to be protected! This area should have a focus on housing but there needs to be a significant green space PARK. People need expanses of green to walk in, sit in, take a break. This could take a big load off of the neighborhoods in terms of traffic/transit (e.g., bike lanes, pedestrian and cyclist safety), and traffic.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

Again! So Nothing! Do Not Cast to UCSD! They are NOT good neighbors! Haven’t been since the late 90’s – I own and live in the neighborhood since 1977. UCSD don’t spend any of their billions of dollars maintaining their own property. DO NOT BULGE UP this upper La Jolla area. Down with all of this!

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I am against all three Options A, B, and C.

The current footprint of the transit center shopping center has a very bad design. There is no planning for the existing transit infrastructure. I would love to see the urban transit village with high density housing for UCSD students like myself, maybe even get some bars and restaurants going. I would like to see this being detrimental to the current community’s quality of life, as well as to the green spaces in the canyons nearby. No additional parks, libraries. Is this the way we want to go? I envision this area as a commuter student dormitory, college town, not much traffic and no bikers. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

The Urban Transit Village would transform the Nobel Campus Transit area into a high density area near a major transit line. This would provide much needed new housing units and jobs. Increasing development would also increase walkability of the area as well as provide housing for UCSD students.

In many cases, this transformation appears to be an inaccurate trade-off. Mode share is little changed, but Option A/B bring fewer trips and GHG than existing — despite addition of substantial auto-related ADT/GHG ratios e.g. 8 auto passengers per trip. Changing to B brings approximately 70% larger than existing.

I am deeply concerned that the plans presented here do not provide for adequate improvements in or, protections for open spaces (Rise Canyon Parks, traffic/transit e.g., bike lanes, pedestrian and cyclist safety), and affordable housing. These must be explicitly addressed before a plan can be chosen, because the plans are incomplete.

Since this area is right next to campus, a neighborhood low-density area would best achieve suitable housing for students as well as provide space for the shopping center. This area should have a focus on housing but there needs to be an actual significant green space PARK. People need expanses of green to walk in, sit in, take a break. To do this, significant reduction in the number of vehicles in this area is needed. Remember the 100’ footprint rule. Option D is a place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

We should definitely get rid of the coastal height limit in this area. There is a big ridge between this area and the coast, so no one has coastal views that need to be protected! This area should have a focus on housing but there needs to be a significant green space PARK. People need expanses of green to walk in, sit in, take a break. This could take a big load off of the neighborhoods in terms of traffic/transit (e.g., bike lanes, pedestrian and cyclist safety), and traffic.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

I support building more housing and taking advantage of the existing transit infrastructure. I do not advocate any of these concepts. High density development is uneconomical in UC. I am in favor of more housing availability. While transit is close, we do need to ensure there’s enough parking. (Not for Park, for example, is a no place to actually put it into practice. Any housing built here that is not income restricted is likely to be taken up largely by UCSD students, as the University is growing, and I would support something more than commuter student dormitory. Option B would be a very significant increase in high density, I think there should be enough parking to accommodate such a high density.

The current footprint of the transit center shopping center has a very bad design. There is no planning for the existing transit infrastructure. I would love to see the urban transit village with high density housing for UCSD students like myself, maybe even get some bars and restaurants going. I would like to see this being detrimental to the current community’s quality of life, as well as to the green spaces in the canyons nearby. No additional parks, libraries. Is this the way we want to go? I envision this area as a commuter student dormitory, college town, not much traffic and no bikers.
A - 100   | CHOOSE YOUR FUTURE! ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Make it bike and pedestrian friendly. More trees and shade. Lower density increasing housing and jobs to the greatest extent possible. Development should also face out towards the street and large blocks should be broken up.

We need to build the most amount of housing. This is a good location for it.

Keep open spaces in mind. Make sure all the forms of transit coincide. Bike paths must be safe.

Since the trolley is already built, it needs denser population to be efficient.

Right now this space is mostly covered by a parking lot. That would be nice to use the land more efficiently and to add affordable housing (not luxury housing).

Need measures to make sure it doesn’t all just become housing. A village isn’t a village without commercial and public services.
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- 103

The parking in this area is already horrendous. Any expansion that does not include parking will make this area even more difficult to navigate. Grocery shopping for a family of four is not a public transportation friendly endeavor. These options will result in more traffic and pollution when families shift their shopping to further away stores where they can actually find a parking space.

agreed we should maximize housing density in this area near so many jobs

With the amount of people living in the area, I am worried that other changes to community infrastructure will not be made along with the increase in housing and density. With increased density comes more congestion, changes in parking and increased noise from more cars using the area. I would prefer option A if the housing was affordable for students, as there has been a constant issue with affordable housing for UCSD students. However, with 

Density and housing is the priority here. I believe that the UCSD housing and jobs report is an emphasis on public parks and spaces.

UCSD is such a tremendous source of jobs and energy that it would be a disservice to this area's potential to do anything other than make it an urban transit village. I would like La Jolla Village Square to be denser, with more housing and walkability. Currently it is very car-centric but with the Nobel Drive trolley station there will be a lot more people on foot trying to access homes and businesses, so the planning needs to change to prioritize that.

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE  |  A - 103
The Vons area should retain the small character, reflective of the surrounding neighborhood. East of I-5 should be primarily EMX as no height limit is in effect. 

These are my main concerns: No new parks proposed (despite up to 100,000+ more residents) Poor transit ridership projections: more cars, more GHG emissions; this fails to meet City’s Climate Action Plan goals

This area should be high density mixed use area. With it’s location relative to UCSD and easy access to transit, this is a strong candidate for a future urban center where residents and those in the area for employment can go car-free.

This location is already an important area for UCSD students and staff to live close to campus and amenities and we should continue to develop it as is so more UCSD students and staff can live there. We should not change the 30-foot height limit in the area. While UCSD can use taller buildings in order to increase density, keeping the height limit to 30’ makes it much easier to live near this location and ultimately had to leave because it was too hard to access transit to downtown -- with the trolley station this problem will be fixed and we can continue to develop this area.

Recently people who already live in UTC and require a minimal commute.

Can you make it possible to Bike from Trader Joes to Doyle and not be killed by cars merging onto I5?

The Vons area should retain the small character, reflective of the surrounding neighborhood. East of I-5 should be primarily EMX as no height limit is in effect. It also has no ocean views to preserve. This area and a destination for the nearby community and those using public transit.
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We need more houses not more businesses.

I really want to say that this area is filled with UCSD students with limited means and with the limited parking on campus and the limited time to spend on structures. Maximal green space and outdoor eating locations. Facilitated pedestrian access to UCSD campus. A mini urban center with enhanced entertainment and food options. Less parking blight via vertical parking. It was my favorite important change necessary for UCSD's immediate community is better walkability. Option A is the densest and therefore creates the most walkable community so walkable neighborhoods that are affordable and safe are necessary. There needs to be a focus on low cost housing close to the transit centers to allow students to commute to the university and reduce car use on our roads.

Keep the supermarkets please, the Ralphs and WholeFood are the only two out of three supermarkets that close to the campus that doesn't need a car or a long bus ride. The shopping center desperately needs an update and we need higher housing density everywhere. However, these shopping plazas and roads/freeway entrances would be nice to develop this region more so that students and local commuters are better served.

I think enhancing the shops and parking lot in this area is crucial. The space should be modernized and serve the UCSD campus as well as those who use the transit center to come from/ to work. That said, I think it is critical that we maintain the feel of the neighborhood and so I am not a proponent of plans to urbanize the area (I dislike it and don't want San Diego to look like it) or to increase the height limit of buildings in the coastal zone. The Coastal height from the Coastal Commission should not be relevant as it is not the coast. The coastalcommission seems to have gone beyond its original intention...to protect the coast.

The height limits are in place for a reason. (Speaking as a former beach community planning board member) I would love to see the height limit removed, although it is out of the scope of the community plan. I appreciate that planning is considering this possible future. There is no reason to limit residential or office towers here, especially around the trolley station. Development must center the pedestrian experience at the trolley station; the huge garage is already not optimal but all the surface parking at the malls means there's a lot of room for multi-story buildings with ground floor retail, pedestrian and bicycle access. Small retail spaces can accompany new development; it has excellent mix of proximity of jobs, commercial uses, but the streets are very unfriendly to non-automotive users. Protected bike lanes on La Jolla Village Drive, wider sidewalks set back from the street, bulbouts at all intersections, repainted crosswalks are all needed.

I would support maintaining the existing commercial zoning and encourage retail development here. This location has the streets, freeway ramps, and walkability to UCSD campus to support higher densities. This takes advantage of the access to transit and I-5. Nobel Campus Transit Village already has a strong commercial activity, and nearby student residences will need additional services and retail opportunities. It would be nice to develop this region more so that students and local commuters are better served.

I'm in favor of rehaling the mixed use residential in this area and don't mind the heights used in this option. Option A heights feel too tall.

This area is very close to the trolley line and I-5 and so as UTC and Oceanside have more density.

We need more bike infrastructure (as well as more housing!)

Nobel Campus Transit Village already has a strong commercial activity, and nearby student residences will need additional services and retail opportunities. It would be nice to develop this region more so that students and local commuters are better served.

Keep the grocer stores, and keep Nobel Drive at two lanes in each direction.

For retail areas there should be a sufficient amount of parking and easy access to it.

For retail areas there should be a sufficient amount of parking and easy access to it.

About housing is important.

More housing to lower the costs of rent.

Housing is needed in close proximity to the UCSD campus for both students and employees. Vacant infill sites, both private and public owned may help the housing demand. Case in point, in the vacant lot at Gilman Drive and Via Allicante, within the transit priority area and in walking distance of existing services and retail. These residenally zoned areas may be added to Focus Area 4. Alternatively, a Focus Area 6, Gilman Drive and Via Allicante, as proposed in the University Community Plan update.

High density housing near transit is what we need more models of in this city. The development should have direct access to the trolley station via a bridge if possible. This would give more options for students and staff to commute to school without contributing to parking or traffic.

Keep Nobel Drive at two lanes in each direction. We desperately need more homes.

We need more bike infrastructure (as well as more housing!)
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I would like more affordable housing and better bike infrastructure in this region.
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Concerns about traffic density, parking limitations as well as overfilling of schools in the area. For this reason we need to keep density low and provide more open space/parks since this is a campus area near the ocean.

Traffic congestion in the area and would have more development in that parking lot so that there were more places to shop in easy walking distance. I don’t like walking all the way to the shopping centers on Nobel past the 5, because it’s far and the streets are very fast and busy. It would also be really great to have as much parking close to transit as possible.

More open spaces, more trees, ease of accessibility and more pedestrian friendly walking and bike paths. Area of closed streets with retail and restaurants.

Infrastructure is lagging, traffic in UTC is already much worse than a decade ago.

Area has already grown tremendously and does not need any more large projects to enhance more growth. It is important to keep density lower and provide more open space and parks.

There is a housing shortage that is only going to get worse with the continuing growth of UCSD in the next decade. It would also be a good fit to have high density housing next to a transportation hub that goes all the way to downtown.

I’d like that it serves the UCSD communities.

Please focus more on open space/parks since it will be important as we add more density.

Please include bike paths, also extend trolley to better connect to pacific beach and ocean beach.

Having protected bike paths is a very nice feature. However, relying on public transit for most of these new developments is not practical. As a resident of the Nobel/La Jolla area, I’m concerned by the additional pollution that more density will be bringing which is why the trolley extension is important. I prefer options that maintain long term mom and pop businesses and do not increase density.

I would vote somewhere between option A and B. More housing, newer, improved shopping area with restaurants.

Density on transit lines, support our investment in the trolley expansion

Please consider Option A: Urban Transit Village on this site because there is a significant amount of mixed-use development potential. The introduction of the trolley stop on the site and the proximity to UCSD call for redevelopment that serves the community and the region as a whole. In addition, the Height Limitation Overlay Zone impedes smart growth and serves no reasonable purpose on this site because of its distance from the coast.

Do not choose this site for a C/B option, but still need a for a park or place for people to sit and create community with outdoor seating for establishments, trees, and green space.

More density around transit centers calls for more business opportunities and potentially better transit services in the future. This also creates more housing for UCSD students, with the trolley as a convenient commuting option.

I would pay close attention to any changes in crime rate, littering, etc. associated with these redevelopments. Currently the area feels relatively safe, although not without problems that impact the comfort of students and other passers-by. You may feel you “have it under control” but even just the littering situation in the past 10 years at the Nobel mall intersection or in the Vons mall clearly shows you don’t.

Since this area is a campus environment, the city should move away from making the roads extremely car-centric, as students mainly travel by foot or bicycle. This area is already too dense. We don’t want any more housing. We need more parks and green space.

Here there is more opportunity for a C/B option, but still need a for a park or place for people to sit and create community with outdoor seating for establishments, trees, and green space.

Traffic congestion in the area and would have more development in that parking lot so that there were more places to shop in easy walking distance. I don’t like walking all the way to the shopping centers on Nobel past the 5, because it’s far and the streets are very fast and busy. It would also be really great to have as much parking close to transit as possible.

I’d like that it serves the UCSD communities.

Please focus more on open space/parks since it will be important as we add more density.

Please include bike paths, also extend trolley to better connect to pacific beach and ocean beach.

More density around transit centers calls for more business opportunities and potentially better transit services in the future. This also creates more housing for UCSD students, with the trolley as a convenient commuting option.

More density on transit lines, support our investment in the trolley expansion

Please consider Option A: Urban Transit Village on this site because there is a significant amount of mixed-use development potential. The introduction of the trolley stop on the site and the proximity to UCSD call for redevelopment that serves the community and the region as a whole. In addition, the Height Limitation Overlay Zone impedes smart growth and serves no reasonable purpose on this site because of its distance from the coast.
I vote to keep within height limits and not over expand.

We should focus on the Coastal Zone height limit and plan accordingly.

Keep heights within the coastal limit. We don't need La Jolla to turn into downtown.

I receive a lot of support for UCSD and the community. Time to look through the windshield and not the rear view mirror anymore in San Diego, we are more than a beach town.

This like it would add a lot of traffic, and this area already experiences daily traffic issues and short intersections. I think UCSD should concentrate on less density areas and not on areas which are already suffering from impacts of high density and urbanization.

The height limit must be respected. It's the last chance to keep this area from turning "ugly" into "the very ugly badge of honor of developers".

None of the above! No changes! Keep as existing.

None of it! Greed has ruined California and this is only more of the same. Most often you will find those making the changes don't have to live in the areas they've demand they alter their community to meet my transient students needs. UCSD student housing should not be a consideration.

None of the above. No changes! There is already too much traffic and congestion in this area. Additional infrastructure is not a great idea here.

Reduce traffic in this area. Lowest impact development.

Keep the building height low

The height limit must be respected. It's the last chance to keep this area from turning "ugly" into "the very ugly badge of honor of developers".

None of the above. No changes! Keep as existing.

None of the above. No changes! There is already so much traffic and congestion in this area. Additional infrastructure is not a great idea here.

Too much density with all plans I vote against all of them

This option provides a medium-low density of mixed-use development with heights inside of the local Coastal Height Limit.

I think these locations would make excellent life science/office locations as well as provide for housing.

Build the Regents Rd bridge!

Satisfied

Leverage the transit investments and allow residential uses. Include affordable housing and space for small businesses and local artists and educators.

Build the Regents Rd bridge!

We should focus on the planning for the Coastal Zone height limit and plan accordingly.

Keep heights within the coastal limit. We don't need La Jolla to turn into downtown.

I receive a lot of support for UCSD and the community. Time to look through the windshield and not the rear view mirror anymore in San Diego, we are more than a beach town.

This like it would add a lot of traffic, and this area already experiences daily traffic issues and short intersections. I think UCSD should concentrate on less density areas and not on areas which are already suffering from impacts of high density and urbanization.

The height limit must be respected. It's the last chance to keep this area from turning "ugly" into "the very ugly badge of honor of developers".

None of the above! No changes! Keep as existing.

None of it! Greed has ruined California and this is only more of the same. Most often you will find those making the changes don't have to live in the areas they've demand they alter their community to meet my transient students needs. UCSD student housing should not be a consideration.

None of the above. No changes! There is already too much traffic and congestion in this area. Additional infrastructure is not a great idea here.

Reduce traffic in this area. Lowest impact development.

Keep the building height low

The height limit must be respected. It's the last chance to keep this area from turning "ugly" into "the very ugly badge of honor of developers".

None of the above. No changes! Keep as existing.
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Stop the development! None of the coastal height limits. Planning those developments seems like a waste of time since I don’t believe the voters will opt to allow the height limits to be exceeded. It is essential to cut emissions and increase housing.

Looks like a great start to being able to add jobs and housing! Look at a barley, high density both East and West of I-15 complementing the high density at UTC area.

A high density housing that will allow for enough housing and affordable housing to be provided next to the new transit stop. This is what San Diego needs to increase the quantity of people that use the trolly. A High density development can also provide the community more options for a live work type of environment and some removed retail options.

More parks, expanded roads, which are already jammed. Build bike lanes.

We have to do what it takes to build density! I’ll support the mac, Option A, and vote to amend the coastal height limit. The more density that is built in this area the pressure off of the surrounding areas like South UC, Clairemonth, La Jolla, and Mira Mesa.

The addition of fewer housing units that don’t increase density in a major way. Traffic is already too heavy in these areas.

We all wish UCSD needs more housing for students but why is it not built on UCSD property?

Please do not exceed the height limit. Please add essential and fun amenities so that people who live there don’t have to drive as much.

None of the above.

None of the above. Density is just language for reduced quality of life.

We should keep the local coastal height limit. Keep the area low density. The best thing to do in the University Community is making it more pedestrian and bike friendly!

The transit site should allow the maximum height and density under the RMX or EMX zoning. We need to allow more density around transit stops. The best of a bad lot... Area near universities should feel welcoming. Unfortunately, the streets and prevailing development pattern feels isolating, not friendly, with self-contained pods of housing.

The transit station should also be much better integrated into the surrounding residential community. The streets are extremely auto-centric, which makes biking, walking and crossing highly stressful. To accomplish much-needed improvements, it may be a good idea to hire a firm that has been recognized for placemaking and street redesign (from an architectural and urbanist perspective).

GOVERNOR COMMUNITY VILLAGE

I would like to see more local business restaurants, but I like high density housing. Please keep in mind that Sprouts has 70s what we proposed. A small footprint over our EXSISTING AND MAINTAINED stores and shops. We need to maintain retail, increase walkability, bike, and safe auto and pedestrian traffic. Please do not take the green spaces away! Our Public Park for more cars.

More bike lanes.

The Governor Community Village is in need for an upgrade that allows some housing above business/shops/retail. BUT WE REALLY NEED OUR SHOPS, our UNIQUE small footprint in south UC. We need access to groceries. Additionally, I’ve noticed that a part of the sectioned area around the Vons development includes what I know to be four gas stations.

The Community Village and Neighborhood Village seem the need access to groceries. Additionally, I’ve noticed that a part of the sectioned area around the Vons development includes what I know to be four gas stations.

It is true that there is no need for more housing or retail in this neighborhood. There is no need for more traffic. The Community Village and Neighborhood Village seem the need access to groceries. Additionally, I’ve noticed that a part of the sectioned area around the Vons development includes what I know to be four gas stations.

There is no need for more housing or retail in this neighborhood. There is no need for more traffic. The Community Village and Neighborhood Village seem the need access to groceries. Additionally, I’ve noticed that a part of the sectioned area around the Vons development includes what I know to be four gas stations.

Please I just don’t understand why you keep building so many businesses/offices etc. Here when this is where many UCSD students live and employees of all the nearby companies, UCSD etc I believe something that is missing is a pedestrian bike path that connects UCSD with La Jolla Village Square. Maybe along side the trolly overpass. This would be great for bike commuting an getting across La Jolla Village Dr. is intimidating/drastic to less experienced commuters. Are there plans to build bike lanes?

If you need a 50 mile an hour zone. Regent’s is 40. La Jolla Village 45. Villa La Jolla Dr. is steep. All of the streets I mentioned vehicle traffic is often aggressive to cyclists.

I agree the city of San Diego needs plan to plan for future growth, however, I don’t think it serves residents of University City and surrounding areas with allowing density so that we can build and bring in an estimated $300,000 new residents to the University City area from this new construction within the last five years. I am also concerned of the amount of money the developers are incentivized by fees that are being eliminated that would have more been required for essential resources like libraries, open parks, fire protection for the city to go into a slush fund. It almost seems like highway robbery and stealing from the people who have lived here and contributed through commerce and businesses and have paid their taxes. The developers would make bank overnight with these situation.

Regents Road isn’t going to happen. It almost seems like highway robbery and stealing from the people who have lived here and contributed through commerce and businesses and have paid their taxes. The developers would make bank overnight with this situation.

Areas near universities should feel welcoming. Unfortunately, the streets and prevailing development pattern feels isolating, not friendly, with self-contained pods of housing.

Given that there’s currently talk of downsizing Governor Drive from a four-lane street to a two-lane street, I have some reservations about the traffic usage. This area has the highest density for UCSD students of any neighborhood in UCSD. What if a very well located in downtown-chains-KEEP THE EXISTING stores- add only limited housing above our SHOPS. A WALKABLE town-with retail-similar to Mission Hills-Goldfinch/Fort Stockton.

We the inactive, crowded, not walkable friendly Hillcrest massive complex between Washington and University.

Additional parking must be included for any new developments.

The best of a bad lot... GOVERNOR COMMUNITY VILLAGE

Governor Drive is the center of the University City community. I’ve been a resident of UC for more than 30 years and I sadden me greatly to see that there are plans to build in this area. Both plans would increase traffic, noise, and pollution to a “small-town” community within San Diego. I will absolutely move from my home and business in UC should this overdevelopment take place.

Both of these options would impact wildlife and flood in Rose Canyon.

This area from new construction within the last five years. All of the streets I mentioned vehicle traffic is often aggressive to cyclists.

All of the streets I mentioned vehicle traffic is often aggressive to cyclists.

Please I just don’t understand why you keep building so many businesses/offices etc. Here when this is where many UCSD students live and employees of all the nearby companies, UCSD etc
I am a 3rd-year civil engineering student at UCSD. I don’t have enough money for a car, so I bicycle everywhere. I do not have a car and I can’t afford to buy one. I would like to see more density, but I don’t think that the projects would be beneficial. It would increase traffic and make things worse. I support adding more housing.
I think the area has a much greater need for medium-density residential than for low-density residential at this point. Neither seems really great for adding more housing but A is marginally better. I would prefer a plan that brought in more medium to high-density housing before fewer jobs – the plan that would best serve people who need to commute to the area because there is insufficient affordable housing nearby.

With the year we are in, if you zone it more density, it’s likely that the people who worked there would not live there but would rather commute, and there is not enough road capacity to support more commuting, particularly in the UC Marketplace.

The density in the area is so low that I think there is nothing wrong with adding as much as possible. It definitely needs to be paired with more transit options to encourage non-private car transit. I currently walk to the bus to get to work, and if it became like the area around Regents/Nobel where there are constant lines and no dedicated lanes, that would be absolutely impossible. There’s also a large area separating these areas from the job areas of UC, so if there’s some way to make that more accessible for biking, it could go a long way like a bike path just across the canyon. I don’t know what the schools might be, but I am not currently using one. I could see there being resistance to bring more college students into the area, so likely there would be a need to work on advocacy for these changes. I don’t think understand why there wouldn’t be an increase in businesses, since presumably they all would be job areas.

So many people live around here that want to walk a long way or bike to get to the bus or buy groceries. More density just means more confidence for more people!

No change. Traffic and density is already saturated

I think that Option A goes more for density, but still keeps with the medium density character of the area. Also mixed-use development is always cool!

The community can support some more density. That being said it does need to be in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and thus be on the more conservative side as far as the number of new units.

Neither "vision" is my "vision" for my community. "In-8" of any added "density" will destroy my community.

Both options will add population, traffic, and congestion to an already crowded area, exacerbated by reduced parking. There is nothing good for the neighborhood community in either proposal.

The "goal isn’t to replace existing retail", but what is the plan or regulations slated to stop it from being ILS housing? Many villages have been significantly altered. I think we should stay at the density that was in the "vision" and not increase.

Don’t mess that up.

Traffic and density is already saturated. My concern is that this should not be a luxury housing. It should be affordable for families, especially families with kids going to the schools around the area.

Upgrading the "vision". This doesn’t have to be a luxury housing. It should be affordable for families, especially families with kids going to the schools around the area. May be smaller units, less parking. I don’t think more jobs/businesses needed in this area. This is not a business area, it only serves people living in the area with hundreds of workers, many students and many not in the area at all.

As the world slowly approaches a state where Covid-19 will be able to be managed in a fairly good manner, I do not imagine that density issues will become a major issue in the long term. This in mind, I imagine a plan for both housing and employment to both have greater access and opportunity and it seems like Option A aims at both.

As the world slowly approaches a state where Covid-19 will be able to be managed in a fairly good manner, I do not imagine that density issues will become a major issue in the long term. This in mind, I imagine a plan for both housing and employment to both have greater access and opportunity and it seems like Option A aims at both.

We need to build bigger due to the shortage of housing. Even though it may take away from the quiet neighborhood, it is a good location for growth.

I support more housing. My concern is that that this should not be a luxury housing. It should be affordable for families, especially families with kids going to the schools around. May be smaller units, less parking. I don’t think more jobs/businesses needed in this area. This is not a business area, it only serves people living in the area with hundreds of workers, many students and many not in the area at all.

I think that Option A gives more availability for density, but still keeps with the medium density character of the area. Also mixed-use development is always cool!

No change. Traffic and density is already saturated

I don’t see either option as viable without additional infrastructure.

I think you are quite deceptive in your proposed infill. Either you have medium density or low density infill, not both. Height limits have a purpose that includes anything that is out of scale for the neighborhood. Anything taller than 2 or 3 stories will loom over the surrounding area.

I really enjoy high density living which comes with the added convenience of the close proximity of schools, stores and restaurants.

Immense changes should be paired with greater transportation infrastructure investments, especially near Regents & Governor. New bus routes or higher frequency on MTS Route 50, protected bike lanes, and the resurrection of the Regents Rd bridge over Rose Canyon should be looked into.

I'd be happy to have a new shopping center and more family housing. We need a better grocery store. BUT we do still need space for small mom and pop shops.

I support more housing. My concern is that that this should not be a luxury housing. It should be affordable for families, especially families with kids going to the schools around. May be smaller units, less parking. I don’t think more jobs/businesses needed in this area. This is not a business area, it only serves people living in the area with hundreds of workers, many students and many not in the area at all.
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More housing is crucial specifically with respect to job creation and development near our largest source of intellectual capital. These metrics seem unrealistic. Even option B is too much, too fast. Increasing the number of housing units without increasing parking, schools, parks, etc. will turn these areas being comparable in price to housing for students, not as expensive as the luxury apartments adjacent to the UTC.

Higher density in this particular area of UC makes the most sense as it is close to mass transit. Once the protected bike lanes are in, it will be close to them and no more driving to get from place to place. However, this area is already close to the UTC which is home to approximately 44,000 residents. Why ruin the neighborhood for everyone who is already here? We aren’t close to mass transit so there will also be more cars and inability to park.

Neither option is viable. It will create too much traffic congestion, and make gapelyn of roads more difficult and create traffic issues along Governor and to freeway entrance. The Claimont/Elfinvill exit of 52 is already backed up during rush hour.

More through traffic must be directed away from this intersection which is live subscribed by four schools, through traffic to UTC and USCD. Increasing housing density with overbuild the corridor.

Neither option is acceptable. Mix use will add density, parking issues, more traffic, and create additional issues related to walkability, access to emergency services and evacuation in case of fire. Genesees and Regents are the only exits and Regent street were evacuate residents in the UC area because the bridge was never built. Future community-oriented housing with jobs and groceries that can be reached without a car.

I am already negatively affected by the overpopulation and traffic in University City, and do not really like either plan. Please keep all currently existing open space in UC. We need more restaurants in this neighborhood, not more...

More medium-density, mixed-use residential is what is required to reduce traffic and increase quality of life.

I voted B, although A looks nice, but I have high doubts on the implementation.”

Neither. Do not put apartments/homes at the intersection of major streets (will be woken up at all hours of the night). Also, new plans do not have enough parking to support the apartment buildings. (The street is not a valid alternative to insufficient parking capacity).

I would prefer that you do not increase the density of the development in UC.

Don’t destroy the community, No new changes, keep the same.

Although more housing is attractive, the population density of the UC population is higher than the national average. Increasing density will create more traffic congestion, and make gapelyn of roads more difficult and create traffic issues along Governor and to freeway entrance. The Claimont/Elfinvill exit of 52 is already backed up during rush hour.

More through traffic must be directed away from this intersection which is live subscribed by four schools, through traffic to UTC and USCD. Increasing housing density with overbuild the corridor.

Both options do not address the bad outline of the VON’s mall/parking: too many entrance/exits with drivers crossing Governor to take opposite directions. Also, new plans do not have enough parking to support the apartment buildings. (The street is not a valid alternative to insufficient parking capacity).

More housing units as possible. There’s already long enough lines at both grocery stores. Schools are full. This neighborhood cannot support the increase in residents.

I love UC as a family neighborhood. EdUCate, Oh say can UC, and the adorable Little League opening day are lovely. Unfortunately, this neighborhood is a WFT Forgotten by City Hall. There are only 3 green streets, and the only one that is available to us is closed to the back side of the mall. Fronts of buildings (and their main entries) should face streets instead of parking lots. Stopping traffic on Governor/Genesse more pedestrian and bike safe for the whole community. Minor tweaks, the high retaining wall at the SE corner is unsightly, but this is a building document so I note it to you know the face of the development is important.

Don’t put apartments/homes at the intersection of major streets (will be woken up at all hours of the night). Also, new plans do not have enough parking to support the apartment buildings. (The street is not a valid alternative to insufficient parking capacity).

No COMMUNITY OR NEIGHBORHOOD VILLAGE.  WE JUST LEFT PACIFIC BEACH TO LIVE IN A QUIET AND PEACEFULL NIEGHBORHOOD!!!!DO NOT TAKE THIS AWAY FROM US.

Neither. I love UC as a family neighborhood. EdUCate, Oh say can UC, and the adorable Little League opening day are lovely. Unfortunately, this neighborhood is a WFT Forgotten by City Hall. There are only 3 green streets, and the only one that is available to us is closed to the back side of the mall. Fronts of buildings (and their main entries) should face streets instead of parking lots. Stopping traffic on Governor/Genesse more pedestrian and bike safe for the whole community. Minor tweaks, the high retaining wall at the SE corner is unsightly, but this is a building document so I note it to you know the face of the development is important.

This is a really important area that needs smart infill development. The Neighborhood Village scenario doesn’t go far enough in allowing for more density, opportunities in respect to job creation and development near our largest source of intellectual capital.

Higher density in this particular area of UC makes the most sense as it is close to mass transit. Once the protected bike lanes are in, it will be close to them and no more driving to get from place to place. However, this area is already close to the UTC which is home to approximately 44,000 residents. Why ruin the neighborhood for everyone who is already here? We aren’t close to mass transit so there will also be more cars and inability to park.

More medium-density, mixed-use residential is what is required to reduce traffic and increase quality of life.

Definitely not Option. Think longer term and think about the people, not their vehicles.”

"Neither option is acceptable. Mix use will add density, parking issues, more traffic, and create additional issues related to walkability, access to emergency services and evacuation in case of fire. Genesees and Regents are the only exits and Regent street were evacuate residents in the UC area because the bridge was never built. Future community-oriented housing with jobs and groceries that can be reached without a car.

None of the options...
I would prefer a higher density mixed use development option with minimal surface parking lots. Will the landscaping be drought-tolerant? developments: what eco-friendly construction will there be? Will there be trees to offset carbon and provide shade (i.e. reduce the need for cooling)? Will there be... I really enjoy high density living. I enjoy the convenience of being in close proximity to stores, medical facilities, and recreational shopping districts. Keep the way it is. I don't like Option A or Option B. Small businesses own, and more pop, and we will priced out. Will add traffic and there is talk of bringing Governor down to one lane each way, which would be a nightmare for the people who live here. More housing, there's not enough housing in this area. This is one of the places that is still accessible by public transit to the UCSD campus.

I think the city should focus on including open green spaces to accommodate the increase in population. These pedestrian focused centers should be developed with the planned improvements along Governor Drive to be more bike and pedestrian friendly.

I'm fine with a Community Village-quantity of housing, but not a community village-quantity of jobs/office space/businesses. It's a great location for housing since that you can lock your bike frame to the rack; bike racks that only allow you to lock the bike wheel are subject to a higher the risk of theft. Make the small investment in good bike infrastructure by adding bike racks in the parking lots to encourage people to go shopping by bike. Bikes should be sure that it's close to the bus, but I think increasing the density of businesses will create too much traffic that that intersection can't handle.

Don't like either selection. Leave it the way it is. Redevolving will mean the demise of our small business owners. They will be priced out. There is already... I think Governor Drive down to one lane each way, which would be a nightmare for the people who live here.

Keep it the way it is! I don't like Option A or Option B. Small business owners, mom and pops, will be priced out. Will add traffic and there is talk of bringing Governor down to one lane each way, which would be a nightmare for the people who live here.

No guaranteed funding for expanded rec centers, libraries, protected bike lanes on Genesee and Nobel. These are my concerns: No new parks proposed (despite up to 100,000+ more residents). More housing, there's not enough housing in this area. This is one of the places that is still accessible by public transit to the UCSD campus.

I would prefer a higher density mixed use development option with minimal surface parking lots.
Option A appears to be less dense than Option A, but neither option is needed. Increasing density in the neighborhood around Governor is a horrid and short-sighted idea. This is a neighborhood made up of single-family homes with a few small shopping centers, so you want to increase density, focus on the areas north of Nobel. There are no single-family homes in that area, and it is almost entirely mixed-use. There are also multiple offices in that area sitting empty thanks to the pandemic which could be converted to dense housing.

We need more housing! Medium to high density residential plans are needed to keep housing accessible to the middle class in San Diego. Option A provides the most density.

Medium-density, with the additional housing and jobs it brings is best in the long-term future of the area.

I support as much density as is being offered (also for improved transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

Like the smaller neighborhood feel for this part of UC, given so much of the larger more dense format of the UTC area. This will keep the area feeling like a small community but modernize and bring in some new to the outdated places, hopefully with some better options for a small community.

Option A with more density is definitely preferred.

I am strongly against either "vision". I do not want any increase in multi-unit housing or multi-level/big box retail south of the 52 fwy. This is a quiet bedroom community and not an extension of UCSD.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

Density is important to not become like Los Angeles.

Keep the area south of Rose Canton as single family residential. In addition, the building at Sprouts shopping center is a beautiful building that should be protected.

More housing, restaurants, and bars

I think that there should be more density in this area of UC. The area around Governor is huge and there is more space made for housing here then Option A doesn't propose nearly enough additional housing in my opinion. There is still an educational and professional opportunity nearby that it seems like a shame to exclude so many people with a sprinting single-family zoning. At the very least, allowing what are currently shopping centers to convert into mixed-use communities would be a welcome change.

Increased public transit will be necessary to cut back the need for cars. Right now some growth in housing would be good, but there isn't much transit to support this. Option A is a good step in this direction.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support a mix of single家 housing and housing in strip malls. Bringing more housing into strip malls is something I've been advocating for a long time and the medium density mixed use option seems to do this the best.

I think that there should be more density in this area. Even Option B doesn't propose nearly enough additional housing in my opinion. There is still an educational and professional opportunity nearby that it seems like a shame to exclude so many people with a sprinting single-family zoning. At the very least, allowing what are currently shopping centers to convert into mixed-use communities would be a welcome change.

It is essential that Univ. City accept the fact that we are part of a city, a city that must increase the available housing. I can't imagine most current UC residents will have the patience for this if we don't do it soon. I really hope this works.

You need to tie in the East end of UC down at the end of Governor by the 805. How are residents down there, especially the ones at the bottom of hills who are dangerous traffic situation for those dropping their children off at Curie (across the street from the proposed development) and/or crossing Governor as they enter/leave. May be less parking lots, more bicycle paths, and more medium density, mixed-use residential planning.

These needs to be homes for purchase. Not apartments for rent!

These needs to be homes for purchase. Not apartments for rent!

We need more housing accessible to the middle class in San Diego. Option A provides the most density.

Keep the area south of Rose Canton as single family residential. In addition, the building at Sprouts shopping center is a beautiful building that should be protected.

Option A has the most housing and so it should be prioritized.

Density is important to not become like Los Angeles.

I think that there should be more density in this area of UC. The area around Governor is huge and there is more space made for housing here then Option A doesn't propose nearly enough additional housing in my opinion. There is still an educational and professional opportunity nearby that it seems like a shame to exclude so many people with a sprinting single-family zoning. At the very least, allowing what are currently shopping centers to convert into mixed-use communities would be a welcome change.

It is essential that Univ. City accept the fact that we are part of a city, a city that must increase the available housing. I can't imagine most current UC residents will have the patience for this if we don't do it soon. I really hope this works.

You need to tie in the East end of UC down at the end of Governor by the 805. How are residents down there, especially the ones at the bottom of hills who are elderly supposed to get to these village centers without sufficient parking and REGULAR buses at all hours of the day & night? Thanks for listening.

Traffic is a major issue, and increasing housing density in this area would potentially make commute times impossible.

Increased public transit will be necessary to cut back the need for cars. Right now some growth in housing would be good, but there isn't much transit to support this. Option A is a good step in this direction.

I want to allow growth while keeping the integrity of the community feel. I do not welcome growth at both extremes. We need to create as much new housing as possible while not overwhelming the balance and esthetics of the site. I think Option A does this in a very efficient and admirable way.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support a mix of single家 housing and housing in strip malls. Bringing more housing into strip malls is something I've been advocating for a long time and the medium density mixed use option seems to do this the best.

During times of crisis, like the one we are experiencing with regards to housing, there should be an emphasis placed on developing as much dense housing as possible. Option A has the most housing and so it should be prioritized.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I would like more affordable housing and better bike infrastructure in this region.

I would like more affordable housing.

I would like more affordable housing and better bike infrastructure in this region.

Do not want more housing there. Would prefer single level buildings. If multi-level is necessary, buildings with a second level should be set far away from street. I would like more restaurants.

Less housing, low level buildings, less traffic and more space for children and neighbors to be together.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

More housing, restaurants, and bars

This is a growing neighborhood - so it makes sense to go with Option A, which adds the most housing. 30 years is a long time, and it is a critical period for climate. I think we absolutely also need to prioritize options that decrease community emissions as much, which is why I also pick A.

I would support adding more affordable housing if that was an option. But they must not add the massive amounts of dense housing that is near lots of great pedestrian-focused areas - if surface parking lots are necessary, keep behind buildings and away from shopfronts.

More housing, restaurants, and bars

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.

I support as much density and housing as is being offered (hoping also for improved public transit options). Good for the economy, good for the environment, good for quality.
Includes unique restaurants and shops rather than just incorporated businesses.

More housing.

As a student in UCSD, we need lower housing prices and more markets nearby.

Less housing density & more parking while maintaining the commercial property within this option:

Stop overcrowding this area. Let's not forget that employees need houses.

More housing, more jobs!

Provide more housing and more jobs clearly a benefit to the area, especially if integrated with local public transit.

This area needs more low income housing, also higher density housing is more compatible with future public transit expansions.

More housing and more jobs is a benefit to the area, especially if integrated with local public transit.

Less housing density & more parking while maintaining the commercial property within this option.

Try to keep the rent reasonable. Right now rent is too high in this surrounding area.

There is a need for green space and seating near all of this new development and if you want a community or village feel. Grassy places with picnic tables and outdoor seating for establishments. We would like to see more options for children to walk and bikers to bike.

An area where longtime residents feel at home and at the same time have their quality of life elevated.

I'm all about adding housing density to the area to help with the shortage in San Diego. I also think it could bring some cool businesses to the area. I'd even be happy to see more housing instead of jobs.

I would recommend a medium to low density housing because of population density around those shopping areas, which have constantly people in and out.

I would like to see more detail about how many units will be built.

Are there adequate school facilities for new development throughout the new plan? Will gas stations still be provided? Will the housing provided be affordable for families and include more than just 2 bedroom units?

More housing and more jobs is clearly a benefit to the area, especially if integrated with local public transit.

More housing and more jobs is clearly a benefit to the area, especially if integrated with local public transit.

A good place to look at: the Clarendon neighborhood in Arlington, VA. It has lots of shops mixed with residential housing and a vibrant community. Another good place to look at anywhere in Europe.

I don't see any information about the library, which needs to be increased in size. Is it on land slated for redevelopment?

Neither option. This area already has a lot of traffic and limited parking for existing businesses and adding dense housing will only exacerbate the problem. Also, the City is going to convert Grove Street to local traffic, but I'm concerned the apartment sizes and densities are too small to support a community that offers a variety of housing options to accommodate the population. It would be amazing if dependence on vehicles could be minimized, but I believe that would require the entire San Diego county to transform transportation.

Village rather than jobs

The crisis will continue. My vision is creating a community that offers a variety of housing options to accommodate the population. It would be amazing if dependence on vehicles could be minimized, but I believe that would require the entire San Diego county to transform transportation.

That area does need to be spruced up, but I don't think you should add housing, so I'm choosing the option with less housing.

In addition to what is proposed in Option B, you may consider adding second story office use over grocery stores with separate parking and entry.

I prefer Option A because it allows for more housing units.

I prefer Option A because it allows for more housing units.

More housing units, but the plan should include a dedicated vertical parking structure for the new homes. I am concerned there will not be enough parking space.

Increase residential units and add transit options.

The traffic density increase with either of the two proposals.

Build up higher if possible. We need housing units, more is better and no one here should have a credible claim that you're blocking their view of the ocean.

I'm not sure if I would make substantive changes to the plan. However, there should be a balance between available housing and planned economic expansion to ensure San Diego meets its housing goals in the next few years. If more jobs must be created to finance the expansion, then ensure that ample public transportation is planned to keep the area accessible to traffic.

In terms of building, right next to too high in this surrounding area.

Add more housing and additional retail would be a great way to open the community to more families who are just priced out of the housing market.

We need more housing units, but the plan should include a dedicated vertical parking structure for the new homes. I am concerned there will not be enough parking space.

If gentrification could greatly improve 41st usage as well as accessibility to the governor center.

The income of more housing units, but the plan should include a dedicated vertical parking structure for the new homes. I am concerned there will not be enough parking space.

None of the options in the area around UC San Diego as there is an extreme lack of it as of right now. It is within my understanding that more housing in this Village rather than jobs.

Neither it feels too dense for the amount of housing visualized, and worry that the current transit options (bus lines etc) aren’t robust enough to allow new residents to move around without adding more single driver cars into the mix and congest traffic.

There is a need for green space and seating near all of this new development and if you want a community or village feel. Grassy places with picnic tables and outdoor seating for establishments. We would like to see more options for children to walk and bikers to bike.

More housing, more jobs!

Stop overcrowding this area. Let's not forget that employees need houses.

But please know that as of today a) people who work in that shopping center park in the neighborhood down Agee Street, and cars from the existing condominium plans update results in options with fewer future car trips.

Lots of people around the Governor Community rely on the bus to get to work/school. More housing near amenities like Vons or the bus station means that it is easier to go shopping, go out, go to work. So I think higher density translates into higher happiness for people here.

Why are we focusing on housing and less on how that new jobs are to spend time together, not just shop and go.

I would like to see more housing instead of jobs, so I'm choosing the option with less housing.
San Diego is in a housing crisis, and prioritizing housing is essential. Option A adds the benefit of creating more jobs simultaneously.

More dense walkable community with mixed use and communal areas.

What happened to the service stations (gas)...they are needed to and from schools in the area and it would be nice if the city could make some changes to make Governor Dr and also the intersection with Genesee Ave safer.

There is already too much traffic in this area and the addition of more units in Option A is excessive for the area. Until you bring back the Regents bridge that was a part of the plan more then 25 years ago, this area can not handle more traffic. There is already too much traffic in this area and adding the number of units in option A is excessive for the area. Until you bring back the Regents bridge that was a part of the plan more than 25 years ago, this area can not handle more traffic.

More modest increase in density. We'll need a fire station in South UC with such an increase in density and traffic.

We have already seen massively tall luxury apartment buildings constructed in North UC. High rises continue to be constructed in North UC. Traffic is already gridlocked at rush hours. Additional density and/or height will have a substantial negative impact on the character and livability of this community. There is no plan to increase parking or open space, only increase high density.

It needs to provide the best housing to job ratio, which option A is able to fulfill. The Governor Community Village should remain low density housing, retail and business. It was originally designed for that purpose and this should be retained. Public space must be increased to accommodate increased density.

This housing should be low income family dwellings to take advantage of the proximity to great schools.

Less housing, area is already too congested. Less density at that shopping center. Getting out of that shopping center is already difficult due to the traffic at that intersection.

Consider the housing crisis, having more...more homes or nearby neighborhoods would be most helpful for the community in my opinion. Also having more available commercial locations would increase locations, potentially decrease the use of automobiles.

More parking for residents will be needed in both shopping centers so there will be parking available for others using the retail space. While bike lanes should be encouraged, Governor Drive should not be reduced to one lane. Regents Road Bridge should be reconsidered. Full fire station needed in this area. More modest increase in density. We'll need a fire station in South UC with such an increase in density.

I'd change there to be no housing development and more commercial use (restaurants, consumer goods) cater to the community already there. This area is a hidden treasure in the first place.

I prefer no changes like the ones proposed to the Sprouts Shopping Center. The Sprouts Shopping Center has a certain level of charm, which the new plan seems to ignore.

I would prefer low-density.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give us that option to choose. Why isn't Option C, do no change, provided? Option B is too much for the area.

I choose neither option because they both will eliminate long term mom and pop businesses. I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More housing

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

San Diego is in a housing crisis, and prioritizing housing is essential. Option A adds the benefit of creating more jobs simultaneously.

More parking for residents will be needed in both shopping centers so there will be parking available for others using the retail space. While bike lanes should be encouraged, Governor Drive should not be reduced to one lane. Regents Road Bridge should be reconsidered. Full fire station needed in this area. More modest increase in density. We'll need a fire station in South UC with such an increase in density.

What is going to happen to the University Community Library? With more people living in the area, are there any plans to increase pedestrian safety on Governor Dr? Some of the other plans seem to prioritize the areas more walkable with less traffic but I don't see that here. Just seems like there is going to be more traffic and I am concerned we have not heard from the community on that road (Governor) with the character of the west end of University City.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice

Maintain set backs. Please do not blight University City.

I would prefer low-density.

I'd change there to be no housing development and more commercial use (restaurants, consumer goods) cater to the community already there. This area is congested enough.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More hiking

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

I prefer low-density.

I'd change there to be no housing development and more commercial use (restaurants, consumer goods) cater to the community already there. This area is congested enough.

There is already too much traffic in this area and the addition of more units in Option A is excessive for the area. Until you bring back the Regents bridge that was a part of the plan more than 25 years ago, this area can not handle more traffic. There is already too much traffic in this area and adding the number of units in option A is excessive for the area. Until you bring back the Regents bridge that was a part of the plan more than 25 years ago, this area can not handle more traffic.

More parking for residents will be needed in both shopping centers so there will be parking available for others using the retail space. While bike lanes should be encouraged, Governor Drive should not be reduced to one lane. Regents Road Bridge should be reconsidered. Full fire station needed in this area. More modest increase in density. We'll need a fire station in South UC with such an increase in density.

I would prefer low-density.

I'd change there to be no housing development and more commercial use (restaurants, consumer goods) cater to the community already there. This area is congested enough.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More hiking

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More hiking

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More hiking

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.

More hiking

I would keep the density as low as possible. There are already severe traffic issues that are consuming at certain hours of the day. If emergency vehicles need to get around more traffic could cause serious issues for individuals involved.

I prefer no more housing at all but you don't give me that choice to option. This intersection is already impacted by too much traffic and noise. It does not need housing to add to the issue. Curie Elementary is across the street and additional traffic and congestion will impact an already dangerous situation. The UC schools are already impacted with over enrollment so bringing more students to the area will only overload them even more. I do not want any additional growth in this area. Governor needs to be protected from further encroachment.

I would like to see remediation of outdated shopping complexes and welcome building of more apartments, particularly for the UCSD students that live in this area. I am concerned, however, that the images presented show fewer parking spaces that we currently have. This will be a problem with more residents in the area.
Many housing units as possible into this area will likely ruin the allure of this neighborhood. I think there should be other options besides options A or B that limits from neighborhood bigger better library, protected open spaces and parks, slower traffic, limited new housing unless libraries, parks, rec centers, traffic are heavily improved apartment buildings.

I still want a small community feel with more of a Main Street feel with local small businesses shops and restaurants. Not a bunch of chain restaurants and I would want to keep the existing option but it is not offered in the survey. WHY?

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems. Prefer a low density and high visibility solution - low structures not tall buildings for instance! Let's keep this a neighborhood and not a “North UC” replication!

This will forever change the culture of this neighborhood for the worse. This area is already traffic congested at multiple times of day, partially because of the best of the two--Option A--is too much density and unsafe for the amount of cars and the 3 schools in the vicinity.

Updated shopping area. The area is already too crowded with too much traffic. Accidents at Governor and Genesee have killed bikers...no one can reasonably bike this is a poor development proposal. The area should not be densified. Totally opposed to this proposal!!!

I grew up UC and option A is way too big and ugly. Plus they are talking about making Governor Drive only two car lanes total so this would be a nightmare for I lived in University City throughout middle and high school and attended UCSD as an undergraduate and now live here again as a graduate student. I support

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems.

How about just improving the current structures and keep OCI! businesses! don't want to add housing, parking is bad enough as is.

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems.

We need more affordable restaurant options for the community and less residential additions which will make it too crowded for the community.

This survey fails to give an option C -- none of the above. It is unbelievable to think that the City has basically made a foregone conclusion that high-density development is unnecessary and facts to placeing neighborhood intimacy and charm. There's something being destroyed in this process --what makes San Diego pleasant and appealing is going to be lost forever.

Increasing density in this area is not advisable. It's already an area of high density traffic and that will only increase even more as high density residences are built in the UC area. Genesee is the only north south route now that the Regents tunnel at multiple times of day, partially because of the best of the two--Option A--is too much density and unsafe for the amount of cars and the 3 schools in the vicinity.

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems.

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems.

Traffic is already bad. Increasing housing density will only increase the problems.

Leave these areas as is. They are already difficult to navigate with limited parking and lots of pedestrians. Any increase in density will just make it worse. We need more affordable restaurant options for the community and less residential additions which will make it too crowded for the community.

Reasonable rent is the priority. Especially for lower-income residents.

Will increase traffic more than necessary

Keeping it a smaller neighborhood village feel. The community village aspect will bring in too many cars in the quiet neighborhood that we can to love and settle in. We need more affordable restaurant options for the community and less residential additions which will make it too crowded for the community.

If you add housing it will take away parking and less traffic for customers for traffic to come and go. No change
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I would like to see pedestrian bridges over Governor and Garnet Ave if there is to be more housing there. Or at the very least there should be no right turns on Rose divider during school start times. It will be a mess. We already have issues with cars doing right hand turns on Rose when kids are crossing the street and cars running the signals because they are in a hurry. If more housing is going to be put there we need to do something to protect all the kids who are walking/living to school.

We don't think any changes should be added. The area is already too crowded.

More homes is preferable. Office buildings are an eyesore.

I'd want to keep this area the same because there's not enough space for new developments and allowing more people to move into that area. It's already dense enough with all the housing around there and keeping the open space will allow more room for people to enjoy.

Keep it as is, density, the village places already contain healthy businesses there is no need for additional business space.

I hold both options A and B need to address additional parking. Are there plans for a low level parking garage at least? (With lots of trees around it so it blends in)

Both options A and B need to address additional parking. Are there plans for a low level parking garage at least? (With lots of trees around it so it blends in)

Neither!!

I would like to see pedestrian bridges over Governor and Garnet Ave if there is to be more housing there. Or at the very least there should be no right turns on Rose divider during school start times. It will be a mess. We already have issues with cars doing right hand turns on Rose when kids are crossing the street and cars running the signals because they are in a hurry. If more housing is going to be put there we need to do something to protect all the kids who are walking/living to school.

We don't think any changes should be added. The area is already too crowded.

More homes is preferable. Office buildings are an eyesore.

Keep it as is, density, the village places already contain healthy businesses there is no need for additional business space.

I would like to see pedestrian bridges over Governor and Garnet Ave if there is to be more housing there. Or at the very least there should be no right turns on Rose divider during school start times. It will be a mess. We already have issues with cars doing right hand turns on Rose when kids are crossing the street and cars running the signals because they are in a hurry. If more housing is going to be put there we need to do something to protect all the kids who are walking/living to school.
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I think we should have a bias towards higher density residential.

I do not see either of these options as viable. This area is in proximity to 4 public schools which already experience overcrowded traffic in the morning as afternoon. Unless something is done to rectify this traffic situation at Governor and Genesee, I do not see either of these options as viable.

Neither option is acceptable. You are planning in a vacuum, and you have even started to create an acceptable infrastructure for all the changes you are proposing. This is ridiculous!!! Let UC alone.

We need more parks not more pavement. Our streets are packed and traffic is terrible. Fix the streets before allowing builders to build more housing and include parking.

We would change NOTHING. Leave it alone; do the improvements at the west end or UTC trolley areas. Genesee and Governor neighborhoods should remain just as they are. Keep it as nature intended it and please do not allow the University to create more problems for the people that live in the area.

Leaving it as it is. Please don’t add apartment to the shopping centers.

We’ll increase speeding cars on Governor. Will endanger children walking to schools. Is not easily accessible to slow bus transit or medium trolley transit.

Neither - both of these options increase residents while simultaneously undercutting the amount of parking in the shopping centers, which residents require to get their groceries and access business. There are actually a lot of high-density residential areas already in existence in South UC, so the video contains misleading information. This is quite possibly the worst vision ever laid out for University City South. Whoever came up with this plan should be fired.
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no residential added to either shopping center
A commercial real estate appraisal that lives near the UTC mall. I believe the medium to low-density mixed-use residential will better serve the community and minimize the chances of traffic congestion and other factors that would reduce the quality of life in residents and in the area at the same time, increase property values due to a modest amount of density.

I would add minimal housing, the traffic is already heavy along Genesee.

I don’t like either. I think housing should be kept separate from shopping.

Where is the parking? There doesn’t seem to be nearly enough surface parking so we hope that underground parking is part of the plan, so the plan is not needed to be changed.

Please do not ruin our neighborhood.

Traffic and do not pull in or opportunity for increased crime.

Neither, we don’t need to increase density to our neighborhood.

Traffic at this intersection is already way too congested; especially considering all the schools. You cannot, or at least should not, add more residential housing.

University City has enough affordable housing and almost too much density as is. We have many apartment/condo units throughout UC and DO NOT NEED ANY MORE. I am firmly against any more high density or affordable living projects in UC. We have done our part in contributing to this effort.

I don’t like either of the projects. I would rather less housing at that location. The traffic is already bad and a challenge particularly during school hours. I would prefer to leave it as is.

Mostly, I like both options A and B, but I don’t like that they seem to offer limited to no parking. While the hope is probably that mass transit will be used, and it may be, but the parking is going to be crucial. If the spaces are added a primer for such, employees may have trouble finding positions if insufficient parking is available. While use of mass transit is desirable, it is still not very efficient for most that can afford a vehicle.

Neither, we don’t need to increase density to our neighborhood

The location of the shopping center of the community is a very important and excellent idea, but the design of the new shopping center must be considered carefully. The changes should be made to ensure that the shopping center is accessible to everyone and provides a comfortable environment for shoppers.

I love University City! EdUCate, Oh say can UC, Curie craft fair, Doyle International Festival, and the adorable opening ceremonies for Little League. It’s a great place to live and work.

I would like more housing and have more shuttles around.

Preferred the higher density option for the Governor. This part of University City is very underserved. Would like to see single family homes on Governor have increased density to allow for two homes per lot. Creates more housing at a lower price per single family home.

If the higher density provides significantly more housing and dramatically more jobs, that seems a worse choice for San Diego in general, although the additional density is going to make the traffic congestion problems in this area of town much worse (especially since the freeway is not within walking distance of this shopping center). The library will also need to be expanded somehow.

I like Option A but want to make sure there is adequate parking, but with all of the added traffic, want to make sure that it is safe to walk across Genesee (eg build a bridge or walkway for people crossing Genesee North/South)<West/Albion]

Higher-density housing is a priority to me!

Neither looks good. Both are much too dense. Where is the new park space for all these people? Where is the bike lanes?

Stop the development!!!

I avoid Vons at Governor due to the poor parking lot planning. It is never full yet feels crowded. Parking space seems inefficient. I will brave the parking lot for Golden Doughnuts.

Neither of the visualizations/options appear to interface well with the community. Instead the options appear to be self-contained, car-oriented development with the backs of buildings, utilities, storage balconies and dead space facing the adjacent community. Please create an option that is more pedestrian oriented in character, with development that respects the community by interfacing with it in a positive manner (street front retail / humane architecture), not imposing structures with their back sides and utilities facing University City. Parking mid-block is good, but the fronts of buildings (and their main lights behind Vons).

Access to shopping center for Park III homeowners who utilize the fence to access parking lot. Any Lights on at night at development should not be distracting/harmful to residents. We do not want to maintain that. No added pools, playgrounds, loud music, residential balconies, or bright lights behind Vons.

I think the improvements, specifically low cost, are a good idea. New bike paths (both of which are exellent ideas), I think the town center development will balance additional housing and community feel with increased traffic.

Functionally limited but great!

Don’t increase housing density at all.

Bus service no longer exists east of Genesee. It used to extend east to the multi-family senior housing. Already we have increased the density near Curt school by allowing manufacturing house in back yards. Parking 5 am issue. The bus route should once again extend east to the parking lot near I-805.

Better use of old run down area that need improvement

Eliminate the need for new development, that is what we need in terms of additional housing. We support the retention of the existing buildings, in place, and over time we can support additional retail. Furthermore, given the existing roads we are already over burdened by the traffic on Governor. I am completely against any changes to University City. I also think the monstrosity happening up the road in the golden triangle is horrible and could be eliminated.

Welcome more walkers and shops/restaurants so there will be fewer commuters.

We need more retail, I like this plan better.

The intersection of Governor and Genesee is already quite heavily used.

Tax land values

New energy efficient and green minded buildings for residential and businesses.

We leave our neighborhood alone! We do not need either of your nightmare visions.

I would like to envision the inclusion of African-Americans in this Community Village and Work Environment. I didn’t see any representation in the video? Also, there are places for members of our neighborhood to hang out and meet up and do our errands so that we don’t need to travel to other communities, such as yogurt/crime/smoothie shops, bagel shop or bakery. Etc. A Farmers’ market in the community would also be lovely. Increasing housing by adding residential properties to the two shopping centers is likely going to increase traffic congestion and wreak havoc on the whole area. We need a large light rail line near I-805 that is a freeway that is prepped for a housing development, and that is where additional housing should be built. UC is a great place, and will better with innovative and new ideas.

mostly, I like both options A and B, but I don’t like that they seem to offer limited to no parking. While the probability that mass transit will be used, and it may be, but the parking is going to be crucial. If the spaces are added a primer for such, employees may have trouble finding positions if insufficient parking is available. While use of mass transit is desirable, it is still not very efficient for most that can afford a vehicle.

I would rather less housing at that location. The traffic is already bad and a challenge particularly during school hours. I would prefer to leave it as is.

Leaving our neighborhood alone! We do not need either of your nightmare visions.

Actually like both proposals to increase density and have mixed use areas in UC.

University City has enough affordable housing and almost too much density as is. We have many apartment/condo units throughout UC and DO NOT NEED ANY MORE. I am firmly against any more high density or affordable living projects in UC. We have done our part in contributing to this effort.

Traffic at this intersection is already way too congested especially concerning all the schools. You cannot; or at least should not, add more residential housing without relieving the existing traffic conditions (and mass transit is not going to fix it all).
Of the three options, the existing option fits my vision for the future the best by far. A distant second choice might be option B.

None of the options are acceptable.

No more density in either Oz.
The topography of the area surrounding Governor Dr. from I 805 to the west end beyond Regents Rd. is very hilly. It is not flat and is not conducive to everyone walking or biking to school, work, shopping or medical appointments, etc. There is NO bus service on Governor Dr. east of Genesee. I have proposed several times in the past 50 years that I have lived in South University City using small buses running the length of Governor Dr. connecting to small buses on Genesee. The Vons Shopping center at Governor and Genesee already has Condominiums adjacent to it and behind the center. Parking is necessary and should not be sacrificed to build high rise apartments or additional condos. There are apartments and condominiums across Genesee. University Village apartments at the east end of Governor not only doubled the number of units but also built larger apartments. It is my understanding that only 1 person in the apartment must be a senior (55+).

Neither.

Neither option makes sense. The Vons parking lot (University Square) is already too crowded with near accidents every day. The same problem is at UC Marketplace Sprouts. Leave our neighborhood alone.

Neither above option. It is best to keep the center in current state.

Keep the low density single family neighborhood as is. There is already plenty of traffic at the intersection of Governor/Genesee.

I don’t want either option. Our lovely neighborhood is just dense enough right now. We could use some safe bike paths on Governor and Nobel. Please don’t destroy the lovely community feeling of University City by overbuilding it.

I don’t see a need to change anything, and neither option appeals to me. Both options eliminate existing parking for shoppers while adding housing, which is clearly not workable. Furthermore, if the city intends to allow housing to be built without providing parking for the residents, then the residents should be prohibited from owning a vehicle. (This applies no matter where the housing is built.)

I don’t understand the differences, I would prefer neither.

I choose neither. I have a single family home, I own my own business as well as my neighbors, this will cause more congestion than it will help the community.

I ABSOLUTELY DO NOT WANT EITHER OPTION

Both plans are too aggressive and will increase traffic density at a busy intersection and too close to schools. I’m worried about pedestrian safety at, and near the Governor and Genesee intersection.