

## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes  
Hybrid Meeting  
April 11, 2023

**Directors present**, directors absent

**Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), Rebecca Robinson (RRW), Jon Arenz (JA), Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Andrew Parlier (AP), Georgia Kayser (GK), Karen Martien (KMar), Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA), Carey Algaze (CA), Steve Pomerence (SP), Sasha Treadup (ST), Nancy Graham (NG-City of SD Planning).**

**1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair.** Chair CN at 6:01 pm

CN: This is our first experiment with the hybrid meeting format. The City will be leading the zoom portion of the presentation and will post a recording of the meeting for item #9.

**2. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.**

- *Adopted by acclamation.*

**3. Approval of Minutes: March 14, 2023.**

- CN: Received edits to the meeting minutes so will not vote on these meeting minutes tonight. The edits to the meeting minutes include:
  - Typo changing reference to 40,000 to 400,000 square-feet for the Biomed Towne Center View project.
  - RWR comment regarding incomplete public comments made by Nick Reed, Dustin Nguyen, Lou Rodolico. CN will send the proposed edits to these speakers for their approval.
  - Correct spelling of KMAR's last name to Martien
  - Verify votes for KMar – she thinks there were 51 total votes, not 51 votes for her.
  - Thanks to JS for taking meeting minutes last month.

**4. Election of UCPG Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Recording Secretary, and Membership Secretary**

- CN: Group to elect Chair, Vice Chair, Recording Secretary and Membership secretary
  - Chair: Motion by RC to nominate CN / AW 2<sup>nd</sup>
    - *Adopted by acclamation.*
  - Vice Chair: Motion by CN to nominate RC / JS 2<sup>nd</sup>.

- *Adopted by acclamation.*
  - CN: Will need to develop leadership to take over officer position as CN will eventually term out.
- Recording Secretary: Motion by CN to nominate CA / JS 2<sup>nd</sup>.
  - *Approved by acclamation.*
- Membership Secretary: Motion by CN to nominate AD/ CA 2<sup>nd</sup>.
  - *Approved by acclamation.*

## **5. Announcements: Chair's Report and CPC Report**

- Chair's Report:
  - CN: CPC had presentation of new housing action package. CN on subcommittee to review land use code amendments and policies. Expecting CPG document from city in a week or two. Adding item to CPC meeting in May to create an action plan to implement it.
  - Next month there will be an informational item on mobility in Campus Pointe Area and informational item from SANDAG on rapid bus route through University City and we'll hear about the Torrey Pines State Park item that has been pending for about 18 months.

## **6. Presentations:**

### **Councilmember Kent Lee: Kent Lee / Dustin Nguyen**

- Dustin Nguyen: Quick updates from Councilmember Lee's office – the Sustainability and Mobility Department are hosting some workshops this April on the Climate Action Plan (<https://www.sandiego.gov/public-library/OurSustainableSD>) which is the plan that guides community plans. The Blueprint San Diego survey is out online (<https://blueprintsandiego.org/>). The annual stormwater maintenance survey also just came out [https://gis.tetrattech.com/sw\\_maintenance/survey/](https://gis.tetrattech.com/sw_maintenance/survey/) Councilmember Lee wants to thank everyone who came to the meet and greet last month - he was happy to see you all. Next month there will be budget town hall meetings and you are all invited. The mayor is set to release the budget, and after the IBA reviews, our offices will host budget town halls on May 4<sup>th</sup> at 9880 Campus Pointe Drive, Third Floor 6 pm. Next Monday, May 8th location TBD.

### **Membership Report: Anu Delouri**

- AD: UCPG is the University Community Planning Group, which is the officially recognized organization that represents both North and South University City. The group is an advisory group that provides recommendations to city officials and meets on second Tuesday of the month. Members are

eligible to vote in the annual election. If you have questions about membership, please email: adelouri@ucsd.edu

### **Plan Update Subcommittee: Andy Wiese, Chair**

- AW: Today is the opportunity for City to present the discussion draft of the Community Plan to the public. It's the very first opportunity for the subcommittee to review the discussion draft next week at UC High School on April 18<sup>th</sup> from 6-8. There will be 3 meetings to review the discussion draft in April, May, and June. These meetings are held to allow the subcommittee and public to make comments, request changes, and provide suggestions, deletions, etc. Those meetings will be in person. The first meeting will focus on land use and mobility, related to CPIOZ. Land use and mobility were two topics of the most concern/interest so we will get to those first. The City will be there to present and there will be representatives from the mayor's office and councilmember Lee's office. We expect robust, respectful, and professional conversation. It will be an in-person meeting but hope to broadcast it to the community – but we don't have capacity to run hybrid meeting in that space.
  - JS: If the city has any suggested way to respond that is user friendly, it would be helpful to know. I started doing with PDF adobe comments, not sure if they can review that, but I welcome their suggestions.
    - AW: What is the most effective way to receive and incorporate comments? CN and AW have put together comments already received which will be made available and will be updated as we go to have as comprehensive as possible document. Can provide comments by email to planuniversity.org or directly to AW. [awiese@sdsu.edu](mailto:awiese@sdsu.edu). At subcommittee meetings we will have comment cards to submit handwritten comments.
    - NG: We can receive comments anyway you want to send them. If you are interested in taking a PDF and putting in comments, that works, and you can send them to the planuniversity@sandiego.gov email or you can send just the pages you commented on. You can use "wetransfer.com" to transmit a large file for free. The consolidated comments from the subcommittee are important so sharing comments with subcommittee is great, but if you would like to make individual comments as well, we can take in any form you want to send to us.

- AW: Will there be a format to take geographically located comments with stickers on maps?
  - NG: We've used "Jamboards" in the past which allows us to turn those into a PDF, so that is an option if that is desirable. We are asking for people to submit comments digitally within one consolidated portal. The preference is for comments to be submitted digitally and submitted to the planuniversity@sandiego.gov email address.
- Zoom Chat Question: Clarification if subcommittee meeting will include a discussion on the Governor Dr. road diet?
  - AW: Yes, we will discuss land use and mobility so that would include the Governor Dr. road diet.
    - IK: Where/when does UCPG get involved.
      - AW: After the April, May, June subcommittee meetings, the subcommittee will prepare a report and recommendation that will be shared with UCPG who will vote in July, if schedule holds.

**Mayor Todd Gloria: Michaela Valk**

- Michaela Valk: Director Community Engagement for Mayor Todd Gloria. Two items going to land use housing committee this week: (1) Unsafe Camping Ordinance would prohibit tent encampment at locations considered to be high risk for health and safety (i.e., Balboa Park, Shoreline Parks, all canyons, waterways, and K-12 schools). Working with councilmember Whitburn for safe sleeping sites. (2) Civic Center Revitalization: the City and Mayor's vision to revitalize the civic center core to transform so the city administration building is more friendly. It includes 5 blocks being designated as surplus land and setting aside 1 block for a new city administration building. This would allow for the building of affordable housing, re-envision the dilapidated public space, and consolidate the city portfolio of inadequate office space, and also increase workplace morale.
  - AP: Concern regarding timing of enforcement of safe camping policy zones versus the timing of identification of these zones`.
    - MV: As Dustin mentioned, the Mayor is releasing budget this Friday, there is allocated funding to safe sleeping program. There are a lot of communities that don't want this type of use in their community. But just

as there are those who don't want to accept shelter, we can't say no to programs that will help reduce encampments. If it goes past committee, the mayor will propose it at the city council. We are hoping to get safe sleeping in operation as soon as possible.

- IK: is there just one safe sleeping site?
  - MV: Right now, there is a certain pot of funding, but multiple sites are being explored, most are city owned sites.
- JS: Read in paper some enforcement or removal in tent camping has already started?
  - MV: This option is not tied to shelter availability. The Police department uses progressive enforcement which includes 4 contacts with individuals who deny using shelter before an arrest can be made. The difference here is that high-risk public spaces such as canyons are not tied to shelter being available for enforcement to take place.
- IK: Instead of law enforcement, what about social services that need to contact people and give them the information to help them move, is there budgeting for that?
  - MV: We have a portfolio of options available, and this is just one option. We have doubled coordinated outreach efforts (i.e., with PATH). Any and every time an officer approaches an individual, they ask if shelter is available will you take it? If they say no, they use the 4-step progressive enforcement model.
- ZOOM participant: city owned sites – is it possible to provide more details on those sites?
  - MV: Inspiration Point – located at the southern parking lot below Navy hospital adjacent to Balboa park.

## **Planning Department: Nancy Graham**

- NG: The City is officially closing the public comment period for community plan comments on June 30<sup>th</sup>. However, they are making an exception for the Planning Group which can have its July meeting and the city will receive the groups' recommendation after that date. All other comments are due by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

### **7. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).**

- RC: A lot are concerned about finding clean sources of energy, it takes quite a bit of evaluation and integrate new information. Six navy patents were pursued in 2019 by naval warfare center. Naval higher ups and patent office objected to technology because it didn't conform to science. A fusion engine is simple, safe, inexpensive and provides clean energy. Go look at Reagan's white house diaries from June 11, 1985 – it references capabilities that were not part of the public conversation whatsoever and haven't been in public conversation whatsoever.
- Diane Ahern: President of University City Community Association - we are the newsletter people. I am the one who normally livestreams the meeting using Facebook at CPUS meetings, but I am out of town next week and am looking for a volunteer to stream the meeting. You must have your own FB account, have some kind of digital device like cell phone to broadcast, and while the high school does have Wi-Fi, it is not as reliable as your own cell phone connection may be. If you're willing to do it, we will temporarily hook you up to UCCA's Facebook and you are welcome to livestream – email address is in the newsletter.
  - CN: Diane has been doing the livestream to date and it has been very much appreciated.

### **8. Action Item: PRJ-1066559, Existing Wireless Control Facility. Renewal of existing Conditional Use Permit 929351. Base Zone IL-2-1, CPIOZ-B, Miramar APZ1 Zone. Process 4. The project is located at 6080 Miramar Road. Stephanie Vanderveen, SCV Consulting, presenting.**

- Stephanie Vanderveen: Represents AT&T. We have an existing cell site at 6080 Miramar Road and we are looking to renew this permit with the city. When we went in for administrative review, we noticed the permit expired (in 2022) so we are renewing the underlying permit and presenting it to you tonight for renewal. Presented photos survey showing a 3-sector site, 4 antennas per sector. The proposal is to remove and replace the antennas and to upgrade the technology. All is screened and enclosed so no visual impact or

aesthetic changes are proposed with the site. The proposal has landlord approval. The area will serve a 2-mile radius.

- CN: Were all neighbors noticed?
  - No, City did not require noticing for the site since it had screening and is a fully concealed site.
- CN: This is in APZ 1 so did Miramar need to give any approval?
  - No, was not required.
- RC: What is the upgrade technology? Is it from 4 to 5G?
  - It is to 5G?
- RG: Physicians have concerns about 5G because the lower frequency interrupts cellular communication they cannot adapt. Testimony to congress revealed that telecoms haven't put any money into safety studies. Safety standards are under review. For the last 50 years, there's been a consistent stream of research that tells us that non-ionizing radiation disrupts the cellular process. We know it's a pollutant and dangerous. Would like to see some pause in this process implementing 5G. I cannot endorse 5G antenna without this information and how it interacts with antennas in the area. Can you tell us what you've done to ensure safety in the immediate environment?
  - I am an acquisition and permit specialist – I can tell you we have emission reports that are provided to the city that is approving the WCF. I can request to share those with the committee. I can see what else we can provide, but I can't speak to the frequency safety and emissions tonight and understand the concerns.
    - RG: I need to wait to for federal court mandate is completed. Nowhere can you go and find standards as low as United States. Invite people to look at literature. It concerns protecting children/vulnerable people. Look at that 2-mile radius and see if there are schools/hospitals in 2 miles radius.
  - CN: Motion to approve as proposed/ 2<sup>nd</sup> by AP
    - AW: City has stated health standards are not grounds for approval/disapproval. If there are concerns with health and safety, those are to be addressed with state legislatures. If there were health concerns, this would be the best location since it's in the APZ 1 with no housing nearby and is isolated from sensitive receptors.
      - *Motion approved: 10 Yes – 1 Abstain – 0 No*

**9. Information Item: Community Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan Update. The Draft may be downloaded at [planuniversity.org/](http://planuniversity.org/)**

- NG: Supervising Project Manager for community plan update with a large team on project. Tait Galloway is physically in the room. The team asked that I do my presentation via zoom since the recording quality would be better at my desk.
- Schedule: NG Presented CPU schedule and overview on process to date. We are currently at the community discussion draft –which is the very first complete draft of the community plan. This is not the draft that will be sent for environmental review, it is the one presented as first draft to take the most amount of public comment. We are working with the subcommittee to have additional meetings and to discuss it in more detail. Later this summer, we will release the official draft community plan which will include a zoning map and draft environmental impact report to look at impact of policies in the plan and the potential mitigation to deal with impacts that arise from plan. In late 2023, we collect input on the environmental impact report, revise the draft plan and make the final draft. That final draft is the one that will go through public hearing and plan adoption. The goal is to get this all done within 2023.
- Basis of plan: We used the citywide policy framework to draft the community plan including the General Plan, CAP, Housing Element, Parks Master Plan, and Climate Resilient SD. There are also a series of guiding principles that were created with the subcommittee and also plan priorities which also guided the plan which included: supporting thriving economy, maximizing transit investment success, allowing a variety of new homes, ensuring a sustainable future, and street design for people.
- Contents: There are 7 main topical chapters: vision land use framework, urban design, mobility, parks and recreation, open space and conservation, historic preservation, and public facilities services & safety.
- Land Use Map: Made some changes to scenario A to potential build out 32,500 new homes (went up from 30,000) and 59,000 new jobs (went down based on one calculation error but is more accurate of build out) and dedicate 130 acres of open space as part of the plan. Some changes include:
  - Governor/Regents – was condos. The existing designation is commercial but moving to residential designation. Changed

some density areas on maps - built in some protection for canyons.

- Urban village had 90 du/ac but moved to 0-109 du/ac. More recent community plans used 109 du/ac for this level. Having communities with different densities can be harder for development services so changed that to be consistent with other plans.
  - Provided illustrations of densities in land use designation category description
- Considerations for Creating Land Use Plan: While community input is a big aspect of consideration for creating the land use plan, the city also takes other things into consideration – like the General Plan, Climate Action Plan, Housing Equity goals, SANDAG demographics, opportunity and market feasibility. All of these come into play when we make land use maps.
  - Urban Design: We put a lot of effort into providing direction on urban design to ensure that when buildings are built, they are built in compatible ways with surrounding development. For example, ensure that towers are not too massive, make them smaller and thinner to allow additional light to come through.
  - Canyon Adjacent Development – suggested edge setback and then have the building step back.
  - 5P Concept Plan provides examples and where the 5Ps (Promenades, Plazas, etc.) can be located.
  - Urban Greening: Looking at how we can make stormwater infrastructure greener and improve street trees pallet and where they should go.
  - Area specific direction Provided area specific plan guidance.
  - Mobility: Focus is on complete streets and smart corridors. Provided illustrations in the plan to give an idea of what these will look like. Also included mobility maps.
  - Parks & Rec: Identified new park facilities that were not in previously released maps. The city has had joint use opportunities with schools. Looking towards a similar arrangement with Montessori school in south UC since it's owned by SD Unified and trying to work with them for a joint use agreement that is built into their lease. Also looking beyond schools for joint use – maybe partnering with UCSD, Preuss school, JCC, or Westfield. Miramar grassy area that exists could be a pocket park. Included a full park inventory; how many points they have now and how many points in the future. Plan identifies 6,000 park points. We

do have a deficit of 5,000 points but were able to find a large number of new facilities and improvements.

- Trails and Overlooks One segment in south UC one in north UC. Not identifying a specific route at this level of planning.
- Open Space: Recognize Debbie Knight and Karen Strauss for providing photos and descriptions in this section. Open space dedications here are subject to city council action.
- Historic Resources Section – Don't map anything in the plans, none of the newer plans map historic resources. The environmental document will have a historic context statement that can be used for future identification of sites that can be used at plan level.
- Public Facilities, Services and Safety Section: Integrates resilient SD. Includes heat exposure index, fire map, other maps that haven't been included previously but team is working to figure out the best way to address these items since those maps often change. Have all public facilities detailed in plan.
- Implementation section: All plan policies are consolidated into an implementation section.
- CPIOZ: Have used this strategy in newer and some older plans as well. We are able to introduce code into the plan through an overlay zone to supplement the zoning itself. The 5 Ps are codified so any development in purple areas will have to provide 1 of the 5 P's if the site is big enough. This requirement is also for commercial projects not just residential– this is new. Also, have requirements to break down mega blocks. There are also requirements for vehicle parking, design requirements, tower controls, roadway dedications for adding bikeways, community serving retail development – concerns about community serving retail put a requirement sites that have community village (Spouts and Vons) have requirement to include community serving retail if redeveloped, requirement for onsite affordable housing – still studying what is the precise number that is appropriate but still doing economic research but will have a requirement in the plan. Area specific requirements – canyon adjacent and freeway adjacent development.
- Timing: We would like to receive all comments to the general plan email address [planuniversity@sandiego.gov](mailto:planuniversity@sandiego.gov), not to NG. Later this summer, we will release the official draft plan and zoning map then the draft EIR later this summer and collect community input then later this year will release final documents.

Discussion/Q&A

- CN: What feedback is helpful?
- NG: What is helpful is if you have questions on the draft; if you have comments, we'll take your comments and say thank you.

UCPG Board members Comments:

- IK: Open space – point system is controversial. Is there an opportunity to acquire more open space? It seems that's what we need if we're missing 5,000 "park points". Can there be acquisition for public spaces? Plazas that are privately owned and not accessible to the public if the owner decides to close them.
  - NG: Parks Master Plan already been adopted. Plan has the points for all different facilities and how many points are existing and potential park points. If you have more ideas for new facilities, we're happy to take those ideas as comments. With a CPIOZ it requires projects to create one of the 5Ps. If they put a recreation easement on the property, they don't have to pay their fees. If they don't, they still owe fees. They would have to develop the 5P area consistent with the council policy.
- KMar: CPIOZ, looks like it includes every parcel that's being upzoned, it says on page 189 – any development permit within the CPIOZ that satisfies those SDRs can be processed as ministerial permit.
  - NG: If something else triggers a discretionary permit they would still need to have discretionary approval. (i.e., a SDP) If you don't want to meet the SDRs then you are put into a discretionary process. If you do, you can process ministerially.
    - KMAR: If developer does the bare minimum to meet the SDR, then they don't come before the planning group/planning commission?
      - NG: If it's a ministerial project, then that's correct, yes.
        - Kmar: so they don't have to provide EV spaces?
          - They still have to do that to meet the code. They have to meet the CAP requirements.
            - Kmar: bike infrastructure?
              - NG: Ministerial projects still have to improve frontage. Putting

in facilities required by street design manual. Can do deferred agreements if building segment at one time doesn't make sense but ministerial still must improve frontage.

- RC: City has yet to recommend affordable housing requirement that would be built into the plan. On Nextdoor with a single mom in an affordable building south of Nobel, rent increased 300/month so there is pressure on affordable units is there already. The price of a condo has gone up 9x since I bought my condo. I hope the figure city comes back with is very robust and more than 10/20%.
  - NG: The City is bringing in an expert to create a requirement. This is a complicated issue and its why we're taking our time with it, but we are open to the input the community has on this and what income requirements will bring to the consultant that we're working with.
- LB: The discussion draft proposes too much additional density – the proposal seeks to more than double housing units in plan area and that seems unreasonable because there are no required provisions for traffic or to increase parks. It discusses goals and opportunities to do things but provides no guarantee they will be funded/implemented. Increased density at shopping centers on governor drive is too much. Neither meet transportation criteria. Is Scenario B still being considered? Will Sprouts/Vons remain with current zoning and height restriction remaining the same? Houses adjacent to shopping centers will be impacted if anything goes higher than the 30 feet current zoning. How will the requirement be enforced that retail/essential services remain at those shopping centers?
  - NG: Staff recommended the land use is in the plan but they did include slip sheets for scenario B, which can be considered by council if they choose. The staff recommended plan is what is in the body of the plan and it does include land use changes in Sprouts and Vons shopping center and would increase density and heights.

- JS: Vehicular corridors – consider taking private property – what areas/streets are you thinking of? In description of community and goals, there is no acknowledgement of the fact that we have in north UC a very sizable residential community in several places. The plan discusses business opportunities without a discussion of existing residential communities and services they rely on and the impacts that the high rises will have on the communities. It's a lifestyle issue that needs to be considered and articulated in the plan.
  - NG: The corridors are listed in plan in supplemental developmental regulations – on page 200. Generally, it's only a couple of feet where we can't get a bike lane in.
- AW: Nancy, I acknowledge the amount of work of the team and recognize its not an easy undertaking, especially since you came into the project midstream. It is important to recognize the positive things: the draft reaffirms the goal of UCPU fair housing, projects will provide affordable housing near jobs, include affordable housing minimum, open space dedication, shopping centers revitalized not replaced, linear parks on Regents/Governor, range of bike/ped infrastructure (notes bed of Rose Creek has a mobility trail that needs to be adjusted), SDR contact sensitive design near open space, native/low water planting (notes only 1 native plant on street trees need to do better there), onsite park requirement greater than 2 acres. For suggestions to consider: streets, road diets request street diagrams with key streets so we can see what's being proposed - what does it actually that look like? Agree with JS we should acknowledge residential communities, highlight environmental goals of community much more –its the most biodiverse places on planet earth, suggest the name University Community be used accurately and consistently – University Community is also called University City but no one refers to it as University. Inclusionary should be robust and needs to be able to work, be worried about displacement, preserve affordable housing we have now and add to housing stock, retail displacement concerns. Park deficiency is problematic – doubling the park deficit – absence of park for 50,000 people – new plan tells us that there's too much development being proposed here unless we can find more park points, a UCSD problem counting population but not their parks, count population accurately, JCC – is in Mandel Weiss park when it was built it was envisioned it would be a model for private contribution to parks, stronger language for community serving retail including La Jolla Village Square.

- Katie Rodolico: Plan uses terms like urban village but in municipal codes it uses EMX/RMX. How does urban village translate to what's in the municipal code? Would be great if there was a cheat sheet translation tool. Was it an oversight 2 large churches are still not marked as institutional? Synagogue on Towne Center and high school are not marketed as institutional/school but marked as urban village. Will there be a traffic study? How does that work with pure water project and construction on Governor? Things are not a normal traffic flow and we're talking about road diets. We need to have accurate data; I assume we need an up-to-date traffic study. Fire safety map – seems to be new/different than on SD county and city that everything but Rose Canyon is in a fire zone but the canyon is combustible.
  - NG: The urban village land use designations are implemented with EMX/RMX zones 1, 2, 3 correspond to 3 levels of urban village. If the existing use is commercial, then EMX is applied. If existing use is residential, then RMX is applied. This is true unless a property owner contacts NG and specifically says they would like to switch. The city is open to these conversations because they don't want to create a lot of non-conforming use issues. The churches on Eastgate Mall are looking to increase densities which is why we indicated this land use category. Their land use could be institutional but would still zone them consistent with adjacent properties. The Synagogue underlying zoning is commercial which is why gave them the urban village. If they would rather have institutional, that would be fine. We will be doing traffic study/mobility as part of environmental document –which does have to take into consideration the traffic conditions you mentioned and pipeline projects have to be acknowledged with EIR. Fire map is the most up to date data – but the map often changes, so they are discussing the best way to acknowledge the policy with Resilient SD, but not include the map, so they will continue to work on that and are open to suggestions.
- ZOOM AUDIENCE Questions:
- Aidan Lin: Thank you to Nancy and all of planners on hard work on this. Excited with the direction it's going in, love the 5Ps & promenade on Executive rive, happy with density and increases near trolley stops. Question - between Nobel Drive and Regents –there are lighter purple zones– where the Escala, Axiom, and other apartment complexes that students live. This area is within a mile of the trolley stop, why this area

is still lighter purple instead of darker purple? is there room to be expanded in future drafts?

- NG: We wanted some diversity in the plan and to not have everything be the same density. Also, it is further from the trolley. So, we don't want the highest density everywhere in the plan, even downtown has different levels of density to create more variety.
- Jesse O'Sullivan: Circulate SD, thank you for presenting plan, there are some great things in there – mobility section looks good – I'm happy about protected bike facility, saw a lot of flex lanes which look great but noticed there is not a flex lane on Genesee on the southern end – this area has a lot of traffic so all the more reason to do one there. Circulate SD and the coalition sent a letter that scenario 1 be included in EIR and city council should be able to consider that alternative since it was preferred alternative in community survey.
- Michael Kozma: 33,000 housing units are going to be added in UC region and 59,000 jobs. Where is the increased housing and jobs being distributed throughout UC? What the responsibility to other parts of SD are to provide housing and job?
  - NG: Increases shown are where land use changes are being made – simple map to refer to is CPIOZ map – page 190 of the plan. Those are the locations where there are increases to the plan. This is the 15<sup>th</sup> community plan we've updated; other communities have had significant increases in jobs/housing as well and we increase density on most climate friendly areas. Now that the Blue Line trolley is complete, we want to make the most out of the trolley which is why we are proposing to increase density in this area, but many other communities have gone first so it's not only in this community.
- Judith Becker: Can see you've done a lot of work and took a lot of care to include what is important to people. I have a deep-rooted fear of fire. The map of all of UC shows very high fire hazard severity zones. I live in south UC trapped between two canyons with one narrow street and 3 emergency exits, and with increased density I fear for my life. I feel like I'm being sacrificed. If there's an emergency that blocks an exit people are going to drive to the schools, so there will be no exit. What about the elderly? I'm scared.
  - NG: Emergency services is one area that is studied in the environmental impact report that will be prepared to review that issue. There is fire risk throughout the City of San Diego, We

coordinate with the Fire Department which is a part of City of SD and have ongoing discussions with them to coordinate. We cannot eradicate fire risk in SD, but the plan is reviewed by experts.

- Tom Mullaney: Plan density is grossly excessive – it's a growth mania. It's about 60 years' worth of growth and it could be scaled back to 1/3 and would be enough. Parks will be terribly unplanned. I worked for 14 months on parks master plan and it is set up to be easy to meet and obtain points yet we are still 5,000 points short. Phasing is not being discussed, FBA had phasing, development should not go forward without public facilities being met. Should be regular communication with Kent Lee with a campaign of letters/postcards. If Councilmember Lee can't support scaled back density –the community needs to make it clear he's not welcome to be the representative.
- Andrea Contreras: Represent the Robinson Wood Trust – with 30 acres adjacent to Gilman Drive on Villa Alicante. Currently processing an application to vacate an open space easement while leaving MHPA intact. Believe the site is developable to put affordable housing, much needed housing which is needed to support thriving economy. The site is less than mile from Blue Line trolley stop at Nobel. It also provides a variety of new homes and can support low-income families/young professionals, allowing housing while leaving MHPA and would preserve the value of open space while building transit-oriented units. Streets designed for people Gilman along planned corridor to UCSD. The application is to vacate the easement on the property and have residential use on the site, and we ask again that the designation be changed to residential or have a split designation or abatement until open space vacation is complete.
- Gail Friedt: What a fantastic presentation by the planning group – there are a lot of concerns about change and change is hard, but I think we're in a situation where we need housing and I applaud the increase in density. I don't think it's going to be a problem. The same concerns about fire and earthquakes are all fears that we can share, but we need to build housing for people to live. If we can't get more young people to live in our community we'll have a problem, we need them to work in the hospital. This is not the only community where this is happening. We can also reach out to our Councilmember and give them your support for more housing/mobility plans.
- Susan Baldwin: Who is the consultant doing affordable housing economic analysis and when see analysis? Is land value capture being considered as part of that analysis?

- NG: Keiser Marsten is doing the report. We can share the report when available. They are only studying affordable housing requirements as written in the plan.
- KMar: Inclusionary housing - found wording difficult to understand – what is the alternative method of compliance constructing units in community plan area, except that XX units affordable? Would like to better understand that. Canyon setbacks 50’ not adequate – shading of canyon by tall buildings is one issue but the other concern is impact of construction and foundations. Concerned about that impact and suggest increased distance perhaps some fraction of depth of lot up to 100’ of setback if possible. The retail/commercial services minimum seems inadequate, 10% of space for development 50-100K sf could be 5-10K sf, or if over 100,000 then 15,000 sf. Is that the size of a grocery store? Would love to see that they have to keep however much community serving retail that is present now.
  - NG: Affordable housing language is the same as the Barrio Logan plan. There is a 10% inclusionary requirement city wide which allows a fee option per state law so we have to allow the fee for 1<sup>st</sup> 10 % then above 10% we can require units to be built onsite. Regarding the commercial services component, we are open to suggestions, but Trader Joes has about 10-15K sf, Ralph has about 30-40K sf. If you have suggestions on that requirement, let us know. But groceries are a format that is changing and it’s more common that they are becoming smaller as the focus on food delivery is shifting so we proposed something that could be flexible in this long-term plan.
    - CN: how big are Sprouts/Vons?
      - NG: Not sure but can get that information.
- JS: La Jolla folks who are north of 52 already shop in our grocery stores, Claremont residents also shop in our grocery stores, and because of trolley the same holds there. So, this is not just usage by the community, there are substantial uses of these shopping areas by people outside of our community so the demand is there. We haven’t talked about neighboring community plans – can you give us some idea for what planning groups around us are doing and what the increase in density will look like in residential and jobs?
  - NG: Mira Mesa was adopted recently and is available online, Claremont has a draft plan out for review, and the Kearny Mesa adopted plan is online as well. I believe we showed this in a

previous PPT showing SANDAG projections. Can dig back through that again.

- Jennifer Martin-Roff: Can you please explain what unbundled parking is with respect to the Governor community village?
  - NG: Unbundled parking is when the cost of renting parking is separate from rent of unit. So, you are not just provided a space if you rent a unit, but you pay a separate fee for parking. It helps people realize the cost of parking and they may choose not to incur those costs, and it discounts rent if you don't want a parking spot.
  
- CN: Thank the board members, members of the audience and members on the zoom for giving thoughtful comments. The review process has started and there is a lot to unpack and many details to absorb. Tonight's presentation is really a start for that review. One week from tonight, AW will reconvene the process at UC High School at 6pm with the CPUS discussion on land use and mobility.

**10. Adjournment: Next Meeting will be on May 9, 2023, in-person at 9880 Campus Pointe Drive, Second Floor. This will be a hybrid meeting in person and on zoom.**