

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Virtual Meeting Via Zoom
March 8, 2022, at 6:00pm

Directors present, directors absent:

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), **Nancy Groves (NG)**, Caryl Lees Witte (CW), **Joann Selleck (JS)**, **Isabelle Kay (IK)**, **Ash Nasserri (AN)**, **Rebecca Robinson (RRW)**, **Jon Arenz (JA)**, Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), **Jason Moorhead (JM)**, **Anu Delouri (AD)**, Kristie Miller (KM), Michael Leavenworth (ML), Kristin Camper (KC), **Petr Krysl (PK)**, **Carol Uribe (CU)**, **Andrew Parlier (AP)**, **Georgia Kayser (GK)**, **Karen Martien (KMar)** Katie Witherspoon (KW-City of SD Planning).

1. **Call the Meeting to Order:** Chris Nielsen, Chair 6:07pm
2. **Agenda: Call for additions / deletions:** No additions/deletions. Agenda approved without objection.
3. **Approval of Minutes: February 8, 2022**
 - CN - minutes from February 8, 2022, will be considered for approval at the April 12, 2022, meeting.
4. **Announcements: Chair's Report and CPC Report.**
 - Elections:
 - Election results will be reported after counting at 8pm tonight.
 - Thank you to JM and AD for making the election efficient and fair. Thank you to Melissa Martin and Staff at the University Community Library and Michelle Ruiz and Staff at the North UC Library for allowing placement of ballot boxes in libraries and for friendly and courteous service provided for voters.
 - Thank you to departing UCPG members for service and for distinguishing themselves as volunteers for the community.
 - Minutes:
 - Carey Algaze will be taking minutes tonight and is running unopposed for Dan McCurdy's B-2-C seat unopposed so will likely continue taking minutes as a board member starting next month.
 - New UCSD representative
 - Andrew Parlier will take over as the representative from UCSD student organization.
 - Costa Verde:
 - Alexandria representative, Randy Levison, is not prepared to present plans but allowed CN to report on their conversation. The change for Alexandria to purchase Costa Verde occurred in the middle of January as Regency, like many other retailers, were hurting and felt they had greater exposure with the project. They ultimately decided to exit the development.

- Alexandria intends to develop the Site consistent with the development permits that have been secured which include a hotel, retail, and R&D (though the retail may decrease slightly)
- Alexandria still thinks a market is an important component of the site but would like to see a specialty market (like Jimbo's). They are looking for pedestrian friendly experience, rather than auto centered experience.
- All tenants are expected to be gone by March 15th at which time the Site will be fenced, and Alexandria hopes to secure demo permits and starting by June.
- McDonalds and the gas station/car wash will remain in operation. Their motto is "vacant real estate is bad real estate", so they will be moving as expeditiously as possible to get the project built.
- Torrey Pines State Park ADA
 - A project to improve Torrey Pines State Park ADA access and utilities is expected to come before the UCPG in April or May.
- UCPG Plan Update Subcommittee
 - Next meeting is Tuesday, March 15th at 6pm using webinar format
- Land Use and Housing Committee Meeting
 - Thursday, March 10th at 1:00pm to review Councilmember LaCava's proposed revisions to community planning groups as an information item.
- Build Better San Diego Workshop
 - March 10 from 6:00PM to 7:30PM is the city's Build Better SD virtual workshop. Those interested in how the DIF may evolve under this program should consider attending. Here is the link to register to attend. [Build Better SD | City of San Diego Official Website.](#)

5. Presentations:

- a. **Councilmember Joe LaCava** **Kaitlyn Willoughby**
 - Councilmember LaCava's revisions to Community Planning Group reform is going to Land Use and Housing committee on Thursday as an informational item.
 - Budget town halls are scheduled for May. Registration link will follow.
 - Lakewood/Governor traffic signal to be installed in mid-April as soon as supplies are received.
 - Councilmember LaCava will attend April UCCA meeting regarding Miramar.
 - New phone number for Kaitlyn provided in the chat
- b. **Plan Update Subcommittee** **Andy Wiese, Chair**
 - Urge everyone to engage in the community plan update process as now is the moment of maximum involvement. Proposals for the land use scenarios are out and next week's meeting will strive to obtain community feedback on those land use options.
 - February 15th meeting discussed the online engagement tool that the City preformed last fall and discussed proposed land use scenarios.
 - Online Community Engagement Tool:

- Much greater involvement and community participation. UC remains in leading edge in planning of city with 2,600 people completed the survey which is 1,000 more than in 2019.
- Representation across the community was much more representative in terms of demographics.
- City did a great job of reaching out into the community to receive more diverse feedback.
- Important questions were raised about the nature of the survey and quality since 7,000 surveys were started but only 2,600 were completed. City to report on that next meeting.
- Land Use Scenarios:
 - Some felt the proposals were astonishing in size, scope, and scale.
 - There is value in what the city is proposing and there are also some areas of improvement so encourage the community to attend the next meeting to provide feedback.
 - Also included some areas that had not been studied previously including rezoning and medium density development on Governor in South UC.
- March 15th meeting at 6:00pm will be devoted to community feedback on those proposals. Members of the public may also be heard by providing comment via email to KW and Andy Wiese.
- April 19th subcommittee will vote on its preferred land use scenario.
- May Planning Commission Workshop
- June UCPG vote.
- c. **Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer Meghan Elledge**
 - Supervisor Lawson-Remer is excited to welcome traffic improvement carpool project on north bound/south bound on I-5 and supports infrastructure investments like this.
 - Funding available to nonprofit for community enhancement funding. An informational workshop will take place on April 7th 1:00pm where county team will go over requirements and application process. Link is here: <https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZUvcuirrT4tEt0siG9HxrJ7h0gOXOoYjq4t>
 - Funding for neighborhood reinvestment is also available
 - Can arrange 1:1 with grant advisor if desired
- d. **Introduction of Andrew Parlier: UCSD**
 - AP introduced himself to the group.

6. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).

- Diane Ahern:
 - UCCA University City Community Association meets Wednesday, March 9, at 6 PM via Zoom. The agenda is available on UCCA's UniversityCityNews.org website. Featured guests for March include SDPD Officer Bognuda and Lieutenant Brinkerhoff (Crime related to trolley); Chris Nielsen/Andy Wiese Planning Group; Ruth DeSantis, University City

Community Foundation; and our new friends from City Council District 6 - Jeff Stevens, Bari Vaz and/or Pam Stevens from the Mira Mesa Planning Group and Town Council. You'll hear about public safety, community planning, and redistricting; plus information from our legislative and community leaders.

- UCCA is sponsoring a D6 City Council Candidate Forum in April and we may have a few City Council candidates who wish to introduce themselves. The agenda and Zoom info is posted on UCCA's website at www.UniversityCityNews.org.
- Bill Beck Comment:
- Bill Beck:
 - Member of the UC Fire Safe Council. A Free Smoke Detector Giveaway event is set for March 12th, between 10AM and 4PM at the First Baptist Church-San Diego, 5055 Governor Drive. This event is being held thanks to the support of the San Diego Regional Fire Foundation and the University City Fire Safe Council. Homeowners are reminded that battery operated detector older than 10 years should be replaced. So, while supplies last, two smoke detectors per household will be given to those UC residents in need. So be sure to bring your ID."
- Ash Nessari:
 - Provided photo presentation on increase of people experiencing homelessness.
 - Has worked in the area since 2010 and typically see the same faces year after year. Since the trolley came in, has seen an increase in people experiencing homelessness. Reports people yelling and screaming outside of workplace at one another and sometimes talking to themselves.
 - Reports seeing encampments starting below Whole Foods under the bridge, people washing clothes, and panhandling.
 - Presented photos of gentleman passed out requiring emergency services fire passed out at work.
 - Most concerning is the tents.
 - Had meeting scheduled with Councilmember LaCava for tomorrow morning but despite confirming multiple times, it was cancelled.
 - Concern that this is not a UTC problem it is a community problem that is going to get worse.
- Jennifer Martin-Roff
 - South UC resident. Took the trolley for the first time. Parked in UTC parking structure with MTS sign on it and understood parking was free. Wondered if this goes against what is planned. It has spots labeled for transit.
 - IK: There is no informative signs whatsoever about the parking/trolley. No signage indicating access to trolley is on the 4th level, not the top level. Really poor signage.
 - Tom Heckman: MTS website states the transit center is paid parking.

- CN: Understanding is SANDAG built a separate garage at UTC. Will ask Gia the MTS/SANDAG contact
 - Kent Lee:
 - 15-year Resident in Mira Mesa running for San Diego City Council for District 6
 - Served on Community Planning Group for last 9 years, thankful for service and those running.
 - Redistricting shifted boundaries, district 6 now includes University City.
 - Proud of support endorsements from Mayor Gloria, 6 of councilmembers and Council President Sean Elo riviera
 - Lily Higman:
 - Running for District C of San Diego Unified School District. Have 3 kids in the school system, has been active for 10 years in the school system, on Monday March 21st there will be a community town hall with all three candidates on the forum. Will follow up with zoom link.

7. Action Item: AB361 provisions for ongoing UCPG virtual meetings. A vote will be required each month to authorize the next meeting to be held virtually. Public health reasons must be cited. Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- Motion by CN to authorize next meeting to be held virtually for public health reasons with second by CU
- *Motion carries unanimously 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain, with Chair not voting.*

8. Action Item: PTS 0683337 Belmont Sign, Neighborhood Development Permit. Neighborhood Development Permit for two signs at the Belmont Village Senior Living project located at 3880 Nobel Dr. Process 2. Laura Fairbanks, presenting.

- Presentation by Ruben Andrews, President of Graphic Solutions. Joined by Brent Covey representing ownership.
 - Application for a discretionary permit to allow deviations for two (2) signs related to 17-story residential facility for seniors which deviate in size, setback and illumination.
 - Monument Sign:
 - Proposing 3' x 15' tall double-faced monument sign about 1' from property line, outside of visibility triangle
 - Deviations Requested: sign area increase of 28 sf, height increase of 9', and internal illumination proposed.
 - Wall Sign:
 - The building where the wall sign is proposed is set back 175'. Proposed sign is 14' wide and 4' tall letter, illuminated in silhouette sign.
 - Deviations Requested: 2 signs, where 1 is allowed, 36 square feet increase in sign area and internal illumination.

- JS: How does adjacent senior residence signage compare to this?
 - Ruben Andrews: To the west there is a double-faced sign just about as high but bigger than this sign. To the east, they have about 3 signs and also have a double faced sign on the property line – not 15’ tall like this one but located near the property line just as this one would be.
- IK: Why does the sign have to be 6” from the sidewalk and why does there need to be a second sign on the building? If you’re turning in and there’s a massive building you don’t need a sign to say that’s where you’re arriving.
 - Ruben Andrews: is a senior facility, project is set back 175’ needs to be a confirming sign after you turn in. It is a fast street and 3 lanes.
- CU: Is it a 1-way driveway? View of traffic
 - Ruben Andrews: Yes, both in and out. Sign is located outside of the visibility triangle to serve that purpose.
- KMar: Don’t understand why such a large and prominent sign is required. If it’s a hotel, for people who can’t find it then ok, but this is a residential building. Hesitant to approve such substantial deviations from requirements when there’s not an obvious need to have such signage. Not sure why we should put a sign that is much larger than is part of the current regulations and deviates from requirements in multiple ways.
 - Ruben Andrews: It’s a 17-story senior facility, there will be seniors coming and going, guests coming and going. The building is set back 175’ and is couched between two other properties so it is not immediately clear. If there wasn’t a sign, you would not know it was there.
- IK: Shows google image of Pacific Regent La Jolla Sign Wall sign
 - Ruben: That sign is 115 sf, 8’ high. Sign to west is La Jolla Garden Villas which is 228 sf, 9’6 high and set back 7 feet. La Scala apartments has 75 sf sign, 4.5’ high and has a 0 setback.
- Bill Beck:
 - When Palisades was built, they requested the same kind of deviation.
- Debbie Knight
 - Issue with deviation for internally lit sign as those are part of light pollution. Prefer fully shielding lights that shine down on the lettering rather than internally lit lettering that contributes to light pollution
 - Every time the city allows a deviation for one, future projects point to the one before as justification.
- Katie Rodolico:
 - Have trouble finding Pacific Regents. It is easy to miss a driveway on this street. Being able to slow down and turn into a driveway is eased a lot if you know its coming if you see a sign.
 - Lots of people coming in and out of senior care like caregivers, visitors, hospice, etc. and they those people will need to find out

where this place is. Turning on Nobel and having a big sign you can see easily, is really helpful.

- Rhianen C;
 - Agree that lighting should not add to light pollution. Maybe streetlight around it instead. Does not understanding the use of a sign since most if all people use navigation. Why is it vertical instead of horizontal? It may be harder to read
- Andy Wiese:
 - Similar comment to Katie Rodolico. Nobel is a pretty busy traffic way with people moving quickly on the street. The sign provides legibility and safety. Additionally future planning for the area includes bike facilities and bus facilities. Thinks safety is enhanced where you need to make a turn. A sign enhances that safety.
- KMar:
 - Agrees. Anytime we approve a variance it sets a precedent. Talking about the neighboring signs don't adhere to existing code, but those are not internally lit. Ask group to confirm.
- JS:
 - The monument sign looks less obtrusive than the signs on the buildings on either side. Those take up more surface area and have more landscaping in front and around. Other than lighting issue, don't think it is terribly inconsistent with adjacent signs. Nice to have placement a foot or two off the sidewalk but is more sleek
- GK:
 - Confirming deviation, seems like a lot of deviations with an addition to light pollution, there is some precedent approving other signs this large, but there is a reason for the sign code, now we are deviating significantly. Do we as a community want to continue to set this as precedence?
- Ruben response:
 - These standards apply to residential apartments in suburban and urban locations. In order to have a sign that fits the project and serves the needs there often need to be deviations.
- CN call for motion:
 - JS Motion to approve both signs as proposed, with the caveat that they are not backlighted but indirect downlighting; Second; CN.
 - IK: Friendly amendment that it be lit only on the east side of oncoming traffic
 - JS appreciates friendly amendment but states it does not solve the concern so does not agree to amendment.
 - Discussion:
 - AP has not given Ruben Andrews the chance to justify the internal lighting

- Ruben: It is low light. Letters have a film, so the light is filtered, the background is opaque, it is only the letters illuminated – they don't have to be illuminated strongly, just readable. Regarding downlighting, when you have hardware/lamps on the sign it lays a shadow across the sign. The cleanest thing is having the internal illumination or superfluous elements.
 - AP confirming: Internal illumination leads to the least amount of light pollution.
 - Ruben: Yes.
- *Motion Fails: 4-yes (JS, JA, CU, AP), 6- no (NG, IK, AN, PK, GK, KM), 2- abstentions (RRW and JM), Chair not voting.*

9. Action Item. PTS 697543 “Gilman Village” Community Plan Amendment Initiation for the following parcel: Lot 2, Map 7174, La Jolla Village Apartments Unit 2, (APN: 346-802-13-00), SE corner of Gilman Drive at Via Alicante south to Interstate 5. As of January 5, 2022, Property Zone Map is RM-1-1, however, Property Zone Per City DSD ZAPP Property Information Profile the site has three zones as follows: RM-1-1, RM-2-5, and RM-3-7. An Open Space Easement for the entire property was granted to the City of San Diego in 1972, with 22 of the site’s 31 acres later designated as MSCP and 100% conserved. The action will be to recommend approval or denial of the plan initiation and may involve approval of a report with supporting findings. Approval of the CP Amendment Initiation would require removal of the Open Space Easement and adjustment of the MSCP boundary. The Planning Commission is scheduled to hear the plan initiation on April 7, 2022 and is the decision maker.

- CN: Presents project overview. Project Applicant is RRW.
 - Site: Gilman Village Lot 2, 31.06 acres, owned by Robinson Wood Revocable Trust. Currently undeveloped area. Current land use is open space/park/recreation, adopted land use is open space. Zoning RM-1-1 (though RRW found 3 zones RM-1-1, RM3-5 RM 3-7)
 - Site has open space easement from 1970 over the entire site when the condos on the mesa top were developed. This mechanism was used by city to develop mesa tops and designate the sides of mesas as open space. In 1997, 23 ½ acres were added to MHPA and 100% were conserved. Core MSCP area.
 - Community Plan Amendment proposal would imply removal of open space easement, imply significant MSCP be removed, CPAI would change land use designation from open space to residential.
 - Planning does not support removal of open space easement of the property
 - Appearances before UCPG:

- Informational item in July 2021
 - Action Item for recommendation in October 2021, cancelled by applicant. Rescheduled to January 2022, cancelled by applicant.
 - On the Planning Commission docket for April 7th. Planning department rescheduled from March 3rd to allow for UCPG recommendation and to receive input.
- CN Motion: Oppose the removal of the Open Space Easement on the 31.06-acre parcel at the SE corner of Gilman Drive and Via Alicante (APN 346-802-13-00). It opposes any change of the Community Plan Land Use Designation from open space, and any changes to the MSCP boundaries for the ~ 23.5 acres of MSCP on the site. Consequently, the UCPG recommends the city deny the proposed community plan amendment initiation for this site. A letter to the planning commission will be sent detailing our motion and discussion, PK seconds the motion.
 - Andy Wiese: presents supplemental information on why the proposal is inconsistent with controlling planning documents (open space easement, University Community Plan, MSCP, City of San Diego General Plan and Community Plan Update) for inclusion in CN letter
 - AN: Any reasonable person would come to the judgment that this petition should be denied for all reasons mentioned. It has been protected for many years, may have been purchased with the thought it could turn into profit, it's not going to happen.
 - Andrea Rosati:
 - Attorney for applicant
 - Emphasizes this is the beginning of the process. If the initiation is approved, then it can be analyzed. Supporting the initiation is not a vote of any project. It would only allow staff to vet the plan amendment. Any project would have to go through an application process and complete environmental reviews. All plans and inconsistencies Andy Wiese spoke of would be resolved. Trying to provide more affordable work force housing and find alternatives for the open space matter. This project would come back again and again.
 - Lou Rodolico:
 - Open space is a conflated term also means any undeveloped land. This is a good spot for housing. It is way to get our density up rather than having to do infill by the state
 - IK:
 - Value of this parcel is irreplaceable function in the landscape. Important parcel to connecting mission bay to rose canyon to open space on the bluffs on UCSD, through UCSD to Torrey Pines reserve. You could not mitigate for the environmental losses if you develop this property
 - Debbie Knight:

- Thank Andy Wiese for his insightful and wonderful presentation. This is one small area has been preserved from the beginning of the community plan. You can't just say that you can take a piece of habitat and will make up for it by doing it somewhere else. The birds go back and forth from Rose Canyon. This is a corridor for them, and to say we'll destroy it, loves what ash has said. Strongly support the motion.
- Chris Wood (RRW husband)
 - The MSCP area is mostly slope, it's not really buildable so it would not go away. You may wonder about the importance of affordable housing to students and think about the 50-year-old with \$100,000 in unpaid student loans and if high housing costs may have contributed. I suggest that the broader idea/definition of community is considered- community of the university who would like more housing, community of environmentalists, community of State of California, etc. and many other communities. Community involves all of the above, not just the community group gathered today.
- Jonathan Rivas, LMA said housing is important to San Diego and wants residential development.
- Karen Martian, UCPG, thinks strategically approving housing is what we're aiming for with the plan update.
- Anu Delouri, UCSD, Assistant Director, Community Planning, reported their goal is to provide housing to 65% of students with 42% living on campus now. Lack of housing is statewide.
- Tom Heckman:
 - Question confirming current zoning.

○ *Motion carries 10-yes, 1-abstain (JM), 1-recuse (RRW), Chair not voting.*

10. Information Item: March 8 UCPG election results. Anu Delouri and Jason Moorhead, presenting.

○ UCPG Election votes were tallied and presented by AD:

District/Seat	Name	Votes
District 1/Business Seat B	Linda Bernstein	2 votes
District 2/Business Seat A	Fay Arvin	1 vote
District 2/Business Seat C	Carey Algaze	1 vote
District 3/Business Seat C	Steve Pomerence	2 votes
District 3/Business Seat A	Neil DeRamos	1 vote
District 1/Residential Seat C	Tom Hekman Andy Wiese	23 votes 271 votes

District 2/Residential Seat C	Liane Barkhordar Isabelle Kay	18 votes 39 votes
District 3/Residential Seat A	Sasha Treadup	7 votes
District 3/Residential Seat C	Jon Arenz	1 vote

- 366 votes total were cast
- CN: Thank AD and JM for doing a really good job on tallying the votes. Thank you for running the election.
- AD: Thank you to CN and all of his work and efforts putting the ballots together and picking them up, bringing the boxes and assisting throughout. Thank you, JM, for providing the space at Alexandria and making sure the signage was in place. Thank you to all for voting tonight.

11. Action Item. One Alexandria North. PTS 691942, CDP/SDP/NDP/TM to demolish 2 existing buildings and development of 4 buildings and a parking structure at 11255 & 11355 N Torrey Pines Rd. The 11.4-acre site is located in the IP-1-1 zone, PIOZ-Coastal-Impact, PIOZ-Beach-Impact, MHPA, ESL, Prime Ind, First Public Roadway, Coastal (N-App-1), CHLOZ, CPIOZ-B, VHFHSZ, MCAS Miramar - ALUCOZ / APZ-2 / AIA Review Area 1. Process 3, decision by hearing officer. Steve Pomeranke, Alexandria Real Estate, presenting.

- CN: Project was an information item on Feb. 8th, today Alexandria is asking for a project recommendation
- Steve Pomeranke Presenting:
 - Project One Alexandria North came before the board last month and obtained excellent feedback that they have able to act upon.
 - Met with State Parks representative and walked the open space. Discussed partnership on mitigating some issues already occurring in the canyon. Discussed strategy to harvest seeds from adjacent property to develop plant material so no foreign species are introduced. They did not come up with a lawn substitution.
 - Bird strike mitigated with vertical mullion. One elevation may need some additional work to address bird strike issues.
 - Project proposal includes: 2 R&D buildings, 1 amenity building, parking structure with smaller conference center.
 - Building 1: 127,008 sf/3 stories
 - Building 2: 115,501 sf/3 stories
 - Building 3: 5,014 sf/1 story
 - Building 4: 8,976 sf/2 stories
 - Total of 256,500 sf
 - Schedule:
 - April 2022: Entitlements secured/Demo & Grading

- April 2023: Vertical construction
 - February 2024: Shell & Site TCO
 - April 2024: TI/TCO
- Questions:
 - IK: Thanks team for addressing building bird strike. Asks how will lighting be shielded? LEED certification? Parking just for site or include more?
 - Steve Pomeranke/Team Response: Vertical mullions will also help with light. Building pushed back from property line, so lighting won't go offsite at all.
 - Companywide goal that all developments achieve LEED Gold
 - Life science as a use has the lowest parking requirements. Designed for the tenant parking only.
 - Debbie Knight: Appreciate partnership. Any outdoor lighting should be fully shielded. Illumina building is lit up all night long.
 - GK: Why some of the greenest buildings are the ones that are already build. Why couldn't renovate and have to demolish? Why not LEED Platinum?
 - Steve Pomeranke/Team Response
 - Try to renovate to bring up to energy code, you have to take the skin off the building, so you're left with the bones, and mechanical systems that are 30-40 years old and highly inefficient, and the base structure doesn't have floor to floor for labs or column spacing for labs. So, demo is typically necessary.
 - LEED Platinum is very difficult to obtain and generally not realistic for the use type. Use other certification systems like Fitwell that ranks life of building and user experience.
- Sonja Robinson: Rooftop solar, clean renewable energy, solar batteries?
 - Steve Pomeranke: Yes, included.
- Motion:
 - IK: Recommendation of approval as presented; AN Second.
 - *Motion passes 11-yes, 0-no, 1-recusal (JM), Chair not voting*

12. Information Item: Clean Local Energy. Benefits of local solar power and the recent NEM (“Net Energy Metering”) decision by the California Public Utilities Commission will be discussed. Bill Powers, P.E., and Sonja Robinson, Program Manager / Lead Organizer, Protect Our Communities Foundation, presenting.

- Informational Presentation by Sonja Robinson:
 - Local Clean Energy and benefits of generating electricity for clean renewable energy locally. Presentation addressed immediate threat to roof top solar in San Diego and the San Diego Community Power and accountability to the local power mission.
 - Electricity rates are rising and projected to continue to rise, rooftop solar is a solution to mitigate that that.

- Council unanimously passed resolution urge public utilities commission to adopt net energy metering rulemaking decision which would support continuing growth of customer sited solar energy installations.
- Action request to call: (1) Governor's Office to support a fair solar deal that keeps rooftop solar growing, (2) Senator Toni Atkins requesting she sign legislator NEM solar support letter sponsored by Sen Nancy Skinner (3) call to express appreciation for signing onto the letter.
- Electricity rates are so high because of transmission, capital projects and distribution charges much higher. Often which are more expensive than the cost of energy. SDGE has highest rates in the country.
- Other option is solar, but the current solar proposal would destroy solar as an option.
- Explained Tariffed-On Bill financing as paid to the meter, not to the customer.
- ***No vote taken. Informational item.***

13. Action Item. ARE//Scripps Health NDP. PTS 686158. Neighborhood Development Permit for Demo of an existing Building and a new 5-story with basement 157,694-square-foot commercial office building and a 4.5-level parking structure located at 4555 Executive Drive. The 3.80-acre site is in the RS-1-14 Base Zone, ALUC-MCAS Miramar, ALUCP Noise - MCAS, AIA-Review Areas 1 & 2 - MCAS, FAA Part 77, CPIOZ-A, PIOZ-Campus, PSTPA, TPA, Prime Ind Lands. Process 2, decision by city staff. Steve Pomeranke, presenting.

- CN: Item 13: Action item for a project approval of an Alexandria project that involves a demo of an existing building and construction of a new five story building, including basement, and a 4.5 story parking structure located at 4555 Executive Drive. Process 2, decision by hearing officer.
- Steve Pomeranke presenting:
 - Project is the old Brain Institute Site, located 0.4 miles away from trolley.
 - Developing the site for Scripps Health as their headquarter so design is tenant led.
 - Will demolish existing structure and replace with 5-Story office building with 4-level parking structure total of 131,200 gross floor area.
 - Palm street trees will remain. Corner landscape parcel owned by another owner.
 - Will work with Gensler on bird strike
 - Project is consistent with Community Plan Update plans.
- Questions:

- Debbie Knight: Why can't you get rid of the palm trees. City says palm trees are not street trees and they put seeds into the environmental areas nearby. Debbie volunteers to go to the meeting with the City.
 - Steve Pomeranke: Has not approached the City about removing them, will accept Debbie's offer to go to the meeting. The trees are lining the streets of multiple streets, but it is worth the fight to try to remove them.
- CU: Palm trees are so iconic of Southern California. Understanding now why they may be a problem, but don't need to kill trees regardless of the type.
- Andy Wiese: Clarify whether the project proposal is building to density of EMX zone:
 - Steve Pomeranke Team: No, the scale is substantially less than EMX zone, approximately ¼ of the intensity that EMX would allow.
- Motion: CN: Motion to approve as presented; AP Second. IK friendly amendment to approve the project with stipulation that Alexandria work to improve plant pallet to minimize environmental impact and maximize ecological benefit. CN and AP accept friendly amendment.
 - *Motion passes: 10-yes, 0-no, 1 recusal (JM)*

14. Adjournment: Next Meeting will be on April 12, 2022, via zoom.

Appendix A: Letter authorized by the UCPG opposing the "Gilman Village" Community Plan Amendment Initiation, sent to the Planning Dept. and Councilmember LaCava's office in place of the Planning Commission after the applicant, the Robinson Wood Revokable Trust, pulled the item from the PC's agenda.

March 29, 2022

Planning Commission
City of San Diego

RE: Gilman Village Community Plan Amendment Initiation PTS697543

Dear Planning Commissioners,

On March 8, 2022, the University Community Planning Group, voted unanimously to recommend that the City deny the Gilman Village community plan amendment initiation, PTS697543, requested by The Robinson Wood Revokable Trust. It passed the following motion by a vote of 10 Yes, 0 No, with 1 Abstention, and 1 Recusal:

“The University Community Planning Group opposes the removal of the Open Space Easement on the 31.06-acre parcel at the SE corner of Gilman Drive and Via Alicante (APN 346-802-13-00). It opposes any change of the Community Plan Land Use Designation from Open Space, and any changes to the MSCP boundaries for ~ 23.5 acres of MSCP on the site. Consequently, the UCPG recommends the city deny the proposed community plan amendment initiation for this site. A letter to the Planning Commission will be sent detailing its findings and discussion. PTS 697543”

The UCPG summarizes its *findings* on page 2 and presents detailed reasoning for these *findings* on page 3. Minutes for this agenda item are provided on page 8.

We urge the Planning Commission to deny the community plan amendment initiation.

Sincerely,

Chris Nielsen, UCPG Chair

Summary of Findings in Support of the Motion

The UCPG finds that proposed development on this parcel is inconsistent with:

- **The Open Space Easement on this property**
 - Development restricted by Open Space easement granted w development (1972)
- **The University Community Plan**
 - Adopted land use (Open Space) w specific textual references to the parcel (1987)
- **The Multiple Species Conservation Program**
 - Core of parcel, ~23.5 acres, is 100% conserved MSCP (1997)

- Biological value includes steep slopes, riparian and coastal sage scrub habitats, MSCP covered species (CA Gnatcatcher), wildlife connections to open space system, especially for birds and other pollinators
- **The City of San Diego General Plan**
 - Conflicts with “City of Villages” strategy: “directing growth primarily toward village centers” and preserving “established residential neighborhoods and open space.” (2008)
- **The University Community Plan Update** (in progress)
 - Parcel is not in or adjacent to a planned focus area; outside 10-min walk-shed
 - “Urban Villages” and housing planned for elsewhere, nearer to transit
 - Proposed use as open space reflects predominant public input (2018-pres)

Detailed Reasoning for the Findings in Support of the Motion

The UCPG finds that proposed development on this parcel is inconsistent with:

- **The Open Space Easement on this property** (Map 7174, La Jolla Village Apts, No 2, 1972)
 - **The parcel is subject to an Open Space Easement** granted to the City of San Diego as part of the development process (1972).
 - **Termination of this easement would call into question the protections afforded by open space easements** in the University Community and city wide, undermining our open space system and placing in jeopardy, as in this case, Multiple Species Conservation Program lands in private hands.
- **The University Community Plan** (1987)
 - The **adopted land use is Open Space** (UC Plan, 1987, p 227).
 - The UC Plan identifies this parcel as part of an **“open space corridor”** in Gilman Canyon (p 229).
 - The UC Plan specifies that **“The slopes along Gilman Drive between I-5 and Via Alicante should be preserved as undeveloped open space”** (p 229).
 - The UC Plan calls on the city to **“Preserve the natural resources of the community through the appropriate designation and use of open space. Major topographic features and biological resources should be preserved as undeveloped open space.”** (p 225)
- **The Multiple Species Conservation Program** (1997)
 - The MSCP Subarea Plan (City, 1997) identifies **~23.5 acres of the parcel as 100% conserved.**
 - The MSCP recommends **Open Space Easements as a strategy for “permanent protection”** to ensure the **“long-term biological integrity of the MHPA”** (MSCP, 1.6.2, p 98).
 - **Development strictly outside these 100% conserved lands is impractical** because they encompass the core of the parcel for its entire length on both sides of Gilman Creek. Lands outside the MSCP consist of a narrow strip around the outer edges of the parcel.

- A **boundary line adjustment would have foreseeable impacts** that are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the MSCP.
- Development would result in **foreseeable impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL), which include wetland habitat** (consisting of native wetland and riparian habitat), and Tier II habitat (including Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub). (Coastal Rail Trail, Biotechnical Report, 2020)
- The MSCP Subarea Plan (MSCP, 1997, p 100), City Land Development Code (LDC) Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations, and Biology Guidelines (City 2018), **require that impacts to wetlands shall be avoided.**
- Development of the parcel would have foreseeable **direct impacts to occupied California Gnatcatcher habitat within the MHPA.**
- City sponsored environmental studies document **at least one “breeding pair” of federally-threatened California Gnatcatchers, a covered MSCP species**, on the property. (Coastal Rail Trail, Biotechnical Report, 2020, 20).
- The 2020 CRT “Biological Resources Map,” identifies **two pairs and one family of CAGN on site** (Coastal Rail Trail, Biotechnical Report, Appendix B: Biological Resources Map, 2020, Sheet 8).
- **“Documented populations of covered species** within the City’s portion of the MHPA **will be protected to the extent feasible.”** (MSCP, 1997, 3)
- The parcel is part of a larger **“open space system”** in the University Community (UCP, p 220) with **wildlife connections** to Rose Canyon and Mt Soledad Open Space Parks for small mammals and **“avian species with adequate dispersal capabilities.”** (CRT Biotechnical Report, 2020, 23)
- **Functionality of wildlife connection** for avian species indicated by **on site list and birding “hotspot”** in the adjacent Villa La Jolla Park - 123 observed bird species (Cornell Univ, eBird, <https://ebird.org/hotspot/L3347000>), CRT-BTR, 2020, Appendix H)
- **On Site species include Mule Deer, Coyote, and Common Raccoon**, indicating that the parcel is functionally connected for small (and large) mammals (see CRT-BTR, 2020, Appendix H).

- **The City of San Diego General Plan (2008)**

- Development of the parcel is **inconsistent with the first “core value” of the General Plan**, established to guide future development: 1) “An open space network formed by parks, canyons, river valleys, habitats, beaches, and ocean” (GP, Strategic Framework, SF-6)

- Development of the parcel is **inconsistent with the guiding principle of the General Plan**: “this is the first General Plan in the city’s continuing history that **must address future growth without expansion into its open lands.**” (GP, SF-6).

- Development here would **directly contradict the “City of Villages” strategy**, which calls for “**directing growth primarily toward village centers” and preserving “established residential neighborhoods and open space.**” (GP, SF-6)

- Development of this parcel is **inconsistent with the General Plan, Conservation Element**: Policies for Climate Action (CE-A), Open Space and Landform Preservation (CE-B), Water Resources Management (CE-D), Urban Runoff Management (CE- E), Biological Diversity (CE-G), Urban Forestry (CE-J).

- Development of this parcel is **inconsistent with the GP, Urban Design Element**: Goals for Natural Landforms and Features (UD-A). (General Plan, 2008)

- **The University Community Plan Update (2018-pres)**

- The **University Community Plan Update has identified five “focus areas” for future “Urban Village” development** in conformance with the General Plan, “City of Villages” strategy.

- A very large number of **new housing units** are planned for the focus areas.

- The **parcel is not in or adjacent to these planned focus areas.**

- The parcel is **outside the 10-minute transit walkshed** from the La Jolla Square Trolley Station. A small, upslope portion of the parcel is within a ½ mile radius of the station, however, any development on this steep site would take place on the lower slopes, **outside of a Transit Priority Area** and farther still from accessible transit. (City, UCPU Proposed Land Use Scenarios, 2022)

- The **Community Plan Update envisions the proposed site to remain Open Space.** (City, UCPU Proposed Land Use Scenarios, 2022)

- This choice reflects the **preponderance of public input** gathered since 2018.

- The protection of Open Space resources in the University Community **has consistently ranked first** among the concerns of residents and workers expressed through the Community Plan Update Process.

- **More than half of all comments** collected at the 2018 CPU Open House prioritized the protection of open space.

- E.g.: “Protect all remaining open space. Add density only on already developed/paved parcels; “Permanently protect all MSCP; Connect these spaces for people and wildlife. Build up not out. “

Re. Gilman Dr. Open Space: “permanent OS east side Gilman;”
“please keep natural,” “Permanent open space;” “Improve habitat,”
“memorial park” (UCPU Open House, 2018)

- **“Canyons and open space are protected as community assets” ranked foremost** among community priorities in the **2019 Online Community Engagement Survey**. (UCPU OCET Survey Report, 2019)

- Development here would be **inconsistent with CPU draft Conservation goals** for Open Space, Urban Design and Landform, Biodiversity and Wetland Resources:

“Protection, enhancement and long-term management of an open space system that preserves canyonlands, habitat, and sensitive biological resources.

Development patterns that preserve natural landforms, public and private open spaces, wildlife linkages, sensitive species and habitats, and watersheds, and which contribute to clean air and clean water and help the city meet its climate action goals.

Preservation of San Diego’s rich biodiversity and heritage through protection and restoration of wetland resources, including coastal waters, creeks, bays, riparian wetlands and vernal pools.

“Preservation and enhancement of wetland resources, including estuarine and coastal waters, creeks, bays, riparian wetlands and vernal pools.

“Preservation and enhancement of biologically diverse ecosystems and improved viability of endangered, threatened and sensitive species and their habitats.”

- Development of the parcel would be **inconsistent with the CPU-adopted “guiding principle”**: *“a sustainable community integrated with natural habitat, open space, and recreational areas. Preservation of open space, watershed protection and improvement, restoration of habitat, enhancement of species diversity, improvement of population-based parks and recreation areas, and provision of connections for wildlife and people contribute to community character, enhance quality of life and preserve unique natural resources.”* (CPU, Minutes June, 2019)

- The **University Community Planning Group has voted on 10 occasions** since 2011 **to protect remaining open space lands** in the University Community... as “an essential part of our identity, our quality of life, and the environment for this generation and the next.” (UCPG Minutes, July, 2020)

Minutes for the Gilman Village CPAI, March 8, 2022
Minutes to be approved at the UCPG meeting on April 12, 2022

Directors present, directors absent:

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Nancy Groves (NG), Caryl Lees Witte (CW), **Joann Selleck (JS)**, **Isabelle Kay (IK)**, Ash Nasser (AN), **Rebecca Robinson (RRW)**, **Jon Arenz (JA)**, Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), **Jason Moorhead (JM)**, **Anu Delouri (AD)**, Kristie Miller (KM), Michael Leavenworth (ML), Kristin Camper (KC), **Petr Krysl (PK)**, **Carol Uribe (CU)**, **Andrew Parlier (PB)**, **Georgia Kayser (GK)**, **Karen Martien (KMar)** Katie Witherspoon (KW-City of SD Planning).

15. Action Item. PTS 697543 “Gilman Village” Community Plan Amendment Initiation for the following parcel: Lot 2, Map 7174, La Jolla Village Apartments Unit 2, (APN: 346-802-13-00), SE corner of Gilman Drive at Via Alicante south to Interstate 5. As of January 5, 2022, Property Zone Map is RM-1-1, however, Property Zone Per City DSD ZAPP Property Information Profile the site has three zones as follows: RM-1-1, RM-2-5, and RM-3-7. An Open Space Easement for the entire property was granted to the City of San Diego in 1972, with 22 of the site’s 31 acres later designated as MSCP and 100% conserved. The action will be to recommend approval or denial of the plan initiation and may involve approval of a report with supporting findings. Approval of the CP Amendment Initiation would require removal of the Open Space Easement and adjustment of the MSCP boundary. The Planning Commission is scheduled to hear the plan initiation on April 7, 2022, and is the decision maker.

- CN: Presents project overview. Project Applicant is RRW.
 - Site: Gilman Village Lot 2, 31.06 acres, owned by Robinson Wood Revocable Trust. Currently undeveloped area. Current land use is open space/park/recreation, adopted land use is open space. Zoning RM-1-1 (though RRW found 3 zones RM-1-1, RM3-5 RM 3-7)
 - Site has open space easement from 1970 over the entire site when the condos on the mesa top were developed. This mechanism was used by city to develop mesa tops and designate the sides of mesas as open space. In 1997, 23 ½ acres were added to MHPA and 100% conserved.
 - Community Plan Amendment proposal would imply removal of open space easement, imply significant MSCP be removed, CPAI would change land use designation from open space to residential.
 - Planning does not support removal of open space easement of the property
 - Appearances before UCPG:
 - Informational item in July 2021
 - Action Item for recommendation in October 2021, cancelled by applicant. Rescheduled to January 2022, cancelled by applicant.
 - PC docket for April 7th. Planning department rescheduled form March 3rd to allow for UCPG recommendation and to receive input

- CN Motion: Oppose the removal of the Open Space Easement on the 31.06-acre parcel at the SE corner of Gilman Drive and Via Alicante (APN 346-802-13-00). It opposes any change of the Community Plan Land Use Designation from open space, and any changes to the MSCP boundaries for the ~ 23.5 acres of MSCP on the site. Consequently, the UCPG recommends the city deny the proposed community plan amendment initiation for this site. A letter to the planning commission will be sent detailing our motion and discussion; PJ Seconds the motion. .
 - Andy Wiese: presents supplemental information on why the proposal is inconsistent with controlling planning documents (open space easement, University Community Plan, MSCP, City of San Diego General Plan and Community Plan Update) for inclusion in CN letter
 - AN: Any reasonable person would come to the judgment that this petition should be denied for all reasons mentioned. It has been protected for many years, may have been purchased with the thought it could turn into profit, its not going to happen.
 - Andrea Rosati:
 - Attorney for applicant
 - Emphasizes this is the beginning of the process. If the initiation is approved, then it can be analyzed. Supporting the initiation is not a vote of any project. It would only allow staff to vet the plan amendment. Any project would have to go through an application process and complete environmental reviews. All plans and consistencies Andy Wiese spoke of would be resolved. Trying to provide more affordable work force housing and find alternatives for the open space matter. This project would come back again and again.
 - Lou Rodolico:
 - Open space is a conflated term also means any undeveloped land. This is a good spot for housing. It is way to get our density up rather than having to do infill by the state
 - IK:
 - Value of this parcel is irreplaceable function in the landscape. Important parcel to connecting mission bay to rose canyon to open space on the bluffs on UCSD, through UCSD to Torrey Pines reserve. You could not mitigate for the environmental loses if you develop this property
 - Debbie Knight:
 - Thank Andy Wiese for his insightful and wonderful presentation. This is one small area has been preserved from the beginning of the community plan. You can't just say that you can take a piece of habitat and will make up for it by doing it somewhere else. The birds go back and froth from rose canyon. This is a corridor for them, and to say we'll destroy it, loves what ash has said. Strongly support the motion.
 - Chris Woods
 - The MSCP area is mostly slope, its not really buildable so it would not go away. Suggests that the broader idea/definition of community

is considered- community of the university who would like more housing, community of environmentalists, community of State of California, etc. and many other communities. Community involves all of the above, not just the community group gathered today.

- Tom Heckman:
 - Question confirming current zoning.
- ***Motion carries 10-yes, 1-abstain (JM), 1-recuse (RRW), Chair not voting.***

Appendix B. Email from the Applicant, the Robinson Wood Revokable Trust, to the UCPG Chair, University Community Plan Update Chair, and Planning Department regarding agenda Item 9 in the March 8, 2022, UCPG minutes.

March 13, 2022

It has come to our attention the arguments presented for Agenda Item 9, Gilman Village at the March 8, 2022 University Community Planning Group Executive Committee zoom meeting were specious and not supported by the City Planning Department report on the Gilman Drive Segment of the Coastal Rail Trail.

We request the Tables 1 and 2, seen here with quoted text from City Planning Report BTR July 2020, specific to the Gilman Drive location be, 1) included with the March 8, 2022 UCPG meeting minutes, 2) provided to the UCPG April 2022 meeting, and 3) provided and presented to the Tuesday, March 15, 2022, 6 P.M. University Community Plan Update Subcommittee meeting. We will appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Table 1: UCPG Chair’s Presentation

UCPG Chair’s Presentation Factual Errors and Items of Concern	Reply from Applicant, Sources: City of San Diego Planning Department Staff and AECOM:Coastal Rail Trail(CRT)-Gilman Drive Segment, Biological Technical Report (BTR) July 2020
Labeled property as “core” MSCP	Property is not a linkage (core area), Per City Planners/AECOM. See BTR , 3.1.3 Biological Conditions BSA Pages 22-23(PDF 23-24). Gilman Segment CRT “Highly Developed Area, extremely dense residential development, limited connectivity with ... Rose Canyon and Mt. Soledad ... I-5 corridor (roadway, ROW

	fencing and non-native landscaping) creates an effective barrier... wildlife movement.”
Claimed CPAI Approval will require significant % MSCP(MHPA) be removed from property.	No impact to MHPA is proposed. Applicants’ Biological Consultant whom has studied this property more than 10 years, identified 7.7 acres of the 31.06 acres as developable areas, outside the MHPA.

Table 2: UCPUS Chair’s Presentation

UCPUS Chair’s Presentation Factual Errors reputedly quoted from City of San Diego CRT-Gilman Drive-BRT July 2020	Reply from Applicant, Sources: City of San Diego Planning Department Staff and AECOM:Coastal Rail Trail(CRT)-Gilman Drive Segment, Biological Technical Report (BTR) July 2020
Stated 3 pair CAGN 2020 Field Study	Actual report: 1 pair CAGN detected 2018 Field Study, Pg. 19, 20 (Pdf pgs 20 & 21), and Appendix F (PDF Page 140 CAGN)
Stated was important to wildlife linkage.	CityPlannerReport: Physical Barriers to Linkages pages 22 and 23 (PDF pgs 23-24) Gilman Drive described as “Highly Developed Area, extremely dense residential development, limited connectivity with ... Rose Canyon and Mt. Soledad ... I-5 corridor (roadway, ROW fencing and non-native landscaping)

creates an effective barrier... wildlife movement.”

We hope this information may reach the decision makers and the truth be known by all.

Call or email with any questions or to discuss this or anything.

Thank You.