



TALKING POINTS

FIRST DRAFT COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE (CPU) 1/27/25

Some ideas for responding to the proposed College Area CPU. Mix and match, put into your own words and make them your own, add to them, etc.

- **College Area Community Plan Update targets are sky-high and unjustified by SANDAG Series 15 population and housing need projections.**
 - College Area CPU 2050 population targets are almost equal to growth SANDAG Series 15 projections for the entire City of San Diego.
 - College Area housing targets are 25% of what entire City is projected to need by 2050 (SANDAG Series 15), but our population is only 1.8% of San Diego's population.
- **The College Area CPU should not have to plan for a 325% increase in housing units** versus what existed in 2020! Other CPUs in the 6th housing cycle have averaged a 135% increase in dwelling units versus 2020 base dwelling units. (College Area was a mere 1.8% of San Diego's population in 2020.) **The community's 7-Visions Plan plans for a 137% increase in dwelling units 2050 vs. 2020, which is in line with the average of what the other four recently passed CPUs have adopted** (Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, University and Hillcrest/Uptown). **That plan MUST be included in the CACPU EIR as promised by the Planning Department on 5/25/22.**
- **College Area CPU dwelling unit projections don't include estimates for ADUs, Complete Communities and Affordable Bonus Density Program developments. The huge impacts of these programs cannot be ignored when they represent the bulk of our community's building permits.**
 - College Area Plan doesn't include density bonus programs, yet these programs account for 70% of College Area building permits 2021-2023 (only underlying base units counted in proposed plan)
 - 20% ADUs (none counted in proposed plan)
 - 23% Complete Communities
 - 27% Affordable Bonus Density Program
- **Complete Communities: To avoid extreme density in intended low-density transition zones, either the Residential Low 4 category must be reduced to Low 3 (10-14 du/acre) or the College Area must be exempted from Complete Communities development for a minimum of at least one complete housing cycle (rest of 6th and 7th Housing Cycle) to allow the newly adopted College Area CPU to be applied.**
 - Proposed Residential Low 4 meets/exceeds the Complete Communities eligibility threshold (20 du/ac). The resulting densities of 450-660 dwelling units/acre will:

- Pull high density housing into planned transitional zones between high-density mixed use development and low density and single-family residential neighborhoods
 - Take dense development away from the transit corridors, where it belongs
 - Eliminate/compromise transition zones
 - Produce less affordable housing versus inclusionary housing regulations
 - Purchase of Alvarado Hospital by UCSD Medical Campus may increase much of the College Area to Complete Communities Tier 2
 - Eligible for 8.0 to 9.5 floor area ratio (FAR) bonus (previously 6.5 to 8.0 FAR)
- **Infrastructure: Without firm financial commitments for real parks (with fields and equipment for recreation), parking for our library (which should have 80 spaces and has only 28), the recreation center the College Area was eligible for in 2020 (with population of 25,000), the fire station we were promised years ago, etc., expanding our population and housing is unacceptable.** Proposed CACPU plan provides no commitment for much needed supportive infrastructure. College Area:
 - Has a current 91% park point deficit or more (based on non-existent parks) and
 - Lacks
 - Recreation Center
 - Library Parking
 - Fire Station
 - Adequate Police Coverage, etc.
 - The idea of putting a Rec Center in the old police museum is a disservice to our community and our youth. The lot is too small for a meaningful, functional rec center, there is no room for outdoor facilities and minimal space for parking.
 - Parks: Calling an overlook of a canyon a park is insulting. Our youth deserve fields to play sports in. “Pocket parks” may work for the elderly, if they are ever built by the developers, but they won’t serve the children. Meanwhile, how many “promenades” has the City seen built or permitted since this idea was floated? As residents, we see buildings being built to the sidewalk without promenades, pocket parks or anything much in the way of greenspace or public space of any kind. All these ideas are left to the discretion of the developers. The College Area has ONE PARK of approximately 1.6 acres and part of that is an unusable drainage swale.
- **Proposed CPIOZ – If you create a CPIOZ along the transit corridors requiring public amenities in exchange for streamlined approvals, what are the chances that placing more requirements on those developments (public spaces with recreational amenities, promenades and parkways) will discourage development on the corridors and instead encourage higher density developments in single-family neighborhoods with ADUs?**
- **Fire Safety: If the City wants higher density in the College Area, we deserve not only a fire station, but also safe, enhanced evacuation plans.** The recent Montezuma fire showed how vulnerable the College Area is and how poor our evacuation plans are. Even without SDSU evacuating, residents of Alvarado Estates and College View Estates were stuck in traffic for hours trying to flee the fire-threatened areas. Before adding any additional density, our community deserves more evacuation routes to keep the existing population safe, let alone more residents.