
MISSION VALLEY



COMMUNITY PLAN

FINAL: October 2008

MISSION VALLEY

COMMUNITY PLAN

Prepared by
The City of San Diego
with the assistance of
The Mission Valley Unified Planning Committee



Printed on recycled paper.

This information, or this document (or portions thereof), will be made available in alternative formats upon request

MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENTS

The following amendments have been incorporated into this October 2008 posting of this Plan:

Amendment	Date Approved by Planning Commission	Resolution Number	Date Adopted by City Council	Resolution Number
Mission Valley Community Plan approved	January 24, 1985	5576	June 25, 1985	R-263536
EIR Certified EQD No. 84-0194	--	--	June 25, 1985	R-263535
Hazard Center II	January 9, 1986	--	April 8, 1986	R-265413
Frazer Rd/Camino Del Este	July 10, 1986	--	October 13, 1987	R-269479
MV Calmat	June 7, 1990	0710-PC	September 11, 1990	R-276503
Water Reclamation Facilities	February 4, 1991	--	February 15, 1991	R-277366
MV Plan and PDO	January 23, 1992	--	April 21, 1992	R-279807
SDB-MBM III	--	--	October 6, 1992	R-280832
Park in the Valley IV	--	--	May 4, 1993	R-281917
Rio Vista West	November 18, 1993	--	December 7, 1993	R-283175
Hazard Center Phase 2	January 6, 1994	2055-PC	February 8, 1994	R-283390
Homestead Village	July 25, 1996	--	September 10, 1996	R-287814
MV West	May 29, 1997	2513-PC	July 15, 1997	R-288970
Mission City	March 19, 1998	--	April 21, 1998	R-289995
Rio Vista West VIII (repealed 4/13/99)	October 30, 1997	2571-PC	February 2, 1999	R-291254
Rio Vista West VIII	--	--	April 13, 1999	R-291480
Presidio View	August 10, 2000	3013-PC	October 24, 2000	R-294065
Mission Valley Heights	November 21, 2002	3329-PC	February 18, 2003	R-297655
A-1 Self Storage	September 16, 2004	--	January 25, 2005	--
Quarry Falls	September 4, 2008	XXX	October 21, 2008	R-XXXXXX

Letter of Transmittal - Mission Valley

June 25, 1985

The Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of San Diego, California


Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I am pleased to present to you the accompanying Mission Valley Community Plan. This Plan represents a comprehensive guide for the enhancement and future development of the Mission Valley Community through the year 2000. The plan was prepared by the City Planning Department. The community plan evaluated eight alternatives covering a range of development strategies, from the —no development” alternative to an alternative permitting highly intensive development throughout the valley. The alternative selected as the plan is one of moderate growth, where the development intensity is measured by the ability of the surface street system to carry the traffic. This base development intensity is to be increased as additional transportation opportunities become available. An important feature of the plan's transportation element is the establishment of a light rail transit corridor located in a manner that provides maximum access throughout the valley. The Metropolitan Transit Development Board, and the City Planning Development staffs worked together to develop the preferred alignment through the valley.

This community plan also includes a proposal for the creation of a linear park along the San Diego River. This proposal is complemented by a wetlands management plan for wetland preservation, restoration and enhancement. The wetlands management plan was developed with the cooperation of the California Department of Fish and Game and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and is designed to be responsive to the Army Corps of Engineers permit standards. An Urban Design Element incorporating development guidelines for development along the river and on the valley's hillsides is also included in the plan.

In closing, the Planning Department wishes to give special recognition to the Mission Valley Unified Community Planning Committee and the citizens who worked with City staff in the development of this plan. Their input has made this plan a better document.

Finally, I wish to thank Councilman Ed Struiksma, the elected representative of District 5. Without his interest and effort many of the key elements of this plan, such as the light rail transit proposal, urban design element and transportation recommendations, would not have been resolved as clearly. Implementation of this plan will owe much to his efforts on behalf of the City and the Mission Valley Community.



Jack Van Cleave

DEDICATION

Long time residents of the county can remember when Mission Valley was virtually virgin territory, with a few scattered dairies and farms, and where once in a decade a storm would flood the valley from rim to rim. In the 1950s, the Town and Country Hotel's first unit was opened and in 1958 the City Council approved the rezoning and construction of the Mission Valley Center shopping mall. That action, coupled with the freeway construction that followed, changed the face of the valley completely and forever. From the early part of the century until today, Mission Valley development has been a citywide concern. Prediction of doom has dominated the community's attitude towards this part of the City.

In 1974, urbanologists Kevin Lynch and Donald Appleyard cited the valley as a supreme example of bad planning in their —*Temporary Paradise?*” study of San Diego. Their observations:

“The most dramatic loss was the conversion of historic Mission Valley in the 1950s into a chaos of highways, parking lots and scattered commercial buildings ...the city should erect an historic monument to that tragic event. It struck a double blow; one directed at the landscape and (second) at the economy of the Center City ...Mission Valley is the second downtown of the region and its future appears gloomy ...Mission Valley is a landscape disaster, yet few disasters are beyond all repair. It is only that repair demands money, time, and effort.”

Kevin Lynch and Donald Appleyard
—*Temporary Paradise?*” 1974

John Nolen, the landscape architect who wrote the City's first master plan in 1908, dreamed of a parkway through the valley with development set back from the mesa rim to afford vistas to the ocean. In 1926, he returned to issue a warning, which still holds meaning for Mission Valley 60 years later:

“The failure to regulate growth has resulted in many parts of the city, in an unfavorable, and in some cases, unsightly distribution of building development ...Without doubt, San Diego should be a more distinctive city in its physical development. Its topography, its climate, its purposes are all different from the average American city. Not to be distinctive is an advantage lost, and some things in San Diego cannot now be changed. The question is what can be done to recover lost ground and lead the city toward a more distinctive San Diego in the future?”

John Nolen
—*A Comprehensive Plan in San Diego*” 1926

The following plan is the product of hard work of citizens and planners which spans the period of 60 years. As such, this plan is seen as a tribute to all the planning directors the City of San Diego has had; they all envisioned a development plan for Mission Valley, and as such, these individuals contributed with their ideas and efforts to this Plan.

This Mission Valley Community Plan is therefore dedicated to:

Mr. Glen Rick - City Planning Director from 1931 to 1955
Mr. Harry Haelsig - City Planning Director from 1955 to 1964
Mr. James Fairman - City Planning Director from 1964 to 1968
Mr. James Goff - City Planning Director from 1968 to 1979



MAYOR

Roger Hedgecock

CITY COUNCIL

Bill Mitchell
Bill Cleator
Gloria McColl
William Jones
Ed Struiksma
Mike Gotch
Dick Murphy
Uvaldo Martinez

CITY ATTORNEY

John W. Witt

CITY MANAGER

Ray T. Blair, Jr.

PLANNING COMMISSION

Dorothy Leonard, Chairperson
Ron Roberts, Vice Chairperson
Marie Widman
Dan Guevara
Paula Oquita
Yvonne Larson
Henry Empeno, Jr

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Jack Van Cleave, Director
Michael Stepner, Assistant Director

The Mission Valley Community Plan was prepared with assistance from the:

MISSION VALLEY UNIFIED PLANNING COMMITTEE

William R. Walker, Chairman
Hugh M.P. Higgins, Vice-Chairman
Barbara Krumvieda, Secretary
James E. Moore, Treasurer

Voyd H. Beights	H. Eugene Kemp, Jr.
Lance Burris	Samuel R. Lundgren
William E. Carl	C. Dennis Marteeny
Robert Cohrs	Dennis McGillivray
Alvin R. Cushman	James S. Nierman
Timothy C. Flanagan	Frithjof F. Ohre
Russell V. Grant	James Pontziouz
E. W. Hale	William B. Scott, Jr.
Thomas Bruce Hazard	Lillian B. Stafford
Raymond L Hoobler	Harold F. Tebbets

Former Members:

Eugene Aloï	Morley R. Golden
Eldon C. Anderson	Gary Goss
Stephen A. Bieri	Bernard Heifers
Harley K. Branson	Henry F. Hunte
Jon Busse	Jeanne Jones
Peter A. Comstock	Philip K. Markman
Lawrence M. Cushman	Robert Neal
Perry M. Dealey	Donald F. Sammis
Duane P. Deverill	Jerome Sandstrom
Charles A. Dickenson	Wallace B. Wade
William P. Fusselman	Lola Weinberg-Murphy
Phillip L Ginsberg	Lou Westby

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Background.....	1
Planning Program.....	1
History of Development.....	5
Planning History.....	9
Existing Settign and Regional Context.....	10
Plan Summary.....	15
Plan Development Issues.....	15
Goals and Objectives.....	17
Environmental Context.....	21
Plan Alternatives.....	21
Recommended Alternative.....	30
Environmental Impact Conclusions and Recommendations.....	31

PLAN ELEMENTS

Land Use.....	39
Residential.....	39
Commercial.....	46
Industrial.....	53
Transportation.....	69
Street System.....	70
Public Transit.....	84
Parking and Goods Delivery.....	92
Bikeways.....	97
Pedestrian Circulation.....	101
Open Space.....	109
San Diego River.....	111
Hillsides.....	121
Parks and Recreation.....	127
Open Space Linkage System.....	129
Development Intensity.....	133
Community Facilities.....	141
Community Services.....	141
Public Utilities.....	146
Public Facilities.....	147
Conservation.....	153
Air Quality.....	153
Noise.....	153
Water Quality and Conservation.....	154
Land.....	154
Habitat.....	154
Energy.....	154

Cultural and Heritage Resources.....	161
Historic Sites.....	161
Churches.....	161
Landmarks.....	161
Other Institutions.....	163
Urban Design.....	167
Design Protection Areas.....	167
Transportation Corridors.....	179
Energy and Conservation Considerations.....	188
Implementation.....	197
Public Facilities Financing.....	197
Schools.....	198
Transportation Improvements Phasing.....	199
Legislative Implementation.....	199

List of Figures

Figure 1. Location Map.....	2
Figure 2. Adjacent Communities.....	4
Figure 3. Population Characteristics (1980).....	40
Figure 4. Existing Zoning.....	43
Figure 5. Land Use.....	44
Figure 10. Specific Plan/Multiple Use Areas.....	64
Figure 11. Existing Traffic Flow.....	73
Figure 12. Proposed Roads.....	75
Figure 13. Horizon Year Recommended Street Classification.....	80
Figure 14. Future Traffic Flow.....	81
Figure 15. Streets Forecasted to Operate Above Desirable Maximum ADT.....	82
Figure 16. Proposed Street Name Changes.....	83
Figure 17. Proposed Light Rail Transit with Shuttle Service.....	88
Figure 18. 1984 Transit Passenger Flow Map.....	89
Figure 19. Existing Transit Routes.....	90
Figure 20. Consolidated Parking Areas.....	94
Figure 21. Bikeways.....	99
Figure 22. Pedestrian Circulation System.....	105
Figure 23. San Diego River Drainage Basin.....	110
Figure 24. San Diego River.....	112
Figure 25. Hillsides.....	124
Figure 26. Development Intensity Districts.....	136
Figure 27. Community Facilities.....	142
Figure 28. Schools.....	144
Figure 29. Cultural Resources – Landmarks.....	162
Figure 30. Urban Design – San Diego River.....	168
Figure 31. Urban Design – Hillsides.....	172
Figure 32. Urban Design – Landmarks and Community Entrances.....	180

List of Tables

Table 1. Mission Valley Community Plan Alternative Issues	22
Table 2. Mission Valley – Existing Zoning	42
Table 3. Mission Valley Vehicle Generation Rates by Land Use	135
Table 4. Development Intensity Districts	137
Table 5. Enrollment and Capacity Statistics for Schools.....	147

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Mission Valley Transportation.....	209
Appendix B. Implementation Program	217
Appendix C. Mission Valley Traffic Forecast.....	223
Appendix D. Recommendations for Water Conservation and Water Reclamation.....	235
Appendix E. Recommendations for Flood Damage Prevention.....	239
Appendix F. Acceptable Plant Species for Mission Valley	243
Appendix G. San Diego River Wetlands Management Plan	249
Appendix H. Concept 8 Planning Committee Alternative.....	337

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Introduction Section

- ***Background***
- ***Plan Summary***
- ***Environmental Context***



Background


BACKGROUND

The Mission Valley planning area comprises approximately 2,418 net acres and is located near the geographic center of the City of San Diego. It is bounded on the west by Interstate 5 (I-5), on the north by Friars Road west of State Route 163 (SR-163) and by the northern slopes of the valley east of SR-163, on the east by the eastern bank of the San Diego River, and on the south by approximately the 150-foot elevation contour line. The Planning Department estimated that 7,253 people resided in 4,834 housing units in Mission Valley as of January 1984. The Mission Valley Community Plan (Plan) is based upon a projection of 24,558 people residing in 15,159 housing units as of the horizon year of the Plan. (This population projection is based on a household size of 1.62 persons per dwelling unit.) Attainment of these population levels depends upon the economic conditions in this community, relative to regional economic conditions.

PLANNING PROGRAM

The Mission Valley Community Plan and Environmental Impact Report are the result of a planning program authorized by the San Diego City Council on October 22, 1977, by Resolution No. 219488. The Mission Valley Unified Planning Committee, the officially recognized citizen planning organization, has met regularly with Planning Department staff, and other City staff on an as needed basis, to assist in the preparation of this Plan.

The purpose of the Plan is to provide recommendations to guide development in Mission Valley through the horizon year. The horizon year is defined as attaining the Plan's maximum occupancy capacity, which is based upon land use, development intensity, circulation and public facilities. It is anticipated that the horizon year will be reached sometime after the year 2000. A series of goals and objectives established by the community and consistent with citywide policies are included. Once the Plan is adopted by the City Council, any amendments, additions, or deletions will require that the Planning Commission and City Council follow the same public hearing procedures as were required in the initial adoption. While it sets forth proposals for implementation, the Plan does not establish new regulations or legislation, nor does it rezone property. Controls over zoning, subdivisions, transportation, building construction and other development must be enacted separately as part of the implementation program. The adoption of the Plan will concurrently amend the Progress Guide and General Plan (General Plan) for the City of San Diego but will require rescission of the existing East Mission Valley Area Plan. The Serra Mesa Community Plan will be amended by deleting those areas of the plan area lying south of the Linda Vista Community Plan, will be amended by deleting those areas of the plan lying south of the northerly slopes of Mission Valley and incorporating them into the Mission Valley Community Plan. The Linda Vista Community Plan will be amended through the incorporation of language pertaining to that area of the community plan lying immediately north of Friars Road and which is dependent upon the Mission Valley circulation system. This area is part of the Mission Valley traffic forecast and the incorporated language will indicate that this area will be subject to the implementing zoning legislation of the Mission Valley Community Plan. Future development based on the new Plan shall be undertaken in complete conformance with all appropriate Council Policies and City Ordinances.




Location Map
Mission Valley Community Plan **1**
FIGURE

The relationship of this Plan with Planning programs and development patterns in surrounding areas was considered during its preparation. This process included coordination with the adopted Serra Mesa Community Plan, Navajo Community Plan, Uptown Community Plan, Mission Bay Master Plan, Park North-East Community Plan, and the revisions to the Tierrasanta Community Plan, Mid-City Community Plan, and Linda Vista Community Plan. Proposals by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and those contained in the adopted San Diego County General Plan were also evaluated. Two comprehensive transportation-planning programs were completed during preparation of this Plan. These are an Interstate 8 (I-8) Transportation System Management (TSM) Study, prepared by SANDAG, and a Transportation Plan for the San Diego Metropolitan Area, prepared by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB).

This Plan should not be considered as a static document. It is intended to provide guidance for the orderly growth of the Mission Valley community. In order to respond to unanticipated changes in environmental, social, or economic conditions, the Plan must be continually monitored and amended when necessary to remain relevant to community and City needs. Once adopted, two additional steps will follow: *implementation* and *review*. The implementation is the process of putting Plan policies and recommendations into effect. Review refers to the process of monitoring the community and recommending changes to the Plan as conditions in the community change. Guidelines for implementation are provided in the Plan, but the actual work must be based on a cooperative effort of private citizens, City officials and other agencies. It is contemplated that the Mission Valley Unified Planning Committee and other private citizen organizations will provide the continuity needed for a sustained, effective implementation program.

Although this Plan is intended to be a development guide for the next 15 to 20 years, circumstances may arise requiring a plan reviewer update. Community conditions and the legislative framework must be continually monitored to ensure that the Plan remains timely. Considerable technical information was generated in the preparation of the Plan. This material is contained in files at the Planning Department and in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), prepared by the Environmental Quality Division of the Planning Department, which evaluates the environmental effects of each of the eight alternative plan concepts presented. The EIR Conclusions and Recommendations for the Plan are included in this Plan document.



Adjacent Communities
Mission Valley Community Plan **2**
FIGURE

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

Mission Valley is part of the floodplain of the San Diego River, historically a major source of fresh water in the San Diego Metropolitan Area. This water supply has attracted people to the valley since prehistoric times. Archaeological findings include remains of Cosoy, an ancient Kumeyaay Indian village, located near the base of Preside Hill. The Spaniards located the original Mission San Diego de Alcalá near this Indian village site in 1769. As the missionaries and Indian converts developed an agricultural economy, they moved the Mission further inland to its present location in the Valley in 1774. The Valley was named for the presence and influence of this Mission. By 1816, Padre Dam was built and a tile and masonry flume was constructed to convey water directly from the river impoundment to the agricultural lands located near the Mission. Agricultural activities, especially livestock raising, dairying and field cultivation, continued as significant land uses in Mission Valley until the 1960s.


The arrival of the Mormon Battalion in 1847 signaled the beginning of Anglo-American settlement in Mission Valley. Although little new development occurred in the Valley proper during the 19th Century, several nearby settlements were founded in the 1880s. These include Grantville, located just east of the Valley north of Mission Gorge Road, and Silver Terrace (Linda Vista) overlooking west Mission Valley.

Sand and gravel extraction was introduced into the area about 1913, and began in earnest about 1923. Primary sources were the sands along the San Diego River and Murphy Canyon, and the conglomerate rocks in adjacent Serra Mesa. The industry flourished as development spread northward. Although material is no longer being extracted from the San Diego River, extensive activity continues north of Friars Road in Murphy Canyon.

Mission Valley has played a key role in local and regional transportation since prehistoric times. Trails that apparently date back to the Kumeyaay Indians include Cañada de la Soledad (Murphy Canyon Road), Mission Trail (Friars Road), Poor Man's Grade (Murray Canyon) and Father Junipero Serra Trail (Mission Gorge Road).

Major urban development has occurred in Mission Valley since 1958, primarily as a result of improvements in the regional highway network. The construction of U.S. 80 (later I-8) provided an impetus for commercial development in Mission Valley, and for the rapid displacement of the agricultural economy. This process accelerated when U.S. Highway 395 (now SR-163), and Interstate 805 (I-805) were completed, the latter in 1971.

The first major urban development was the Mission Valley Shopping Center, approved in 1958. During the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, Hotel Circle became an important commercial-recreation and visitor-oriented area. Other significant projects include San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium, completed in 1967 and Fashion Valley Shopping Center, built in 1969. During the early 1970s, the religious order of the Poor Sisters of Nazareth sold much of the land surrounding Mission San Diego de Alcalá. This knoll eventually developed as a multiple dwelling neighborhood, the largest residential area in Mission Valley.



Mission Valley at the turn of the century

*Indians of the Kumeyaay
tribe were the first known
inhabitants of Mission Valley.*




Photo of Mission San Diego de Alcala taken in the early 1900s



Remaining structure of the old mission dam built in the 1700s to provide water for irrigation

Mission Valley had become a satellite urban center of San Diego.

Throughout the history of Mission Valley, the San Diego River has been a primary attraction, first as a source of fresh water and later as a scenic recreational asset. The river has had an interesting history in relation to its impact on human use of the floodplain. During the agricultural period (1769 to 1958), drought was as much of a concern as flood. The subsequent period of rapid urbanization from 1958 to 1977 was characterized by very low annual rainfalls. Although the flood potential had been documented in detailed historical accounts from the 1920s and 1940s (a concrete flood channel was approved in 1965 but never constructed), much of the post-1958 development occurred on the floodplain. In 1978, 1979, and 1980, however, three consecutive rainy seasons brought flooding which resulted in property damage. The continuing threat of flooding will have an impact on the future development of Mission Valley.



PLANNING HISTORY

This section summarizes planning programs carried out in Mission Valley by the City of San Diego from 1960 to date. Some of these planning programs did not get adopted by the City Council.

1. Mission Valley Plan (1960)

The Mission Valley Plan (November 1960) was the first planning effort in the Mission Valley community. Background information was supplied by previous studies prepared in 1955 and 1958. This proposed plan recommended that: 1) industrial expansion be limited to ~~those~~ extractive industries east of Cabrillo Freeway (SR-163) and north of the river"; 2) commercial expansion be focused on tourist-related recreational uses; 3) office and professional uses remain secondary (up to 25 percent of the total floor area of a building) due to the problems of limited freeway access, unsuitability of existing and proposed streets for public transit, potential heavy peak-hour traffic and congestion associated with office buildings; and, 4) medium- to high-density residential development be encouraged as desirable —because of the relatively low rate of traffic generation and living amenities which are offered there," and the compatibility with the pattern of tourist-oriented development. No official action was taken to adopt the proposed plan.

2. East Mission Valley Area Plan (1963)

This plan was developed in 1962-63 in the hope that a long-range land use plan could be adopted by the City to guide future development. The study was requested by the Planning Commission in response to a communication from property owners in the area. It included the area east of (then proposed) I-805 to Fairmount Avenue. This plan recommended that: 1) light industrial uses be located in the area between the proposed flood channel and U.S. 80 (I-8); 2) natural resource extraction activities continue north of the river; 3) low-density residential (one unit per acre) uses be permitted in limited portions of the south slopes; and, 4) residential-professional land usage, rather than strip commercial, be located along the south side of U.S. 80 because of the low employee density ratio, low peak-hour traffic generation, and integration of residential use with administrative and professional office uses. This plan was adopted by the City Council on April 11, 1963.

3. Revised East Mission Valley Area Plan (1968)

A review and revision of the previously adopted plan was necessary due to proposed changes in the alignment and interchange configuration of I-805 and the Escondido Freeway (Ward Road - Murphy Canyon Road), the reduction in width and the realignment of the San Diego River Flood Channel, possible annexations and the construction of the San Diego Stadium and connecting highways. The planning area was revised to include the area between Friars Road and the top of the bluffs on the north side of the Valley. The recommendations of the revised plan differed from the previous plan in the following ways: 1) light industrial uses were proposed for both sides of Friars Road between I-805 and the Stadium; 2) commercial-recreational uses were proposed for the land surrounding the Stadium and the northern slopes were designated for low-density residential,

encouraging the use of planned unit developments, and medium-density residential was proposed north and south of the river channel east of Rancho Mission Road;

- 4) commercial-offices replaced the residential-professional office use south of I-8; and
- 5) a concrete-lined flood channel with an overall width of about 300 feet was first proposed.

4. West Mission Valley Report (1971)

In November 1968, the City Council designated the West Mission Valley Planning Committee as the citizen representative group that would assist in preparation of the West Mission Valley Community Plan. This report provided resource material to be used by the Committee in developing such a plan. The report assumed that future development would follow (then) existing trends in order to perform a travel forecast. It was concluded that future traffic volumes (359,609 trips excluding through trips) would be greater than could be accommodated in existing or proposed street systems. The report indicated that a future plan would have to consider three possible alternative solutions to this problem:

- 1) modifying the existing roadway system; 2) reducing the intensity of land use; and,
- 3) developing and supplementing the existing circulation system with another mode of transportation. The community established the following objectives for the development of the West Mission Valley area plan: 1) (provide flexibility in the location of land use; 2) develop qualitative standards for each type of land use; 3) create an urban center in a park-like setting; and, 4) preserve the hillsides and existing open quality of the Valley. This report outlined a planned district concept (with qualitative standards for each type of land use) as an approach to guide the planning and development of Mission Valley.

In October 1977, the City Council determined that a single plan for the entire Mission Valley area would be appropriate and directed planning staff to focus their efforts in that direction. The proposed Mission Valley Community Plan is a response to that direction.

EXISTING SETTING AND REGIONAL CONTEXT

Mission Valley was formed through the erosive action of the San Diego River upon the coastal mesa region. Mission Valley separates two mesas—the northern Linda Vista Terrace and the southern San Diego Terrace. The geology of these mesas consists of tertiary marine sediments made up of conglomerates and tuffaceous sandstones, generally overlain with Quaternary terrace deposits of sands, gravels and boulders. The Valley floor is composed of alluvial clays, sands, gravel and boulders. The topography of the Valley is that of a wide, flat floodplain surrounded by steep slopes and mesas to the north and south. The Valley gently slopes from about 600 feet above mean sea level on the eastern end of the community, to sea level at the western end. The San Diego River is the lowest point of the drainage basin.

Mission Valley is identified in the General Plan as an urbanized community. It is primarily a business community with much of its developable land devoted to commercial and office uses. Most development has occurred on the north and south sides of the Valley, along Friars Road and I-8. The central area of the Valley contains the San Diego River which is zoned FW (Floodway) due to the flooding potential, restricting development in areas of inundation. The southern slopes are still primarily in a natural state, while the northern slopes have been excavated for sand and gravel extraction.

Mission Valley is located at nearly the geographic center of the City of San Diego. The Valley is the crossroads for the regional freeway system, enjoying access from I-5, I-8, I-15, I-805 and SR-163. It has been a regional center since it first began to urbanize. It is a major employment center, with retail sales, office buildings, and newspaper publishing. It is also a visitor center with a large number of hotels and freeway accessibility to tourist attractions (Mission Bay, Sea World, Balboa Park). A regional entertainment center, it has movie theaters, restaurants, golf courses and the San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium. With its two regional shopping centers, Mission Valley is also the major regional retail center in the San Diego area at this time.

The Valley has fulfilled a regional role in almost all its development. Only recently has Mission Valley seen itself as a distinct community. The addition of residential development will alter the character of the Valley, giving it a more balanced regional/local character.



Cloverleaf with dairy on left side looking west from Madison Street, November 1954




Ferrari Dairy, east of Texas Street, December 1954




American Sand Company, just north of Twain and Powers Streets, December 1954



Mission Valley Country Club Golf Tournament, January 1955



Friars Road just west of Highway 163, January 1955



Plan Summary

PLAN SUMMARY

The Plan is based on a realistic land use proposal. Specific plans with a multiple land use emphasis are proposed for large undeveloped tracts of land along Friars Road. The transportation plan has been developed based primarily upon land use assumptions provided by the property owners. The limitations on the permitted intensity of development have been based on the capacity of the surface street system. The **Transportation Element** has an additional dimension; it permits increases in intensity (bonuses) when commitments are made for public transit systems (regional light rail transit and an intra-Valley transit system).

The **Open Space Element** is the key, not only to open space recommendations, but also to urban design recommendations as well. The **Urban Design Element** focuses on the river, hillsides, and transportation corridors. The open space element discusses development criteria for the flood control facility, hillsides, and park and recreation areas.

The San Diego River Wetlands Management Plan, contained in **Appendix G**, is an integral part of the implementation of the San Diego River element. The Wetlands Plan provides a framework for integrating the protection of wetlands with land development, transportation facilities and flood control.

The **Implementation Element** envisions the development of new zoning legislation to address development intensity, urban design guidelines and multiple uses. Bonus provisions for intensifying permitted development upon the implementation of a public transit system are also included. A table identifying responsibilities for the development of public facilities within the community is included as part of the Implementation Element.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

1. Traffic Circulation

The present transportation system has inadequate capacity. As currently developed, it will be unable to handle future local circulation and regional transportation needs. The Plan, in conjunction with the SANDAG-Caltrans Interstate 8 Corridor Study, proposes major structural and operational transportation improvements, including: a) encouraging the completion of the regional freeway system; b) closing gaps and remedying other deficiencies in the local (non-freeway) street system; c) reducing the effects of flooding on the transportation network; d) mitigating congestion by providing incentives for the use of modes of transportation other than the automobile; and e) instituting operational improvements (for example, ramp meters) within the I-8 corridor (both within and adjacent to the Mission Valley community).

2. Form and Intensity of Development

Development to date in Mission Valley has been occurring in a largely unplanned fashion. There has been little coordination to ensure compatibility of contiguous developments. The issue of form and intensity of future development has been addressed in the Plan

through the establishment of: a) development intensities related to the planned transportation network, designated activity centers and river-related open spaces; b) design guidelines to shape development adjacent to the river and north and south rim hillsides; c) encouragement of multiple use complexes which offer environments for living, working, shopping and related activities; and d) design guidelines for streets and other public rights-of-way, placing a new emphasis on the environmental quality of pedestrian-oriented spaces.

3. Flood Protection

Flooding of the San Diego River has become a major problem in Mission Valley since urbanization became prevalent in the floodplain area. This issue has been addressed in terms of: a) protection of lives and property; b) the use of land adjacent to flood control facilities; c) environmental constraints of wetland preservation and mitigation; d) equitable financing and maintenance of flood control facilities; and e) aesthetic appearance.

4. Public Facilities and Services

The Mission Valley community contains major regional facilities for entertainment, recreation, shopping, dining and lodging. Yet, facilities of a local or neighborhood nature serving the resident population are nearly nonexistent. Residents must rely upon other communities for “neighborhood” facilities to fulfill their daily needs, including schools, parks, libraries, emergency medical services and a post office. This situation has become an issue in Mission Valley. The provision of “neighborhood” services should help reduce the number and length of automobile trips within and through the Valley and otherwise enhance the livability of the community.

5. Physical Environment

The physical environment of Mission Valley continues to play a significant role in planning for the community's future. This is true with respect to constraints as well as opportunities. The potential for flooding, and liquefaction during earthquakes affects much of the Valley and must be considered when planning for any new development. Portions of the natural environment still exist, and if managed properly could provide opportunities for creating an urban center of high environmental quality. The San Diego River floodway should become a scenic resource with which projects can be integrated. Other environmental assets are the hillsides which provide the green backdrop on the Valley's south side. Proposals contained within this Plan provide development standards to assure a measure of protection for the natural assets of Mission Valley.

6. Economic Impacts

The public facilities required to provide the level of service desired in the community (roads, transit, flood protection, etc.) need to be financed primarily by the property owners and developers in the Valley, since they will receive the direct benefits of such

improvements. Additionally, as the flood control facility is constructed in the San Diego River corridor, it is anticipated that new areas (formerly prone to flooding) will become available for development, offsetting some of the initial costs of the facility.

7. Regional Impacts

Existing development, extensive freeway access and a location near the geographic center of the urban San Diego region, make Mission Valley a major activity center. The predominant land use in the Valley is commercial, including retail, recreational, and office development. The Plan proposes to encourage this activity in combination with other uses. It is expected that Mission Valley will continue to expand as the regional commercial center, complementing the other two other regional activity centers: Center City (government/ financial center); and University City (educational/high technology center).

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES


Overall Goal

To provide a Plan for Mission Valley which allows for its continued development as a quality regional urban center in the City of San Diego while recognizing and respecting environmental constraints and traffic needs, and encouraging the Valley's development as a community.

Overall Objectives

- Encourage high quality urban development in the Valley which will provide a healthy environment and offer occupational and residential opportunities for all citizens.
- Provide protection of life and property from flooding by the San Diego River.
- Provide a framework for the conservation of important wetland/riparian habitats balanced with expanded urban development.
- Facilitate transportation through and within the Valley while establishing and maintaining an adequate transportation network.
- Provide public facilities and services that will attend to the needs of the community and the region.
- Provide guidelines that will result in urban design which will be in keeping with the natural features of the land and establish community identity, coherence and a sense of place.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



Environmental Context

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

PLAN ALTERNATIVES

Although an infinite number of plan alternatives could be formulated and evaluated, the following eight alternatives offer a comprehensive variety, satisfying the objectives of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and illustrating feasible approaches to community planning options in Mission Valley in terms of land use classification and development intensity. The selected alternatives are briefly summarized and then followed with more detailed descriptions. The alternatives are:

1. No Mission Valley Community Plan (The “No Plan” Alternative).
2. Limited Development (No Comprehensive Flood Protection Program).
3. Intensive Development.
4. Moderate Development - Commercial Office Emphasis.
5. Moderate Development - Integrated Use Emphasis.
6. Moderate Development - Residential Emphasis.
7. Development to SANDAG Series V Projection Levels.
8. Planning Committee Alternative: Multiple Use - Integrated Use Emphasis.

**TABLE 1
MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN ALTERNATIVES ISSUES**

Plan Alternatives	Flood Protection	Transportation/ Transit	Land Use	Development Intensity
Concept 1	Existing FW, FPF Zones	Surface street improvements on project-by-project basis to be financed by developers as part of project approval. Transit-buses.	Continuation of existing uses.	That permitted by existing zoning.
Concept 2	Apply FW Zone where FPF Zone now exists prohibiting all new structural development within the floodplain.	No significant improvements to existing surface street system.	Continuation of existing uses, addition of non-structural uses such as agriculture, grazing, campgrounds	Only low-intensity uses permitted. Capacity of existing streets determines extent of development.
Concept 3	Concrete channel	Major improvements to freeways and surface street system. Transit: LRT line, shuttle buses, trams, and bikeways.	Continuation of existing uses.	High-intensity, high-rise development.
Concept 4	Natural appearing, soft-bottom floodway with 100-year flood capacity in a natural setting.	Improvements to street system. Transit: improved bus system, bikeways, and intra-Valley tram.	Emphasis on new commercial-office development which includes other commercial and/or residential uses.	Moderate levels of development.
Concept 5	Natural appearing, soft-bottom floodway in natural setting, accommodating recreational uses, habitat-conservation, flood control.	Improvements to street system. Transit: LRT, improved bus system, bikeways, and intra-Valley tram.	Emphasis on multi-use which includes commercial-retail, recreation, office, residential.	Moderate levels of development.
Concept 6	Natural appearing, soft-bottom floodway approx. 700'-800' wide to carry 111,000 cfs in park-like setting.	Improvements to street system. Increased number of small local streets.	Emphasis on new residential development with support services.	Moderate levels of development.
Concept 7	Existing FW, FPF Zones	Surface street improvements on project-by-project basis to be financed by developers as part of project approval. Transit-buses.	Continuation of existing uses.	That permitted by existing zoning.
Concept 8	Natural-appearing soft-bottom floodway with optional augmentation by means of a supplemental diversion facility with the capacity to contain the 100-year flood.	Improvements to street system. Transit: improved bus system, bikeways and intra-Valley tram.	Emphasis on multi-use which includes commercial, recreation, office or residential.	As permitted by existing zoning or proposed CA2 Zone and other ordinances in plan implementation, CA-2 Zone permits FAR of 2.0. (1,400 trips per acre-office & hotel development. 2,500 trips per acre for retail development.)

CONCEPT 1: NO MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN

This “No Plan” concept assumes: a) retention of existing general and area plans, including the General Plan and the East Mission Valley Area Plan; b) continuation of current trends of development; c) continuation of current zoning classifications and other land use controls; d) minimal street improvements; and e) no flood control facility.

Following the construction of the San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium, Hotel Circle visitor facilities, and the two regional shopping centers, four major categories of land uses have located in the Valley. These are office, commercial-recreation, retail and multiple dwelling residential uses. These uses are designated in a general fashion by the General Plan. The sand and gravel extraction operations located between Mission Center Road and the Stadium are shown for natural resource extraction. The East Mission Valley Area Plan (a development plan) covers Mission Valley east of I-805. A major departure from that plan is the concentration of multiple dwelling units around the Mission San Diego de Alcala. Much of that area was designated for commercial-recreation use in the East Mission Valley Area Plan. The office, commercial-recreation and retail areas are not single-purpose use types. Recently, office uses have been interspersed among the visitor facilities located along Hotel Circle. Although offices prevail along Camino del Rio South, a random mixture of freestanding retail uses currently exists between SR-163 and Texas Street.

The zoning pattern throughout the Valley strongly reflects the random mix of land uses. Pockets of CR, CO, CA and R-3 zoning resulted from the absence of an adopted community plan containing specific guidelines. This is especially true in the Hotel Circle South and Camino del Rio South areas. This trend toward “undefined mixed uses” or “any use” is likely to continue if remaining vacant land and redevelopable areas urbanize without the guidelines of a community plan.

The surface street system also will remain fragmented and disjointed unless a comprehensive effort is utilized to finance completion of an internal street system. Although the City can require local street widenings for individual projects, those projects could develop a “piecemeal” fashion, resulting in traffic flow difficulties. There would also be little effort to balance the heavily automobile-oriented transportation system with buses and other modes of public transit.

The approach to flood protection in use today is land use regulation by zoning. The FW Zone defines the extent of the 100-year frequency flood (based upon 36,000 cubic feet per second). This zone is the basis for the “open space” designation along the San Diego River by the General Plan. Land uses permitted by the FW Zone are limited to non-structural uses unaffected by flooding. No structural flood control facilities are planned under Concept 1. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has withdrawn its participation in a flood channel for Mission Valley, based upon their 1975 cost-benefit analysis. Efforts to implement short-term solutions (i.e., pilot channels to handle low flows) have met with limited success to date. Some property damage occurred in three past consecutive rainy seasons (1978, 1979, 1980) and is likely to occur again in the future under the “No Plan” Alternative.

In summary, existing plans covering Mission Valley do not provide a comprehensive set of policies for future land use, transportation and flood protection. Equally important is the lack of a comprehensive implementation program, including financing, to provide needed improvements.

CONCEPT 2: LIMITED DEVELOPMENT

This —“Limited Development” concept assumes that no new structural development will occur in any areas subject to flooding, including both FW (Floodway) and FPF (Floodplain Fringe) zoned property, and will limit development located outside the flood-prone areas. Of the 1,982 net acres of land in Mission Valley, about 432 acres are contained in the FW Zone and about 900 acres in the FPF Overlay Zone as of October 1980. This means that about 1,332 acres (67 percent of Mission Valley) are subject to flooding and therefore, could be excluded from new structural development under Concept 2. As indicated, the City now provides flood protection by application of the FW and FPF zones. The FW Zone precludes any structural development. The FPF Overlay Zone permits structural development, but requires that measures such as diking, filling or special development techniques be undertaken to mitigate potential flood damage. Concept 2 proposes to replace the FPF Overlay Zone with FW zoning. Concept 2 also limits new development outside the floodplain areas. In addition to potential flooding, the traffic carrying capacity of the existing road system would be a major factor used to limit and direct new development.

In terms of land use, Concept 2 would result in no new development in the two-thirds of the Valley subject to flooding, and only limited development elsewhere. Some relatively low-intensity uses that could remain include sand and gravel extraction and golf courses. Some possible new uses within the flood-prone area could include campgrounds, miniature golf courses, truck crops, livestock grazing and other non-structural uses. The overall impression would be a wide, partially developed greenbelt extending the length of Mission Valley. Outside of individual flood protection projects for existing development, no major expenditures of public or private funds would be anticipated for flood protection. No significant improvements to the transportation system would occur under the Limited Development concept. There would be little incentive by private development to provide needed street connections or even widenings because few new projects could be built.

CONCEPT 3: INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

This —“Intensive Development” concept assumes that urbanization would occur to the greatest extent possible. This high degree of development intensity would require: a) a light rail transit (LRT) system supplemented by feeder lines and tramways; b) extensive freeway and surface street improvements; and c) a concrete channel to control floodwaters along the entire length of Mission Valley.

The land use pattern could change dramatically from its current relatively open character to one dominated by intensive high-rise development. Open space would be virtually eliminated, especially along the San Diego River. New developments possible under Concept 3 include a major hotel/convention complex located west of San Diego de Alcalá and on the

golf courses north of the San Diego River and major hotel and office complexes elsewhere. This approach to development would be like that under the “Plan” Alternative except that provision of a concrete channel for flood protection and an upgraded transportation network would encourage development on a highly intensive scale. Traffic (trip generation) under Concept 3 would be so extreme that development of a public transit system would be mandatory for Mission Valley. The MTDB has under study the alignment for a “transit corridor” extending from Center City northward to Escondido along I-15. Concept 3 proposes that an LRT line be extended through the Valley to the Stadium. This proposed east-west line could connect with future lines serving the La Mesa/El Cajon area. The LRT system would be supplemented with a coordinated internal public transit network consisting of shuttle buses, trams, bikeways and other alternative transportation modes. Additionally, some street improvements might still be required.

CONCEPT 4: MODERATE DEVELOPMENT - COMMERCIAL OFFICE EMPHASIS

This “Moderate Development - Commercial Office Emphasis” concept assumes the following: a) a planned multiple use approach to development; b) an emphasis on commercial/office uses; c) a balanced transportation system, and d) a natural appearing, soft-bottomed floodway approach to flood protection to contain a 100-year flood under the year 2000 conditions.

A “Multiple Use Option” approach (employed in Concepts 4, 5 and 6) is intended to permit greater flexibility in project design than is possible through strict application of conventional zoning regulations. It permits developers to combine land uses in such a way that community and individual project “self-containment” can be achieved. “Self-containment” means that all support facilities and services associated with a project are located either within the project or within a short walking distance. Examples include banks, restaurants, health facilities and food markets. “Self-containment” should reduce the number of intra-Valley automobile trips, resulting in fuel conservation, decreased air pollution and less traffic.

Concept 4 encourages development of an urban community with an emphasis on commercial office projects, with little land devoted to new housing. The pattern of a mix of land uses has already been established; there are no residentially oriented support facilities (schools, parks, libraries, for example), and there has been high economic demand for new office and retail space. This concept requires a considerably upgraded road system supplemented by a greatly improved bus service, bikeway system, and possibly, an internal tram or “people mover” line. Although a light rail transit line is not part of Concept 4, one could ultimately be of great benefit to Mission Valley.

Also embodied in this concept is a different approach to flood protection in Mission Valley. This is the “natural appearing soft-bottomed flood-way,” derived from the “grass-lined swale” recommended by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers in the 1975 San Diego River-Mission Valley Flood Control Task Force Report and the supplementary design memorandum. This approach consists of a major flood control facility to contain the year 2000 100-year frequency flood (based upon 49,000 cubic feet per second) and a low-flow or “pilot channel” design to handle the year 2000 ten-year frequency flood (4,600 cfs). The overall appearance of this flood protection system would be that of a river in a greenbelt

setting with water in the low-flow channel on a year-round basis. Creation of this flood control facility within the river corridor area would make more land available for development than is presently the case. Indeed, the riverbank areas could be designed to accommodate a variety of outdoor recreational uses compatible with habitat preservation.

CONCEPT 5: MODERATE DEVELOPMENT - INTEGRATED USE EMPHASIS (Recommended Alternative)

The —Moderate Development - Integrated Use Emphasis” concept includes: a) an emphasis on an integration of commercial-retail, commercial-recreation, office and residential uses; b) encouragement of residential development in order to complement the commercial and office development presently occurring in Mission Valley; c) the addition of resident-oriented community facilities and services; d) a comprehensive transportation system with an emphasis on achieving a viable internal circulation network; and e) a natural appearing soft-bottomed floodway solution to flood protection in order to contain a 100-year flood under the year 2000 conditions.

Concept 5 is an attempt to complement existing and future commercial office development with an appropriate amount of residential development. In order to provide residents with the opportunity to live close to employment, shopping and recreational opportunities, a comprehensive integrated use development approach is necessary.

Mission Valley is characterized by an abundance of regionally oriented shopping, office and recreational facilities, but lacks resident-oriented support facilities despite considerable residential growth. It is felt that a residential growth, as provided by this concept, would justify providing such local support facilities as supermarkets, and other neighborhood retail and service facilities, medical clinics, etc.

A balanced transportation system is an essential ingredient of Concept 5 with an emphasis on achieving a viable internal circulation network. This concept requires a significantly upgraded surface street system in order to reduce, or eliminate entirely, current reliance upon use of the freeway system to travel within the Valley. Public transit improvements would include higher levels of express and urban route bus services as well as the addition of an intra-Valley shuttle bus system. A light rail transit (LRT) line is an important part of Concept 5. The future extension of an LRT line from Center City through Mission Valley to the stadium (and possibly north along I-15 to the city of Escondido) could reduce dependence upon the automobile and reduce traffic congestion and parking problems in the Valley. Public transit modes would also be supplemented by an extensive walkway and bikeway system linking many of the Valley's major activity centers.

Concept 5 embodies the —natural appearing soft-bottomed floodway” previously described in Concept 4. Continued urbanization in the San Diego River Basin is expected to increase runoff rates through at least the year 2000. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates that the 100-year frequency flood will increase in magnitude from 36,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) in 1975 to approximately 49,000 cfs by the year 2000. Concept 5 recommends that the 100-year flood control facility be designed and constructed to the year 2000 standard of 49,000 cfs in order to provide flood protection for the Valley.

The overall appearance of this flood protection system would be similar to that of a river greenbelt with water year-round in the low-flow (year 2000, ten-year flood) channel and preservation or revegetation of much of the extensive riparian/wetland habitat. Development of this facility would make more land available for structural development. Indeed, the river corridor itself could conceivably be designed to accommodate a variety of active outdoor recreation uses, which would complement the abutting land uses and provide multi-purpose uses of flood protection, critical habitat conservation and recreational facilities for the community and region.

CONCEPT 6: MODERATE DEVELOPMENT - RESIDENTIAL EMPHASIS

This —Moderate Development - Residential Emphasis” concept is the third plan option which is based on a —multiple use” approach to development. However, Concept 6 differs from Concepts 4 and 5 in several important respects. These include: a) a heavy emphasis on new residential projects; b) a full complement of community facilities and services to support this new residential development; c) less extensive transportation improvements; and d) a natural-appearing soft-bottomed floodway to handle the year 2000 Standard Project Flood.

The major objective of Concept 6 is to build a substantial amount of new housing in Mission Valley, catering to families and senior citizens at all income levels as well as to the young adult market. A variety of housing types, including townhouses, garden apartments and high-rise structures would be encouraged. In addition, development of modular housing could provide affordable units for low- and moderate-income households. A residential community would require substantial new support facilities and services if the goal of —self-containment” (as discussed previously in Concept 4) is to be achieved. These would include: a) neighborhood shopping centers with full line supermarkets; b) schools; c) libraries; d) public parks and recreational facilities; and e) health care facilities. These services are presently provided in areas adjacent to the Mission Valley community.

Maximum protection from floods is another major objective under Concept 6, due to the anticipated large number of residential dwellers. In addition, flood facilities should be aesthetically pleasing in appearance. To achieve both objectives, Concept 6 proposes a natural appearing soft-bottomed floodway large enough to accommodate the Standard Project Flood. The standard project flood (SPF) represents the flood that would result from the most severe combination of meteorological and hydrologic conditions considered reasonably characteristic of the region. It normally is larger than any past-recorded flood in the area, and can be expected to be exceeded very infrequently. In 1975, it was calculated to be 95,000 cfs. It would average about 700-800 feet in width and would have approximately twice the handling capacity of the year 2000 —100-year” floodway. Although more land would be placed within the SPF floodway than the 100-year floodway, the Floodplain Fringe (FPF) Overlay Zone could be eliminated from Mission Valley.

The configuration and cost of transportation improvements for Concept 6 would be substantially different from those proposed under Concepts 3, 4 and 5. The size and number of major street facilities needed would be proposed under Concepts 3, 4 and 5. The size and number of major street facilities needed would be reduced substantially due to the generally

lower traffic generation rate of residential development (as compared to that generated by office or retail uses). However, it is probable that there would be more local streets providing access to housing units than would be the case under the commercial office alternative. Still, the overall cost of providing adequate transportation should be lower under Concept 6 than under Concepts 3, 4 and 5. As in Concepts 3 and 5, an LRT line through the Valley would be beneficial, especially if combined with improvements in bus service or the addition of an intra-Valley transit system. However, an internal transit system would not be needed as immediately in a residential community as compared to a commercially oriented one, but it would be equally desirable.

CONCEPT 7: SANDAG SERIES V DEVELOPMENT FORECASTS (1978-2000)

The SANDAG Development Forecast is based primarily on the continuation of existing development patterns in Mission Valley. It assumes that current zoning will remain the same and that most of the developable vacant land will be used for multi-unit residential construction. It does not address the existence of or need for a flood protection facility. It also assumes that the surface street system remains the same, with only normal maintenance, but no substantial additions or deletions.

The SANDAG Forecast identifies four types of land use activity: 1) residential; 2) basic or exportable commercial and industrial; 3) non-basic or local service and commercial; and 4) vacant. Residential development would be located primarily in the western end of the Valley. The acreage used for residential purposes would expand 61 percent, an increase from 126 to 327 acres. This translates to a 54 percent increase in the total number of housing units. The forecast also estimates a 55 percent increase in the number of multifamily units (from 2196 to 4919). The increase, however, is based on an R-2 density (a maximum of 14 dwelling units per acre). This would result in a projected residential population of 9,716.

Basic or exportable commercial and industrial activity includes any enterprise in which the goods or services produced are to be used or sold outside of the region. This aspect of the economic base in Mission Valley will change very little. The acreage used for this type of commercial activity is expected to increase from 106 to 110 acres, or slightly less than one percent.

Local economic activities include commercial-office and retail uses which serve the region. These kinds of activities are expected to expand to 25 percent in terms of area (from 509 to 674 acres), and 36 percent in terms of employment (from 11,767 to 17,709 employees). The majority of the growth, both employment and acreage, is forecast to occur in the western portion of the Valley.

In essence, the SANDAG Forecast is a reflection of the anticipated changes in housing unit and employment figures for the year 2000, based upon existing zoning and past trends. The effects of such growth are discussed in the —No Plan” concept. The same basic assumptions hold true.

CONCEPT 8: PLANNING COMMITTEE ALTERNATIVE MULTIPLE USE - INTEGRATED USE EMPHASIS

(This alternative was prepared by the Mission Valley Unified Planning Committee. The alternative is included as submitted by the Planning Committee. For additional detailed information see Appendix H.)

Overall Goal

To provide a community plan for Mission Valley which allows for its continued development (through market initiative) as a quality regional urban center in the City of San Diego while recognizing environmental concerns, the Valley's traffic needs and encouraging the Valley's development as a community.

The —Planning Committee Alternative - Integrated Use Emphasis” concept includes: a) a multiple use approach to development; b) an emphasis on an integration of commercial-retail, commercial-recreation, office and residential uses; c) encouragement of residential development in order to complement the commercial and office development presently prevalent in Mission Valley; d) the addition of resident-oriented community facilities and services; e) a comprehensive transportation system with an emphasis on achieving a viable internal circulation network; and, f) a natural appearing, soft-bottomed flood-way solution to flood protection, with optional augmentation by means of a supplemental diversion facility in order to contain a 100-year flood.

This concept assumes the following: a) all developable and redevelopable property is to be designated —multiple use” unless the property owner elects to retain the existing zoning applicable to the property; b) existing CA, CO, and CR zoning remain on developed properties at the option of the property owners; c) all future development intensity is regulated by a maximum floor area ratio of two.

A balanced transportation system is an essential ingredient of Concept 8 with an emphasis on achieving a viable internal circulation network. Public transit modes would be supplemented by an extensive walkway and bikeway system linking many of the Valley's major activity centers. This concept also requires a significantly upgraded surface street system in order to reduce, or eliminate entirely, current reliance upon use of the freeway system to travel within the Valley. Although an LRT line is not an integral part of Concept 8 at this time, one could ultimately be of significant benefit to Mission Valley. The future extension of an LRT line from Center City through Mission Valley to the stadium (and possibly north along I-15 to the city of Escondido) could reduce dependence upon the automobile and reduce traffic congestion and parking problems in the Valley.

The open space element is the key, not only to open space recommendations, but urban design recommendations as well. Urban design focuses on the river, hillsides, and transportation corridors. The **Open Space Element** discusses development criteria for the flood control facility, hillsides and park and recreation areas.

Implementation envisions the development of new zoning legislation to address development intensity and multiple use. A financing plan that envisions the establishment of assessment districts to provide funds for the development of public facilities within the community is included as part of the implementation plan.

RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Concept 5, the —Moderate Development - Integrated Use Emphasis” alternative, represents the recommended approach in achieving the Goals and Objectives established for Mission Valley. Concepts 1, 7 and 8 were discarded, as they would not result in a coherent, well-designed community. Likewise, Concept 2 was rejected, because it would be unrealistic to bring development to a virtual standstill in Mission Valley. Concept 3 was also rejected because such a high intensity of development would be detrimental to the physical environment and quality of life. Concept 6 was eliminated because of the cost of providing major residential support facilities and a standard project flood control facility and the lack of demand for such a development pattern. Concepts 4 and 5 were similar in terms of community goals. It was felt that concept 5 was more responsive to the private market constraints and opportunities than was Concept 4. Under Concept 5, the emphasis is on moderate levels of development which includes an integration of commercial-office, retail, recreation, and residential uses with improvements to the circulation and public transit systems, a natural appearing floodway, and limits to development intensity.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Implementation of either the Planning Department's community plan alternative for Mission Valley (Concept 5) or the Mission Valley Unified Planning Committee's alternative (Concept 8) would create an urban environment very different from today's conditions. Mission Valley of 1984 contains about 5.1 million gross square feet of commercial office space, and all land uses generate about 0.3 million Average Daily Trips (ADT). Concept 5 could lead to creation of 17.2 million gross square feet of office space, with traffic doubling to 0.6 million ADT. Development under Concept 8 could result in 65.7 million square feet of office use, with ten times more traffic (3.4 million ADT) than is present today. (It is important to note that development under the existing General Plan and East Mission Valley Community Plan would permit about twice as much intensity as Concept 5: 1.3 million ADT vs. 0.6 million ADT.)

Either concept would lead to significant environmental impacts. Mitigation measures can reduce the significance of many impacts associated with Concept 5. The intensity permitted by Concept 8 would create unmanageable and extreme environmental conditions. The following paragraphs explain in greater detail the impacts of the two community plan alternatives.

Traffic

Traffic forecasts show that traffic volumes generated by the land use intensity under Concept 5 can be accommodated on Mission Valley's proposed horizon year circulation system with congestion in some areas of the Valley during peak periods. In order to accommodate the traffic generated by the level of development proposed under Concept 5, the traffic forecast assumes that several regional highways will be completed (e.g., State Route 52), State Route 56 (SR-56), and State Route 125 (SR-125), and that development will be limited to the intensity designated in Concept 5. Nonetheless, SANDAG's Draft 1983 Regional Transportation Plan projects heavy congestion would exist on I-5, I-8, I-805 and on SR-163 within Mission Valley.

The intensity of development allowed by Concept 8 could not be accommodated by any feasible street system. Only three miles of streets would function above a Level of Service of "F"; 39 miles of the Valley's total of 42 would be at LOS "F" (system failure). Interstate 8 and SR-163 would carry twice as much traffic as the most congested freeway in California; Friars Road would carry six times as much traffic as the most congested freeway in California. Communities to the north and south of Mission Valley would be very negatively impacted. For example, Texas Street in Park Northeast would carry as much traffic as I-8 does today. Such volumes are clearly impossible to accommodate, and the freeways would be unable to perform their role as regional traffic arteries.

Air Quality

Because development under Concept 5 would cause congestion on several roadways, direct air quality impacts would result. The elevated pollutant levels associated with poor traffic flow might delay but would likely not prevent attainment of federal ambient air quality standards. The level of intensity and emissions associated with Concept 8 would preclude the region from achieving the air quality standards. In addition, the extreme congestion created by Concept 8 would produce elevated carbon monoxide levels throughout the Valley, creating a direct threat to public health.

Biological Resources

Further development of Mission Valley will result in additional confinement and channelization of the San Diego River. In recognition of this, the Plan (both concepts) includes a Wetlands Management Plan which is intended to improve habitat value and recreational opportunities along the river as flood-control improvements are made. While the Plan incorporates extensive requirements for enhancement and revegetation of the river corridor, it will be difficult to fully offset the loss of biological resources as development proceeds. The ultimate river corridor will be much narrower, and will be far more segmented by roadway and trolley crossings. Future development will provide greater access to the river, but with a minimal buffer. The improvements provided in the river corridor will probably be aesthetically successful, but extraordinary revegetation and maintenance efforts will be necessary to restore the river's biological value.

Visual Quality/Urban Design

Both alternative plan concepts contain an urban design element which, if implemented, could improve the visual character of Mission Valley. However, without a mechanism to ensure implementation of the design guidelines, continued chaotic development is possible. Adoption of a requirement that all new projects be subject to the planned development (Planned Commercial Development, Planned Residential Development) or specific plan process would substantially reduce the possibility of new development blocking views of the south slopes of the valley, restricting views and access to the San Diego River, obstructing visual access to community landmarks, or creating disharmony in building scale relationships.

Public Facilities

Both Concept 5 and Concept 8 would result in traffic congestion which would affect the ability of fire and police vehicles to respond to calls.

RECOMMEND MITIGATION MEASURE

The planning concepts and objectives presented in Concept 5 can only be achieved if new regulatory controls are available to ensure implementation of the Plan's guidelines. Satisfactory mitigation of traffic, air quality, biological, urban design impacts and public

facilities can occur only if discretionary approval is required for new development. Several parcels could be redeveloped under existing C, CA, or CO zoning without regard to the Plan's recommendations. To ensure that mitigation measures are implemented, it is recommended that a regulatory system be adopted which requires that all new development in the Valley be processed through planned development permits or similar discretionary approvals.

Unless this (or an equivalent) mitigation measure is adopted, project approval will require the decision maker to make specific and substantiated findings which state that: a) the recommended mitigation measure is infeasible; and b) these impacts have been found acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Note: The above discussion of the governmental impacts of this Plan is an excerpt from the Environmental Impact Report. The complete Environmental Impact Report (EQD No. 840194), as prepared by the Environmental Quality Division of the Planning Department, is on file in the Environmental Quality Division and is available for public review.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Plan Elements Section

- *Land Use*
- *Transportation*
- *Open Space*
- *Development Intensity*
- *Community Facilities*
- *Conservation*
- *Cultural and Heritage Resources*
- *Urban Design*
- *Implementation*



Land Use

LAND USE

The major components of existing land use in Mission Valley are commercial, residential and industrial. Commercial activities are the primary land use, encompassing 634.1 acres or approximately 26 percent of the area. Residential uses currently occupy about eight percent of the Valley, while industrial activities (excluding the extractive areas) utilize 26.4 percent. Additionally, approximately 18 percent of the Valley is identified for mixed use development, integrating commercial and residential land uses.

The proposed land use for certain large, vacant or redevelopable areas is multiple use, in keeping with the recommended plan alternative of “Moderate Development – Integrated Use” to be achieved through the use of Planned Commercial Development (PCD) permits or Specific Plans. Multiple use in Mission Valley will contain various combinations of commercial and residential uses.

RESIDENTIAL

In January 1984, 196.8 acres (8.13% of the land area) in the Mission Valley community planning area were devoted to residential land uses. At that time there were 4,834 housing units in Mission Valley. The few remaining single-family dwellings are scattered along Camino del Rio South between Texas Street and Fairmount Avenue, and along Hotel Circle South. These remaining single-family dwellings are amount the last vestiges of the rural environment of the Valley, present since the early 1900s.


Recent residential development in the Valley has been primarily multiple unit structures. The largest concentration of these complexes is in the vicinity of the Mission San Diego de Alcala (east of I-15), with the next largest grouping between I-15 and SR-163 and north of Friars Road near Mission Valley. According to the Community Analysis Profile for the Mission Valley Community Plan area, there were in January 1984, 7,253 residents in Mission Valley. For new residential developments, vehicle trips generation rates decrease as the density of the development increases. This factor can affect the overall intensity of development in the Valley.

SANDAG Series V Population Forecast estimates a 54% increase in the total number of housing units in the Valley by the year 2000. This would result in a projected residential population of 9,716. However, currently approved projects and rezonings, and the nature of projected development indicate that a more realistic projection would be approximately 6,900 units or 11,200 residents. This discrepancy is due primarily to SANDAG’s assumption that new residential development will have a maximum density of 14 units per acre. In fact, proposed residential projects will be developing at densities of up to 73 units per acre.

The Plan (Concept 5) projects a planning area horizon year residential capacity of 15,159 dwelling units or 24,558 residents based upon the 1984 occupancy ratio of 1.62 residents per dwelling unit.

AGE

75 +
 65 - 74
 60 - 64
 55 - 59
 45 - 54
 35 - 44
 30 - 34
 25 - 29
 20 - 24
 15 - 19
 10 - 14
 5 - 9
 1 - 4



AGE GROUP

of PEOPLE

% of POPULATION

75 +	162	3.2
60 - 74	430	8.4
45 - 59	731	14.3
30 - 44	1163	22.7
20 - 29	2390	46.6
1 - 19	246	4.9
TOTAL	5122	



Population Characteristics (1980)

Mission Valley Community Plan

3

FIGURE

PROPOSALS

- Encourage imaginative land development techniques and varied building site layouts.
- Provide amenities for residents such as recreation, shopping, employment and cultural opportunities within or adjacent to residential development.
- Encourage the design of residential areas so as to prevent the encroachment of incompatible uses and minimize conflicts (such as excessive traffic noise) with more intensive non-residential uses located nearby.

DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES


Residential development should be in the form of generally self-contained areas. The following proposals are intended to achieve this concept:

1. Provide amenities intended primarily for use by residents. These amenities should include:
 - a. Leisure activity areas.
 - b. Active recreational facilities.
 - c. Child care centers.
 - d. Neighborhood and convenience shopping and medical and other similar professional office complexes.
 - e. Cultural/educational opportunities.
 - f. Community facilities and services.
2. Design internal pedestrian and bicycle circulation paths to reduce dependency on the automobile and minimize conflicts among pedestrian, bicycle and automobile traffic.
3. Employ the Planned Development Permit (PDP) approach to residential and/or commercial development to encourage a mix of housing types and densities, integration of commercial uses, and flexibility in site arrangement. Residential use will be allowed to occur without the use of PDP permits up to a maximum density of 14 dwelling units to the acre. However, higher densities of up to 73 dwelling units may be obtained through the Planned Development approach. This approach will ensure residents that higher density development will provide open space and recreational facilities.

TABLE 2
MISSION VALLEY – EXISTING ZONING*

Zone	Acres	Percent of Area
Residential/Single		
R1-40000	752.77	31.34
R1-10000	11.97	0.50
R1-5000	244.43	10.18
Subtotal	1009.17	42.02
Residential/Multiple		
R-1500	32.09	1.34
R-1000	154.43	6.43
R-600	18.15	0.76
R-400	8.22	0.34
Subtotal	212.89	8.87
Commercial		
CP	5.13	0.21
CR	132.84	5.53
CO	189.41	7.89
CN	16.78	0.70
CA	240.46	10.01
C	2.12	0.09
Subtotal	586.74	24.43
Industrial		
M-1B	97.71	4.07
M-1A	10.47	0.44
M-1	22.77	0.95
Subtotal	130.95	5.46
Miscellaneous		
A-1-1	40.10	1.67
FW	421.84	17.56
Subtotal	461.94	19.23
Total	2401.69	100.00


* July 1984 (Excludes Public Right-of-way)



Existing Zoning
Mission Valley Community Plan

4
FIGURE

- LEGEND**
-  Residential
 -  Residential / Office Mix
 -  Commercial Retail
 -  Commercial Office
 -  Commercial Recreation
 -  Office or Commercial Rec.
 -  Multi-use
 -  Business / Industrial
 -  Industrial Park
 -  Mission and School
 -  Public Recreation
 -  Open Space
 -  Public Facility
 -  Visitor Commercial
 -  Trolley
 -  100' Contour
 -  20' Contour
 -  Community Plan Boundary
 -  Subject to Sand and Gravel Resource Depletion



Land Use
Mission Valley Community Plan

5
FIGURE

4. Discourage visitor-oriented uses from locating within predominantly residential areas to minimize conflicts between residents and tourists. These include:
 - a. Lodging facilities.
 - b. Outdoor amusements.
 - c. Theaters.
 - d. Other uses that tend to draw traffic from outside the community.
5. Encourage a wide variety of housing types and styles. Although detached single-family dwellings are probably not feasible, there are still many options available. These include:
 - a. Attached single-family dwelling (row or townhouses).
 - b. Low-rise garden multiple-dwelling structures.
 - c. Mid- and high-rise multiple-dwelling structures.
6. Relate residential development to other elements physically and architecturally. Important considerations should include compatibility, livability and attractiveness.
7. Encourage driveways serving residential units to take access from private streets.
 - a. Relate residential development to the traffic circulation system.
 - b. Encourage access to residential complexes from local or private streets.
 - c. Discourage direct access to residential units from:
 - (1) Collector streets.
 - (2) Major streets.
 - (3) Primary arterial streets.
8. Encourage mid- and high-rise multiple dwelling structures where:
 - a. They are compatible with surrounding development.
 - b. They are conveniently situated with regard to shopping and other amenities.
 - c. They are located within walking distance of transit lines.
 - d. There is adequate street capacity to handle traffic generated by such development.
9. Provide low- and moderate-cost housing.

10. Encourage housing designed for the elderly, especially in areas where residents daily needs can be easily met, particularly with easy access to public transit and public and community facilities.
11. Encourage close, easy access between residences and daily shopping facilities.
12. Encourage use of the citywide Low-Income Housing Bonus which provides a 25 percent increase in the permitted residential densities if the development includes a percentage of low-income units.
13. Permit medium- to medium-high density residential developments (up to 73 units per acre) in conjunction with commercial facilities, through the utilization of PRD/PCD permits.

COMMERCIAL

Although Mission Valley is noted for its commercial facilities, these uses currently comprise only about 26 percent of its land area. Commercial uses in the Valley can be categorized as commercial-retail, commercial-recreation and commercial-office. The western portion of the Valley (from Morena Boulevard to Fashion Valley Road) is predominantly used for commercial-recreation, the central section (between Fashion Valley Road and I-805) has a commercial-retail emphasis, and the primary use in the eastern section (between I-805 and I-15) is commercial-office.

The Plan (Concept 5) provides for the development of approximately 17 million square feet of office development, 4.3 million square feet of retail floor area and 9,800 hotel rooms. This level of commercial development is expected to generate an employment base of approximately 50,000 employees which is a 230 percent increase above the most recent employment figure of 15,000 (SANDAG, 1980).

This Plan also provides for self-storage facilities in appropriate commercial areas as support facilities for commercial and residential development. There are very limited opportunities in industrial areas of the community for these facilities, which are in growing demand due to the continuing development of higher density residential projects with their limited storage space. Providing these facilities within the Valley rather than at a more distant industrial location reduces the amount of travel required of local residents and businesses to patronize them. These facilities can be compatible with surrounding commercial development with the appropriate design, location and operational considerations.

Commercial-Retail

Retail uses can further be divided into regional, freestanding and neighborhood/convenience. Generally, the larger the retail center, the fewer daily vehicle trips are generated by that land use. This can result in greater intensity of new retail developments depending upon the overall transportation impacts.

Regional Retail

The most intensive commercial activity in Mission Valley Center is contained in the two regional shopping centers—Mission Valley Center and Fashion Valley Center. The Mission Valley Shopping Center currently contains 88 establishments, including such major retailers as the May Company, Montgomery Ward, Bullock's, Walker Scott and J.J. Newberry. An expansion of the shopping center recently added a Saks Fifth Avenue store and other small retail shops. The total land area for the Mission Valley Center and Mission Valley Center West is 77 acres, with about 1,219,000 square feet of useable retail space. Additional retail floor area of approximately 300,000 square feet is proposed for this shopping center as part of the First San Diego River Improvement Project Specific Plan.

The Fashion Valley Shopping Center contains 80 establishments (January 1981), including The Broadway, Buffum's, Robinson's, J.C. Penney and F.W. Woolworth. The total land area for Fashion Valley Center is about 76 acres, with about 1,345,000 square feet of useable retail space. Fashion Valley Center has recently completed an expansion that added Neiman-Marcus and Nordstrom Department stores and other smaller stores. This expansion added about 341,000 square feet of retail space to the original center.

Freestanding Retail

Freestanding retail uses are establishments that generally tend to locate outside of shopping centers, and often comprise "strip" commercial developments along heavily traveled streets. Example of freestanding retail uses in Mission Valley include automobile service stations, restaurants, automobile sales showrooms and furniture stores, all of which encourage or demand the use of the automobile as their only means of accessibility and, by their very nature, discourage or preclude pedestrian access. The existing freestanding retail areas are located west of Mission Center Road along Camino del Rio North, and along Camino del Rio South between SR-163 and Texas Street.

Neighborhood/Convenience Retail

Neighborhood/convenience retail shopping centers provide for the day-to-day needs of residents. They are typically located within or adjacent to residential neighborhoods. The only convenience shopping facility within Mission Valley is Rancho Mission Plaza, located at the intersection of San Diego Mission Road and Rancho Mission Road. This three-acre center contains several establishments that could be considered neighborhood/convenience businesses. Although there is a convenience food store, delicatessen and restaurant, there is no full line supermarket characteristic of a neighborhood shopping center. Residents of Mission Valley must travel to Grantville, Serra Mesa, Linda Vista or other communities for groceries and other daily needs. However, it is anticipated that future residential development, increases in the number of retail and office employees and the needs of residents in adjoining communities (i.e., those residential developments, existing and proposed, along the north side of Friars Road in the Linda Vista and Serra Mesa communities) will create the necessary demand for neighborhood convenience centers complete with supermarkets. These centers, when designed and developed, should be integrated with residential and other supportive development in order to encourage pedestrian patronage and reduce dependence upon vehicles for access.

Commercial-Recreation

Commercial-recreational uses include lodging facilities (hotels and motels), recreational facilities (health clubs, tennis and racquetball courts) and entertainment facilities (theaters and convention centers). Each of these uses generates different rates of average daily vehicle trips, which can be a determining factor in the permitted intensity of any new development.

Lodging Facilities


There are generally two types of lodging facilities in the Valley – low-intensity” resort motels and high-intensity” urban hotels. Low-intensity motels typically have a “room density” of 15 to 30 rooms per net acre, are one or two stories high, and have spacious, open grounds. High-intensity urban hotels are characterized by room densities general of 30 to 65 rooms or more per net acre, are three or more stories high, and have limited open ground. Currently, most lodging facilities are located along Hotel Circle, west of SR-163, however, a number of hotels are proposed, approved, and/or permitted by existing zoning in other areas of the community. At present, there are 3,864 rooms in 17 establishments.

Recreational Facilities


Outdoor recreational uses include the golf courses and athletic fields. The Stardust (206 acres) and River Valley golf courses (33 acres), are the predominant existing land uses in the western portion of the Valley. Athletic fields, leased from the City and Stadium Authority, comprise approximately 13 acres. Indoor recreational facilities include two major health and tennis clubs. These are generally located in the western portion of the Valley; however, one health club and racquetball court is located on Rancho Mission Road, at the eastern end of the Valley.

Entertainment Facilities

Entertainment uses located in the Valley include motion picture theaters, bars and restaurants, and the privately operated convention facility. Currently, four motion picture theaters are located in Mission Valley. Numerous bars and restaurants are located in the Valley, many of which feature live entertainment. These restaurants attract customers from the region as well as nearby hotels and motels. The convention facility located in the Town and Country Hotel complex is used as a concert hall in addition to its regular function. Additionally, the Quarry Falls amphitheater and other outdoor gathering places within Quarry Falls provide other venues for entertainment.



Suggested character of Residential development in Mission Valley



Suggested character of Commercial development at Urban Nodes within the Valley

Commercial-Visitor

Business-Serving Hotels

The commercial-visitor category is primarily intended to provide for establishments catering to the lodging, shopping, or dining needs of visitors/travelers. The permitted uses within the commercial-visitor category are defined in Section 101.0426.1 of the Municipal Code. There currently is only one site located within the Plan which is designated as commercial-visitor, Lots 15 and 16 of the Mission Valley Heights Specific Plan.

This site consists of a limited-service hotel built within Mission Valley Heights Industrial/Business Park. Limited-service hotels are typically built within industrial/business parks to serve the corporate/business traveler, are two stories high, have a room density of 40 to 42 rooms per net acre, and are "limited" in that they do not provide pools/spas, restaurants, or meeting/conference facilities. The limited service hotel is assessed a vehicle trip generation rate of 5 ADTs/room.

Commercial-Office

The commercial-office category generally includes the following: multi-tenant office buildings; single purpose office-administrative facilities; professional-medical buildings; and financial institutions. There are major office clusters located on Hotel Circle North, at the interchanges of I-8 and SR-163, and I-8 and Texas Street, and at the Mission Center-Friars Road interchange. The rest are scattered along Camino del Rio South east of Texas Street, along Friars Road between Qualcomm Way and River Run Drive, and have recently become the predominant new use along Camino del Rio North, east of I-805. Most of the office-administrative developments consist of low-rise complexes.

The area along Camino del Rio South, although designated for commercial-office development also provides an opportunity for residential development as an alternative land use through the provisions of PCD/PRD permits.

Currently, there are approximately 4,000,000 square feet of office space in Mission Valley with additional amounts of square footage approved by rezonings and PCD permits. For purposes of transportation planning related to land use, office uses have been further categorized as: large commercial (over 100,000 square feet of gross floor area); small commercial (less than 100,000 square feet of gross floor area); governmental; and medical. Each of the categories generates different rates of average daily vehicle trips, which will affect the permitted intensity of development.

OBJECTIVES

- Encourage multi-use development in which commercial uses are combined or integrated with other uses.
- Maintain Mission Valley as a regional retail center.

Provide a full range of retail uses.

- Encourage visitor-oriented commercial development.
- Encourage continuation of existing and development of new commercial-recreational uses, particularly along the San Diego River.
- Encourage new commercial development which relates (physically and visually) to existing adjacent development.
- Provide support facilities for commercial and residential uses, including storage space.

PROPOSALS

- Provide neighborhood/convenience commercial facilities near, or as part of, residential developments.
- Utilize planned developments to combine different commercial uses together with other uses.
- Encourage commercial-office development which includes personal services for employees such as cafeterias, barbers, dry cleaners, etc.
- Encourage commercial-recreational uses and other related uses (restaurants, sports facilities and equipment, specialty shops, etc.) to locate adjacent to the river.
- Allow self-storage facilities in appropriate commercial areas and under limited conditions, as described under Development Guidelines.

DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

- Provide parking garages as an integral part of new development utilizing existing ground level spaces for retail activity. These parking garages should be adjacent to public streets.
- Locate neighborhood/convenience uses toward the center of residential areas to promote pedestrian and/or bicycle access and therefore reduce reliance on the automobile.
- Connect various developments (new and existing) by transit, pedestrian, and bicycle routes to discourage intra-Valley auto traffic.
- Provide commercial-retail development in areas that are pedestrian-oriented and have pedestrian linkages to other pedestrian activity areas. Retail-oriented parking facilities should be located in close proximity the developments.
- Provide for self-storage facilities with a planned development permit under the following conditions:
 - The site should be north of Friars Road or south of I-8.

- The site should be isolated from areas of high pedestrian activity, and otherwise located where it will not functionally or visually disrupt other uses, such as remnant or isolated parcels.
- There should not be a proliferation of this use in commercial areas.
- The maximum usable area of the site should be two acres.
- The development should be consistent with its surroundings and be similar in appearance to other permitted uses in the zone, such as office, hotel, or retail.
- Loading areas should be internal to the structure.
- No outside storage should be permitted.
- Hours of operation should be limited.
- Businesses should not be permitted to operate within the storage spaces.
- Encourage multiple uses on the site, such as retail on the front or upper floors.
- The development should be consistent with all other recommendations of this Plan.
- This use when in commercially designated areas requires a planned development permit.

INDUSTRIAL

Industrial land uses in the Valley include a pipeline tank farm, a newspaper publishing facility, industrially zoned areas north of Friars Road, and small group of industrial and distributional uses located near the Mission San Diego de Alcala.

The San Diego Pipeline Company owns a high-pressure underground pipeline that brings liquid fuels from Norwalk, California to the petroleum tank farm located at Friars Road and I-15. Most of this facility lies north of Friars Road, in the Serra Mesa community planning area.

The San Diego Union Tribune plant, located at the northwest quadrant of I-8 and SR-163, is a combined administrative and industrial distribution facility. In terms of strict land use classification, a newspaper plant is industrial. However, it may be permitted in any zone if a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is granted by the City Council.

There are two areas north of Friars Road zoned for industrial development. One area is immediately east of I-805. The second area, Mission Valley Heights Specific Plan Area, lies between Mission Center Road and SR-163. A portion of this area has already developed in commercial-office; a portion has been approved for a —limited service” hotel serving the surrounding industrial business park uses, while other portions have been approved for industrial park.

The cluster of industrial, distributional, and —heavy” commercial uses located at San Diego Mission and Rancho Roads has diminished in recent years. Remaining are a water bottling plant and a precision valve manufacturer.

SAND AND GRAVEL

Sand and gravel operations and related activities once occupied about 596 acres within Mission Valley, including 240 acres undergoing annexation. Three firms operated sand and gravel extraction facilities in Mission Valley at that time: Fenton, Conrock and Hazard. Mining sites operated by Fenton and Hazard have since developed in accordance with this Community Plan. The Conrock operation has been taken over by Vulcan Materials Company.

The last remaining resource extractions are being operated by Vulcan Materials Company. The Vulcan Materials Company operation covers about 209 acres, located in the vicinity of Friars Road and Qualcomm Way. It is operating under City CUP No. 5073 (as amended and extended) and City CUP NO. 82-0315. The asphalt and concrete plan operations associated with the Vulcan site will be relocated to the southeast corner of Quarry Falls as an interim use.

Mission Valley contains three types of aggregate deposits: lower San Diego River alluvial material, predominately sand; Stadium conglomerates, which yield almost exclusively coarse aggregate before crushing; and metavolcanics which must be crushed in order to be used as aggregate material. Of the total resources, the conglomerates are the most abundant. Of 6,545 million tons of total resources, 177 million tons are acceptable grades of sand and 6,368 million tons are acceptable grades of gravel. A calculated 152 million tons of aggregate resources were once associated within the non-urbanized areas of Mission Valley (“Mineral Land Classification of the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region,” California Division of Mines and Geology, 1981).

OBJECTIVES

- Continue sand and gravel operations in the community until depletion is reached.
- Require and enforce land reclamation which is consistent with municipal, state and federal guidelines during and following termination of extraction activity for subsequent reuse.

PROPOSALS

- Retain and maintain those industrial uses which will be compatible with the commercial and residential development of the Valley.
- Allow existing sand and gravel operations and related activities to continue until depletion of aggregate resources is reached. This can be achieved by renewing, and when necessary, amending existing permits. The existing review procedure should ensure compliance with all conditions.

RE-USE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

1. Relationship to Existing Development

- All development should be oriented away from the mesa.
- New development should be a logical extension of existing land use.
- Support facilities needed for new development should be provided within the new development or in adjacent lowlands. No additional burden should be placed on existing schools, parks and local shopping facilities on the mesa.
- Streets serving new development should be connected to the road network, and not to major streets serving residential areas on the mesa.

2. Environmental Problems

- Environmentally sensitive issues should be addressed in each precise development plan. These should include but not be limited to the following: air quality; flood hazards; high quality habitats and adjacent open space systems; hillside preservation and conservation; carrying capacity of the local street system and the impact of Jack Murphy San Diego Stadium.
- Ideally, depletion or termination of mining operations should be reached in any given extraction area before re-use begins. If this proves infeasible, new development should be sufficiently buffered from continued mining operations to meet existing noise and air pollution standards; present no danger to public health, safety and welfare; and minimize environmental conflicts.
- The use of Planned Developments and Specific Plans should be encouraged to assure the highest quality of development and sensitive treatment of the environment.



Suggested character of Industrial/Business Park development

3. Land Use Guidelines

- When land within an existing sand and gravel extraction area is proposed for urban development, multiple land uses should be considered and processed consistent with the land use and development guidelines of the Multiple Use Development Option of this Plan.

4. Implementation Guidelines

- New development should be logical and cohesive, not piecemeal or fragmented.
- If two or more entities are operating in a given extraction area, they should coordinate their activities to assure logical, cohesive development and minimize environmental conflicts.
- In recognition of the large areas involved, changing economic conditions, and the extensive time frames necessary for complete re-use, Specific Plans for parcels of ten or more acres and Planned Developments for parcels of less than ten acres should be utilized to process development plans. Development plans should include specific land use allocations, development intensities (floor area square footage for office and retail uses, number of guest rooms for hotels, and number of dwelling units for residential development), complete street networks, and, if applicable, phasing programs.

DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

- Apply appropriate land reclamation measures to all sand and gravel operations. These reclamation measures should begin before the termination of extractive activities. Ensure compliance with the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975, City ordinances, and all subsequent legislation concerned with the reclamation and rehabilitation of mined land. This will be achieved by requiring the approval of a reclamation plan for all nature resource operations. The following criteria are proposed to guide the evaluation of such reclamation plans:
 - a. Contour finished slopes so they blend into the surrounding terrain.
 - b. Control erosion caused by storm runoff and other water resources.
 - c. Plant and seed recontoured slopes with local native-drought resistant trees, shrubs and grasses. If possible, the planting pattern should be in keeping with the native growth on adjacent unmined lands or with that of other hillside areas within the valley.
 - d. Create water areas wherever possible to further enhance the greenbelt flood control concept. This will enhance the unique setting of the floodplain area and will help to replace riparian habitat areas, lost elsewhere in the Valley.
- Develop feasible land use conversion plans in the form of specific plans for the reuse of terminated sand and gravel operations and related lands. Because these lands which are presently undergoing extraction are significant in terms of acreage, it is anticipated that they may develop under the multiple use development option.

MULTIPLE USE DEVELOPMENT OPTION

A “multi-use development” means a relatively large-scale real estate project characterized by the following, which are implemented as part of a comprehensive development plan. It is not the intent of this Community Plan that these elements occur at the parcel level.

- Two or more significant revenue-producing uses (such as retail, office, residential (either as rentals or condominiums), hotel/motel, and/or recreation – which, in well-planned projects, are financially supportive of the other uses.
- Significant functional and physical integration of project components including uninterrupted pedestrian connections, if available, to adjacent developments.
- Development in conformance with a coherent plan (which frequently stipulates the type and scale of uses, permitted densities and related items), and
- Public transit opportunities and commitments.

This definition clearly differentiates multi-use developments from other forms of land use and also identifies “common denominator” characteristics of multi-use projects with a minimum number of criteria.

These two or more uses should be significant (e.g., retail should be more than site-serving convenience facilities) and revenue-producing (e.g., to amortize cost over time and provide a reasonable return). In most multi-use projects, revenue-producing uses consist of retail, office, residential, and/or transient (hotel/motel) facilities. Two or more revenue-producing uses in the project usually imply large-scale development.

Another defining characteristic of multi-use development is a significant physical and functional integration of project components. All project components should be interconnected by pedestrian ways, although (physically) this integration can take many forms:

- Vertical mixing of project components into a single structure, often occupying only one parcel.
- Careful positioning of key project components around centrally located focal points (e.g., a shopping gallery or hotel containing a large central court).
- Interconnection of project components through an elaborate pedestrian circulation network (e.g., subterranean concourses, walkways and plazas at grade and aerial bridges between buildings), or
- Extensive use of escalators, elevators, moving sidewalks, bridges, and other mechanical or structural means of facilitating horizontal and vertical movement by pedestrians.
- Permanent pedestrian linkages to public transit systems.

Whatever their form, “coherent” plans for multi-use development typically set forth at a minimum the types and scale of land uses, permitted densities, and those areas on the site where different kinds of development are to occur. Plans for projects entailing substantial public improvements should specify respective responsibilities and financial obligations (e.g., for provision of on-site and off-site improvements) on the part of public and private sectors. These documents guide – and in the case of some projects, govern – development as to scale, timing, type, and density of buildings and relationships among project components, open space and public improvements on the site. This distinguishes such projects from unplanned mixing of uses often resulting from the separate, unrelated actions of several different developers. In Mission Valley, multi-use projects (in the form of specific plans) are proposed for the majority of the large undeveloped parcels and redevelopable areas.

There are four different revenue-producing land uses in Mission Valley. They are: 1) Commercially-Retail; 2) Commercial-Office; 3) Commercial-Recreation; 4) Residential. Any two of these four revenue-producing uses in a single land development project create a “multi-use” development and are usually found in a large-scale project.

Multi-use projects may also include separate structures on separate parcels of land providing that the creation of parcels and designation of uses is the result of a plan approved for the entire designated project and it meets the basic criteria for a multi-use project.

Multi-use is an option for developers. It may be applied for through a PDP Permit or through a Specific Plan. In general, the Specific Plan should be used for projects of ten or more acres. This may vary, however, and should be determined on a case-by-case basis. An application for a multi-use project should include:

- Location, scale, size, and proposed use of all buildings.
- A schematic plan of pedestrian areas (plazas, courtyard, etc.) and interconnecting usable paths.
- Vehicular access plan including streets, parking, goods delivery and linkages to the public circulation system (freeways and major surface streets).
- A landscaping plan to tie the various uses together.
- A financing and maintenance plan for any and all public facilities or improvements.
- Linkages to public transit system.
- Other land use controls as may be required to conform to the urban design guidelines included in the **Urban Design Element** of this Plan.

This multi-use option is intended to encourage comprehensive developments which will minimize the need for an over reliance on automobile access and emphasize pedestrian orientation and proximity to public transit. Mixed-use activity centers that are pedestrian-friendly, centers of community, and linked to the regional transit system are encouraged within larger multi-use projects, creating opportunities for villages within the community plan area. Village development is pedestrian-friendly and characterized by inviting, accessible, and attractive streets and public spaces. These spaces may consist of: public parks or plazas, community meeting spaces, outdoor gathering spaces, passive or active open space areas that contain desirable landscape and streetscape design amenities, or outdoor dining and market activities.

Urban villages respond to the needs of larger, mixed-use communities of compact development of varying intensities and densities. This type of multi-use development serves a broad range of retail demand, combining opportunities that meet the day-to-day needs of neighborhood residents (markets, drugstores, etc.), as well as upscale shopping for the surrounding communities. Residential and office development, typically built above retail, is also a common component of the urban village and provides a higher degree of walkability and security than traditional retail centers. A critical mass of small to medium scale retail uses, including dining and entertainment elements that activate the streetscapes, support a highly amenitized town center. Such amenities include public plazas, water features, artwork, and enhanced landscaping and lighting to create a sense of place and connection for residents and visitors. An increased intensity and mix of retail may support the construction of structured parking, allowing for greater design emphasis on the pedestrian experience and increasing the viability of transit to serve the village and community.

Density bonuses may be given to such developments if they can incorporate some of the bonus provisions included in the **Development Intensity Element**. Additional development intensity based upon increased traffic generation may be permitted if it can be shown that: 1) the additional traffic generation can be accommodated; or 2) additional improvements can be made to the circulation/transportation system which will accommodate the increase in traffic generation.

OBJECTIVE

- Provide new development and redevelopment which integrates various land uses into coordinated multi-use projects.

PROPOSALS

- Include a variety of revenue-producing uses in each large-scale multi-use project.
- Ensure functional and physical integration of the various uses within the multi-use project and between adjacent uses or projects.
- Combine uses within a multi-use project to create a 24-hour cycle of activity.

Figure 6
Removed by
City Council
April 21, 1992

Figure 7
Removed by
City Council
April 21, 1992

Figure 8
Removed by
City Council
April 21, 1992


Figure 9
Removed by
City Council
April 21, 1992



These areas are covered by adopted specific plans. Refer to the identified specific plan document for more detailed information.



The areas indicated are those most likely to develop under the multiple use option. Large and multiple-parcel projects should use the specific plan/PCD mechanism, and smaller projects should use the PCD permit for implementation.




Specific Plan/Multiple Use Areas
Mission Valley Community Plan

10
FIGURE

DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

- Multi-use development projects should include all of the following design elements:
 - a. Separate vehicular access and delivery loading zones.
 - b. People-oriented spaces.
 - c. Compatibility with adjacent development.
 - d. Uninterrupted pedestrian connections.
- Encourage activity on a 24-hour basis within a development project by including one or more of the following types of uses in addition to office and retail:
 - a. Restaurants.
 - b. Theatres.
 - c. Hotels.
 - d. Residences.
- Multi-use development projects should be processed and evaluated through the use of PCD permits and/or Specific Plans.



Conceptual design for a mixed use or highly integrated multiple use development