

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS		
<p>1. <u>Balboa Avenue</u></p> <p>Balboa Avenue should be widened from a four-lane collector to a six-lane major from Clairemont Drive to the community's western boundary at Interstate 5. The six-lane major should continue just east of the intersection at Clairemont Drive to provide a transition to the four-lane major.</p>	<p>The Mobility Element of the General Plan overall recommends designing or redesigning the street network for efficiency and to reduce negative effects to community character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section E. Transportation Demand Management goal: Improved performance and efficiency of the street and freeway system, by means other than roadway widening or construction. • ME-C.3.d - Where possible, design or redesign the street network, so that wide arterial streets do not form barriers to pedestrian traffic and community cohesiveness 	<p>Recommendations for widening do not coincide with the community's vision to emphasize active transportation (e.g. biking, walking & transit) however recommendations such as this will need to be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis.</p> <p>In areas where roadways traverse open space areas, widening would not be recommended in order to prevent encroachment into open space.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>2. <u>Genesee Avenue</u></p> <p>a. Standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk should be constructed on Genesee Avenue from Sauk Avenue to north of Derrick Drive.</p> <p>b. Genesee Avenue should be widened from five to six lanes between Derrick Drive and Mt. Alifan Drive as adjacent property develops or redevelops.</p> <p>c. Genesee Avenue should be widened to four lanes with bike lanes from Boyd Avenue south to the community boundary.</p>	<p>The Mobility Element of the General Plan overall recommends designing or redesigning the street network for efficiency and to reduce negative effects to community character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section E. Transportation Demand Management goal: Improved performance and efficiency of the street and freeway system, by means other than roadway widening or construction. • ME-C.3.d - Where possible, design or redesign the street network, so that wide arterial streets do not form barriers to pedestrian traffic and community cohesiveness • ME-C.1. - Identify the general location and extent of streets, sidewalks, trails, and other transportation facilities and services needed to enhance mobility in community plans. 	<p>Recommendations for widening do not coincide with the community's vision to emphasize active transportation (e.g. biking, walking & transit) however recommendations such as this will need to be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis.</p> <p>Standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk is still needed on the eastside of Genesee Ave. from Chateau Dr. and Sauk Ave.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Improve the east side of Genesee Ave between Chateau Dr. and Sauk Ave. with standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>3. <u>Mt. Abernathy Avenue</u></p> <p>The operating level of service at the intersection of Mt. Abernathy Avenue, Mt. Alifan Drive and Balboa Avenue should be improved by providing dual left-turn lanes for southbound to eastbound traffic. This will require reconstruction of the median on the north side of the intersection (Mt. Abernathy Avenue), modification of the traffic signal, and some restriping.</p>	<p>ME-C.4. Improve operations and maintenance on City streets and sidewalks.</p>	<p>This policy has been implemented. There are currently two dual left turns from Mt. Abernathy Ave. that head eastbound on Balboa Ave.</p>
<p>4. <u>Mt. Alifan Drive</u></p> <p>Mount Alifan Drive should be widened to a four-lane collector street between Mt. Acadia Boulevard and Genesee Avenue. This will require the acquisition of additional right-of-way as development or redevelopment occurs.</p>	<p>The Mobility Element of the General Plan overall recommends designing or redesigning the street network for efficiency and to reduce negative effects to community character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section E. Transportation Demand Management goal: Improved performance and efficiency of the street and freeway system, by means other than roadway widening or construction. • ME-C.3.d - Where possible, design or redesign the street network, so that wide arterial streets do not form barriers to pedestrian traffic and community cohesiveness 	<p>Recommendations for widening do not coincide with the community's vision to emphasize active transportation (e.g. biking, walking & transit) however recommendations such as this</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

<p style="text-align: center;">What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?</p>
<p>5. <u>Morena Boulevard</u></p> <p>Morena Boulevard should be restriped to three lanes (two through lanes and a center, two-way turn lane) between West Morena Boulevard (north intersection) and Tecolote Road. Access from Morena Boulevard to Interstate 5 should be improved. The current access route takes motorists from Morena to Clairemont Drive via Ingulf Street, impacting residential neighborhoods. Direct freeway access from Morena Boulevard to Interstate 5 should be provided. A direct ramp from Morena Boulevard to Clairemont Drive should be developed to provide direct access to Interstate 5. This would reduce the through traffic on adjacent residential streets attempting to access the freeway.</p>	<p>ME-C.1. Identify the general location and extent of streets, sidewalks, trails, and other transportation facilities and services needed to enhance mobility in community plans.</p> <p>ME-C.4. Improve operations and maintenance on City streets and sidewalks.</p>	<p>Recommendations to reconfigure right-of-way will need to be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>6. <u>Knoxville Street</u></p> <p>Knoxville Street should be a through street connecting Morena Boulevard to West Morena Boulevard. This connection will improve circulation by providing a connection between the community and a major street while bypassing the Morena Boulevard- Tecolote Road intersection. The Knoxville connection will also require the widening of Morena Boulevard from Knoxville Street to Tecolote Road, including the bridge over Tecolote Creek, to provide two northbound turn lanes, one southbound left-turn lane, one southbound through/right-turn lane, and an exclusive southbound right-turn lane</p>	<p>The Mobility Element of the General Plan overall recommends designing or redesigning the street network for efficiency and to reduce negative effects to community character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section E. Transportation Demand Management goal: Improved performance and efficiency of the street and freeway system, by means other than roadway widening or construction. • ME-C.3.d - Where possible, design or redesign the street network, so that wide arterial streets do not form barriers to pedestrian traffic and community cohesiveness <p>ME-C.1. Identify the general location and extent of streets, sidewalks, trails, and other transportation facilities and services needed to enhance mobility in community plans.</p> <p>ME-C.4. Improve operations and maintenance on City streets and sidewalks.</p>	<p>Recommendations to reconfigure or widen right-of-way will or need to be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis.</p> <p>A policy recommending that Knoxville St. be a through street will carried over into the new community plan.</p> <p><u>Potential policies could include:</u> Improve traffic circulation in the vicinity of Tecolote Creek by improving Knoxville St as a through-street connecting Morena Blvd and West Morena Blvd.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONIS FOR DESIGN OF MAJOR AND COLLECTOR STREETS		
<p>1. <u>Street Design</u></p> <p>Streets should be designed to physically incorporate all transportation modes, including automobile, pedestrian, bicycles and public transit.</p>	<p>ME-C.3. Design an interconnected street network within and between communities, which includes pedestrian and bicycle access, while minimizing landform and community character impacts.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the new community plan to encourage a multi-modal transportation network in the community. However, the plan will also look at emphasizing certain modes on streets as opposed to striving for incorporating all transportation modes on all streets.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could be revised as:</u> Design streets to physically incorporate all transportation modes where it can be done safely and efficiently.</p>
<p>2. <u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Streets in Clairemont Mesa should be enhanced by providing landscaping that would serve as a buffer between the street and adjacent land use in accordance with the Citywide Landscaping Ordinance. Landscaping in the public right-of-way should be incorporated along portions of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Clairemont Drive, and Genesee Avenue.</p>	<p>ME-C.6.i. - Employ landscaping to enhance or screen views as appropriate.</p>	<p>This recommendation would be addressed in the Urban Design Element where specific streets will be identified to provide landscape buffers between the street and adjacent land uses.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could be revised as:</u> Enhance streets along portions of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Clairemont Drive, and Genesee Avenue by providing landscaping to serve as a buffer between buffer between the street and adjacent land uses</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>3. <u>Street Signals</u></p> <p>The following intersections should be signalized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clairemont Drive and Merrimac Avenue b. Morena Boulevard and West Morena Boulevard (northern intersection) c. Linda Vista Road and Stalmer Street d. Mount Aguilar Drive and Mount Alifan Drive 	<p>ME-C.4. Improve operations and maintenance on City streets and sidewalks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Regularly optimize traffic signal timing and coordination to improve circulation. Implement new signal and intersection technologies that improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular safety while improving overall circulation. 	<p>Recommendations have been implemented. All intersections are currently signalized.</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRAFFIC STUDY		
<p>1. <u>Community Core</u></p> <p>The estimated redevelopment potential of the community core is an additional 119,321 square feet of retail and 31,000 square feet of commercial offices. If new development exceeds the estimated redevelopment potential of the community core, a traffic study should be submitted in order to mitigate any potential traffic impacts to Balboa Avenue and Genesee Avenue.</p>	<p>ME-C.8.b. - Consider the results of site-specific studies or reports that justify vehicle trip reductions.</p>	<p>This recommendation would not be included in the new community plan. Instead, permit conditions will be researched to see what types of traffic mitigation has been completed. Any needed traffic mitigation will be analyzed and included as a new recommendation in the plan.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSIT STOPS		
<p>1. <u>Facilities and Services</u></p> <p>Transit stops should provide passenger shelters, public telephones and bus schedules in order to provide a more convenient service and to improve their visibility.</p>	<p>ME-B.3. Design and locate transit stops/stations to provide convenient access to high activity/density areas, respect neighborhood and activity center character, implement community plan recommendations, enhance the users' personal experience of each neighborhood/center, and contain comfortable walk and wait environments for customers</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element to address any future transit stops or upgrades.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Provide passenger shelters and bus schedules to improve visibility and provide convenient information at existing and future transit stops.</p>
<p>2. <u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Transit stops should be enhanced with landscaping, where feasible.</p>	<p>ME-C.6.j. - Select landscape designs and materials on the basis of their aesthetic qualities, compatibility with the surrounding area, and low water demand and maintenance requirements.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element and Urban Design Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Utilize drought tolerant landscaping to enhance transit stops.</p>
<p>3. <u>Maintenance</u></p> <p>Advertising spaces should be leased in transit shelters to subsidize the cost of maintaining the facility.</p>	<p>The General Plan does not address subsidizing costs for transit shelters via advertising.</p>	<p>The community plan would not provide recommendations regarding how other agencies (MTS) advertises on their facilities to subsidize their operations.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LRT STATIONS		
<p>As development or redevelopment occurs along the LRT corridor, all development proposals should be reviewed by the MTDB and the San Diego Association of Governments to reserve, if necessary, land for LRT right-of-way and stations.</p> <p>1. <u>Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard</u> The transit station near the intersection of Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard should be four to six acres to accommodate automobile and bicycle parking, connections to bus routes, passenger loading zones and a retail convenience center. A parking structure should be incorporated into the design of the station in order to increase on-site parking opportunities.</p>	<p>ME-I.1. Support commuter, intercity and high-speed passenger rail transportation projects that will provide travel options and improve the quality of service for intercity travel while minimizing impacts to communities.</p>	<p>Balboa Avenue /Morena Boulevard Station is already under construction.</p>
<p>2. <u>Clairemont Drive and Jutland Drive</u> Transit stations near the intersections of Clairemont Drive and Jutland Drive along Morena Boulevard should be two to three acres to accommodate parking. An intensification of multifamily development and commercial and industrial uses, adjacent to the transit station, just south of Tecolote Road on Morena Boulevard, is recommended</p>	<p>ME-G.1. Provide and manage parking so that it is reasonably available when and where it is needed.</p>	<p>The Clairemont Dr/Morena Blvd Station is already under construction. The Jutland Drive station was previously removed as a trolley station.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Support an additional trolley station at Jutland Drive along Morena Boulevard to support industrial employment uses in the northwestern portion of the community based on ridership, service efficiencies, and discussion with MTS.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>3. <u>Connection to Bus Service</u></p> <p>Bus service and bikeways should be routed to serve LRT stations. Transfer facilities should also be incorporated into the site and station design.</p>	<p>ME-F.5. Increase the number of bicycle-transit trips by coordinating with transit agencies to provide safe routes to transit stops and stations, to provide secure bicycle parking facilities, and to accommodate bicycles on transit vehicles.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Promote and increase opportunities to connect all modes of transportation to the trolley through connections that include designated bus corridors equipped with transit priority treatments and multi-use bike paths parallel to major roadways.</p>
<p>4. <u>DART/Park-and-Ride</u></p> <p>The MTDB should study the feasibility of DART (Direct Access to Regional Transit) and park-and-ride opportunities to serve commuters, via Balboa Avenue and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard in order to minimize traffic congestion and to provide a direct link to LRT stations.</p>	<p>ME-B.4. Collaborate with regional agencies to evaluate the need for, and design of, park-and-ride spaces at transit stations based on the character of the neighborhood, community plan recommendations, and the stations role in the regional transit system</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Support local access to regional transit and park and ride opportunities to serve commuters, via Balboa Avenue and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard in order to minimize traffic congestion and to provide a direct link to the trolley stations.</p>
<p>5. <u>Station Facilities and Services</u></p> <p>a. Shelters with benches should be provided for passenger waiting areas.</p> <p>b. LRT stops should include graphics identifying LRT routes and schedules.</p> <p>c. Bicycle racks and lockers should be provided at each LRT stop.</p> <p>d. Landscaping should be consistent with citywide landscaping guidelines.</p>	<p>ME-B.3. Design and locate transit stops/stations to provide convenient access to high activity/density areas, respect neighborhood and activity center character, implement community plan recommendations, enhance the users' personal experience of each neighborhood/center, and contain comfortable walk and wait environments for customers</p>	<p>The Mid-coast Trolley Stations are currently under construction.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BIKEWAY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS		
<p>1. Bikeway System</p> <p>The recommended bikeway system for Clairemont Mesa as shown on Figure 26 should be completed to encourage bicycling as an alternative mode of transportation. The development of the bikeways south of State Route 52 and the bicycle lanes along Genesee Avenue should be a high priority.</p>	<p>ME-F.2. a. thru c. - Identify and implement a network of bikeways that are feasible, fundable, and serve bicyclists' needs, especially for travel to employment centers, village centers, schools, commercial districts, transit stations, and institutions.</p>	<p>Specific bikeway recommendations will be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis and evaluation of street cross sections</p>
<p>2. San Clemente Bikeway</p> <p>The bikeway from Interstate 805 to Interstate 5 should be located at the northern boundary of Marian Bear Memorial Park, adjacent to the Caltrans right-of-way. The alignment of the bikeway should not disrupt the biological resources of the park.</p>	<p>ME-F.2. a. thru c. - Identify and implement a network of bikeways that are feasible, fundable, and serve bicyclists' needs, especially for travel to employment centers, village centers, schools, commercial districts, transit stations, and institutions.</p>	<p>Specific bikeway recommendations will be reevaluated upon completion of the traffic model analysis and evaluation of street cross sections.</p>
<p>3. Signs</p> <p>Bikeway signs should include destination sign plates that indicate that major activity centers will be reached via the bikeway system (i.e. Mesa College, Mission Bay Park and downtown San Diego).</p>	<p>ME-C.6.k. - Utilize signs, lights, furniture, and other accessories suitable for the location.</p>	<p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Incorporate a community-wide wayfinding sign program that guides pedestrians, bicyclists as well as motorists to major activity centers in the community. The wayfinding program should also provide directions to other destinations outside of the community (e.g. Mesa College, Mission Bay Park, and Downtown San Diego) via the local and regional bike network.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>4. Bicycle Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bicycle racks should be placed in visible location near building entrances, but should not impede pedestrian circulation. b. Bicycle racks should be of a secure and stable design. c. Bicycle parking signs should be used to identify bicycle parking areas. b. Bicycle lockers should be provided for employees who commute to work by bicycle. 	<p>ME-F.4. Provide safe, convenient, and adequate short- and long-term bicycle parking facilities and other bicycle amenities for employment, retail, multifamily housing, schools and colleges, and transit facility uses.</p>	<p>These policies will be carried over into the new plan.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Facilitate bicycle use as a convenient transportation option by incorporating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bicycle racks should be placed in visible location near building entrances, but should not impede pedestrian circulation. b. Bicycle racks should be of a secure and stable design. c. Bicycle parking signs should be used to identify bicycle parking areas. b. Bicycle lockers should be provided for employees who commute to work by bicycle.
<p>5. LRT Connection Bikeways should be routed to serve LRT stations and incorporate bicycle racks and lockers at each LRT stop.</p>	<p>ME-F.4. Provide safe, convenient, and adequate short- and long-term bicycle parking facilities and other bicycle amenities for employment, retail, multifamily housing, schools and colleges, and transit facility uses.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the new plan to facilitate bicycle connectivity to the trolley. The new trolley stops will include bike storage features.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Promote Interconnectivity between the community's bike network and the trolley stations.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENTRYWAYS		
<p>1. <u>Community Identification Signs</u></p> <p>With the streetscape improvements, there should be improved community identification signs at entry points to establish a sense of community pride. Signage should therefore include the name of the community and a community logo. A community logo should be developed and incorporated into the sign program to establish community identity. The logo should represent the community's unique assets.</p>	<p>UD-F.1.c - Reinforce community pride and identity by encouraging artworks and cultural amenities that celebrate the unique cultural, ethnic, historical, or other attributes of each unique neighborhood.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element to promote community gateways. There are currently established community identification signs at both ends of Balboa Avenue.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Incorporate community identification signs at entry points to the community to establish a sense of community pride and include a community logo that is representative of the community's unique assets.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

<p>2. <u>Points of Entry</u></p> <p>The following entryways have been identified for landscaping and sign improvements in order to enhance the community's image (Figure 28):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The intersection of Regents Road and State Route 52 should have a park entry with a community identification sign that will be consistent with the proposed Master Plan for Marian Bear Memorial Park. b. The intersection of Genesee Avenue and State Route 52 should have a park entry with a community identification sign that will be consistent with the proposed Master Plan for Marian Bear Memorial Park. c. The intersection of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard and I-805 should have landscaping in the public right-of-way along the Boulevard extending from I-805 to the intersection of Luna Avenue and Regents Road. New landscaping should include plant species that are consistent with the existing landscaping on Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. There should also be a community identification sign located in the public right-of-way at this intersection. d. The intersection of Balboa Avenue and I-805 preferably located in the Caltrans public right-of-way. 	<p>(See previous)</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to community gateways and recommending specific locations for community identity signs.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Include community identification signs along with landscaping at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The intersections where Regents Road and Genesee Avenue intersect State Route 52 should have a park entry with a community identification sign that will be consistent with the proposed Master Plan for Marian Bear Memorial Park. b. The intersection of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard and Interstate 805 should have landscaping in the public right-of-way along the Boulevard extending from Interstate 805 to the intersection of Luna Avenue and Regents Road. New landscaping should include plant species that are consistent with the existing landscaping on Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. c. The intersection of Balboa Avenue and Interstate 805 preferably located in the Caltrans public right-of-way. d. The intersection of Mesa College Drive and Linda Vista Road (near the State Route 163 off-ramp). e. The intersection of Tecolote Road and Interstate 5 is the gateway into Tecolote Canyon Natural
---	-----------------------	---

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

<p>e. The intersection of Mesa College Drive and Linda Vista Road (near the State Route-163 off-ramp) should have improved landscaping in the public right-of-way and/or a community identification sign.</p> <p>f. The intersection of Tecolote Road and I-5 is the gateway into Tecolote Canyon Natural Park and should therefore have improved landscaping along the perimeter of Tecolote Creek channel and/or a community identification sign located in the public right-of-way. Any improvements to this intersection, however, should be coordinated with the development of the future LRT stop.</p> <p>g. The intersection of Clairemont Drive and I-5 should have improved landscaping in the public right-of-way with a community identification sign. City improvements to this intersection however, should be coordinated with the development of the future LRT stop.</p> <p>h. The intersection of Balboa Avenue and I-5 should have improved landscaping in the public right-of-way with a community identification sign. Any improvements to this intersection, however, should be coordinated with the development of the future LRT stop.</p>	<p>(See previous)</p>	<p>Park and should therefore have improved landscaping along the perimeter of Tecolote Creek channel and/or a community identification sign located in the public right-of-way.</p> <p>h. The intersection of Clairemont Drive and I-5.</p> <p>i. The intersection of Balboa Avenue and I-5</p>
--	-----------------------	---

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STREETSAPES		
1. Existing street trees should be preserved and the quality of landscaping in the public right-of-way and front yards should be improved (Figure 28).	UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.	This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm. <u>Potential policy could include:</u> Preserve existing street trees and the improve the quality of landscaping in the public right of way.
2. Development along Morena Boulevard, north of Balboa Avenue should continue the current landscaping theme of lawns, pine trees and eucalyptus trees in the front yard setback.	UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.	This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm. <u>Potential policy could include:</u> Incorporate a theme of drought tolerant landscaping which maintains the pine trees and eucalyptus trees in the front yard setback along Morena Boulevard, north of Balboa Avenue.
3. Future landscaping along Santa Fe Street should establish a theme that consists of tall trees and bushes to buffer development from I-5.	UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.	This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm. <u>Potential policy could include:</u> Establish a landscaping theme along Santa Fe Street that includes tall trees and bushes that will buffer development from Interstate 5.
4. There should be landscaping in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb, along Clairemont Drive, as well as in the median from Joplin Avenue to Iroquois Avenue (Figure 31, Street Section for Clairemont Drive). New	UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.	This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>landscaping should include plant species consistent with existing landscaping on Clairemont Drive.</p>		<p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Include landscaping in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb, along Clairemont Drive, as well as in the median from Joplin Avenue to Iroquois Avenue. New landscaping should include plant species consistent with existing landscaping on Clairemont Drive.</p>
<p>5. There should be landscaping in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb, along Genesee Avenue, as well as in the median from Chateau Drive to Boyd Avenue to emphasize and visually enhance Clairemont Mesa's community core (Figure 31, Street Section for Genesee Avenue). New landscaping should include plant species consistent with existing landscaping on Genesee Avenue.</p>	<p>UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Include landscaping in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb, along Genesee Avenue, as well as in the median from Chateau Drive to Boyd Avenue to emphasize and visually enhance Clairemont Mesa's Community Core. New landscaping should include plant species consistent with existing landscaping on Genesee Avenue.</p>
<p>6. As redevelopment occurs on Cowley Way, the existing landscaping theme of tall mature trees should remain in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb (Figure 31, Typical Street Section) and continue from Field Street to Tomahawk Lane.</p>	<p>UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Maintain the existing landscaping theme of tall mature trees within the landscape parkway along Cowley Way from Tomahawk Lane to Field Street.</p>
<p>7. As redevelopment occurs in the Community Core, a landscaping theme should be established to visually enhance the streetscape. Trees</p>	<p>UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>should be planted at entrances to the core area and the parking areas should be landscaped.</p>	<p>provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.</p>	<p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Establish and maintain a landscaping theme that visually enhances the streetscape and includes landscaped parking areas and street trees planted at the entrances to the Community Core area.</p>
<p>8. With the introduction of the LRT system parallel to Interstate 5 and the railroad, the City of San Diego, MTDB, Amtrak and Caltrans should coordinate their efforts and establish a Landscaping Improvements Program to buffer adjacent land uses from the freeway and railroad tracks. The Improvements Program should extend from the intersection of Morena Boulevard and Tecolote Road to the northern terminus of Santa Fe Street.</p>	<p>UD-A.8.i - Demarcate public, semi-public/private, and private spaces clearly through the use of landscape, walls, fences, gates, pavement treatment, signs, and other methods to denote boundaries and/or buffers.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Develop a Landscaping Improvements Program to buffer adjacent land uses from the freeway and railroad tracks from the intersection of Morena Boulevard and Tecolote Road to the northern terminus of Santa Fe Street, in coordination with City of San Diego, MTDB, Amtrak and Caltrans.</p>
<p>9. There should be landscaping in the public right-of-way, between the sidewalk and curb, along Balboa Avenue from Interstate 805 to Genesee Avenue (Figure 31, Typical Street Section). New landscaping should be consistent with the existing landscaping on Balboa Avenue, west of Clairemont Drive.</p>	<p>UD-A.6. Create street frontages with architectural and landscape interest to provide visual appeal to the streetscape and enhance the pedestrian experience.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Urban Design Element related to enhancement of the public realm.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Maintain landscaped parkways along Balboa Avenue from Interstate 805 to Genesee Avenue. Any new landscaping should be consistent with the existing landscaping on Balboa Avenue, west of Clairemont Drive.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION		
<p>1. Pedestrian Walkways - Design</p> <p>a. Exclusive pedestrian walkways separate from automobile traffic should be provided, whenever possible. Pedestrian walkways separate from automobile traffic should be provided for access from neighborhoods to open space areas, public parks, community centers and school sites.</p>	<p>UD-B.5.d. - Emphasize the provision of high-quality pedestrian and bikeway connections to transit stops/stations, village centers, and local schools.</p>	<p>This recommendation will be carried over into the Mobility Element related to walkability.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Provide exclusive pedestrian walkways separate from automobile traffic that provide access from neighborhoods to open space areas, public parks, community centers and school sites</p>
<p>b. Planned Residential Development projects and Planned Commercial Development projects should include an internal pedestrian system that provides linkages to adjacent properties and public streets.</p>	<p>ME-A.7. Improve walkability through the pedestrian-oriented design of public and private projects in areas where higher levels of pedestrian activity are present or desired.</p> <p>ME-A.6.a.2. - Provide convenient pedestrian connections between land uses, including shortcuts where possible.</p>	<p>The community plan will not differentiate between development permit processes.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could Include:</u> Include an internal pedestrian system with new commercial and residential development that provides linkages to adjacent properties and public streets.</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAYS		
<p>1. <u>Procedures</u> The vacation of a public right-of-way should be approved only in conjunction with development permits in order to determine the overall impact of the vacation.</p>	<p>The General Plan does not specifically address public right-of-way vacations.</p>	<p>The Municipal Code does not require processing of public right-of-way vacations to be associated with a specific development project.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The proposed development should identify the need for the vacation, and how it affects the project and surrounding neighborhood. b. A public right-of-way vacation may be approved with conditions that address a specific issue related to the design of a project. For example, design conditions may include enhancement of view corridors requiring specific landscaping and height limits. 		
<p>2. <u>Policies</u></p> <p>Public rights-of-way may be vacated only when the City has determined that the right-of-way is not needed for public access in any form, either physical or visual. Any right-of-way that is not needed for access but has important visual access quality may be closed to vehicular traffic, but should be left open to pedestrian traffic and view access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A right-of-way proposed for vacation should not be within an area designated for open space. If it is, the closing should be approved only in order to provide a more environmentally sensitive site for buildings and facilities. An alternative area or site should be reserved as open space in 	<p>The General Plan does not specifically address public right-of-way vacations.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u></p> <p>Vacate public rights-of-way under the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City has determined that the right-of-way is not needed for public access in any form, either physical or visual. Any right-of-way that is not needed for access but has important visual access quality may be closed to vehicular traffic, but should be left open to pedestrian traffic and view access. b. That the vacated public right-of-way would not be used to intensify development on a site, unless a specific finding is made that the intensification will

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>exchange for the public right-of-way vacation.</p> <p>b. A vacated public right-of-way should not be used to intensify development on a site, unless a specific finding is made that the intensification will not result in a negative cumulative impact to the surrounding development or environment.</p>		<p>not result in a negative cumulative impact to the surrounding development or environment.</p>
<p>3. <u>Streets to be Retained for Public Access</u></p> <p>In Clairemont Mesa, there are six streets that should not be vacated in order to provide access into Tecolote Canyon Natural Park (see Open Space and Environmental Resources Element for list of streets and location.)</p>	<p>The General Plan does not specifically address public right-of-way vacations.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Maintain the following streets for access into Tecolote Canyon Natural Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South end of Mt. Culebra Avenue (dedicated street) • South end of Mt. Bagot Avenue (street reservation) • West end of Mt. Ashmun Drive (dedicated street) • West end of Mt. Ariane Drive (dedicated street) • South end of Mt. Carol Drive (dedicated street) • North end of Goldboro Street (dedicated street).
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARKING		
<p>1. <u>Parking Structures</u></p> <p>Parking structures should be incorporated into the project design, where feasible, in order to increase on-site parking opportunities. If parking</p>	<p>ME-g.2.b. - Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, shared parking, mixed-use developments, and managed public parking.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>is located on the first and second levels of the building, automobiles should be screened from the public right-of-way with landscaping, and the facade of the parking structure should be sensitive to the pedestrian environment.</p>	<p>ME-C.6.i. - Employ landscaping to enhance or screen views as appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Incorporate parking structures into new developments to increase on-site parking opportunities. If parking is located on the first and second levels of the building, automobiles should be screened from the public right-of-way with landscaping, and the facade of the parking structure should be sensitive to the pedestrian environment.</p>
<p>2. <u>Joint Parking</u></p> <p>Joint parking should be permitted to reduce site area used for parking, provided that a parking study identifies what specific parking reductions are proposed, and how such reductions will not adversely affect required levels of available parking spaces. Examples of subjects to be analyzed in the parking study include: existing and proposed land uses; scheduling of business hours; secure bicycle storage facilities for both customers and employees; and, proximity to public transit.</p>	<p>ME-g.2.b. - Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, shared parking, mixed-use developments, and managed public parking.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element in increase parking opportunities.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Allow Joint parking to reduce site area used for parking, provided that a parking study identifies what specific parking reductions are proposed, and how such reductions will not adversely affect required levels of available parking spaces. Examples of subjects to be analyzed in the parking study include: existing and proposed land uses; scheduling of business hours; secure bicycle storage facilities for both customers and employees; and, proximity to public transit.</p>
<p>3. <u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Large surface parking areas should be broken up with landscaped islands and screened from the</p>	<p>ME-g.2.b. - Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, shared parking,</p>	<p>This policy will be included in the Urban Design Element to address the design of parking areas.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u></p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)	How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?	How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?
<p>public right-of-way by landscaping. This will be accomplished through the use of trees, shrubs or mounding, where appropriate. Surface parking should also include colored and articulated paving rather than asphalt as a means to visually enhance surface areas and driveway entrances.</p>	<p>mixed-use developments, and managed public parking.</p> <p>ME-C.6.i. - Employ landscaping to enhance or screen views as appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break up and screen large surface parking areas from the public right-of-way with landscaped islands. This will be accomplished through the use of trees, shrubs or mounding, where appropriate. • Incorporate colored and articulated paving rather than asphalt within surface parking areas as a means to visually enhance surface areas and driveway entrances.
<p>4. <u>Parking Restrictions - Mesa College</u></p> <p>If the availability of on-street parking continues to be a problem in the residential neighborhoods adjacent to Mesa College, residents should petition for a residential parking district or a restricted parking limit for their neighborhood in order to reduce the number of parked cars or length of stay.</p>	<p>ME-G.3. Manage parking spaces in the public rights-of-way to meet public need and improve investment of parking management revenue to benefit areas with most significant parking impacts.</p> <p>ME-G.3.b. Implement parking management tools that optimize on-street parking turnover, where appropriate.</p>	<p>This policy will be carried over into the Mobility Element.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Employ measures such as restricted parking limits or residential parking districts within neighborhoods adjacent to Mesa College should the lack of available parking for residents continues.</p>
<p>5. <u>Supplemental Off-Site Parking - Morena Boulevard/Chicago Street</u></p> <p>With the existence of severe parking deficiencies for commercial properties in the area between Morena Boulevard and Chicago Street, south of Ashton Street and north of Littlefield Street, it is recommended that supplemental off-site parking areas be allowed to develop on the west side of Chicago Street between Ashton Street</p>	<p>ME-G.1.b. - Implement strategies to address community parking problems using a mix of parking supply, management, and demand solutions.</p>	<p>Temporary parking facilities are typically not allowed in single-family (RS-1-7) zones, however development that complies with the applicable land use plan designation, but contains uses that are not permitted in the underlying base zone, will be reviewed under a Planned Development Permit.</p> <p><u>Potential policy could include:</u> Establish supplemental off-site parking areas along the west side of Chicago Street between Ashton Street</p>

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Mobility Element Policy Comparison

<p style="text-align: center;">What is in the Adopted Clairemont Community Plan (1989)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">How does the General Plan (GP) address this policy?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">How would this be reflected in the Community Plan Update (CPU)?</p>
<p>and Littlefield Street. This allowance should be granted if the following standards are followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The primary use of the property must continue to be Residential. b. Access to the supplemental parking should only be provided via the alleyway. c. Parking areas should be well screened from the adjacent residential uses. Trees and other landscaping should be used for shade, screening and storm water runoff. d. Parking areas should provide lighting for safety. The light fixtures should shape and deflect light into a layer close to the ground in order to prevent stray light from impacting adjacent residences. e. A Planned Development Permit (PDP) be processed in conjunction with each proposed off-site parking area. 		<p>and Littlefield Street to address severe parking deficiencies for commercial properties in the area. This allowance should be granted if the following standards are followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The primary use of the property must continue to be residential. b. Access to the supplemental parking should only be provided via the alleyway. c. Parking areas should be well screened from the adjacent residential uses. Trees and other landscaping should be used for shade, screening and storm water runoff. d. Parking areas should provide lighting for safety. The light fixtures should shape and deflect light into a layer close to the ground in order to prevent stray light from impacting adjacent residences.