

# Midway Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Amendment

Workshop 2: February 23, 2005

District Comparison - Likes and Dislikes Debrief

<b>ELEMENT</b>	<b>LIKES</b>	<b>DISLIKES</b>
Element #1 - Open Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Varied open space</li><li>2. Open space that fits the community</li><li>3. Parks in safe corridors and clear air</li><li>4. Meet the current code for parks</li><li>5. Recreation space and center</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Only small park</li><li>2. No gated communities</li><li>3. No rectangle parks/open space features</li><li>4. Dislike condos residential units next to freeway</li></ol>
Element #2 - Community Character	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Old business maybe renovate</li><li>2. Soma</li><li>3. Have shows utilizing local businesses</li><li>4. Sports Arena</li><li>5. City College</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Lack of grass/benches</li><li>2. Landscaping</li><li>3. Wide roads</li><li>4. Renovate (City college)</li></ol>
Element #3 - Mixture of Uses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Historic properties</li><li>2. Established property upgrades that serve the elderly</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Truly blighted areas</li><li>2. Misinformation concerning notifications to private property owners</li></ol>

ELEMENT	LIKES	DISLIKES
Element #6 - Amenities and Services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sports arena</li> <li>2. Swap meet</li> <li>3. Satellite police department</li> <li>4. Foundry uses - industrial variety of small businesses</li> <li>5. Some live/work space</li> <li>6. Some properties that are maintained and landscaped</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Homeless - trash etc.</li> <li>Safety noise, tall bushes</li> <li>2. New development water/sewer line</li> <li>3. No waste of resources - i.e. purple pipes</li> <li>4. Deferred Maintenance by land owners</li> <li>5. Pot holes</li> <li>6. Lack of medical services - i.e. hospital</li> <li>7. Miss specialty boutique retail shops</li> <li>8. Confusing traffic pattern - Kurtz and Hancock</li> </ol>
Element #7 - Economic Vitality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Walk ability</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Parking shortage</li> </ol>

**ELEMENT**

**LIKES**

**DISLIKES**

Element #8 - Density and Compactness

Element #9 - Redevelopment and Revitalization

1. Street scape in Little Italy
2. Mixed use - residential
3. Landscaped sidewalks - Little Italy
4. Location

1. Adult Entertainment
2. In affective use of City college property
3. Traffic congestion
4. Mental health facility
5. Homeless

**Midway Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Amedment  
Workshop #3  
March 23, 3005  
Matrix of Public Comments on Proposed Concepts**

DRAFT  
3-28-05

District 1: Civic Entertainment and Regional	
I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. Allow Kobey's to create a permanent outdoor market with appropriate landscaping and park-like setting.	1. Malls and landscaping. Street furniture.
2. Pedestrian connections.	2. Emulate Emory Bay in Alameda County.
3. No building over 30 ft. height! Brings in too much traffic. Need traffic plan first. Need hospital. Redo Sports Arena. Remove gas station crispy.	3. Start by paving all the sidewalks, pedestiran access is horrible!
4. No more big franchise, rgssau??? Local owned. More green space around Sports Arena. Parking bldg to develop for mass surface lot. Link to River Park. Walking/hiking path. Think Austin, TX. River Park Sport????	4. Provide an active edge to the Sports Arena area - adressing the street.
5. Support open space on Sports Arena site.	
6. No height change (keep 30 ft.).	
7. No expansion of industrial into Sports Arena area.	
8. Keep Swap Meet.	
9. Retain Sports Arena.	
10. Encourage small business.	
11. No breaking of 30 ft. height limit. No eminent domain condemnation. I support some new housing near Black Angus.	
12. Keep Sports Arena - enhance paving.	
13. Increase residential housing in North.	
14. Replace or renovate Sports Arena.	
15. Tie in existing.	
16. Keep light industrial.	
17. Could be even more sub-districts (residential -	
18. Renovate Sports Arena - incorporate other uses.	
19. Keep light industrial.	
20. Change Midway name (new name?).	
21. Connection to San Diego River.	
22. Keep light industrial.	
23. Create a busy community/retail business district with exciting retail uses - smaller NOT big box.	
24. No expansion of light industrial.	
25. Traffic.	

## District 2: Community Serving

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. I want a hospital.	1. Forget the hospital, it will never happen due to market forces in the health care industry.
2. Hospital needed. Do not want to exceed 30 ft. height.	2. No tourist serving. Area should serve communities of Peninsula, OB, Midway.
3. Keep any new construction under 30 ft. Eliminate any eminent domain condemnation. More support.	3. Improve public transportation to the shopping centers.
4. Building removed replace legal of some height.	4. I'm worried that splitting too many districts would lose the synergy of the mixed use idea.
5. <u>Still needs</u> urgen care complete "upgrade".	5. Still missing less strip malls (less big box) break up with mixed use.
6. I do not want to go over 30 ft. No exceeding 30 ft.	6. Keep this as a shopping district.
7. Question future "community" for visitor-serving uses instead of need for adjacent heavy residential-serving community uses!	7. No condos over 30 ft.
8. <u>Still needs</u> small businesses with general receptionist sec. & equipment. Multiple businesses split cost. Flex	8. I want the hospital used.
9. There are real needs of residents - police, fire, library.	9. Need hospital!!! No building over 30 ft. height. Need traffic plan 1st. Too dense for over 30 ft. bldg.
10. It will help to increase the building height limitation we need 75 ft.	
11. I think the pedestrian arcades of the mission style should be considered.	
12. Maintain retail and commercial.	
13. Still needs... Midway school / expand senior services.	

### District 3: Residential

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. Keep post office. Only one in the area. Pt. Loma post office is a very small 2-person office at front service area with no parking and located in La Playa, towards end of Point. Long way to travel.	1. Please build a medical complex of doctors, dentist, eye care.
2. The park area is closely associated to the elementary school and residential uses. Keep post office.	2. Make a historic focus on the "Dutch Floats" history and Lindbergh.
3. With more residential makes it a stronger community.	3. This area is really ugly.
4. I like the open space planned.	4. More mixed use smaller "boutique" developments like Little Italy to break up big industrial concrete areas, more affordable safer for pedestrians.
5. Maintain retail or mixed use on commercial corridors.	5. Residential uses have to be supported by appropriate neighborhood services (stores, etc.)
6. Keep post office but make improvements in building.	6. Maybe developing stem cell research area here with labs and a hospital.
7. I think residential is needed <u>provided</u> it is pedestrian scaled and continues with the use of pocket parks.	7. Keep commercial uses, especially small businesses and offices.
8. Make it safe for pedestrians. I support increase boutique retail, mixed use need more small restaurant / coffee house gathering spaces. Soften strip mall energy, more trees.	8. I don't see how much has already been developed except Lytton St. - could use a big face lift.
9. We need more open space more retail.	9. Allowing residential serving retail uses in the area. Not eliminating regional commercial uses.
10. Lots of residential already (Navy).	
11. The open space is needed easy access to the area.	

## District 4: Employment

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. Supports residential use mixed with employment uses.	1. Use SPAWAR as a catalyst.
2. It could draw offices from Downtown - needs parking however.	2. I'm concerned about Pt. Loma traffic to/from the Freeway 5.
3. Kepp SPAWAR. Encourage other business developments to support their needs.	3. Could be another Westfield Shopping Center.
4. Good idea to cluster activities according to SPAWAR work. Similar to Torrey Mesa and biotech. Need for collaboration and...	4. By determining zoning & ht limits.
5. Employment and residential uses are centered around the trolley stop.	5. Providing a central green space.
6. Concentrates employment in one area adjacent to transit center.	6. If SPARWARS closes keep building promote environmental business & indoor farmer market.
7. Material presented was much to abstract for a firm	7. Seriously address the traffic issues.
8. Need more. Keep green-serving retail/commercial like Anderson's for 'open' space, keeping air - (cln) providing sources & respite (mental) places to shop or browse amongst offices.	8. Parking for offices.
9. This area is a good location for commercial office space.	9. Keeping air fresh with greenery. No eminent domaine.
10. No eminent domain.	10. Keep the post office.
11. Like the turn lane from Rosecrans to trolley.	11. The use of linear parks by the rau and accessible pocket parks utilizing disused public spaces.
12. I'm interested in how our property will fit in to your concept. Idea seems OK. (Moore St. next to Scheib's).	12. Good question. <i>LOL!</i>
13. We need to support the SPAWARS facility & provide work force housing for these people.	13. What about traffic control.
14. I support concept if under 30 ft. height and traffic plan that works. No taking of private property - no give a way of public land.	14. Better if keep open space retail/commercial like Anderson's so encourage greenery, fresh air sources & place to get away from work to shop.
15. Concentrated employment center for small, medium and large employment.	15. Multimodal connectivity is very important & very difficult.
16. I think SPAWAR should stay around it brings a lot of employment to the area.	16. Eliminate the Pac Hwy undercrossing & ramps, put it all at street level.
17. It can be a hi tec facility supporting each other.	17. Less emphasis on public park or open space but more emphasis of landscape guideline for commercial & industrial uses.

	18. Expand on industrial area. Build industrial complexes - this space is so crucially needed in this area. People can work close to where they live.
	19. Remove County Mental Healthy facility.
	20. Workforce housing for the employees working at SPAWARS.
	21. Keeping 30 ft. height limit upgrade good It industrial that works. No taking property by eminent domain! Landscape. Remember "traffic" solutions 1st before adding any density.
	22. Negotiate land use to improve utilization of Navy property.
	23. Close to trolley - have & encourage <u>existing businesses to integrate</u> with upgraded buildings planned.
	24. Walkway to get Old Town employees easily to trolley.

## District 5: Industrial Arts

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. Retail uses in support of transportation intermodal	1. Little parking & access to trolley.
2. Residential use is good but train noise is loud.	2. Get rid of recycle center to clean up area.
3. Workforce housing for SPAWARS is essential.	3. Accomodating additional transportation realted uses in support of the airport similar to Zone 6.
4. Like small businesses wherehse & lite industrial stays! (Loft - maybe OK for above buisness).	4. Better "in & out" access by air & pedestrians into area. Access from trolley parking lot? More restaurants/entertainment.
5. Keep Brewery. Use architecture to develop other structures.	5. Allowing <u>high</u> density residential use near the trolley stop.
6. Continue the design from Little Italy.	6. Having air pollution monitor when planning & selection for industrial businesses there to the east of airport with residences east.
7. It allows residential use adjacent the trolley stop.	7. Noise mitigation for residential.
8. It would provide SD w/an art work center w/residential.	8. Ensuring higher density residential use near to the trolley stop.
9. It allows higher density residential use near to trolley stop.	9. De-emphasize residential increase lite industrial.
10. I like the Brewery.	10. Limit residential because of air pollution concerns (short-term apts? Temp workforce housing)
11. They node around Washington & Hancock should be mixed use residential. To get residents in this area.	11. Residential sites should not be next to railroad track. That's why it's been industrial/commercial in the area.
12. Warehouse Arts.	12. No housing - keep light weight industrial.
13. No eminent domain.	13. Increased residential areas more traffic congestion.
	14. There is not enough parking at trolley stops. Makes it hard to use. Condos along trolley track. Hwy 5 & Airport is bad idea due to extreme noise level!! Also traffic & air pollution.
	15. Hike up height in this area.
	16. Paint & landscape along trolley line. Many tourists ride that line.
	17. If residential build a full lap swimming center.
	18. Linking this to Washington area & its restaurant row is very difficult.

## District 6: Airport

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. It meets needs of area.	1. Introduce residential & mixed use.
2. Autos & airport uses for Area 6 are the highest and best uses for this area.	2. Moving the airport to Miramar.
3. It's pretty much what it is now.	3. Expanding Lindberg Field.
4. It makes sense to build on the current airport activities.	4. Break up some of the monotony - restaurants, clubs. Have you ever tried to return a rental car here - very poorly marked onramps very confusing - needs clear signage by businesses & shuttle services.
5. This needs to build the airport access.	5. Move the airport.
6. Heavy use of landscape and street furniture and lighting to create people places.	6. Clubs.
7. Like Pier 1 Outlet (could be extension of Morena "design district"). More clubs/restaurants entertainment.	7. Forgetting about pedestrian & bicycle access because it's not going to happen.
8. No eminent domain.	8. Increasing multimodal connectivity to the area.
9. Proposed airport uses are the best recommendation for this district.	9. Improving traffic access between the airport and the freeway.
	10. Linking the trolley to the airport.
	11. No expanding into east side! W/gates too much impact w/air pollution. Have airpollution monitor if expand industrial here.
	12. There is a lot of trash and weed here in area 6. It would be a significant improvement if this was regularly cleaned up.
	13. Point back side of all buildings facing trolley (landscape trolley too).
	14. Get rid of Laurel Gas Station (to dangerous remember LA explosion).
	15. Allowing the residential corridor of the Little Italy to extend into the Zone.
	16. Improve residential use, mixed use.

## Group 7: Open Space Concepts

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. If it connects greenways to existing schools & parks & residential community.	1. Not wiping out but going around existing businesses.
2. PLEASE - Hike & bike trails & recreational park area linked to the river. We have to make it accessible / pedestrian friendly.	2. Leaving it alone.
3. There is a great need for open space in these areas.	3. Having larger park area for visitors & regional since it is a publicly owned.
4. The neighborhood links need to be protected and improved.	4. More dense you go, the more park (dedicated) you need! 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents - 1,000 more & 300 + existing x 3 psns each = 11 acres of 88 5,000 st lots!
5. No eminent domain.	5. Skateboard park, pools, soccer field. No high rise buildings that drown out sunlight & ocean.
6. Beautification is good.	6. Keep on city-owned land.
7. Adequate & carefully planned open space is critical to the liv/durability of our area. I support human scale (30 ft.) development.	7. Understanding of power lines to be undertaken by the City of San Diego. <i>Undergrounding</i>
8. The area desperately needs places to sit, eat lunch, walk, jog, etc.	8. Having this be a top priority. This should not be put in place last.
9. Nature and a sense of belonging is a must.	9. Being clear about the specific objectives. Is it residential expansion. High density office space.
10. Pocket parks. Landscape buffer to freeway edge.	10. Please refrain from massive palm tree plantings! We need adequate & varied shade trees. Please incorporate sunlight, rest areas for our aging population.
11. It addresses the problem areas & promotes pocket	11. Making sure it is a reality.
	12. Focusing on outdoor aerobic activities - walking, jogging, maybe a Par Course for exercise.
	13. This is infrastructure that must be put in first... before the other parts go in.
	14. Make the San Diego River an accessible resource.
	15. Undergrounding power lines in residential areas.

## Group 8: Architectural Guidelines & Methodology

I support this future plan because...	This future plan could improve by...
1. Industrial Arts Style: I support this style & idea.	1. Modern: No on modern!
2. Warehouse Style: I think this area needs to expand the Brewery concept (mixed use).	2. Modern: No more of this junky "Little Italy" style architecture. This is an insult to historically well done Italian architecture.
3. Warehouse Style: Warehouse good for mixed use.	3. Architectural G&M: Architectural expression should NOT be restricted. A design review panel could be set up to control design quality.
4. Modern: I like this continuation of what has occurred in Little Italy.	4. Architectural G&M: Flexibility in interpretation of guidelines as it relates to site constraints and opportunities.
5. Modern: Support for commercial & mixed use.	5. Architectural G&M: Oppose big box/massive/tall developments. We love San Diego because it is (mostly) livable! Love mission brewery style / idiosyncratic.
6. Spanish Mission Style: I support the Spanish (Monterey, Mediterranean) style architecture.	6. Architectural G&M: Look at the Tampa model - the hockey rean surrounded by public open space and low density dining & entertainment.
7. Spanish Mission Style: Support Spanish style for residential.	7. Architectural G&M: 1 - A signage plan that reduces size in signs & building lighting. 2 - Upholding 30 ft. height limit LAW.
8. Spanish Mission Style: Rosecrans is a historic road - the oldest in the country. Support Old Mission - Spanish. Others would not be appropriate.	8. Architectural G&M: Too high - all photos - keep 30 ft. height!
9. Architectural G&M: Increase height limit to 75 ft!	9. Architectural G&M: Modern or factory. No eminent domain.
10. Architectural G&M: It includes the main architectural styles of the neighborhood.	10. Architectural G&M: Have the redevelopment agency provide financial incentives to remodel consistent with the vision.
11. Architectural G&M: Adding a "style" can create a sense of culture, atmosphere.	11. Architectural G&M: Getting rid of Crispy Cream style buildings.
12. Architectural G&M: If it leaves need "open" spaces between larger buildings.	12. Architectural G&M: Maintaining 30 ft.. Retain It industrial jobs. Rosecrans is a historic road - the oldest in the country. Keep it Mission style, Spanish no.
13. Architectural G&M: Support North Bay Association concept plan architecture and landscape guidelines.	13. Architectural G&M: High building shown not in 30 foot reality.

14. Architectural G&M: 3 forms supported = modern, Spanish & Warehouse.	14. Architectural G&M: Encouraging other - ie Diane Powers to contribute to design & ideas. Keeping & commitment of Sports Arena to stay in area. Keeping 30 ft. height limit.
15. Architectural G&M: I do not support the limiting of architecture style.	15. Architectural G&M: Showing buildings that comply with 30 ft. limit.
16. Architectural G&M: Varied is good.	16. Architectural G&M: Including Brutalist Architecture (Post Office) in the mix of styles!
17. Architectural G&M: If it supports the "upgrading only" of existing businesses.	17. Architectural G&M: Add one more style - the 1950's drive in type look. Eg such as Bookston, 1950's historic uses like bowling alley & drive ins. <i>google!</i>
18. Architectural G&M: If NO eminent domain is used or threatened and local owned businesses remain & Kolbey's.	18. Architectural G&M: Including Neon as a possibility.
19. Architectural G&M: They keep the post office & Sports Arena.	
20. Architectural G&M: I do not support plan if break 30 ft. height limit. That will increase traffic & congestion. Height limits light & air also and takes away from walkable community.	
21. Architectural G&M: Bldgs higher than 30 ft. could be a blessing if they could block out freeway site and noise along freeway.	
22. Architectural G&M: Support 30 ft. (or close to) height limit & need for human scale/livability/Old Town/River/Point Loma/Bays). Support humanizing details to need industrial/modern styles.	
23. Architectural G&M: No Little Italy!	

## QUESTIONS

1. Dist 6 - Airport. What is happening?

Rob Arjmand: 858-459-8161

(District 2 group)

2. How do you get the City to cut down weeds on their property, fix curb & water meter?

John: 619-442-3065

(District 2 group)

3. Some people don't have the Internet. How do I get what I request?

Joe: 277-1037

(District 2 group)

4. Area on corner of District Two - what are the streets?

What will take place?

Joe: (printed material) cell: 277-1031

Medowgrow Drive by remade church

(District 2 group)