

Midway-Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting

DRAFT Meeting Summary

July 18, 2012

3:00- 5:00 pm

San Diego Community College, West City Campus
3249 Fordham Street Room 208, San Diego CA

The following were present:

City Staff: Nancy Bragado, Tait Galloway, Katrin Kunz
Consultants: Christine Babla, Kristen Byrne
Committee Members: Walter Anderson, Mike Drogin, Celeste Grant, Tod Howarth, Melanie Nickel, Chuck Pretto, Ken Rae, Joe Scaglione, Kurt Sullivan, Kristy Swanston, Mike Swanston
Public: Sal Fiores, Marne Foster, Mel Kuhnel, Tom Littell, Kim Sheredy

Meeting was called to order by Chair Melanie Nickel at 3:20 with a quorum, immediately following the North Bay Community Planning Group meeting

- 1. Opening Remarks:** Opening remarks were made by Melanie Nickel and Tait Galloway. This meeting's topics are the continuation of the land use discussion and the October community workshop.
- 2. Non-Agenda Public Comment:** There was no non-agenda public comment.
- 3. Approve Meeting Summary for the June 20, 2012 CPUAC meeting:** The approval of the minutes was postponed to the next meeting.
- 4. Discussion of the Draft Plan Land Use and Mobility Alternatives - Continued from the June 20, 2012 meeting:**

Tait Galloway presented potential land use options for the subareas not covered in the last meeting.

First, he showed a map with the Community's subareas and gave a short summary of the discussion and input heard in the last meeting.

Summary of last meeting's discussion on sub-areas A-D:

- Greenwood St concept north of the Kurtz St connection will not be analyzed
- Sports Arena property:

- Kemper St extension between Sports Arena Bl and Kurtz St(in current Community Plan) will be analyzed.
- Mix of commercial uses desired
- Create an inviting atmosphere
- Destination for the community, more identity needed
- Address park/public space (especially for employees in the area)
- Incorporate space for the Swap Meet

Participant questions and comments:

- What is the use of the Kemper Street connection through the Sports Arena property?
- Will the City look at a double-decking Rosecrans solution?
- Park areas could be attractors for homeless people – would need enforcement.
- What does the ad-hoc Committee recommend for the Sports Arena area?
- Discussion about the designation of the Sports Arena area is obsolete as long it is not clear if Arena stays or will be removed.
- Real Estate Assets Dept. should coordinate leases on property near Sports Arena, so they expire at the same time.
- Community likes to keep the Sports Arena or something similar with a sport/entertainment use – could include green spaces.
- 30 feet height limit would require voter approval for a special project.
- Exceeding height limit would need to be spectacular development with adequate infrastructure (i.e., LA Live, Paseo Colorado in Pasadena)
- Discussion about the use of the recommendations.
- The City should consider releasing a request for proposals for all land in Sports Arena area for future.
- List of dates when properties/parcels will be available.
- Would the City ever buy out leases if great development proposal came forward? Could be costly.
- Would not want to prevent things from happening until all under one lease – could mean properties are unused in the interim.
- Will be difficult to do anything different with Orchard Apartments. Should retain and assume no change.
- Which land use designation offers the most flexibility?

Sub-area D-F:

In the beginning Tait briefly explained that the bay-to-bay concept shown in the adopted Community Plan will be removed with the Plan Update.

Participant questions and comments:

- Where do adult uses belong? (Commercial use)

Neighborhood Commercial Residential Permitted (at Rosecrans and Lytton Street)

- Mixed-use development could work on area designated neighborhood commercial.
- Area of the bookshop/Loma Theatre is underutilized at the moment. It is not designated as historical landmark.
- Retain neighborhood commercial on Lytton – allow flexibility for residential.
- Include policy to address transition between commercial and residential in this area.

Community Commercial Residential Prohibited (at Rosecrans and Midway Dr)

- General agreement about community commercial designations as shown.

Business Park, Community Village, Community Commercial (at Sports Area Bl, Midway Dr, Pacific Highway and Post Office)

- Could recommend a more diverse land use for the Navy property (parking and distribution) between Midway Dr. and Sports Arena Bl should becomes available
- Avoid land use designations that would support big box commercial development.
- Feasible location for a parking structure?
- This would be a change from industrial use.
- Business Park, residential, possibly hotel?
- If Business Park, could provide office and flex space for contractors associated with SPAWAR
- If Business Park does not allow retail, it is not as flexible as Community Village. Should provide flexibility for retail, office, flex space, hotel and residential
- Spectrum development in Kearny Mesa is an example.
- Should consider Kurtz St Sports Arena Bl as one-way couplets.
- What happens to existing uses if area becomes Community Village?
- Definition of “Community Village” required
- Community Village would be good opportunity, near employment and transit.
- What if zoning and Community Plan designations are contradictory?
- Specification for uses needed for example “Community Village with business focus”.
- Community relies on City’s expertise to define uses in the Community Plan as uttered in the meeting.

- No more big boxes surrounded by parking lots wanted (no big retail on Post Office site).
- Community has enough large scale retail.
- Both areas should have the same character (plus adjacent area just east at Barnett and Pacific Highway).
- Express support for Navy's mission at SPAWAR (Sub-Area F).

Sub-area G:

- Institutional use for Veterans Village is appropriate.
- The more flexible the designations are better.
- Business Park is not the best use along Pacific Highway – more flexibility is needed for retail, office, and light industrial.
- Consensus on 1. “Heavy Commercial” for the area North of Pacific Highway and South of the rail right of way.
- Consensus on 2. “Mixed Commercial/Residential” for the area north of the rail right of way and South of Hancock Street.
- Traffic on Hancock is heavy and there is limited on street parking available – need to be considered when determining use.
- Residential uses should be encouraged in area G due to the proximity to the transit station.
- Development in Seattle cited as an example – small units targeted to non-auto owners and near transit.
- Not a good location for a potential park in the area.
- Green strip along Hancock St or the rail right of way suggested.
- Along Hancock St flexibility of mixed-commercial suggested.

Sub-area H:

Tait described the “Destination Lindbergh” concept. The Airport Authority will consider Destination Lindbergh as part of the update of the Master Plan for San Diego International Airport as well as addressing the future of Terminal 1. The Airport Authority is planning to construct a consolidated rental car facility (CONRAC) on the north side of the airport between Washington Street and Sassafras St. Passengers using the CONRAC will primarily use an on-airport shuttle to access the terminals. CONRAC is anticipated to open probably in 2016/17. Potentially the larger car rental companies could move all or most of their operations to the CONRAC which could create vacant properties along the Pacific Highway corridor.

Participant questions and comments:

- Intermodal Transit Center (ITC) – Community does not know what it will look like.

- Enhancements to Pacific Highway for the ITC may be needed.
- A lot of the area is airport serving parking, which is unlikely to change.
- Is there a market for office use/Business Park?
- Transit oriented commercial uses would make most sense.
- Area will be a gateway into the City and should make a good impression.
- Consensus on prohibiting residential uses in the area.
- Airport serving uses may be most appropriate.
- Companies should be found that are attracted to proximity to airport.
- No retail, except those that serve immediate area.
- Could limited service hotels be accommodated?
- Flexibility towards uses is needed.
- Similar character like Little Italy would be feasible.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD):

- Should the Community Plan boundaries include MCRD and designate as military use?
- Peninsula community plan included language to include NTC when it was a Navy use.
- Address support for the MCRD mission.
- Consensus to include within the Community Plan boundaries

5. Overview of Next Steps and October Workshop:

Next step will be a revision of the alternatives based on the input from the Committee. Then, on October 8, 2012 from 4 to 8 PM the Community Workshop will take place at the Hampton Inn, 3888 Greenwood St. Tait explained the purpose and the outline of the workshop. Land Use and Mobility Alternatives and a General Urban Design Approach will be covered. Afterwards, a preferred alternative based on Committee and community feedback will be selected and a traffic modeling will be conducted October through December 2012.

- 5. Closing:** The meeting was closed by Tait Galloway at 5:10 PM.