

COMMENTS

MARCH 29²⁰¹⁸

①

- Stonecrest Alt add Res where it exists & has amenities
- If golf area stable & devel?
- opp for Res in future makes sense near Stonecrest
- What about S most Red site? Should it be INB?
- WHAT does Residential mean? Rental or ownership?
- Will the 6.5 km note go away?
- Bring this recommendation forward w/ the plan update
- Support raising density around the County complex
- Surprised by ITP 0.5-1.0 FAR limit
- Solar is a key employer should have the intensity they want

- ②
- Some large users in ITP would be concerned w/ FAP Increase and traffic increase
Higher FAP is not a blanket benefit
 - Manufacturing space here is valuable
consider where more FAR makes sense but preserve manufacturing at lower FARs too
 - FAR is a max does not require the 2.0
 - will KM keep the 0.5*?
 - can less than 2.0 FAR desirable areas be addressed thru plan policies?

- Create a plan with flexibility to make it easy for business
'simple & predictable'

③

- mobile home park proposed for condos? No update to reflect this site

- is the minimum lot size being changed? this has the largest requirement in the city

- can ITP 0.5 be dropped, just 1.0 would be better

- Surprised by high far in VI + ITP areas, will the traffic support this

- PARKS, will Hickman field be enough with addition of all the purple?

- WONT ID ~~new~~ parks on private prop? make developers responsible for parks

- CC area on Convoy, why separated by purple

(4)

- W.B. of shoreline on CMB, should that be purple to make a cohesive community entry even if Res not allowed in Miramar area?

- Why not purple on CMB by SDGE site
SDGE wants to protect critical infrastr.

- plan should allow a lot of flexibility even if traffic challenging mobility is changing so FAR would be better

- Convoy District likes the density in the convoy area by transit purple should continue down to Daguerre

- from the city's perspective how does leaving low far in place benefit business?

- (5)
- UEV M & H: description a little confusing
don't exclude Hotel from UEV
 - Convoy court traffic is a concern w/ ↑ FAR
Is there a plan for street widening to
accommodate > traffic
 - want an asterisk on the airport safety
zones to say where Res is permitted
and only as long as safety zone is in place
 - Royal Highlands traffic on Convoy
↑ Res on Convoy will make traffic
worse, issue w/ noise from buses
types of buses not compatible w/ SF Res
Othello to CMB worst traffic
 - like Res S of Aero compatible w/
schools & parks there
 - safety issues @ CMB & RFN due to high
traffic need > safety infrastrct
 - Ped bridge btwn Vickers & Spectrum Cntr Blvd
would improve pedestrian quality

- how will work/life units be used in KM?
good to meet CAP goals

(6)

- Park @ Dump when capped
- 30 yr planning, tech will change
Density is not causing noise, its a use issue
- want to make convoy noticable & safe
- where is the linear park around the airport?
address at future mtg. ✓/like this
- none of city is built @ 2.0
- Convoy court cant handle much > trips
denser com footprint will make worse
- Spectrum Center Blvd Apt. heavy
parking is congested - circular mirror
for driver assistance wanted
- Res on Armour has noise issue