

Mira Mesa
Sophic SchultMira Mesa
Sophic SchultMira Mesa
Sophic SchultMira Mesa
Sophic SchultMira Mesa
SchultSophic SchultSchul

Image: Google Earth

www.PlanMiraMesa.org

S Planning Department – Presentation Outline

1. Schedule

2. Benefits and Trends

- Benefits of Walkable Mixed-Use Places
- Changing Retail Landscape
- Who's Doing Mixed-Use?

3. Urban Design Approaches and Concepts

- Aspirational Places
- Mira Mesa Town Center
- Mira Mesa Gateway



CPU Schedule



Mira Mesa Plan Update Schedule



TECHNICAL STUDY (Mobility, Land Use and Urban Design)



Key Milestones

Community Outreach & Engagement



Community Priorities – Online Survey

Land Use and Urban Design

Vibrant mix of uses, entertainment, & a walkable streetscape.

Planning Dept.

- Diverse housing types for young people, families, and seniors.
- > Shift from auto-centric development to more compact walkable neighborhoods.
- > More plazas, public square, and street trees.

> Locate new housing near jobs and transit.

Allow new housing on parking lots and build parking vertically/underground.





Benefits of Walkable Mixed-Use Places

Benefits of Walkable Mixed-Use Community

Walkable Places* are:

Planning Department

- Wealthier;
- Safer;
- Healthier;
- Greener; and
- **Age-friendly** (provides independence and options for children, youth, families, adults & seniors support all ages and abilities).



*On average - research citations available in Subregional Employment Area Profile: Mira Mesa and University Community Plan Updates (www.planmiramesa.org)

Planning Department National Metro Ranking of Walkable Urbanism

Current Donking

Shortage of Walkable Places

- San Diego metro is the16th largest by population in the nation,
- but ranks 25th for Walkable Urbanism*
- There is a pent up demand for mixed-use, walkable places connected to jobs and opportunity

In Philadelphia 21 6,065,644 286,840 19 12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 308,103 22 1 13 Portland 18 2,382,037 132,335 4 1 14 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 23 1						a state of	MATTE P			
2 Denver 19 3.115.466 163.972 6 3 Boston 57 4.77.1936 83.718 1 4 Washington, DC 50 6.090,196 121.804 3 5 San Francisco Bay Area 59 6.611.777 112.065 2 6 Chicago 41 9.549.229 232.908 16 7 Pittsburgh 13 2.346.143 180.626 11 9 Atlanta 2.7 5.700.990 211.148 14 10 Charlotte 9 2.427.024 2.99,669 17 11 Philadelphia 2.1 6.055,644 2.98,400 19 12 Cincinnati 7 2.156.723 300.103 2.2 13 Portland 10 2.062.764 206.276 13 16 St.Louis 10 2.062.764 205.209 23 17 Baltimore 16 2.792.050 174.503 100 <th>NK</th> <th>RECION</th> <th># OF WALKUPS</th> <th>TOTAL IN METRO AREA</th> <th></th> <th>RANK (POPULATION PER WALKUP)</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	NK	RECION	# OF WALKUPS	TOTAL IN METRO AREA		RANK (POPULATION PER WALKUP)				
Johnson Johnson Johnson Johnson 3 Boston 57 4.771,956 63,718 1 4 Washington, DC 50 6.090,196 121,804 3 5 San Francisco Bay Area 59 6.611,777 112,063 2 6 Chicago 41 9,549,229 232,908 16 1 7 Pittsburgh 13 2,348,145 180,626 11 1 8 Seattle 26 3,735,216 143,662 7 1 9 Atlanta 27 5,700,990 211,48 14 10 1,247,024 268,640 19 10 Christite 9 2,427,024 268,640 19 17 11 Philadelphia 21 6,056,444 288,640 19 1 13 52,514 20,529 23 1 1 3,526,149 20,505 13 16 14 Minnepolits-St, Paul 11 3,526,149	1	New York City	149	20,192,042	135,517	6				
4 Washington, DC 50 6.090,196 121,804 5 5 San Francisco Bay Area 59 6.611.777 112.063 2 6 Chicago 41 9,549.229 232,908 16 7 7 Pittsburgh 13 2,248,143 180.626 11 7 8 Seattle 26 3,735,216 143.662 7 7 9 Atlanta 27 5,700.990 211.148 14 7 10 Charlotte 9 2,427,024 298,669 17 7 11 Philadelphila 21 6,056,644 288,460 19 7 12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 308,103 22 7 13 Portland 18 2,392,037 132,335 4 7 14 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 23 7 9,3 12 15 Cicueland 10	2	Denver	19	3,115,466	163,972	8		-	A LAL	
S San Francisco Bay Area 59 6.611.77 112.063 2 6 Chicago 41 9.549.229 232.908 16 7 Pittsburgh 13 2.340,143 180.626 11 8 Seattle 26 3.735.216 143.662 7 9 Atlanta 27 5.700.990 211.148 14 10 Charlotte 9 2.427.024 299.669 17 11 Philadelphia 21 6.065.644 288.40 19 12 Cincinnati 7 2.156.723 306.103 22 13 Portland 18 2.392.037 132.2315 4 14 Minnepolis-St.Paul 11 3.526,149 320.559 233 15 Cleveland 10 2.662.764 13 20% 7.8 8.4 14.2 16 St.Louis 10 2.662.765 13 20% 7.8 8.4 12X <th< td=""><td>3</td><td>Boston</td><td>57</td><td>4,771,936</td><td>83,718</td><td>1</td><td>44</td><td>3</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	3	Boston	57	4,771,936	83,718	1	44	3		
6 Chicago 41 9,549,229 232,909 16 7 7 Pittsburgh 13 2,348,143 180,626 11 7 8 Seattle 26 3,735,216 143,662 7 7 9 Atlanta 27 5,700,990 211,148 14 14 10 Charlotte 9 2,427,024 269,669 17 7 11 Philadelphia 21 6,065,644 268,840 19 7 12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 308,103 222 7 13 Portland 18 2,250,2037 132,335 4 7 15 Cleveland 10 2,262,764 206,276 13 7 16 51, Louis 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 7 18 Kansas City 9 2,068,830 232,092 15 26% 5% 12X 20 Losian	4	Washington, DC	50	6,090,196	121,804	3				-7KN
Pittsburgh 15 2.148,143 180,626 11 8 Seattle 26 3.735,216 143,662 7 9 Atlanta 27 5.700,990 211,148 14 10 Charlotte 9 2.427,024 269,669 17 11 Philadelphia 21 6,065,644 208,800 19 12 Cincinnati 7 2.156,723 508,103 22 13 Portiand 18 2.382,037 132,335 4 14 Minnespolis-St. Paul 11 3.526,149 320,559 2.5 15 Cleveland 10 2.062,764 206,276 13 16 St. Louis 10 2.804,998 280,500 18 17 Baltimore 16 2.792,050 174,503 100 28% 6% 5% 12% 20 Load,nois 37,104,415 186,958 12 28% 6% 5% 10%	5	San Francisco Bay Area	59	6,611,717	112,063	2		-	Va Har	
a Seattle 26 3.735,216 143,662 7 9 Atlanta 27 5.700,990 211,148 14 10 Charlotte 9 2.427,024 269,669 17 11 Philadelphia 21 6.065,644 280,840 19 12 Cincinnati 7 2.156,723 500,103 22 13 Portland 18 2.382,037 132,335 4 14 Minnespolis-St. Paul 11 3.526,149 520,559 2.3 15 Cleveland 10 2.062,764 206,276 13 16 St. Louis 10 2.064,998 280,500 18 17 Baltimore 16 2.792,050 174,503 100 18 Kanses City 9 2.068,830 252,092 15 -25% 7% 5% 12% 19 Sacramento 6 2.268,005 376,001 24 28% 6% 5%	6	Chicago	41	9,549,229	232,908	16		A A	21	
9 Atlanta 27 5,700,990 21,148 14 10 Charlotte 9 2,427,024 269,669 17 1 11 Philsdelphia 21 6,065,644 288,840 19 1 12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 508,103 222 1 1 1 5,26,149 320,559 23 1 1 1 1 5,26,149 320,559 23 1 1 1 1 1 2,26,764 206,276 13 1 1 1 1 1 2,26,764 206,276 13 1	7	Pittsburgh	13	2,348,143	180,626	n			Ponton	20
12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 306,103 222 7 A 13 Portland 18 2,352,037 132,335 4 4 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 2.3 4 4 Minneapolis-St. Paul 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 2,062,764 206,276 13 4	8	Seattle	26	3,735,216	143,662	7		THE M	MV	1
12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 306,103 222 A A 13 Portland 18 2,362,037 132,335 4 A 14 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 2.3 A A A 15 Cleveland 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 A A A A 16 St. Louis 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 A	9	Atlanta	27	5,700,990	211,148	14	111			
12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 306,103 222 7 A 13 Portland 18 2,352,037 132,335 4 4 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 2.3 4 4 Minneapolis-St. Paul 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 2,062,764 206,276 13 4	10	Charlotte	9	2,427,024	269,669	17		0 ////		
12 Cincinnati 7 2,156,723 306,103 222 A A 13 Portland 18 2,362,037 132,335 4 A 14 Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 2.3 A A A 15 Cleveland 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 A A A A 16 St. Louis 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 A	n	Philadelphia	21	6,065,644	288,840	19	111	Tim		
Minneapolis-St. Paul 11 3,526,149 320,559 23 23 15 Cleveland 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 16 10 2,804,998 280,500 18 16 51. Louis 10 2,804,998 280,500 18 17 Baltimore 16 2,792,050 174,503 100 265. 7.8 8% 14% 19 Sacramento 6 2,268,005 378,001 244 28% 6% 5% 12% 12% 20 Los Angeles 59 17,737,760 300,640 200 24% 8% 8% 12% 21 Dallas-Fort Worth 38 7,104,415 186,958 12 23% 5% 8% 10% 22 Houston 16 6,636,208 414,763 25 28% 6% 5% 10% 23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 144,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10%	12	Cincinnati	7	2,156,723	308,103	22	1. All			1
Image: Second Section Sectin Section Section Section Section Section Section Se	13	Portland	18	2,382,037	132,335	4	611		Han Ha	A
15 Cleveland 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 Image: Cleveland 10 2,062,764 206,276 13 Image: Cleveland 10 2,804,998 280,500 18 Image: Cleveland 10 2,804,998 280,500 18 Image: Cleveland 16 2,792,050 174,503 100 Image: Cleveland 16 2,792,050 378,001 24 26% 7% 8% 14% 19 Sacramento 6 2,268,005 378,001 24 26% 6% 5% 12% 20 Los Angeles 59 17,737,760 300,640 200 24% 8% 8% 10% 21 Dallas- Fort Worth 58 7,104,415 186,656 12 28%	14	Minneapolis-St. Paul	n	3,526,149	320,559	23		11 M		in A
16 St. Louis 10 2,804,998 280,500 18 Image: Constraint of the state of the	15	Cleveland	10	2,062,764	206,276	13				and the second second
18 Kansas City 9 2,088,830 232,092 15 26% 7% 8% 14% 19 Sacramento 6 2,268,005 378,001 24 26% 6% 5% 12% 20 Los Angeles 59 17,737,760 300,640 20 24% 8% 8% 12% 21 Dallas-Fort Worth 58 7,104,415 186,958 12 23% 5% 8% 10% 22 Houston 16 6,636,208 414,763 25 28% 6% 5% 10% 23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 134,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10% 24 Miami 20 6,019,790 300,990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368	16	St. Louis	10	2,804,998	280,500	18	////			THE SCHOOL OF BU
9 Sacramento 6 2,268,005 378,001 24 28% 6% 5% 12% 20 Los Angeles 59 17,737,760 300,640 20 24% 8% 8% 12% 21 Dallas-Fort Worth 38 7,104,415 186,958 12 23% 5% 8% 10% 22 Houston 16 6,636,208 414,763 25 28% 6% 5% 10% 23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 134,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10% 24 Maml 20 6,019,790 300,990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 24 Maml 20 6,019,790 300,990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 <t< td=""><td>17</td><td>Baltimore</td><td>16</td><td>2,792,050</td><td>174,503</td><td>10</td><td>1/1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	17	Baltimore	16	2,792,050	174,503	10	1/1			
Instrume	18	Kansas City	9	2,088,830	232,092	15	28%	12	8%	14%
21 Dellas-Fort Worth 38 7,104,415 186,958 12 23% 5% 8% 10% 22 Houston 16 6,636,208 414,763 25 28% 6% 5% 10% 23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 134,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10% 24 Miami 20 6,019,790 300,990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 26 20% 6% 4% 8% 27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonlo 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 2	19	Sacramento	6	2,268,005	378,001	24	28%	6%	5%	12%
22 Houston 16 6,636,208 414,763 25 28% 6% 5% 10% 23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 134,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10% 24 Miami 20 6.019,790 300,990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 266 20% 6% 4% 8% 27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	20	Los Angeles	59	17,737,760	300,640	20	24%	8%	8%	12%
23 Detroit 32 4,304,613 134,519 5 22% 6% 5% 10% 24 Maml 20 6.019,790 30.0.990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 266 20% 6% 4% 8% 27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	21	Dallas-Fort Worth	38	7,104,415	186,958	12	23%	5%	8%	10%
Attach 20 6.019.790 300.990 21 18% 8% 6% 9% 25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 26 20% 6% 4% 8% 27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	22	Houston	16	6,636,208	414,763	25	28%	6%	5%	10%
25 San Diego 19 3,283,665 172,824 9 18% 9% 5% 8% 26 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 26 20% 6% 4% 8% 27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	23	Detroit	32	4,304,613	134,519	5	22%	6%	5%	10%
Z6 Tampa 6 2,978,209 496,368 26 20% 6% 4% 8% Z7 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	24	Miami	20	6.019.790	300.990	21	18%	8%	6%	9%
27 Orlando 3 2,390,859 796,953 28 14% 2% 2% 5% 28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	25	San Diego	19	3,283,665	172,824	9	18%	9%	5%	8%
28 San Antonio 3 2,377,507 792,502 27 11% 4% 1% 4% 29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	26	Tampa	6	2,978,209	496,368	26	20%	6%	4%	8%
29 Phoenix 5 4,561,038 912,208 29 10% 2% 1% 4%	27	Orlando	3	2,390,859	796,953	28	14%	2%	2%	5%
	28	San Antonio	3	2,377,507	792,502	27	11%	4%	1%	4%
30 Las Vegas 2 2,112,436 1,056,218 30 4% 7% 1% 3%	29	Phoenix		4,561,038	912,208	29	10%	2%	1%	4%
	50	Las Vegas	2	2,112,436	1,056,218	30	4%	7%	1%	3%

Form and Function of San Diego



Planning Department Price Refl

600

Price Reflects the Shortage of Walkable Places

Home Value Price Premium

 Today, people are willing to pay \$100
 more per square foot (sf) or 20% more to live in city's walkable neighborhoods Changes in Median Home Value Per Square Foot (\$)



*City of San Diego; Very Walkable includes Walker's Paradise; Median Home Value Data from Zillow

Planning Department Price Re

Multifamily, Office, & Retail Price Premium

 Rent premium of 34% and 24%, for SD metro and city product types

City of SD rent premium:

- 27% for multifamily
- 39% for office
- 6% for retail

Table 1 – Price Premium: Walkable Places Vs. Car-Dependent Places

	City of San Diego**	San Diego metro***
Walkable Places* (average)	24%	34%
Multifamily	27%	-
Office	39%	-
Retail	6%	- DRAFT

*Combination of MF, Office, and Retail; **Data Source: CoStar Asking Rent Per SF (2019 2Q); ***From Foot Traffic Ahead

Suburban Retrofit – National Trend

Market Forces Driving Transition

- 1,500+
 redevelopment
 projects in 2019
- 170 office parks mixing residential and retail



Suburban spaces being transformed into walkable mixed-use spaces in the US



Changing Retail Landscape

Department

The New Retail

The New Retail

Changing Retail Landscape

- Over-retailed
- eCommerce
- Discount stores
- Shift in consumer spending
- Experiential



In the newCommerce Era, the use of space is radically different...



ge-of-Amazon-Garrick-Brown.pdf

Over-retailed marketplace?

Retail Per Capita (Square Footage Per Person)



Source: Cowen and Company, ICSC, Cushman & Wakefield (2015) and CoStar - San Diego/Mira Mesa (2019)



Who's doing mixed-use?

One Paseo

Merge 56

Watermark

Mira Mesa CPA

MCAS Mirama

163

Flanders

3 Roots

Garroll Rd

Jack Mou

Stone Creek

56

The Hub

Google earth

San Diego Case Study: Mixed-Use Projects near Mira Mesa CPA (Proposed & under construction)

ist Bivd

no 10 ho

San Diego Case Study

One Paseo – Carmel Valley

- Highest rental rates in San Diego
- Live, work, & play with a mix of apartments, life science, finance, & retail tenants
- 1.1 mil sf & 608 units
- 23-acre site



San Diego Case Study

The Hub at Scripps Ranch

- A mix of apartments& retail
- 260 luxury units
- 11,000 sf of retail



• 9.5-acre site

San Diego Case Study

The Watermark at Scripps Ranch

- A mix of retail, hotel, & office
- 445k office
- 335k retail/hotel



San Diego Case Study

Merge 56

- A mix of residential, retail, & office
- Along 56 corridor



MIRA MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SEPTEMBER 16, 2019

MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER & MIRA MESA GATEWAY URBAN DESIGN CONCEPTS

MIRA MESA BOULEVARD NARRATES THE COMMUNITY'S STORY



FOCUS AREAS MIRA MESA BLVD IS THE CONNECTING THREAD



TOWN CENTER AND GATEWAY RETHINKING SUBURBAN RETAIL



WHERE ELSE HAS

SUBURBAN RETAIL BEEN

RETROFITTED?

CITYCENTRE HOUSTON, TEXAS



CITYCENTRE *houston, texas*

- Mixed-use redevelopment of abandoned Town and Country Mall
- Existing mall completely demolished, save three parking structures that were refurbished

Development Program

- Retail, restaurants, movie theater, office space
- 370 multi-family units
- 250 lofts
- 35 townhomes
- Hotel and conference facility
- Open space







THE PASEO **PASADENA, CALIFORNIA**

TIT



THE PASEO *pasadena, california*

- Retrofit of an aging shopping mall (Plaza Pasadena)
- Pedestrian shopping street in a new mixeduse redevelopment precinct.
- Phased redevelopment with existing anchors retained and replaced over time

Development Program

- Office space, retail, movie theater
- 391 condos
- Restaurants, concert venue, underground parking garage











SANTANA ROW San Jose, Californi

LarkCreek Blu

NEW

ILEASING


SANTANA ROW *san jose, california*

- Santana Row is an outdoor mall
- Previously a Town and Country Village



San Jose, California

Development Program

- Retail, restaurants, movie theater
- Hotel and office space
- 615 rental homes
- 219 condos









FOCUS AREA STUDIES URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES

MAXIMIZE HOUSING SUPPLY

Residential densities greater than 29 du/acre

EXPANSION OF RETAIL IS NOT A PRIORITY <

New retail should be community-serving and calibrated to increased residential uses

LAND USE

EXPLORE SUBTERRANEAN PARKING

Sub-surface parking structures should be utilized when feasible

REDUCE FOOTPRINT OF SURFACE PARKING

Facilitate usable, active, pedestrian-first places by decreasing areas for auto-only use

FOCUS AREA STUDIES URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES

CREATE STRONG STREET WALLS

Defined interface between the built form and public realm

PLACE-MAKING

MAKE PLACES THAT ARE WALKABLE, ENGAGING, AND VIBRANT

Retrofit aging suburban mall typologies away from auto-centric to pedestrian-first

CREATE INTERNAL MAIN STREETS

Explore street typologies that make smaller blocks and focus activity and density

PROVIDE MORE OPEN SPACE

New plazas, paseos, and parks provided at 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents.

FOCUS AREA STUDIES URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES

SUBDIVIDE SUPERBLOCKS

Create compact and ped-friendly street and block patterns

NO NEW CONTROLLED INTERSECTIONS

New streets should be aligned to utilize existing controlled intersections

SHARE PARKING ACROSS USES

Achieve 20% reduction in parking by sharing residential and retail parking

NO PARKING MINIMUMS

Focus areas lie with TPA's and will be consistent with San Diego's recently approved parking reforms

MOBILITY

MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER

Site area: 34.1 acres Developed area: 418,000 sf Parking: ~ 2,400 spaces Ratio: ~ 5.75 spaces/1,000 sf

> Site area: 30.3 acres Developed area: 322,500 sf Parking: ~ 1,800 spaces Ratio: ~ 5.6 spaces/1,000 sf

Site area: 4.6 acres No. of units: 108 Parking: ~ 125 spaces Ratio: ~ 1.2 spaces/unit Site area: 9.7 acres Developed area: 82,500 sf Parking: ~ 600 spaces Ratio: ~ 7.2 spaces/1,000 sf

Site area: 2.5 acres Developed area: 19,500 sf Parking: ~ 140 spaces Ratio: ~ 7.2 spaces/1,000 sf

(美国新教学学校教育学、教育

MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Focus site area: 81.2 acres

Retail/Office developed area: 842,500 sf

Retail/Office Parking: ~4,940 spaces

Ratio: ~ 5.9 spaces/1,000 sf

Residential units: 108 units

Residential parking: ~125 spaces

Ratio: 1.16 spaces/unit



MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER RETAINED RETAIL ANCHORS

Net area after parcelization:	47 acres
Available site area for new development:	71.04 acres
Footprint of retained buildings:	445,000 sf
Site area:	81.2 acres







DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

MIRA MESA *town center*







OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Public space at Mira Mesa Blvd & Camino Ruiz

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

- Main Street bridging Mira Mesa Blvd
- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Distributed hierarchy of open space plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

RETAINS EXISTING SURFACE PARKING RETAINS ELEMENTS OF SUBURBAN MALL TYPE LOWER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY MAXIMIZES OPEN SPACE AMENITY URBAN, MORE CONDUCIVE TO WALKING HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE MIRA MESA





Reagan Rd looking south



Live Work/townhomes along Reagan Rd

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Public space at Mira Mesa Blvd & Camino Ruiz

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

PARKS PLAZAS & PASEOS PEDESTRIAN SPACE RETAINED BUILDINGS

Hosphornshand Schemedicted







Existing stoplight on Mira Mesa Blvd at Mira Mesa Mall

MIRA MESA *town center*



Reconfigured intersection on Mira Mesa Blvd

2 – URBAN VILLAGE

MIRA MESA TOWN CENTER

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

MIRA MESA

COMMUNITY PARK

CIVIC CENTER

MIRA MESA

- Main Street bridging Mira Mesa Blvd _
- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Distributed hierarchy of open space plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments



MIRA MESA BLVD







Internal Main Street

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

MIRA MESA *town center*

- Main Street bridging Mira Mesa Blvd
- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

PARKSPLAZAS & PASEOSPEDESTRIAN SPACERETAINED BUILDINGS

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER MIRA MESA

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

MIRA MESA COMMUNITY PARK

CIVIC CENTER

MIRA MESA

HIGH SCHOOL

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

PARKS
PLAZAS & PASEOS
PEDESTRIAN SPACE
RETAINED BUILDINGS

MIRA MESA BLVD



MIRA MESA *town center*

Mira Mesa Blvd looking east



Reconfigured sidewalk and mixed-use along Mira Mesa Blvd

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER MIRA MESA

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

PARKS
PLAZAS & PASEOS
PEDESTRIAN SPACE
RETAINED BUILDINGS

DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

MIRA MESA *town center*







OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Public space at Mira Mesa Blvd & Camino Ruiz

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

- Main Street bridging Mira Mesa Blvd
- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Distributed hierarchy of open space plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

RETAINS EXISTING SURFACE PARKING RETAINS ELEMENTS OF SUBURBAN MALL TYPE LOWER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY MAXIMIZES OPEN SPACE AMENITY URBAN, MORE CONDUCIVE TO WALKING HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

MIRA MESA GATEWAY





MIRA MESA GATEWAY SUB AREA A EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Focus site area: 56.8 acres

Retail/Office developed area: 714,670 sf

Retail Parking: ~3,420 spaces

Ratio: ~ 4.8 spaces/1,000 sf



MIRA MESA GATEWAY SUB AREA A RETAINED ANCHORS

Site area:	56.8 acres
Footprint of retained buildings:	591,500 sf
Available site area for new development:	43.35 acres
Net area after parcelization:	29 acres

Site area: 2.75 acres Developed area: 31,357 sf Parking: ~ 122 spaces Ratio: ~ 3.9 spaces/1,000 sf

MIRA MESA BLVD

Site area: 19 acres Residential Units: 162 units Parking: ~ 73 spaces Ratio: ~ 0.45 spaces/unit

ROAD

Site area: 5 acres Developed area: 48,136 sf Parking: ~ 245 spaces Ratio: ~ 5 spaces/1,000 sf

> Site area: 8.9 acres Developed area: 151,667 sf Parking: ~ 475 spaces Ratio: ~ 3.1 spaces/1,000 sf

> > Site area: 2.1 acres Developed area: 26,713 sf Parking: ~ 90 spaces Ratio: ~ 3.4 spaces/1,000 sf

Site area: 14.6 acres Residential Units: 125 units Parking: ~ 65 spaces Ratio: ~ 0.5 spaces/unit

MIRA MESA GATEWAY SUB AREA B EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NO BUILDINGS RETAINED

Focus site area: 52.35 acres

Retail/Office developed area: 257,873 sf

Retail/Office Parking: ~932 spaces

Ratio: ~ 3.6 spaces/1,000 sf

Residential units: 287 units

Residential parking: ~138 spaces

Ratio: 0.48 spaces/unit



MIRA MESA GATEWAY SUB AREA C EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NO BUILDINGS RETAINED

Overall site area: 24.8 acres

Developed area: 257,794 sf

Parking: ~1,370 spaces

Ratio: ~ 5.3 spaces/1,000 sf

CONSOLIDATED HYPOTHETICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

MIRA MESA GATEWAY SUB AREA A+B+C


DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES



OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Distributed public space



OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Distributed hierarchy of open space Central Park, plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments



MIRA MESA GATEWAY

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do no represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

RETAINS EXISTING SURFACE PARKING RETAINS ELEMENTS OF SUBURBAN MALL TYPE LOWER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY MAXIMIZES OPEN SPACE AMENITY URBAN, MORE CONDUCIVE TO WALKING HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE MIRA MESA



TRANSIT HUB

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE MIRA MESA

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

PARKS
PLAZAS & PASEOS
PEDESTRIAN SPACE
RETAINED BUILDINGS

OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Distributed public space



MIRA MESA *GATEWAY*

Existing Black Mountain Road



New townhomes along Black Mountain Road

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

MIRA MESA *gateway*



OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

PARKS
PLAZAS & PASEOS
PEDESTRIAN SPACE
RETAINED BUILDINGS

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking

Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors

MIRA MESA

GATEWAY

- Distributed hierarchy of open space Central Park, plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments



Looking east at Mesa Shopping Center



OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER MIRA MESA

MIRA MESA BLVD

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

TRANSIT HUB 15

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER MIRA MESA

PARKS
PLAZAS & PASEOS
PEDESTRIAN SPACE
RETAINED BUILDINGS

Draft – All images are shown to illustrate planning concepts only and do not represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments



Existing surface parking at Mira Mesa Market Center



DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES



OPTION 1 – COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Combination of surface & structured parking
- Retained surface parking for retail anchors
- Residential: mix of townhome, live-work, and apartments
- Distributed public space



OPTION 2 – URBAN VILLAGE

- Anchor tenants retained
- Mostly structured parking
- Dedicated parking garage for retained anchors
- Distributed hierarchy of open space Central Park, plazas and paseos along with parks
- Residential: mix of attached townhomes/livework and apartments



MIRA MESA GATEWAY

represent a design, project or land use proposal.

OPTION 3 – LIFESTYLE CENTER

- 100% redevelopment no anchors retained
- Combination of structured and subsurface parking
- Highest amount of public space and amenities, most pedestrian-friendly
- Residential: mix of townhomes, podium/wrap apartments, and mid-rise apartments

RETAINS EXISTING SURFACE PARKING RETAINS ELEMENTS OF SUBURBAN MALL TYPE LOWER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY MAXIMIZES OPEN SPACE AMENITY URBAN, MORE CONDUCIVE TO WALKING HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

TOWN CENTER AND GATEWAY RETHINKING SUBURBAN RETAIL





For more information please visit:

www.PlanMiraMesa.org

Mira Mesa
Computing Mesa
Design Plan
Design IDianning DepartmentSeptember 16, 20195:30 pm to 6:50 pm – Mira Mesa Library

Image: Google Earth

www.PlanMiraMesa.org