MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE MISSION VALLEY PLANNING GROUP

March 1, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT
Steve Abbo	Matthew Guillory
Deborah Bossmeyer	Rob Hutsel
Paul Brown	Rick Tarbell
Bob Cummings	
Robert Doherty	
Randall Dolph	
Alan Grant	
Derek Hulse	
John La Raia	
Elizabeth Leventhal	
Kathy McSherry	
Andrew Michajlenko	CITY STAFF
Jim Penner	Nancy Graham
Keith Pittsford	Liz Saidkhanian
Marco Sessa	
Dottie Surdi	
Josh Weiselberg	
Larry Wenell	

A. CALL TO ORDER:
Verify Quorum: 18 of 21 members were present, constituting a quorum. Chairman Dottie Surdi called the regular meeting of the Mission Valley Planning Group (MVPG) to order at 12:03 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library Community Room located at 2123 Fenton Parkway, San Diego, CA.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – led by Randall Dolph

C. INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING REMARKS:
Dottie Surdi welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded those present to sign the sign in sheets. Guests introduced themselves.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Dottie Surdi asked for a motion to approve the February 1, 2017 minutes.
A motion was made by Keith Pittsford to approve the minutes. Alan Grant seconded the motion. The motion was approved 14-0-4 with Andrew Michajlenko, Derek Hulse, Dotti Surdi and Josh Weiselberg abstaining.

E. PUBLIC INPUT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS BUT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF THE PLANNING GROUP.
"The Mission Valley Planning Group has been formed and recognized by the City Council to make recommendations to the City Council, Planning Commission, City staff, and other governmental agencies on land use matters, specifically concerning the preparation of, adoption of, implementation of, or amendment to, the General Plan or a land use plan when a plan relates to the Mission Valley community

boundaries. The planning group also advises on other land use matters as requested by the City or other governmental agency." Mission Valley Planning Group Bylaws as Amended and approved July 2015.

F. **MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE:**

Keith Pittsford announced there are 3 openings on the Mission Valley Planning Group Board; 2 Resident and 1 Property Owner. Keith introduced two applicants for the Resident openings, Kaye Durant and Mary Holland, and stated both were fully qualified and met all requirements of serving as members of the Planning Group.

Keith Pittsford distributed a ballot with both applicant's presented for consideration. Keith Pittsford tallied the votes and both applicants were approved unanimously.

G. **TREASURER'S REPORT:**

Bob Doherty reported that the balance is unchanged at $1,357.06.

H. **NEW BUSINESS**

INFORMATION ITEM: the chairman made an accommodation for FS Investors to present out of order on the agenda due to an unexpected timing issue for the presenter.

FS Investors, MLS Pursuit LLC, Nick Stone Presenting – Information item:
(note: Planning group member Andrew Michajlenko recused himself in advance of the presentation)

Nick Stone presented a proposed redevelopment of the Qualcomm stadium site. The redevelopment would include the construction of a Major League Soccer stadium, residential, office, riverfront park improvements and recreational play field. A website of www.goalsd.com was noted in the presentation materials as available for the public to review the project, and a legal notice of intent to circulate a public petition was published in the San Diego Union Tribute on Wednesday February 22, 2017.

Mr Stone highlighted the various aspects of the project including:

- 100% privately financed project.
- 55 acres of parkland which expands the River Park and adds community recreational fields
- Construction of a soccer stadium which could also be used by San Diego State University for football and other uses.
- Generates tax dollars for San Diego
- Development of a sports and entertainment district with retail, restaurants.
- Anticipates 3,520 residential units with 800 student residential units for the university and 480 units designated as affordable housing.
- 2.4 million square feet of office, 740 thousand square feet of commercial space and 450 hotel rooms.
- Mr Stone further noted that FS Investors has the exclusive rights to San Diego by MLS to bring a team to the city, and that 12 cities are currently vying for one of four MLS expansion teams. To be considered FS Investors has to provide for a stadium facility by March of 2020.

Comments and Questions included:

- What is the evidence that professional soccer would succeed in San Diego? Mr. Stone stated that the current 20 Major League teams have the third highest average attendance among all professional sports leagues in the United States. Also stated that soccer is the world's most popular sport, and that San Diego television viewership during the last world cup was the 2nd

highest in the nation. They have also conducted some levels of pricing models with MLS to assess the viability of the market, and are working with top level executives in Soccer.

- (Q) Do the Kinder Morgan tanks impact the project? (A) Mr. Stone said that the tank farm is outside the scope of the project.
- (Q) How active is the FS Investors team working with San Diego State University on the size of the stadium to see if would be useful to their football program. (A) Mr. Stone said that they have had multiple conversations with the University over the past six months, and would continue on an ongoing basis.
- (Q) Questions arose on the permitting process. (A) Mr. Stone stated that they are putting forward a specific plan through the citizen's initiative process, followed by a request for council vote on the initiative. Going forward if the project or timelines stray outside the specific plan initiative language then the project would revert to the traditional permitting process.
- (Q) Questions regarding mitigation measures such as traffic, and the timing of the installation of mitigation measures. It was noted that traditional permitting process would insure that mitigation measures would be implemented and not side stepped. (A) Mr. Stone stated that the specific plan addresses traffic impacts with specific road an intersection improvements.
- (Q) Question regarding the trolley line, specifically the addition of the purple line to offset traffic impact. (A) Mr. Stone noted that the purple line as of today is unfunded, and for the purposes of the initiative were not assumed in their studies.
- (Q) It was noted that Serra Mesa was not mentioned in the specific plan traffic study, and that there is a direct impact of traffic from the current Qualcomm Stadium event days. (A) Mr. Stone stated that the specific plan indicates improvement on Friars to offset traffic.
- (Q) It was noted that the study states that traffic in the study is double what a typical Chargers 'game day' traffic was, but that would now be every day of the week/year. (A) Mr. Stone stated that was misleading as the ADT's in the specific plan study are spread throughout the day, and not bundled in a 3 or 4 hour window. He also stated that the specific plan traffic assumes a worst case scenario, and that the envisioned live, work, play environment follows the city of villages concept where there is less reliance on cars.
- (Q) Parking concerns were raised. (A) Mr. Stone said the parking study assumes a shared parking analysis based on the various uses.

The Planning Group briefly discussed how best to proceed with making a recommendation to the Council on such a significant City asset as the Qualcomm Stadium site. As the item was before the planning group as an 'information item' no action was taken. The chair noted that the item would be placed on the April agenda as an action item so further discussion and/or formal action could be taken.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. SDMM - Sean St. Peter Presenting – Action Item:

   Project # 523179: The project is returning seeking approval from the MVPG for a conditional use permit for a proposed MMCC. The project consists of a Conditional Use Permit for a MMCC to operate within a 5,074 square foot tenant space of an existing two-story, 17,299 square foot commercial building located at 1233 Camino Del Rio South.

   Applicant introduced himself and provided photographic maps of the area surrounding the CUP location that demonstrated 1,000 foot radius boundary limits of the property. This was in response to the February request by the MVPG. The applicant then invited questions about the application.

   Comments and Questions included:

- Was the property properly noticed with signed posted as required. Applicant stated that they were, and has checked on them periodically as notices tend to be stolen or removed by those in opposition to the facility.
- San Diego for Safe Neighborhoods expressed concerns of criminal activity and sited concerns for the ill health effects of such use. Applicant briefly stated the benefits to those with illnesses.
- Is there an issue of the proposed CUP being within 1,000 feet of a school/park. Applicant stated that the steep hillsides elevation change breaks 1,000 foot path of travel to the school/park. Nancy Graham confirmed the stipulated code.
- Concern about proper noticing of neighbors within 1,000 feet. Applicant stated that they have followed all requirements of the city for noticing.
- Concerns of neighbors and how it would affect their customer base.
- One local business owner stated they had no concerns about the applicant or proposed CUP.

The board discussed that the San Diego City Council has adopted four MMCC's for each district, meaning a total of 4 MMCC CUP's are available for District 7 (within Mission Valley). It was also noted that a small portion of District 3 intersects with Mission Valley south of the 8 freeway and two MMCC's have been approved in that location of Mission Valley.

A motion was made by Marco Sessa to support the project with all cycle comments addressed. Alan Grant seconded the motion. The motion was approved:

10 Ayes: Grant, Pittsford, McSherry, Bossmeyer, Sessa, Cummings, Penner, Hulse, Brown, Michajlenko.
7 Against: La Raia, Leventhal, Wenell, Surdi, Abbo, Doherty, Dolph
1 Abstain: Weiselberg

2. City of San Diego Public Works, Amy Mills, Project Manager and Jim Bliss, Psomas Presenting.
Project #523881: Mission Village Drive – from Ronda to Qualcomm, sidewalk improvements.
The presenter gave a visual presentation of the project along Mission Village Drive traveling north up the hill from Qualcomm Stadium.
Comments and Questions included:
   - Due to the steep hillside nature of the street, does or could the project include a few safe zones, specifically to accommodate ADA path of travel. The presenter stated that it may be difficult due to the steep hillsides beside the sidewalk but they understood the concern and would look into the issue further.

A motion was made by Jim Penner to recommend the project for approval, with inclusion of Keith Pittsford's suggestion to add "safe zones" along the path of travel for ADA due to steep grade of the street. Bob Cummings seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. Town and Country, Todd Majcher (Lowe Enterprises) Presenting.
Project #424475 Recommend approval of the Town and Country project including: Removal from the Atlas Specific Plan, Mission Valley Planned Development Ordinance Amendment, Rezone from MVPD-MV-MV/SP to MVPD-MV-M (MV-CV and MVR-5), General Plan Amendment, Mission Valley Community Plan Amendment, Planned Development Permit (Master Plan), Site

Development Permit, Amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 88-0585, Certification of the EIR, Vesting Tentative Map, Easement Vacations.

The applicant gave an overview of the project that included:

- Reducing hotel rooms from 954 keys to 700 keys
- Adding 840 residential units
- The project is fully consistent with Climate Action Plan
- Restoring 11 acres of the river frontage, and adding a 3 acre public park along river.
- Contributing $64 million to City over 30 years, which is 50% higher than current levels.
- Regarding traffic, the project is adding no new Average Daily Trips (ADT). Hotel and convention center space ADT's offset lower traffic residential use ADT's.
- Randall Dolph reported the findings of the Design Advisory Board sub-committee meeting with the applicant (attached).

Comments and questions included:

- Great project, smart development, applicant has engaged both the public and the board over the past year in their process, and provide clear presentations.
- A question was asked how flood issues may impact the project. Applicant stated that they will improve flow of the river by removing non-native species, and improve elevation change with the public park allowing for better flood control.

A motion was made by Randall Dolph to recommend the project to the planning commission subject to and including all recommendations made by the Design Advisory Board. Alan Grant seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. MMCC, Jim Bartell Presenting.

Project #514308 A Process Three Conditional Use Permit and Site Development Permit for a Medical Marijuana Consumer Cooperative (MMCC) to operate within a 4,401-square-foot tenant space of an existing 10,318-square-foot commercial building located at 2425 Camino Del Rio South in the Commercial Office (MV-CO) Zone of the Mission Valley Planned District within the Mission Valley Community Plan Area.

The applicant gave a brief overview of the project, presenting the floor plans for the project, highlighting security measures, and stating that they operate another MMCC in San Diego for the past year without issues with regard to security. The applicant also stated that they have cleared 100% of all city cycle issues.

Comments and Questions included:

- Question regarding a trade school that operates within 1,000 feet of the applicant's proposed site. The applicant stated that the trade school is specifically geared to those 18 years and older, and that the city has cleared this issue.
- Questions regarding a church that holds services within 1,000 of the site. The applicant stated that the church is not permitted with a CUP to operate at their facility, and are looking for a new location. The city has stated that they do not consider this unpermitted use an impediment to the applicant's CUP request.
- Brief discussion on the number of MMCC's approved by the city for District 7. A total of 4 have been allocated by council. With one previously recommended, this would be the second for District 7.

- A concern was raised regarding parking for a 'retail' operation. The applicant stated that the have exceeded the City's parking requirement as part of clearing all city cycle issues.

A motion was made by Derek Hulse to approve. Bob Cummings seconded the motion. The motion was denied as eight ayes were required to exceed 51% of the Quorum.

7 Ayes: Grant, Pittsford, Bossmeyer, Sessa, Cummings, Penner, Hulse.
6 Against: Leventhal, Wenell, Surdi, Dolph, Michajlenko, Brown.
1 Abstain: Weiselberg
(note: several board members had to leave prior to formal adjournment due to the length of the meeting. The aforementioned vote roll call constituted all members of the board then present.)

I. NEW BUSINESS – Information Items:

2. City of San Diego Capital Improvements Program, Reyhaneh Martin, Project Manager Presenting.
Below are the links to the project information:
Water Portion Project B-13186: http://cipapp.sandiego.gov/cipdistrictnav.aspx
Sewer Portion Project B-14069: http://cipapp.sandiego.gov/cipdistrictnav.aspx

Due to the length of the meeting the chair apologized to the presenters and requested if the capital improvement project item could be rescheduled for the April meeting. The presenters agreed.

J. OLD BUSINESS:
Due to the length of the meeting all subcommittee reports were tabled until the April regular meeting:

K. ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to be brought before the Planning Group, the meeting was adjourned at 2:23 P.M. The next regular meeting will be on Wednesday, April 5, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library, Community Room.

Jim Penner
MVPG Secretary

DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD
Mission Valley Planning Group

March 1, 2017

TO: Dottie Surdi, MVPG Chair

FROM: Randy Dolph, DAB Chair

SUBJECT: Report of February 27, 2017 DAB Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 P.M. in the Mission Valley Library. Members present were: Paul Brown, Randy Dolph, Steve Kiss, Jerry Shonkwiler, and Dottie Surdi. Applicant representatives from the Town and Country Project include Todd Majcher, Mike McNerney, Gary Wood, and Jenny An.

Town and Country Project – Action Item

Todd Majcher provided an overview of the Town and Country project. Highlights included:

- Lowe Enterprises history, including past projects.
- Review of the Town and Country timeline.
- No Army Corps permits are required.
- No historical designations required.
- The overall scope of the development was reviewed, including:
    - 700-key hotel with a resort pool experience.
    - 170,000 sq. ft. convention center.
    - 800-unit compact residential infill. Parcels may be sold to residential developers, but with oversight by Lowe.
    - 7 acres of habitat restoration.
    - 3.31 acre on-site public park (lies within the floodway).
    - 1,200 feet of trails/river path.
    - No additional vehicle trips and reduction from the currently approved Atlas Specific Plan.
    - Design guidelines.
- The next series of discretionary actions include planning commission hearing in April 2017 and City Council hearing in May 2017.

Questions, comments, and concerns included:

- When asked if a noise study had been conducted along I-8 for the residential units, the applicant noted it had.
- With regard to phasing, the applicant noted that Phase 1 included the public park, improvements to Hotel Circle North, hotel improvements, and residential parcels 1 and 2. Phase 2 included residential parcels 3 and 4. The DAB requested the applicant carefully consider the visual aspects of the project subsequent to the completion of Phase 1 but prior to Phase 2.
- The DAB inquired if the internal streets would be public or private. The applicant responded that easements would be granted to the City for the public streets, while the developer remains responsible for maintenance within these easements. The DAB also reviewed two types of roadway/sidewalk intersections and related issues.

- Several DAB members expressed concerns regarding visibility of equipment (i.e. roof-top mechanical equipment, a/c units, gas meters, utility boxes, dryer/kitchen vents). The applicant noted the intent is to conceal these items as much as possible. The DAB requested that the applicant incorporate the applicable municipal code language (San Diego Municipal Code 142.0901-0910) into the masterplan document.
- The DAB also expressed potential concerns with the appearance of parking structures. Such concerns include screening cars/headlights from public/guest view, providing a finished appearance on the exterior elevation, minimizing light trespass from the interior of the parking structure, and treatment of the top floor of the parking structure. Likewise, the DAB recommended the applicant incorporate the applicable municipal code language (San Diego Municipal Code 142.0560(k) into the masterplan document.
- Since specific design of the residential parcels will occur separately from the masterplan document, the DAB inquired if the applicant would be willing to return to the DAB and MVPG for any substantial conformance reviews (SCRs). The applicant was open to doing so, provided that the SCR presentations were for information only.
- The applicant described the overall concept of the bridge.
- When asked about development along the eastern edge of the property, the applicant noted that a north-south bike lane will be provided along this side.
- The connection to River Walk Way was discussed.

Since the project was before the DAB as an action item, Shonkwiler motioned to recommend the project to the planning group, contingent upon the following: (1) parking structures are designed in accordance with SDMC regulations, (2) equipment is screened from public/guest view also in accordance with SDMC regulations, (3) any future SCR's are brought back to the DAB/MVPG as informational items, and (4) the applicant address any outstanding City and EIR comments. The motion was seconded by Surdi. The motion was passed 5-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M., with the next regularly meeting tentatively scheduled for Monday, April 3, 2017.

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department •City of San Diego
1010 Second Ave., Suite 1200, East Tower• San Diego, CA 92101
SDPlanninggroups@sandiego.gov• (619) 235-5200

CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Russ Connelly, City Heights Keith
Hartz, Clairemont Mesa
Jose Reynoso, College Area
Pat Stark, Downtown
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area
David Swarens, Greater Golden Hill
David Moty, Kensington/Talmadge
Noli Zosa, Linda Vista
Cathy Kenton, Midway
Lorayne Burley, Miramar Ranch North
Debbie Watkins, Mission Beach
Daniel Smith, Navajo
Vicki Granowitz, North Park
John Ambert, Ocean Beach
Ann Dahlkamp, Old Town
Mel Ingalls, Otay Mesa
Jon Linney, Peninsula
Wallace Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch
Bob Crider, Serra Mesa
Guy Preuss, Skyline/Paradise Hills
Robert Leif, Southeastern
Janay Kruger, University
Leo Wilson, Uptown

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: Ocean Beach, Old Town

Guests: Cindy Moore, Lisa Lind, Karl Rand and others

City Staff/Representatives: Nancy Graham, Sarah Jarman, Barret Tetlow, Tony Kempton, Maria Reyna and Maria Nieves.

NOTE: *The sign-in sheets provided at the entrance to the meeting are used to list CPC Representatives, guest speakers, and staff present at the meeting.*

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair David Moty called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and proceeded with roll call.

2. **NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Guy Preuss discussed companion units and development regulations.
- Tom Mullaney made some points about how impact fees affect housing cost. Raising impact fees will not increase housing costs and lowering fees will increase developer profit and result in less funds for facilities. The only way to lower housing costs according to a UCSD professor is to lower the standard of living.

3. **MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**
Agenda approved unanimously.

4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2017:**
Minutes approved as corrected by vote of 12-0-7. Abstentions: Serra Mesa, University, Mission Beach, College Area, Navajo, Otay Mesa, Kensington/Talmadge.

5. **SGLU WORK PLAN-** Information Item
CPC membership discussed the City Council's Smart Growth & Land Use Committee's adopted work plan for the coming year. Councilmember Sherman gave a presentation on housing affordability, including strategies to increase housing supply, decrease project costs and streamline the approval process. Regarding affordability CPC members cited cost as a major inhibitor for many San Diegans to own housing when compared with cities like Detroit. Councilmember Sherman said that lowering costs in conjunction with increasing the supply would allow more affordability. Sherman also indicated that restructuring DIF to be calculated by square feet instead of per unit is a strategy in the memo that is expected to encourage development of smaller units, in turn lowering cost per unit. CPC members expressed concern that lowering DIF could also result in less funding for facilities like parks.

CPC members considered the impacts of changing requirements. The trend toward reducing parking requirements for development along transit corridors was questioned for fear it would push parking into adjacent neighborhoods. Lowering park acreage standards was thought to possibly reduce costs and some CPC members thought this strategy should be further explored. Concerns were also expressed about the affordable density bonus program. The use of streamlining incentives is resulting in planning groups having no input on their development. It was suggested that applicants appear as information items to involve the planning groups in design if they cannot be part of the decision-making process. Some saw concentrating smaller units around transit may be a way to preserve the single-family property values. However, there were also concerns over reducing DIF if the goal is to attract density. Park equivalencies/parklets were mentioned as alternatives to large parks and they may be less expensive.

Regarding regionalizing community planning groups (from 48 to 9), the Councilmember shared this as an opportunity to professionalize planning groups and provide more training. He also discussed that the groups would be better served by more diversification and less recycling of planning group membership, and that more outreach is needed to include minorities and renters. CPC members were interested in a training program and suggested videos (such as Robert Stern – Pride of Place or newly created ones) to educate new planning board members. Regionalizing was criticized because CPC members felt each community has unique needs and the residents are the best conduit to those needs for the City. Some CPC members took issue with the use of the term "professionalize" and shared that the knowledge of group members is very valuable to the planning process. Many felt using all industry-related representatives who may not live in a neighborhood would harm planning for the city. Some felt that enforcing term limits would help eliminate an select

group leading the decision-making for extended period of time, but there were also concerns that it could make it difficult for some groups to achieve a quorum.

Other strategies were discussed including having affordable housing dispersed throughout the community instead of concentrated in one area for fear that concentrated units decrease an area's property values. It was also suggested to use eminent domain for park facilities in communities that are 99% deficient or establish a park purchase fund for optimum sites.

A discussion on the Huffman 6-packs also occurred. Some CPC members expressed that these projects do not add to a community's character and their design creates significant negative impacts for surrounding properties, especially from the full lot line curb cut. One suggestion was to develop an overlay where a Planned Development Permit (PDP) could be used to incentivize redevelopment of Huffman 6-packs with community input. The current plan suggests the use of a Process 4 decision, which disincentives developers unlike a Process 2 decision. It was proposed that a wish list/tool kit be developed to help guide the redevelopment of Huffmans, including utility undergrounding, sidewalks, etc. Discretionary review plus the tool kit was recommended as the best approach.

Other concerns expressed included the possibility that accessory units could exacerbate parking problems. Some shared concerns that transit oriented development may not be feasible for some segments of the population, especially on-call workers. However, some CPC members felt smaller lots and zero lot lines may be a way to encourage supply. Certification of developers who would guarantee legal compliance was considered by some as an interesting idea for lowering development costs.

Regarding process streamlining, members expressed concern that the reduction of the CEQA appeal period to five days is inefficient and does provide enough time. Fifteen days was identified as sufficient in order to assemble the planning group. Discussion also surrounded the City's trip generation rates and the need for them to be updated, and the use of SANDAG traffic modeling as opposed to consultant-prepared studies. CPC members also reflected on the smart growth priorities, and some supported incentives for solar and grey water reuse.

The Smart Growth and Land Use work program can be found here:
http://docs.sandiego.gov/councilcomm_agendas_attach/2017/sglu_170215_5.pdf

6. **REPORTS TO CPC:**
   - Staff Report: None
   - Subcommittee Reports: None
   - Chairperson's Report: None
   - CPC Member Comments: None

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING, March 28, 2017
The meeting was adjourned by Chair David Moty at 8:51 PM

Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS)
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE
Feb 10, 2017

Members Present:
Deborah Bossmeyer, Paul Brown, Alan Grant, Derek Hulse, Rob Hutsel, Richard Ledford, Elizabeth Leventhal, Patrick Pierce, John Schneidmiller, Marco Sessa, Dottie Surdi, Karen Tournaire, Larry Wennel

Members Absent:
Andrew Michajlenko, Michael Richter, Karen Ruggels, Rebecca Sappenfield, Nate Smith

San Diego City Planning Staff and Consultants present:
City: Nancy Graham, Maureen Gardiner, Monique Chen (Chen Ryan), Emanuel Alforja (Mobility)

Governmental Staff:
Karen Reilly, San Diego Public Library

Others in attendance:
John Nugent, Hank Gotthelf, Cindy Moore, Marcela Escober-Eck, Gail Rutherford, Ken Goothelf, Allen Leisorch, Jesse, Schrum, Douglas Hoshaw, John Zierbarth, Ted Shaw, Karen Reilly

A. Call To Order
Nancy Graham called the regular meeting of the Mission Valley Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS) to order at 3:00 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library Community Room located at 2123 Fenton Parkway, San Diego, CA.

B. Conceptual Land Use Alternatives
Nancy Graham led a presentation on Mission Valley's Conceptual Land Use Alternatives, beginning with the Project Objectives & Community Priorities, which are to:

1. Guide future growth and development based on current and future demands
2. Focus growth into pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use activity centers
3. Improve and promote regional transit system &
4. Celebrate the San Diego River

The Community Priorities include Mobility, Land Use/Urban Design, and Open Space

Nancy & the Consultants then went over the current Existing Conditions in terms of:

1. Existing Land Use

2. Current Development Projects
3. Opportunity Sites
4. Development Summary

Nancy then went through the 3 Land Use Alternatives:

1. String of Pearls Concept (puts Focus on the River, Transit, and N/S Connections)

2. Vibrant Core Concept (puts Focus on the Central Core of MV, Commercial Development, & Public Uses of Land)

3. Campuses & Clusters Concept (puts Focus on Mixed Use Campuses, Circulation Improvements, & High Density Residential)

Nancy then discussed the next steps regarding getting us to a Preferred Plan

C. Discussion

A discussion took place regarding the pros and cons of each alternative in terms of traffic, density, connectivity, the River, mobility, and design.

D. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm. Next Regular Meeting Date – Friday, March 10, 2017 at the Mission Valley Library, Community Room.