

Stone Creek Subcommittee Recommendations (Complete) Motion made/seconded by John Horst/Joe Frichtel. Motion carried successfully. Jeff Stevens, John Horst, Bruce Brown, Joe Frichtel, Mark Kornheiser, Tom Derr, James Ludwick

May 21, 2012

The Stone Creek Subcommittee of the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group has been reviewing versions of the proposed Stone Creek project since October, 2006. Although the project has evolved over that time period, the main concerns expressed by the subcommittee are still much the same as noted in the minutes of those early meetings. Although we have not completed our review of the project, we feel that it is important to make some recommendations at this time while the project is still in the planning process and has not yet received approval of City staff. The main issues are 1) public facilities, particularly active use parkland; 2) traffic; and 3) appropriate changes to the community plan in the community plan amendment.

The Stone Creek project is very large. In fact it is the largest single project ever proposed in Mira Mesa, and it will increase the population anticipated in the community plan by 17% - almost 15,000 people (half the population of Scripps Ranch). That will impact all of our public facilities – it means 17% more library patrons, more people using our parks, more students in the schools, more area for fire and police service to respond to, etc. The project should therefore provide mitigation for these impacts, and the community plan should take into account the community-wide effects of this population increase. The subcommittee would like to make the following specific recommendations:

1. Traffic – Traffic must be mitigated to the extent that levels of service on existing Mira Mesa streets and through existing Mira Mesa intersections are no worse after the project is completed than they would be without the project.
2. Road improvement – Carroll Canyon Road must be completed from I-15 to I-805 before any residential units are occupied. If this is impossible due to land in private ownership, then the remainder of Carroll Canyon Road must be completed plus road improvements sufficient to route traffic along Miramar Road and Carroll Road until Carroll Canyon Road is completed.
3. Parkland – The Stone Creek project, optionally together with the Fenton/Hanson project, should provide a minimum of 30 acres of active use parkland, including a minimum 20-acre Community Park, in Carroll Canyon (or a suitable alternative in Mira Mesa) prior to the occupancy of any residential units. The community has long anticipated a large active use park in Carroll Canyon, as stated in the reference to an “enlarged park to meet the demand for additional athletic fields” in the Community Plan. The Stone Creek developer has been trying to make the case that this refers to the park on the Hanson property, but the park in the Hanson (Fenton) master plan is only 10 acres, and in any case the additional population will need more active use park space than is in the existing community plan.
4. Community Plan – the Community Plan amendment should update all parts of the Community Plan that are affected by this project and the additional population it will

bring. This should include updates to the buildout traffic projections and updates to public facilities. The amendment should include the additional population of this project, added to the current buildout population in the Community Plan. The amendment should not include SANDAG's higher future population projection unless it is accompanied by an explanation for this additional population. The amendment should include additional parkland to meet population based park standards, and should not include statements suggesting that it is not necessary to meet park standards. In particular in the current draft plan amendment the language "Proposals for acquisition and development of sufficient park acreage to meet the standards for population-based parks are provided..." is changed to "Proposals for acquisition and development of park acreage *to help* to meet the standards for population-based parks are provided...". This change makes the statement meaningless and should not be made.