

**Mira Mesa Community Planning Group
Stone Creek Subcommittee Report
October 23, 2006 Meeting**

The subcommittee as well as the full Planning Group and anyone else interested in this project were invited to this first full presentation on the project design on October 23, 2006 at the Mira Mesa library. The architect, Mike LaBarre, gave the presentation.

This project is the plan for redevelopment of the Vulcan Carroll Canyon property, which is currently used for gravel mining. The site contains 293 gross acres, of which 171 are to be developed as part of the proposed project. The proposed project contains 6,240 multifamily residential units, 149,000 square feet of retail/commercial space, 100,000 square feet of office space, and 550,000 square feet of industrial/business park space. It contains 63 acres of parkland, most of which is in a large park along (and including) Carroll Canyon creek, and the remainder is smaller parks within the project. It also contains 4.7 miles of public trails, and 7 acres of public “piazzas”, which are European style open plazas within the development. There is also a “grand staircase” leading from the development down to the widest part of the central park just east of Camino Ruiz and south of Carroll Canyon Road.

The subcommittee generally liked the architectural features, particularly the central park, the bridges over Camino Ruiz and Carroll Canyon Road which are incorporated into the project, and the distribution of parks and piazzas within the project. Following are specific comments and questions that need to be addressed:

1. The proposed project will add approximately 15,000 people to the Mira Mesa Community, and therefore must provide public facilities for those people, as well as mitigating impacts on the existing community. Following are the most important facilities issues to address:
 - a. The traffic impacts of this project are potentially very large, and must be mitigated to the point where traffic is at least no worse with the project than without. How will this be accomplished?
 - b. The project does a good job of providing neighborhood parkland for the development, however the project increases the population of Mira Mesa to the point where we should have four active use community parks. Since McAuliffe has turned out to be mostly unusable, we really only have 2, so we need more active use community parkland in Carroll Canyon. How will this be provided?
 - c. The project will generate enough elementary school children to fill an elementary school. School enrollment has been declining slightly, and provided we can get Salk built, it may be possible to absorb this. However, the impact on schools needs to be considered carefully, and if we fail to get Salk completed it will certainly be a major issue.
 - d. Other impacts also need to be evaluated, for example the residents will use the existing library, fire stations and commercial centers in the existing Mira Mesa community.
2. The presentation was lovely, but the pictures of fine squares in Europe may not provide a realistic description of this project. We would like to see more pictures of recently built

domestic spaces that exhibit what is proposed here, especially ones that this architect has built elsewhere. This goes for the stream park areas also.

3. We like the concept of introducing some elevation, adding some topographic interest into the project. Doing so, along with stepping back the height of some of the buildings closest to the streets will make it less obvious in 30 years that this land was a gravel pit.
4. The bicycle trails exiting on the north side of the project at Jade Coast and at Westonhill are important for safety, as Camino Ruiz will be very busy and unsafe for bicycles.
5. It would be helpful to see the elevation differences between Stone Creek and the neighboring parcels, and an aerial picture of the project showing neighboring buildings. It is difficult to get a 3D conception of the project with 2D maps.
6. Will the purple reclaimed water system be extended to this neighborhood?
7. Can you provide a better description of the transit stations?
8. The subcommittee like many of the architectural features of the project. We had a recent experience where we approved a project and the developer came back with a “Substantial Conformance Review” that removed most of the features we liked about the project. If we approve this project, how do we ensure that those features will survive further steps in the planning process, possible sale to a builder, etc.

Jeff Stevens, Subcommittee Chair



Figure 1. Picture of proposed development from summary passed out at subcommittee meeting.