

# **City of San Diego**

## **De Anza Revitalization Plan – An Amendment to the Mission Bay Park Master Plan and Local Coastal Program**

### **Ad-hoc Subcommittee Meeting No. 3 Summary**

March 16, 2016

---

Prepared by:  
Katz & Associates, Inc.

## I. Introduction

The City of San Diego conducted the third meeting of the De Anza Revitalization Plan Ad-hoc Subcommittee on March 9, 2016 at Mission Bay High School on Grand Avenue. The Ad-hoc Subcommittee met from 6 to 8:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update regarding meeting dates and topics; review and fine-tune the working draft vision and guiding principles; and provide information about mobility, leasehold, and existing/adjacent uses analyses. In addition to the project team and Ad-hoc Subcommittee members present (Addendum A), approximately 29 community members also attended the meeting.

Click the links below for the meeting agenda and presentation.

[Agenda](#)  
[Presentation](#)

## II. Format

The meeting was facilitated by Joan Isaacson of Katz & Associates (one of the project team consultants). The meeting was called to order by Rebecca Schwartz, the Vice Chair, who managed the meeting in the absence of Paul Robinson, Chair.

After an overview of the agenda and attached materials, committee members provided impressions from a walking tour they participated in to learn about the project's study area. The consultant team then announced a [revised meeting date and topics schedule](#). Afterwards, the committee discussed revisions to the [working vision statement and guiding principles](#). This was followed by a presentation that included results from a [mobility study](#) and a [leasehold analysis](#), and information about existing and adjacent uses. The meeting concluded with a public comment period.

## III. Discussion and Input

In the beginning of the meeting, Subcommittee members had the opportunity to provide their impressions from a walking tour of the project's study area. A summary of the Subcommittee members' comments is provided below.

### Comments

- Wind was surprisingly strong
- Erosion and compaction were significant
- Wanted more information about soil conditions
- Flow of the study area was confusing; the location of uses and activities doesn't seem to have an order
- Playground looked like a prison
- Playground safety is a concern
- Safe configuration of recreational areas is a concern
- Amount of space was surprising (2)

- Environmental safety of abandoned areas is a concern
- Tennis courts are a good example of how recreational areas should be run
- Insights from City planners were helpful
- Project area uses are diverse
- Number of departments that manage the area was surprising
- Bike access along Rose Creek seems limited

The committee then discussed the revised meeting dates and topics schedule, which includes an additional Ad-hoc Subcommittee meeting on April 14 to accommodate additional time for discussion of existing conditions. A summary of the Subcommittee members' comments about the schedule is listed below.

- Meetings should be held mid-June to avoid conflict with other City meetings and allow for greater public participation
- There may be too much information to pack into the next meeting
- Hard copies of materials should be sent to committee members who request them in advance of the meetings
- Workshop No. 2 is scheduled too early

Based on feedback from Ad-hoc Subcommittee Meeting No. 2, the consultant team provided two draft Vision statement options and a revised set of Guiding Principles. The following is a summary of comments regarding revisions to the working vision and guiding principles.

**Table 1. Project Vision and General Comments**

Vision and General Comments	
<b>Vision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not include references to the past</li> <li>• Use visual imagery</li> <li>• Thought it captured blending of uses</li> <li>• Thought it made too many decisions about what uses would be included in the area (2)</li> <li>• Make it more aspirational</li> <li>• Avoid making assumptions</li> <li>• Too long -- move specific details from Vision to Guiding Principles</li> </ul>
<b>Guiding Principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the Coastal Commission Act to the first bullet</li> <li>• Overall, liked Guiding Principles</li> <li>• Clarify mobility principle to indicate there will not be driving in the area</li> </ul>
<b>General Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep vision and guiding Principles as draft</li> <li>• Revisit vision and guiding principles for five minutes at the beginning of each meeting</li> </ul>

Following the discussion on vision, the consultant team presented the results of mobility and leasehold analyses conducted in the study area and provided an overview of existing and adjacent uses. Input regarding the existing conditions and opportunities-constraints was solicited from the Ad-hoc Subcommittee and is summarized below.

## Mobility Analysis

### Questions

- Why was data taken while the mobile home park was operational if there will not be a mobile home park in the study area in the future?
  - To establish a baseline
- What is the speed limit on Grand?
  - Between 30 and 35 mph

### Comments

- Vehicle miles traveled in the area should be reduced
- The connection to the Trolley is a benefit
- Bike access east of Mission Bay Drive should be improved
- Plan should focus on bike and pedestrian paths
- Plan should focus on traffic calming
- Plan should focus on multi-modal transportation
- Sidewalk on Grand Avenue is too narrow for bike and pedestrian use
- Sidewalk on Grand Avenue has no buffer between bicyclists/pedestrians and vehicle traffic
- Bus Route 27 is not reliable
- Rose Creek bike path south of Grand is very constrained

## Leasehold Analysis

### Questions

- Were combined-use facilities on Mission Bay Drive considered in analysis?
  - Yes
- Can revenue per square foot be determined?
  - The analysis breaks it down per use, which is more accurate
- Is revenue analyzed from sources outside of the area?
  - Revenue from concessions on De Anza will pay for maintaining the area

### Comments

- Need to know cost of maintaining De Anza
- Cost estimates should be projected, not current
- Landscaping could be changed to reduce costs
- Analysis does not provide a sense of scale (e.g., revenue from each RV space)
- Off-site spending generated by on-site public uses needs to be considered

## Existing and Adjacent Uses

### Question

- What is the revenue from Campland?
  - That information is not available yet

### Comments

- Planning processes for the golf course need to be coordinated

- Need to know revenue figures from the golf course and what Torrey Pines Golf Course contributes

Before the conclusion of the meeting, a public comment period was held. Input collected from the public is summarized in Table 3 below. Written comments were also collected, which can be found in Addendum B.

The facilitator concluded the meeting by announcing the dates for fourth Ad-hoc Subcommittee meeting (April 14, 2016) and the second Public Workshop (April 27, 2016).

**Table 3. Public Comment Period**

Topic	Comment
<b>Vision/Guiding Principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer version of vision is too wordy (2)</li> <li>• Golf course should not be included in vision</li> <li>• Make vision more general (2)</li> <li>• Vision should be three or four sentences</li> <li>• Study area is not 76 acres</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility Analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A bike path exists by the handball courts that is not shown on the analysis</li> <li>• A bridge over the freeway near the Trolley station should be considered and financed by the Trolley</li> <li>• Accidents occur frequently on Clairemont Boulevard bridge</li> <li>• Need to know daily trip count of Campland</li> </ul>
<b>Leasehold Analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-commercial and commercial use needs to be defined/used clearly (e.g., Boy Scouts are a commercial use)</li> <li>• Need to consider general fund as a source of revenue</li> <li>• Seek maximum short-term benefit for least possible cost</li> </ul>
<b>Existing and Adjacent Uses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campland is not part of the study area</li> </ul>
<b>Future Uses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make land public use</li> <li>• Do not duplicate uses</li> <li>• Tent camping already exists on Fiesta Island</li> <li>• Recreation improvements should be a priority</li> <li>• Golf course should not stay</li> <li>• Move baseball fields</li> <li>• Long-distance bike paths should be included</li> </ul>
<b>General Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De Anza Park should not be renamed</li> <li>• Existing infrastructure has a lot of value</li> <li>• Include every economic and cultural level</li> <li>• Water quality should be the focus</li> </ul>

# Addendum A

## Project Team Members in Attendance

PlaceWorks – Lead Consultant

Brooke Peterson – Project Manager

Michael Paul-Planner

Dawn Wilson, STC Traffic

Sherry Rudnak, BAE Urban Economics

Katz & Associates

Joan Isaacson

Bree Robertoy

Schmidt Design Group

Glen Schmidt

City Staff

Robin Shifflet

Craig Hooker

## Subcommittee Members in Attendance

Chris Olson Pacific Beach Planning Group

Darlene Walter Mission Bay Park Committee

Karin Zirk Rose Creek Watershed Alliance

Lisa Lind American Planning Association, San Diego Section

Rebecca Schwartz San Diego Audubon (Vice-Chair)

Vicki Granowitz Park and Recreation Board

Namara Mercer Mission Bay Lessees Association

## Addendum B



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3/9/14  
 Name: Pam Featheringto  
 Organization/Affiliation: Environmental Center of San Diego  
 Email Address: contactecsd@gmail.com  
 Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

General Comments:

Vision Statement:  
The vision of the De Anza Cove  
recreational area is to enhance the  
public's use of a diverse range  
of activities for all ages, activity levels,  
income levels and cultures.





DE ANZA  
Revitalization Plan



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3/9/16

Name: Judy Swink

Organization/Affiliation: C-3

Email Address: jswink1@cox.net - NEW

Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

Highest priority — RV camping at De Anza Pt.  
— NOT TO EXTEND ALL THE WAY TO  
the tip of the point  
— should be within compact  
60 acre parcel w/ public  
WALKWAY + Bikeway clearly  
visible around perimeter  
and out ~~to~~ to the Point.

DO NOT ENABLE EXPANSION OF GOLF course out toward  
~~the~~ Rose Creek + De Anza Point

Remove non-performing Boat + Ski Club from  
leasehold, make leasehold avail. for other  
uses

Strongly support wetland creation at mouth of  
Rose Creek and re-direction of creek flow  
westerly into existing wetlands.



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: March 9, 2016  
Name: Scott Chipman  
Organization/Affiliation: Pacific Beach Planning Group  
Email Address: SCOTT@CHIPMAN.INFO  
Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

The input I'm receiving is a concern that we not lose any current uses but that we add more and more public uses.

- Current uses - Golf, Tennis, youth fields, camping, RV's
- Possible increased use and additional uses - swim/aquatic center, skate park, amphitheater, more paths, more lawn game areas - croquet, lawn bowling, bocce, horseshoes, small convention center/meeting facilities.
- All this should be done in a balanced way. Balancing recreation, education and the environment



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3/09/16  
Name: KURT CARLSON  
Organization/Affiliation: SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL GOLF COMMITTEE & USER  
Email Address: kurt@ktua.com  
Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

The Vision - I enjoyed the revised longer vision as it expressed well the amenities that make are key to creating a successful plan. Inevitably some things are going to be left out, so what do you leave? Maybe try to keep it more global and let the guiding principles do the specifics. I disagree that the golf not be a part of the vision. There are many thousands of stakeholders who have enjoyed the MB Golf course for many many years. While the course may have lost some revenue, it has not been given the necessary upgrades like Toneyfines, and Babbar. The city has upgraded the practice areas and have improved the irrigation to a more efficient + water saving system. There are plans to ~~rebuild~~ design + rebuild the clubhouse and restaurants which will increase use and revenue. MBGC is the only ~~an~~ night play golf course and has its fan base using it quite often. Would like to see trail system along Rose Creek unproved/widened to provide improved access to new De Anza Revitalization Plan Area. Keep the course as it's important recreational amenity for this area.



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3/9/16  
Name: Rebecca Kongs  
Organization/Affiliation: Compland  
Email Address: rdkongs@gmail.com  
Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

If Compland is eliminated/moved, how is the Audubon group going to replace the millions & millions of dollars of impact on Pacific Beach & San Diego? Putting all the pressure on De Anza seems unrealistic. Businesses (especially local) will suffer.



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3/9/16  
Name: Paula Gandolfo  
Organization/Affiliation: Self. Resident PB  
Email Address: SDFeTraco@gmail.com  
Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

Incorporate the Claremont Bridge over the 5 and terminating at the "Visitor Center" as a possible Ped/Bike/car access to both MB (to So) and PB (to North).

By- Extend the footprint of this development to include this existing (Visitor Center) in the overall solution. (Visitor Center is closed).



# DE ANZA REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Input Card

Date: 3-9-16

Name: CHRIS LANGRISH

Organization/Affiliation: MISSION BAY PARK USER

Email Address: chris@kstua.com

Would you like to receive project updates?  YES  NO

### General Comments:

MY COMMENTS ARE PROBABLY A LITTLE PREMATURE SINCE THE PROCESS HASN'T YET REACHED THE IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS. I WOULD URGE THE COMMITTEE TO SERIOUSLY CONSIDER PRESERVING THE MISSION BAY GOLF COURSE. CURRENTLY THE CITY OF ~~SAN~~ SAN DIEGO OPERATES ONLY THREE GOLF COURSES: MISSION BAY, BALBOA PARK, & TORREY PINES. OF THESE THREE, MISSION BAY AND BALBOA PARK ARE THE ONLY TWO THAT ARE APPROACHABLE FOR CHILDREN AND BEGINNING NOVICE GOLFERS AS WELL AS THOSE GOLFERS ON RESTRICTED BUDGETS TO WHOM GREEN FEES AT TORREY PINES ARE OUT OF REACH. THE MISSION BAY GOLF COURSE PROVIDES AN INVALUABLE RESOURCE TO CHILDREN AND NOVICE GOLFERS JUST BEGINNING TO LEARN THE GAME OF GOLF. THE GOLF COURSE IS VITAL TO THE DIVERSITY OF RECREATIONAL USES THAT MAKE MISSION BAY PARK THE UNIQUE AND SPECIAL PLACE THAT IT IS. PLEASE PRESERVE THE GOLF COURSE AND SUPPORT ITS PLACE IN THE OVERALL VISION FOR DE ANZA COVE.

THANK YOU