

# GPAC Meeting #5 (Special Meeting)

## Summary Notes

December 11, 2023, 6 pm - 8 pm | Virtual (via Zoom)

### *Attendees:*

- City Staff/Consultants: Alyson Hunter, Troy Reinhalter, Melissa Stark
- GPAC Members Present: Cindy Burnham, Grace Silva-Santella, Gilia Baron, Mia Nyugen, Manjeet Dhillon, Richard Zhang, Wesley Haye
- GPAC Members Absent: Catina Smith, Sheila Baker

### *Overview*

On December 11, the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) for the Marina 2045 General Plan Update held its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. The purpose of the meeting was as follows:

- Review the components of a “complete city” and discuss what is missing in Marina.
- Brainstorm land use ideas for each of the areas of discussion.

The following is a summary of the GPAC’s comments and feedback by topic. One GPAC member could not attend the meeting but reviewed the presentation and provided feedback via email. That feedback is incorporated into the summaries below.

### *Presentation*

#### “Complete City” and Missing Land Uses

The meeting began with a presentation covering components of a “complete city” and led to a discussion on what land uses are missing in Marina. A Complete City is one that contains a mix of places and uses that support and foster community, economic sustainability, and healthy living at all stages of life. While Marina offers several key features that make up a Complete City, it also has several missing land uses, including:

- Diverse housing
- Shopping, entertainment, and mixed-use destinations
- Revenue-generating commercial uses
- Tourism and hospitality uses
- Employment and local jobs
- Education and Public Facilities
- Medical services and providers
- Public transportation and transit options
- Investment in and expansion of local parks and open space

Following the presentation, the group moved onto the interactive component of the meeting which included a review of each of the nine areas of discussion and a brainstorm on potential future land uses for those areas. The section below includes a summary of that presentation and discussion.

### *Area-by-Area Review and Discussion*

As the group reviewed each of the nine areas, they were asked to keep the following in mind:

- What role should this area play as part of creating a Complete City?
- Which specific uses should be developed here? Do any “missing land uses fit here?”
- What intensity or scale of development is generally appropriate in this area?

#### **#1 Cypress Knolls**

The group discussion began with the first area - Cypress Knolls. Several GPAC members shared their ideas for future land uses. These ideas are summarized below:

- Mixed-use development on the outer edges, with senior and affordable housing in the interior.
- Development should include employment opportunities and townhomes for purchase.
- Housing should include senior, affordable, veterans, and workforce opportunities.
- Supportive retail and restaurants should be incorporated into the area.
- Community gathering space, including parks with walking paths.
  - Referenced the Evergreen Village Square in San Jose as an example (4055 Evergreen Village Square, San Jose, CA 95135).
- Complete the Patton Parkway road extension to the West
- Senior living and supportive retail
  - Referenced the Forest Hills Manor development in Pacific Grove, CA.

#### **#2 Imjin and 3<sup>rd</sup> Area**

The GPAC collectively had fewer ideas for the Imjin and 3<sup>rd</sup> area. These ideas are summarized below:

- Continue the medical corridor near Imjin.
- Lecture hall or conference center in partnership with MPC
- Performing arts center
- Hotels or hospitality uses

#### **#3 8<sup>th</sup> Street Area**

Many GPAC members had similar thoughts about what land uses could work well in the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Area. These ideas are summarized below.

- Mixed use might work
- Not supportive of a casino in this area
- Additional equestrian trails and open space
- Environmentally friendly burial site, like a green cemetery or other burial options like a crematorium

#### **#4 UCMBEST Expanded Area**

Similar to the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Area, many GPAC members agreed on a short list of land uses for the UCMBEST Expanded Area. Those ideas are summarized below.

- Businesses to support existing employers, like Joby
- Supportive restaurants, hotels, and a conference center
- No housing should go in this area (short-term residential accommodations might work)
- Amphitheater or similar entertainment opportunity

## #5 CSUMB Parking Lots

GPAC members had varying ideas and several questions surrounding the CSUMB Parking area. These ideas and questions are summarized below:

- A mix of entertainment uses with retail
- A “university village” environment
- Fairground or entertainment uses (like Dave and Busters)
- Something that complements the new sports complex
- Miniature golf or similar entertainment opportunity
- Basketball courts and outdoor experiences
- *Does the City have authority over this site?*
- *Would the City collect tax revenue over future development on this site?*
- *How do we make sure the public has access to new uses at this location if it is owned by CSUMB?*

## #6 Preston Park

The idea of infill development at Preston Park received mixed reviews from GPAC members. Several comments related to the existing development in the area. These, and other comments are summarized below.

- Additional housing would be beneficial here
- There are existing resident concerns in this area – difficulties parking
- mismatch between old housing and new development along with utilities could be an issue
- Infill near Imjin towards the bottom of the development could work. This would have to maintain the existing parks.
- *What is the status of the Preston Park ballfield area? Are there planned improvements?*
- *Does the City enforce the number of people per household in this area?*

## #7 Beach Road Gateway

GPAC members had similar suggestions for future land uses at the Beach Road Gateway area. These ideas are summarized below.

- Hospitality like hotels, retail, and/or restaurants
- A hospital
- The City’s Civic Center
- Incorporate a pedestrian-friendly design

## #8 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Extension and #9 Airport, Northwest Corner

The GPAC was not able to finish discussions related to all areas of change in the meeting time allotted. The General Plan Team requested that GPAC members review the remainder of the presentation and email ideas for the remaining areas; 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Extension and Airport, Northwest Corner.

## Other Feedback

Some GPAC members provided feedback unrelated to the areas of discussion, but consistent with the meeting topic. That feedback is summarized below:

- Missing connections between Center and South Marina
- Consider age restricted housing near public transportation
- Desire for more food shopping options
- Desire for public outdoor entertainment space like festivals
- Senior Center and new Civic Center and City Hall should be part of the discussion



## *Public Comments*

Near the end of the meeting, public comment was open to any who wished to share, three members of the public joined the virtual meeting, and one offered public comment (their feedback is summarized below):

- “The Beach Road area should be updated as an appealing gateway to the City. This could include small walkable areas with cafes and restaurants.”

## *Next Steps*

The General Plan Team will provide an update to the City Council on the General Plan and seek feedback on the areas of discussion reviewed during this meeting. The next GPAC meeting is not yet scheduled but will occur sometime in the Spring of 2024.