

TRANSCRIPTION  
NAVY BROADWAY COMPLEX – WORKSHOP #2  
SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 2006  
AUDIENCE COMMENTS

**Speaker No. 1: Marti Kranzberg – Partners for Livable Places:**

*“I would like to talk about a concept that I’d like for you to be thinking about and that is a concept, bringing spiritually into this, of a “peace park.” When we talk about it, there’s no churches, there’s no real organized religious cathedral right up in here but there’s a very strong spiritual movement and I’d like to be able to pull in a lot more people to really get involved or more involved. If there was a sense of that park, not being a gateway but is a gateway to, but something that speaks more to the spirituality and to peace particularly to bound the fact that we have this whole big Navy Complex here and were talking about war and not does the Navy do to go out to defend our country but for our way of life and for peace, and I’d like to see their “peace parks” all over the world with their little peace poles. I’d like to see us be part of that to have a sense of something to balance this war concept, something that goes to more of a lighter spirituality thing.*

*I’d also like to speak on the idea of a concept of the San Diego Center for Arts and Culture. I hope that the museum that is planned is not going to be yet another military. We have the Midway that is on our front lawn right there and I think that this would be a beautiful opportunity as we all know downtown is looking for a home but would be great to have a great center for arts and culture for visual and performing arts and then have the multi theatres and multi places for people to gather and to be able to see and one of the things that I mentioned in the parks thing is, the idea of what do we do in parks now, as parks are different than they were 100 years ago. What do people need as a place for a park and I’d like to see about the possibility that parks space be wi-fied so that people could come and sit there with their computers. People don’t just necessarily read but they do work on their computers now, so it would be nice if people could sit in a park that is actually computer accessible”.*

**Speaker No. 2: Gordon Summer, Downtown Resident:**

*“Hello, I’m Gordon Summer, and I’ve lived downtown since ’92, um, I want to thank you CCDC by the way for doing this thing and things like it, um, this project is gorgeous, uh, I’m completely impressed by it but the one thought that I had which I’m now thinking wasn’t so good, was that the parks space, the smaller space on the north side and larger space on the south side might be switched so that the bigger space would be on the north side since the smaller space since the south side is already adjacent to more park space, but it might not work and would be great staying the way it is so I don’t know whether it’s feasible or not.*

*I would like to thank the Navy and the Manchester Group for, and CCDC, for tremendous foresight and caring so much about park space and about the three partners and about all of that but, and there's one big but, and the but is the Manchester Organization ten years ago promised in mitigation for a second Hyatt Tower, that they would take down the air conditioning tower between the Hyatt and the Marriott and provide a 60-foot cross way to the water, and that has never been done. I have to question whether the Manchester Group fulfills its promises or not and I really want to ask CCDC. I couldn't resist using this form to do this, great, I'm thrilled with the current plan and the NBC but I couldn't resist reminding people that the Manchester group owes the people of downtown a 60-foot greenway between the Hyatt and the Marriott and I really want to see that done. Thank you."*

**Speaker No. 3: Christine Gaunt, Downtown Resident:**

*I'm a resident and so understandingly my concerns are resident concerns and I think that I see a plan where there's a lot to like about the plan, given the design constraints that they were given. I think that my concern is that Tom Boss, who developed four and a half miles of the west side of Manhattan who was here in March and he took a look at the downtown plan. He said, "Do you really understand what you are creating here, I don't know that people get that because this is going to be a mini Manhattan", and so I don't want too many front porches that have 400 and 500-foot tall buildings in them. When I look at the Marina district in San Francisco, I don't see huge buildings down there and I think that they have a world class waterfront so there's a dilemma in my mind in that we've gone ahead and we've entitled all these buildings, but what do I think the result of that this, I think that it's still walling off the waterfront. If I want to live in the land of the possible, I would like to see something done about that but in terms of if we are going to institute this plan, I think a very good suggestion that came up today and apparently is also part of the entitlement it's outdated to say that for sale should be in the middle of the buildings where you basically look at buildings, it should be along Harbor Drive as it is in world-class cities like Barcelona and Athens and other places, so that's one concern I have.*

*I also have the concern about and I have brought this up, that the real residential uses are going to occur in an office building, three hotels, and two Navy buildings. So, however you can make this more accessible and more useable for all of those all of us who are apparently residents here today, I think that's really important and I think it's possible and I know it's certainly part of Perry's vision that you would do that and I hope that he's really able to do that because I would echo the Board who says that we who live across the street from the Hyatt, the Marriott and Convention Center are looking at a wall so substantial that I routinely run into tourists who are asking where the water is. That should not be allowed to happen along this waterfront. I guess the last thing that I would say is that there still seems to be a disconnect on parking. I certainly don't believe that parking should be at the waterfront, however, there seems to be a lack of coordination between the planning between CCDC and the Port so parking is clearly needed along the waterfront somehow, but we get into this demarcation of Harbor Drive so as we go forward, let's just not brush the parking issue aside. Where is this really going to occur? Where is the parking for the Midway going to go? Where is*

*the parking for the old Police headquarters really going to go? Um, and finally, I would love to see a bike lane. We want residents and people out of their cars. It is very difficult right now. There is no dedicated bike lane and you are in peril riding down there. Thank you”.*

**Speaker No. 4: Charles Kaminiski:**

*“Thank you. First of all, I’d like to thank uh, the CCDC staff who gave up their morning and part of their afternoon to be here because I know what it’s like to be on that side, uh, of the university where you give up your free time to do this and I also appreciate it when you do this on evenings as well, so, thank you.*

*I’m of the belief that the Development Agreement needs to be reevaluated. I’ve said that at a number of public forums and I’ll say it here again. I believe that the principles that guided it in ‘92 need to be looked at and reevaluated. Even congress member Susan Davis said at the Real Estate Committee whether those principals are still valid. In light of that, I would like to say that I think that the Manchester Financial and Gordon Carrier did an excellent job in interpreting the Development Agreement and that the design meets the Development Agreement guidelines but again, I don’t believe the Development Agreement guidelines are appropriate in 2005, ’06, ’07, as the amount of residents have increased, the Port is planning a large development, the ballpark plan uh, east side of the city has gone faster than everyone expected, so the EIR needs to be considered and my understanding of the Development Agreement is that the EIR is not going to be reopened. I need somebody to tell me whether that’s the case or not. So that’s the issue I have, what’s happening with the EIR, um the uh, information on the webpage says all buildings will be reviewed by CCDC for conformity. Uh, but I heard at an earlier session that the Navy buildings were not going to be reviewed. I don’t know if that’s a courtesy they’re going to do or why. I think that needs to be clearly defined because the premise of the design is that there be consistent use of design and schematic and so what is the Navy’s status in relationship to CCDC. Um, and the last item that I mentioned at each of the tables is the phasing of this project. I think it’s most important for us as citizens to understand what the phasing is. Will all the public street level improvements including promenades, setbacks, parks, go in first, and then the architectural fill-in later or is this going to be a block-by-block-by-block-by-block development? Obviously, Manchester Financial would want to get their money back as quickly as possible, so they’re going to want to develop as fast but I think that’s a real important aspect that needs to be uh, looked at. Thank you”.*

**Speaker No. 5: Don Wood:**

*“My name’s Don, but I came down here to just clarify a little bit of history. I served on SANDAG’s Bayfront Coordinating Committee that developed the design standards that were used to drive the Development Agreement. I want to point out that the BCC never reached consensus on bay front floor area ratios, the heights and bulk of these buildings. As a result, we never took a final vote on FARs. We had a vote to send the plan, the draft plan out for public review, never went to a final vote. The meeting minutes were never published of the last two meetings. I’ve asked to have those sent to me. The Embarcadero Vision planning process was a very good process. The Port and the Navy, and the City got together. They agreed to sit down and talk about what was going to be built on the bay front, unfortunately turf issues hung the whole thing up. They were willing to talk about landscape, streetscape, open space and public space but they are unwilling to talk about the height and the bulk of floor area ratios of the buildings each entity planned to build on the bay front. Unless you do that in a coordinated manner, you don’t have the people for a timely process. What I think you need to do is get the Port and the City and the Navy to sit down and reopen the Embarcadero Vision planning process, determine what the heights, bulk and the FARs of the buildings from Lindbergh Field down to Seaport Village are going to be. So that if you have a gateway, you have some sort of symmetry near the gateway an it isn’t just putting together block by block on a piece-mail basis which is what we’ve got now. So, I strongly encourage CCDC, Navy, the Port and the City to slow this process down open up bay front precise planning process, determine what the buildings will look like along the entire bay front and then proceed with this process. I agree that since 1992, when the Bay Front Coordinating Committee was meeting, the world has changed. We have all of the hotels and all of the office buildings downtown we need and I think we need to come up with a different vision to what were going to build on our bay front because you only get one chance and if we screw this up, San Diego’s going to have a big screwed up city from all of this”.*