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The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study provides a physical planning framework to guide the development for future housing on the UC San Diego campus. The plan outlines the potential to transform an existing lower density neighborhood surrounded by residual open space into a mixed-use community organized as a collection of villages framing a central park.

Building on the tradition seen across the UC San Diego campus, the open space serves as a primary organizing element for the framework. Within the site's 86 acres, this strategy creates a plan that can accommodate higher densities while also increasing the district's usable open space area. The study builds on the principles of neighborhoods, the park, and connections outlined in the 1989 Campus Master Plan.
The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study explores the strategic capacity for residential development within the 86 acre Mesa site, and identifies the right mix of additional uses such as retail, recreation and amenities that will be essential in creating a vibrant campus district.

The plan’s vision centers on strategies to build community at multiple scales – the Mesa neighborhood, villages and building clusters. Central to the overall vision of the plan is an urban park formed around the existing grove of eucalyptus trees on the site. The neighborhood face along Regent’s Road is envisioned as a vibrant, mixed use center with clear connections to the future light rail transit station on Executive Drive.

Aligning with the UC San Diego 2014 Strategic Plan, the Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study integrates the strategic plan overarching goals which focus on experience, community, collaboration, shared prosperity, enrichment, sustainability and stewardship.

The planning study outlines how the comprehensive vision for the Mesa neighborhood can be implemented at the scale of the overall district, the separate villages and individual project sites. The plan is envisioned as a flexible framework to assist the University and future design teams in the design of buildings and open spaces, integrating circulation, infrastructure and environmental sustainability considerations in several phases. The plan is also intended to inform the UC San Diego Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) update, targeting a 2019 completion.

The design guidelines have been organized around key themes to guide future development in the Mesa neighborhood. These include:

- Community
- Connectivity
- Creativity

Largely performance based, the design guidelines will allow for innovation in future designs while establishing a level of coherence and consistency throughout the neighborhood. In specific areas, more prescriptive strategies are suggested to preserve the unique and memorable qualities of the Mesa site and achieve the character and quality of experience defined throughout the planning process.
The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study strives to think boldly to identify and implement creative solutions for the future. Transform an under-utilized campus neighborhood into a unique destination. Deliver rich experiences. Connect to the UC San Diego campus and larger community. Establish places to engage. Create unique experiences. Build community.

The Challenge

- Identify the site’s maximum development potential while maintaining a walkable neighborhood and high quality of life
- Integrate the existing Mesa landscape
- Sustain a vibrant community based on innovation, collaboration and inspiration
- Build a community where students, faculty, spouses, significant others, children, parents can co-exist and thrive
- Transform an entire neighborhood into a walkable destination
- Create a place that links to the greater surrounding community

The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study incorporates the bold vision outlined in the UC San Diego 2014 Strategic Plan which calls to align all efforts to be a student-centered, research-focused, service-oriented public university.

The Opportunity

The Mesa Neighborhood will be a dynamic place combining residential life with community, recreation, retail, commercial and cultural life.

Guiding the vision throughout the planning study was the need to create valuable communities at all scales. Defined by the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), the themes below are woven throughout the development of the neighborhood plan.

What makes a housing complex a community?

- People
- Inclusion
- Shared values
- Something in common
- Diversity
- Access
- Trust
- Time
- Sense of place
- Identity
- Social interaction
- Gathering spaces
- Support services
- Community events

Figure 1.01 - Vision for Transformation
Mesa Neighborhood
The Mesa Neighborhood will include a new mixed use center along the Regents Road corridor. The commercial commons will include a vibrant mix of unique uses including retail, fitness, food, maker space, markets, art and theatre. The commercial uses are intended to serve both the Mesa residents and the surrounding community. An interconnected pedestrian network links each of the blocks together along a mid-block walk. Above the ground floor commercial is a higher density residential community. Integrated throughout the buildings will be shared common spaces that capture views of the surrounding Mesa Neighborhood, park system, and beyond to the west campus.
A new central open space
the arboleda

Central to the Mesa Neighborhood will be a new park, the Arboleda, which maintains the existing eucalyptus trees on the site, but transforms the area from residual open space into a shared open space for the entire community. The Arboleda will be programmed with active and passive uses and has a unique relationship with each of the neighborhood’s five villages. In addition to the large central park, open spaces at smaller scales are integrated throughout the redeveloped Mesa community. These include connective pathways, courtyards, village centers, community farms, terraces, and upper level rooftops.
Located in the eastern portion of the UC San Diego La Jolla campus, the Mesa Neighborhood is primarily a residential community housing graduate and professional students. Currently the housing demand on campus exceeds the provided capacity, and the University projects continued growth in the student population. The need for additional campus housing has become a pressing need.

The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study develops a flexible framework to incrementally meet the demand for residential growth on an under-utilized portion of the campus. The areas adjacent to the Mesa neighborhood have seen continued transformation and growth. This study also serves as a resource for the ongoing update to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).
**Planning Process**

**Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study**

**Planning Process**

The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study was conducted with the active participation of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), working in collaboration with the consultant team of urban designers, landscape architects and traffic engineers. The PAC included many students and faculty who collectively shaped the vision for the Mesa community and how it fits into the larger UC San Diego campus.

In addition to the iterative development of the plan with the PAC, the planning process also included many topic focused workshops with smaller groups around planning considerations for stormwater, sustainability, emergency access, and transportation.

The resulting neighborhood plan is a flexible framework for the planning and design of buildings, open spaces, circulation, infrastructure and environmental sustainability. The plan provides a clear strategy for the incremental redevelopment of the Mesa neighborhood.

Through roundtable discussions with the PAC an understanding of what characteristics foster community on the UC San Diego campus were established. These themes guided the planning process at all scales - the neighborhood, the village and the building.

The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study also included the input from the Design Review Board (DRB) and Campus / Community Planning Committee (C/CPC), as well as coordination with the East Campus Planning Study.
Build on the principles of the 1989 Campus Plan to support future growth.

The 1989 UC San Diego Master Plan defines character and qualities that are critical to the campus identity and establishes a framework to maintain these important aspects as the campus environment evolves over time. The master plan provides a basis to promote the University’s strength as an academic setting and establishes strategies to preserve and enhance the campus lands.

The Mesa Neighborhood Planning Study incorporates and builds on the original organizing principles for the campus outlined in the 1989 plan.

- Neighborhoods
- Academic Corridors
- University Center
- The Park
- Connections

The park links the sensitive lands across the campus

Related departments are linked by academic corridors

New roads and paths connect neighborhoods, open space and the surrounding community
Campus Wide Considerations

Neighborhoods

Continue to strengthen the campus community defined around distinct neighborhoods

The UC San Diego campus is divided into a series of smaller neighborhoods primarily organized around the Colleges and areas of study. Each neighborhood has a unique character and quality defined by the buildings, open spaces and relationship with the larger campus landscape of mesas, canyons and the park.

Continuing the UC San Diego tradition of neighborhoods as the building blocks of the campus, the Mesa Neighborhood plan embraces opportunities to foster community at the neighborhood scale. Mesa has historically been a residential neighborhood housing graduate and professional students, student couples and students with children.

While the Mesa Neighborhood today is rather isolated from the rest of the campus, future connections of the Gilman Bridge and the San Diego Trolley which will contain multiple stops within a 5 minute walk to Mesa, create improved connections to the West Campus Neighborhoods, the larger community and downtown.
Leverage the natural landscape that links the UC San Diego campus together, and build on the tradition of connecting to this powerful landscape.

The Mesa neighborhood includes existing landscape components that powerfully establish the defining identity of the community. They should not only be preserved but enhanced through the continued development of the neighborhood.

Central to the identity of the place is the grove of existing eucalyptus trees on the site. The larger concentration of the trees in the site’s center will be re-imagined around a new central open space for the entire Mesa community.

To the west are canyons that define a clear boundary between the neighborhood and the West Campus and I-5 Freeway. The canyons provide opportunities for unique and memorable views. The eastern portion of the site is primarily defined by the “mesa” or elevated flat area.

Figure 2.04: Existing site characteristics

- Central Canyon
- Eucalyptus trees
- Mesa
Today, the Mesa Neighborhood includes a collection of residential buildings primarily housing graduate and professional students. The majority of the existing buildings are two story, low density walk-up apartments. These buildings will be incrementally replaced as part of the redevelopment of the Mesa Neighborhood. In the center of the site is a collection of buildings that house the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC). In the long term the ECEC will be relocated to a more ideal location allowing the existing buildings to be re-purposed for other uses.

The western edge of the site contains One Miramar Street Apartments, a recent residential development of two-bedroom units and parking structure. Under construction now is a new residential complex, Mesa Nueva, which will include a mix of studio and multi-bedroom units, and a new parking structure.
Site Considerations
Scale and community

Figure 2.06: Scale Comparison
Existing UC San Diego residential buildings overlaid on the Mesa site for scale comparisons.
02 Planning Context

Residential Capacity

Figure 2.08: Potential residential capacity

Figure 2.07: Existing residential program

The unit mix is illustrative and represents a combination of studio, one bedroom, two bedroom, three bedroom, and four bedroom apartments.

Total Mesa development potential
± 5,000 units
± 8,800 beds
The Mesa Neighborhood Plan establishes a framework to serve as a general guide for future development on the 86 acre site. The plan establishes a set of organizing principles focused on program, place and development which collectively inform strategies to create a sense of community at all scales.

Ultimately a successful neighborhood would meet the following objectives:

- Establish a foundation that supports student and faculty success
- Create an environment students will choose for their home
Principles

Program:
The key elements of community

- Expand the idea of community
- Provide uses that support a real neighborhood
- Reinforce academic life and scholarly achievement
- Promote diversity and choices
- Design multi-functional spaces
- Explore a framework of common spaces
- Focus on programs that emphasize sense of place
- Gateway, welcoming, open, engaging, like home

Place:
The building, the block, the neighborhood

- Walkable
- Engaging and welcoming ground floor
- Density and human scale
- Diversity and identity
- Minimize impact of the car
- Meaningful open space
- Placemaking
- Climate and environmental responsiveness

Development:
The physical framework to guide future growth

- Clearly defined parcels
- New identity around a shared open space
- Optimized access and connectivity
- Sites for unique programs and destinations
- Flexible and adaptable
Building community

How is community defined?

The Mesa Neighborhood plan strives to create a vibrant community centered around walkability, a mix of uses, quality housing, and integrated open spaces. The plan focuses on community at multiple scales including the neighborhood, the village and within an individual building. Paired with strength in community are opportunities for interaction, a strong sense of identity and programs that foster engagement.

The Regents Road corridor is envisioned as an interactive center for community life for the Mesa residents, as well as surrounding community.

live → learn

support → exchange
dining
cafe market
picnic

meet
study
classroom
student space

recreation
mail
laundry
The neighborhood framework plan is informed by a series of organizing ideas rooted in the character and qualities of the site and surrounding landscape, as well as the need to strengthen connections to the larger UC San Diego campus and establish a vibrant life style fostering community at all scales.

The organizing ideas for the Mesa Neighborhood foster the following themes:

- Build community
- Create places for exchange
- Incorporate programs to activate buildings and open spaces
- Integrate places to recharge
- Establish flexibility for evolving student needs
- Consider the long term stewardship of campus lands

Figure 3.01 - Organizing Ideas
How can the Mesa neighborhood assist the University of California in reaching the 2025 goal for carbon neutrality?

The Mesa Neighborhood is a key component for ensuring UC San Diego reaches the overall sustainable and high performance targets established for the University. Through thoughtful and integrated high performance design, the Mesa Neighborhood can achieve climate positive outcomes. Design teams are expected to integrate sustainable solutions into all scales of the development. Innovation in technologies should be explored. All future development in the Mesa Neighborhood should embrace initiatives that will reduce energy consumption, water use and waste reductions. All strategies should consider the overall health of the campus community.

Active design opportunities
- Explore decentralized waste water treatment
- Define tipping point for city’s current waste water network
- Determine capacities for future fuel cells
- Does Mesa connect to the UC San Diego or city grid?
- Can we create a smart grid
- Comprehensive stormwater management strategy
- Understand phasing and implementation of neighborhood wide systems

Impacts on thermal comfort. What can we influence?

1. Climate
   - Air Temperature with MRT (mean radiant temperature)
   - Radiation
   - Humidity
   - Wind
   - Physiological

2. Materials
   - Solar Reflectance
   - Thermal Emissivity (measure of ability to shed heat)
   - Mass (heat capacity)
   - Conductance (higher conducting materials heat up faster)

3. Landscape
   - Shade – Canopies
   - Shade – Trees (evergreen vs deciduous)

Design

Massing

Building Guidelines
- Solar access in the winter
- Shade with building massing, trees, or constructed canopies during the summer

Energy

Climate Neutral*
- Utilize UC San Diego smart grid
- Higher efficiency technologies: solar concentrating, solar thermal
- 10-15% renewable
- 50% energy reduction
- 40% hydrogen fuel cells

*Climate Neutral Building Operations

Water

Greywater reuse network
- Utilize district greywater reuse indoors (not just for irrigation)
- Water savings can jump from ~30% to ~40% in the residential program

Waste

Reuse of de-constructed materials
- Ensure the collection, storage and removal of solid wastes to promote overall waste reduction and operational efficiency
Mesa Neighborhood Framework Plan

Figure 3.02 - Mesa Neighborhood Framework Plan

Figure 3.03 - Development Parcels

1. One Miramar - 5.6 acres
2. Nuevo West - 3.1 acres
3. Mesa Nueva - 9.5 acres
4. Nuevo East - 5.0 acres
5. Regents Road North - 3.0 acres
6. Regents Road Central - 3.7 acres
7. Regents Road South - 2.6 acres
8. Mesa South - 3.7 acres
9. Mesa Central - 3.5 acres
10. Mesa West - 4.1 acres

Existing parcel to remain
Development opportunity
Mesa Neighborhood Potential

view looking south
The site planning and development guidelines are largely performance based, ensuring the opportunity for future design innovation. The guidelines are intended to establish a level of consistency and coherence throughout the community as development is phased overtime.
04  Site Planning and Development Guidelines

Site Planning and Development Guidelines

Guidelines for future development
1. Strengthen identity and sense of place
2. Emphasize community
3. Prioritize the pedestrian (make it walkable)
4. Create a quality environment
5. Respect the character of the landscape
6. Meet the University’s sustainability targets

1. Strengthen identity and sense of place
Villages do not need to share a common architectural style, but rather a shared attitude toward an overall Mesa relationship.
- Each new building and open space should contribute to the overall neighborhood experience
- Buildings should be in conversation with one another
- Vary building heights within a village
- Tall buildings can be incorporated at key locations as outlined in the village guidelines
- Locate taller buildings to minimize shadow impacts on open spaces and primary pedestrian pathways
- Thin building sections are encouraged to increase access to daylight and fresh air. Where possible integrate single loaded corridor buildings
- Buildings should step down in height as the neighborhood approaches the existing residential community to the south

2. Emphasize community
Central to an emphasis on community is the need to establish spaces that bring people together. Buildings and open spaces should promote opportunities for interaction while fostering an active, vibrant environment. Each village and building should provide a variety of spaces that strengthen campus life and sense of community within the Mesa neighborhood.

Social spaces
- Encourage interaction and community through different scales of social rooms, both indoor and outdoor, clearly linked together
- Social spaces should foster the exchange of ideas
- Locate social spaces at key nodes and along major pedestrian pathways

Outdoor rooms
- Each building should contribute to at least one distinct outdoor room
- Buildings should create outdoor rooms linked by shaded exterior circulation
- Each building should have outdoor rooms elevated in the building. These rooms should be adjacent to common spaces.
- Outdoor rooms should maximize views to the Mesa site landscape, canyons and beyond
3. Prioritize the pedestrian

The Mesa neighborhood plan emphasizes pedestrian movement through the community, as well as connections to adjacent areas. Establishing visual and physical connections that link buildings, open spaces and villages together will ensure a connected community that places a priority on the pedestrian.

Pedestrian Pathways

- Emphasize the primary pedestrian circulation through each village and the connections between villages
- Create a continuous pedestrian experience that is reinforced by active uses along the path.
- The relationship between buildings and streets should provide safe walkways
- Sidewalk should clearly define a high-quality pedestrian zone
- Integrate shaded walkways adjacent to buildings
- Locate service areas away from important pedestrian pathways
- Provide pedestrian pathways along existing and the anticipated future pedestrian desire lines

4. Create a quality environment

Integrate the design of buildings, open spaces and circulation networks to ensure a comprehensive design approach that creates quality environments.

Entries and ground floors

- Integrate transparency on the ground floor
- Reserve ground level spaces for the most public functions
- Where possible, provide greater ground floor height to accommodate range of program opportunities
- Locate service areas away from primary pedestrian pathways and building entrances
- Avoid blank walls along the ground floor
- Avoid buildings that are isolated from the community experience
- Buildings should be welcoming and strengthen adjacent open spaces
- Building entrances should be easily identifiable, well-lit, welcoming, and easily accessible

Active rooftops

- Rooftops are to include participatory spaces
- Elevated outdoor rooms should maximize views to the surrounding landscape
- Rooftop mechanical systems should be concealed from view within an architectural enclosure
6. Meeting the University’s sustainability targets

**Energy**
- Reduce energy consumption through certified building construction
- Reduce energy waste through the distribution of efficient energy systems
- Explore a network approach for district energy and shared resources
- Integrate renewable energy
- Integrate passive lighting, heating and cooling opportunities
- Respond to seasonal wind patterns and opportunities for natural ventilation
- Integrate green roof designs

**Water**
- Treat all forms of water, including storm water and waste water, as valuable resources that can be reclaimed for reuse
- Harvest rainwater and reduce potable water demand
- Utilize streets and connective greens to manage stormwater
- Improve permeability of existing soils that have been compacted over time
- Utilize landscape to naturally filter runoff
- Develop low maintenance landscape

**Waste**
- Utilize durable, low impact and recyclable building materials
- Establish centralized recycling centers
- Explore adaptive reuse strategies for existing building materials
Solar radiation study
The San Diego area receives consistent high solar radiation throughout the year, limiting the opportunities for pedestrian comfort in open spaces. A solar radiation study was conducted for the Mesa site to assess the quality of the outdoor space and propose solutions to enhance thermal comfort.

The preliminary analysis showed that relatively wide open spaces within development blocks were not well protected by surrounding buildings. This could result in outdoor thermal discomfort in summer, but could be valuable through the milder winter months.

As a result, the inclusion of deciduous vegetation, providing coverage only during the hot summer months when it is most needed, and other outdoor shading devices such as canopies or pergolas was recommended in order to improve pedestrian comfort year round.
Integral to the future redevelopment of the Mesa Neighborhood is the open space and landscape design. The large grove of existing eucalyptus trees on the site will be transformed into a park, or central Arboleda, for the entire community. Bringing the landscape of the canyons into the center of the site through a series of rustic corridors engages the entire neighborhood with the unique qualities of the Mesa landscape while also serving stormwater needs for the community.

The open space plan incorporates usable open space at all scales, from smaller building courtyards and raised terraces to the larger community park serving as an organizing element for the entire neighborhood plan. The relationship each village has to the open space network creates unique identities and places within the larger framework of the plan.
This section contains guidance about the recommended open space typologies, and it specifies suggested components for the numerous areas to encourage design cohesion and to assure a high aesthetic quality.

The final design and location of open space may shift during the design process. Overall, the objective is to produce unique neighborhoods with various elements including socialization areas, recreation, and reflective spaces.

1. **The Arboleda:**
   The “park” for the entire Mesa neighborhood, many programmed spaces afford areas for a multitude of interactions and activities.

2. **The Villages:**
   These open spaces will provide both outdoor respite for residents and recreational opportunities.

3. **The Rustic Corridors:**
   Serving as vegetated buffers between the villages the corridors also link the Arboleda to the natural canyon landscape at the perimeter and serve as a place for walkways, bio-retention, and fire lane access.

4. **The Fields:**
   A community garden with areas for social interaction.

5. **Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC):**
   A new location for the existing facility that encourages creative play and improves vehicular circulation to and from the center.

6. **The Canyons:**
   Preservation and enhancement of the natural canyon landscape with viewing areas provided at key locations.

---

**Figure 5.01: Open Space Typologies**

- **The Arboleda**
- **The Villages**
- **The Rustic Corridors**
- **The Fields**
- **Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)**
- **The Canyons**
Open Space Typologies

Figure 5.02: Section A - East / West

Figure 5.03: Section B - North / South

Figure 5.04: Section C - North / South
**Open Space Typologies**

The Arboleda

- **The Gardens**: Provide areas for self-reflection.
- **Woonerf**: Encourages pedestrian activity.
- **Play equipment**: Can double as sculptural interest.
- **Shared bike and pedestrian walkways**.
- **Pavilions**: Possess interesting architectural character and become wayfinding elements within The Arboleda.
- **Open lawns**: Create spaces for events, active play, and socialization.

**Figure 5.05: The Arboleda**

This space represents the “Central Park” of the entire Mesa community. Many amenities are provided and shared within the breadth of The Arboleda’s three defining areas.

1. The Porch
2. The Gardens
3. The Grounds
**Open Space Typologies**

The Arboleda

---

**Figure 5.06: Illustrative Site Plan**

---

**Figure 5.07: Components**

1. The Porch
2. The Lawn
3. Play
4. The Gardens
5. The Amphitheater
6. Pavilions
7. The Grounds
Open Space Typologies
The Arboleda

The Arboleda is centrally located and provides a space for various amenities such as recreation, paths, gardens, entertainment spaces, buffers, and social interactive areas. The objective of this is to provide a safe, comfortable, and sustainable area for these activities to occur while preserving the existing tree canopy and encouraging the establishment of new canopies throughout the space.

The Arboleda will become a destination for residents and adjacent communities alike. To achieve this goal the following components are to be included:

The Porch
The Porch is the “gateway” into the Arboleda and is meant to be inviting. Its proximity and connection to the Lawn make it the primary space for larger events and activities. Various characteristics will attract passersby to enter and enjoy the space. These should include:

- Interface with the Living Street or Woonerf: The Woonerf provides pedestrians a safe, curbless, and direct access into the park from the adjacent retail and residential area
- Highly Programmed: Planned activities and events are to be held here on a regular basis
- Cultural Pavilions and Buildings: Architecturally interesting structures to provide shelter and house amenities for visitors
- Kiosk: The kiosk structures can display art, information, and/ or serve commodities such as coffee
- Rest Rooms: These may stand alone or be combined with other pavilions or buildings
- Furnishings: Both fixed and moveable furnishings to allow the space to remain flexible for various activities and events

The Lawn
The Lawn will provide overflow space for events on the Porch as well as an impromptu area for passive recreation and socialization. Lawn is only supported where there is programmatic justification for its use. This area should include:

- Event Space: Adequate level area for both small and large events which may include tents
- Open Area: A space free of obstacles such as planting areas and furnishings (note that the area may be framed and buffered with plantings)
- Turf: All turf is to be a warm season grass and capable of withstanding heavy foot traffic

Play
The Play area is to be a safe and visible amenity for young children and their families, as well as providing active recreational amenities for adults. Elements should encourage imagination and active play.

- Playgrounds: The playgrounds should be divided into age appropriate play features
- Rest Rooms: These may stand alone or be combined with other pavilions or buildings
- Sports Courts (Basketball, Volleyball, Bocce, etc.): A variety of recreational amenities for residents and guest should be included within this area
- Tree House: An imaginative space for children both young and old
Open Space Typologies
The Arboleda

The Gardens
The Gardens take advantage of the existing topography and provide areas for nature trails and quiet reflection. They also can become an educational component through the use of interpretive signage and thoughtful curation of materials. Considerations for the design of these spaces should include:

- Ornamental Plant Material: Areas which display adaptive vegetation that has been introduced to the region (note that all plant material should be drought tolerant and require limited maintenance)
- Trails: Recreational paths with benches for resting
- Interpretive Signage: Both educational and wayfinding signs indicating interesting information and constructed from long lasting materials
- Intimate Spaces: Areas along paths and within the gardens that provide comfortable spaces for interaction between small groups (2-4 people) or individual quiet reflection
- Furnishings: Furniture within this area should be fixed in place

The Amphitheater
The Amphitheater takes advantage of the existing topography and creates a space for presentations and/or performances. The space should share a connection with the adjacent Grounds. Considerations to include:

- Integration: The existing topography should be considered when locating and designing the amphitheater
- Preservation: Existing adjacent trees are to be preserved and protected
- Sustainability: The amphitheater provides an opportunity for creative storm-water management in the area
Open Space Typologies

The Arboleda

Pavilions
Pavilions may be placed throughout the Arboleda and should utilize the footprints of the existing structures on the site. Structures should be creative in design and unique to each area, but cohesive in theme. Elements should include:
- Picnic Shelter: Shelters that provide shade and seating
- Rest Rooms: Located near amenities throughout the Arboleda
- Bandshell: A distinctive structure, located near the Porch, that may be used for performances and/or art exhibits

The Grounds
The Grounds are a repurposing of the existing ECEC buildings and the surrounding area. This space is intended to generate an artistic and energetic environment. A close connection between the interior and exterior spaces should be maintained. Elements include:
- Buildings: Spaces for art classes, meetings, a live music venue, cafe, restaurant, and additional creative places
- Central Commons: Central area for performances, art exhibits, and outdoor classes
- Beer Garden: Exterior controlled access area for entertainment and serving alcohol
Open Space Typologies
The Villages

Each village is intended to represent a unique and inviting neighborhood. To successfully accomplish this atmosphere, the following components are to be included:

1. Courtyards
2. Commons
3. Patios
4. Terraces

Figure 5.08: The Villages

Recreational opportunities within the Courtyard
Activated spaces along Commons
Open Space Typologies
The Villages

The Villages create a network of open spaces of adequate scale and design to deliver relief from the built environment while providing human-scaled places for socialization, contemplation, and circulation. These include courtyards, commons, patios, and terraces.

Although each is distinctive with its own unique characteristics, four typologies create the framework to be included within all of the villages: The Courtyards, The Commons, The Patios, and The Terraces.

The Courtyards
The Courtyards are larger spaces for social interactions. Included within these spaces are amenities such as:

- Lawn: Open lawn areas programmatically justified for social gatherings, picnics, or active play.
- Social Spaces: Fixed and moveable furnishings for impromptu social interactions and gatherings
- Pool: Swimming pool and/or spa of adequate size to accommodate the number of residents associated with the space
- Plantings: Areas of vegetation to frame and buffer (refer to the plant palette in the Materials and Systems section of this document)
- Movie Wall: A designated wall for films to be projected for residents
- Community Gardens should be provided where feasible
- Furnishings: Both fixed and moveable

The Commons
The Commons are very active, high energy spaces. Located adjacent to heavily trafficked walkways and entries of buildings, these spaces are carefully programmed and include:

- Cafe Seating: Movable tables and chairs
- Meeting Areas: Open spaces with seating and clear views of oncoming pedestrians

The Patios
The Patios are intimate communal spaces for a range of 2 to 10 people and include:

- Private Residential: Small ground floor exterior spaces for individual residences
- Family Spaces: Quiet, intimate, buffered spaces for family interactions
- Contemplative Space: Quiet, intimate, buffered spaces for individual reflection or study
- BBQ Areas: Spaces with grills, tables, and chairs

The Terraces
The Terraces are public and/or private open spaces located on the upper levels of buildings and include:

- Furnishings: Both fixed and moveable furnishings depending on the size of the terrace space
- Plantings: Depending on the size of the terrace, trees may be provided for shade along with vegetation to frame and buffer spaces (refer to the tree palette in the Materials and Systems section of this document)
- BBQ Areas: Spaces with grills, tables, and chairs
Open Space Typologies

Rustic Corridors

The Rustic Corridors link the canyons to the Arboleda and serve as the internal network of connections between adjacent villages. They provide access for a variety of services while maintaining an inviting and natural aesthetic.

The Rustic Corridors serve as buffers between villages and extend the rustic canyon aesthetic into the Arboleda.

These “links” may provide many services:
1. Pedestrian Links
2. Fire Access
3. Vegetated Buffer
4. Vehicular Drop-offs
5. Social Spaces
6. Bioretention
7. Utilities
8. Trash Services

Figure 5.09: Rustic Corridors
Open Space Typologies

The Rustic Corridors

Pedestrians and cyclists will rely on the Rustic Corridors to access internal and external sites. Therefore, the design must consider providing a pleasant transitional space with the ability to serve as a thoroughfare while subsequently allowing service access and treating storm-water runoff.

Pedestrian / Cyclists Links

These links are to accommodate both user groups safely and should provide adequate space to accomplish this task. Consider the following:

- Pavement: Materials for pavement may be permeable, but must allow for ADA approved access and cyclists
- Location: Attention should be given to entrances to adjacent buildings and open spaces when designing the rustic passageways
- Signage and change in paving materials or striping should be encouraged at cyclist and pedestrian intersections to communicate shared use

Social Spaces

Social Spaces are intended to encourage interactions while users are transitioning through the Rustic Corridors. Although limited, these areas may include:

- Furnishings: Furniture should be fixed in these areas as to not impede the required fire access
- Location: Locate Social Spaces directly along walkways

Vegetated Buffer

Vegetated Buffers create a screen between adjacent uses and construct an aesthetically pleasing experience along pathways.

- Plant Material: Refer to the plant palette in the Materials and Systems section of this document

Bioretention

The Rustic Corridors are located as to serve as Bioretention sites within the overall Storm-water Management Plan. Design should consider:

- Location: Bioretention should not interfere with required fire access and should be located to intercept as much storm-water as possible
- Design: The latest proven LID techniques are to be considered when designing storm-water management for the area
- Creativity in storm water management design is strongly encouraged

Fire Access

Refer to the local fire code when designing access points. The Rustic Corridors afford an opportunity to provide both pedestrian/ cyclist passageways that in turn double as fire access lanes.

- Pavement: All materials must be approved by the fire marshal as acceptable for fire truck access
- Location: Location of fire access must be approved by the fire marshal

Vehicular Drop-offs

Vehicular access to the residences and amenities will be limited. Therefore, the Vehicular Drop-offs will serve to assist in alleviating conflicts associated with lack of access.

- Locations: The drop-offs should be designed to accommodate as many areas as possible and should be limited to high demand locations
- Pedestrian safety is a top consideration

Utilities and Trash Service

Due to their adjacency to multiple villages, the Rustic Corridors may serve as utility corridors and access to combined trash stations.

- Location: The location of utilities and trash stations will be determined by the final design
- Screening: All utilities and trash stations should be screened to appear as discrete as possible
Open Space Typologies
The Fields

The Fields are intended to supply an opportunity for educational and social interactions while creating an alternative source for food.

The Fields create a community garden which in turn makes a place for neighbors to creatively explore a shared interest in gardening.

1. Community Garden
2. Orchard
3. Herb Garden
4. Compost Area
5. Shed/ Barn
6. Outdoor Kitchen

Figure 5.10: The Fields
Open Space Typologies
The Fields

Community gardens encourage a sense of pride and ownership in a neighborhood. They also assist in alleviating stress and provide opportunities for increased social interactions. The existing gardens are heavily utilized by residents. Delivering a well organized and inviting space should take into account the following:

Community Garden
The Community Garden is the nucleus of The Fields. This area should be designed to be accessible to a variety of users and allow for multiple crops to be planted.
- Materials: Materials used in the community garden should be vetted as safe for the containment of food, require limited maintenance, and aesthetically pleasing.
- Location: Attention to sun and shade should be considered when laying out the placement of the gardens as light requirements vary for different varieties of crops.

Orchard
The conditions in the area provide an opportunity to plant a small orchard.
- Location: Attention to sun and shade should be considered when laying out the placement of the gardens as light requirements vary for different varieties of crops.

Greenhouse
A small greenhouse should be provided for year round cultivation.

Compost Area
A Compost Area allows residents to contribute to the garden as well as provides a source for soil amendments.
- Location: The compost bin should be located away from residences and adjacent uses.
- Screening: The Compost Area should be screened from adjacent areas.

Shed / Barn
The Shed/Barn acts as a storage facility for tools and equipment. The structure should be creative in design.
- Location: The Shed/Barn should be easily accessible and located centrally to major active areas within the Fields.

Outdoor Kitchen
The Outdoor Kitchen can be a space that encourages social gatherings by allowing gardeners to share the bounty of the latest harvest. Classes could also be instructed in this space.
- Materials: The kitchen is to be constructed of materials that will withstand the exterior conditions and require minimum maintenance.
- Kitchen Equipment: The kitchen should be equipped with sinks, prep areas, range top, and other cooking amenities.
- Furnishings: The Outdoor Kitchen furniture should be movable and allow for various configurations.
- Storage: Storage should be provided for utensils and other kitchen related items when not in use.

Outdoor dining areas
Shared interactions within the garden can lead to new friendships.

Outdoor kitchen
Introducing the next generation to the wonders of growing your own food.
Open Space Typologies
Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)

The relocation of the ECEC will allow for improved vehicular access as well as a preferred proximity to adjacent amenities. The development of the new site will allow for many elements of creative play to be implemented. The provided outdoor spaces are the perfect spaces for active, dynamic, and creative play.

Relocating the ECEC to a new location improves vehicular access as well as placing the facility within a close proximity to amenities located within the Arboleda.

1. Age Appropriate Play
2. Sensory Expression
3. Buffer to South
4. Appropriate Plant Material
5. Parking and Access

Figure 5.11: Early Childhood Education Center
The relocated ECEC will allow guardians to easily access the facility from Regents Road. Upgrades should focus on the curriculum determined by the staff. Referring to the five components of Creative Play (inspire, imagine, build, play, and share) will assist in designing a successful facility and grounds.

Age Appropriate Play
The division of play areas into appropriate age groups allows children to build on their current skill set and fosters further development.

- Appropriate divisions: Ranges vary as to the exact age divisions for children’s play. The ECEC will dictate what these divisions are to be and the proper locations.
- Adoption of current guidelines for play and child to opens pace ratio

Sensory Expression
Providing opportunities to engage multiple senses is important within the design of exterior spaces.

- Materials: Check that materials are not poisonous and establish a variety of stimuli to engage each of the senses.
- Location: Locate materials as to allow for children to interact directly with them.

Buffer to South
A screen should be applied along the southern edge of the site to establish a division between the ECEC and adjacent residential use.

- Materials: Vegetated and/or constructed barrier designed to a width and height adequate enough to dissipate audible and visual distractions both onto and off of the site.

Appropriate Plant Material
Plants provide a naturalistic aesthetic to the built environment.

- Materials: Check that materials are not poisonous.
- Location: Locate materials as to allow for children to touch and smell the individual plants.

Parking and Access
It is important for the staff and the guardians of the children to have easy access to drop-off and/or park at the facility.

- Drop-off: Establish a safe drop-off area.
- Parking: Provide adequate parking for guardians and staff that is easily accessible from the facility.
- Screening: Screen adjacencies from the facility with a physical and/or planted buffer.

Age appropriate play provides equipment suitable to a child’s current developmental stage.

Interactive outdoor experiences are an important element in the Creative Play structure.

Children should be encouraged to thoroughly explore their surrounding environment.

Whimsical details inspire children and support imaginative activities.

Open Space Typologies
Early Childhood Development Center (ECEC)
The Canyons are home to Restoration Lands and an Ecological Reserve as defined by the 1989 Master Planning study. These sensitive areas possess a portion of the natural habitat and spectacular views present on the UC San Diego Campus and must be preserved.

The 16 acre Central Canyon supports a densely vegetated riparian corridor averaging approximately 150 feet in width. This corridor is home to four wetland mitigation sites; three currently under the permit jurisdiction of the US Army Corp of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The rehabilitation framework and long term management of this canyon is addressed in the June 29, 2011 UCSD Central Canyon Management Plan. As such, any impacts, temporary or permanent, to sensitive riparian vegetation must be avoided.

Installation of a canyon view overlook station should be considered north of Miramar Street. This station will encourage stewardship of the Canyons by establishing a safe and accessible viewing platform with interpretive signage describing the sensitive habitat.

1. Pedestrian bridge
2. Trails
3. Views

Figure 5.12: The Canyons
Open Space Typologies

The Canyons

The Canyons afford a special opportunity to educate visitors about UC San Diego’s commitment to ecological preservation and current methods of restoration being applied to the sites.

Refer to the Open Space Master Planning Study (OSMPS), 2010 UCSD Habitat Management Plan (HMP), and the 2011 UCSD Central Canyon Management Plan for proper management, maintenance, and monitoring of these sensitive areas.

Pedestrian Bridge
A Pedestrian Bridge has been recommended for safe access from the Mesa neighborhoods across the Central Canyon to create a direct linkage to the main UC San Diego campus via the Gilman freeway overpass.

- Access: A safe passageway needs to be accessible to both pedestrians and cyclists
- Mitigation: Any impacts to the riparian vegetation must be avoided and any impacts to other sensitive habitat must be mitigated

Trails
Site sensitive trails may be implemented within the Canyons, but special care must be taken to not damage or interrupt the existing habitat.

- Interpretive Signage: should be included at the trail heads and along the trails to educate users on the interesting habitat and sensitive nature of the site.

Views
The views both into and out of the Canyons should be evaluated and considered when designing adjacent areas.

- Preserve Views: Existing views are to be preserved and may be enhanced by providing viewing stations at the rim of the Canyons

View of canyon to the south frames the beauty of the existing natural landscape

An artistically interesting pedestrian bridge draws pedestrians and cyclists to the canyon crossing

Interpretive signage can engage users and promote stewardship

Viewing stations provide opportunities for pause and relaxation
Materials and Systems

Storm water Strategies

The management of storm water is an ever evolving practice. As new technologies are introduced development plans need to be flexible for adaptation. The diagram to the right demonstrates current technologies that should be considered for implementation within the design.

By applying a combination of LID (Low Impact Design Strategies), the design can retain the aforementioned flexibility to acclimate as technology progresses.

1. Bioswales
2. Flow through planters in street
3. Flow through planters for roof runoff
4. Green roofs
5. Village bioretention
6. Canyon bioretention facility

Figure 5.13: Storm water Strategies
Materials and Systems

Paving Typologies

The use of unique paving patterns give identity and sense of place to a space.

Variations in paving material assist in delineating separate use spaces.

An example of paving delineation for a Living Street (Woonerf).

Simple variations in concrete surfacing add interest.

Figure 5.14: Paving Typologies

Various pathways connect separate uses throughout the site and can be defined as follows:

1. Primary Pedestrian Walkways and Bike Lanes
2. Secondary Pedestrian Walkways
3. Loop Road Pedestrian Walkways and Bike Lanes
4. Trails
5. Specialty Paths
6. Courtyards and Commons
7. Patios and Terraces
8. Parking Lots
9. Fire lanes
Materials and Systems

Paving Typologies

Each paving typology should possess a unique character as to assist users in delineating between various routes of circulation throughout the site. Materials must be ADA accessible, durable, and easily maintained.

The various paving typologies support a geometry of connections upon the site. In correspondence with the adjacent materials within the landscape, they create an aesthetically pleasing and functional palette. Proper material selection is key to achieving the goal of aesthetic coherence amongst materials. Acceptable pavement materials include:

- Concrete: Apply cast-in-place concrete with integral color (muted colors of gray or site approved color palette), sandblast finish, saw cut joints.
- Pavers: To be stone or concrete paving units installed upon a sand setting bed. Areas with vehicular access will require pavers to be vehicular rated.
- Decomposed Granite: Install decomposed granite with an integrated binding agent or stabilizer.
- Wood Decking: Specify durable hardwoods or composite materials.
- Unacceptable Materials for Pavement: These materials are not to be used as they do not meet the overall intents of the design for the site. Avoid stamped concrete, pavers that imitate natural stone, and pavers with chamfered edges.

Primary Pedestrian Walkways and Bike Lanes

These paths are the principal wayfinding elements upon the site. Distinguishing characteristics inform users of the paths dominance within the circulation hierarchy.

- Appropriate Widths: 20-26’ wide
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians and cyclist safely, apply distinctive markings and wayfinding elements. Walkways may also be dual used as fire lane access.
- Material: Concrete or Asphalt

Secondary Pedestrian Walkways

- Appropriate Widths: 6-12’
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians
- Material: Concrete

Loop Road Pedestrian Walkways and Bike Lanes

- Appropriate Widths: 6-15’
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians and/or cyclist
- Material: Concrete and/or Pavers

Trails

- Appropriate Widths: 6-10’
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians (refer to The Arboleda section of this guideline for descriptions)
- Material: Decomposed Granite

Specialty Paths

- Appropriate Widths: varies
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians and/or cyclist safely at the Woonerf, signaled intersections, building entries, and other areas requiring accentuation or prominence
- Material: Concrete, Pavers

Courtyards and Commons

- Appropriate Widths: varies
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians for gatherings and events (refer to The Villages section of this guideline for descriptions)
- Material: Concrete, Pavers, Decomposed Granite

Patios and Terraces

- Appropriate Widths: varies
- Design: To accommodate pedestrians (refer to The Villages section of this guideline for descriptions)
- Material: Concrete, Pavers, Wood Decking

Parking Lots

- Design: To accommodate pedestrians and vehicles safely, distinctive markings and wayfinding elements
- Material: Permeable Concrete or Permeable Paver

Fire lanes

- Design: To accommodate access for fire rescue vehicles and designed in conjunction with the most current code
- Material: Concrete, Permeable Concrete, Permeable Paver, Decomposed Granite, Grasspave, or Gravelpave
The network of open spaces, located across the Mesa Neighborhood site, are intended to elicit an assortment of experiences. To better reflect the intentions of each individual space, one of the following four plant palettes are to be implemented within specific areas: The Rustic Palette, the Garden Palette, the Native Palette, or the Bioretention Palette.

The Rustic Palette: An informal composition prevalent throughout the campus which strengthens the quality of the site within its region.

The Garden Palette: Located within the villages, is derived from the functional need of the space and its surrounding buildings. Compositions may be formal or ornamental in character.

The Native Palette: Used along the canyons ecologically sensitive habitat.

The Bioretention Palette: Suggested for use in all bioretention areas per the Storm water Strategies section of this document.

All planting palettes should support a sustainable, culturally appropriate, low water usage design.

Gateway trees, positioned at key entry points to the site, announce arrival to guest and coincides with the existing guidelines for the remainder of the campus.
Materials and Systems

Plant Palette

The Landscape Planting Typology of an area can assist in developing a sense of place or identity. The Mesa Neighborhood includes a diversity of spaces from protected courtyards to exposed hillsides.

The plant lists identified below are only a recommendation and are intended to be a guide for use within the Mesa Housing Neighborhood. It is envisioned that each component of the neighborhood should establish a unique yet unifying look through the use of the following plant materials. Due to proximity to sensitive native vegetation communities in adjacent canyons, landscape palettes should not contain invasive plant species.

Rustic Palette
- Acacia - Prostrate Acacia
- Aeonium haworthii – Aeonium
- Agave attenuata - Foxtail Agave
- Aloe striata - Butterfly Aloe
- Aloe vera yellow – Medicinal Aloe
- Aloe striata - Coral Aloe
- Agave attenuata - Foxtail Agave
- Aeonium haworthii – Aeonium
- Arctostaphylos ssp  – Manzanita Species
- Atriplex lentiformis - Big Saltbush
- Baccharis pilularis - Coyote Bush
- Bahiopis laciniata - San Diego Sunflower
- Bothriochloa barbinodis - Cane Bluestem
- Carex spissa - San Diego Sedge
- Cynodon plectrutha – Coastal Cholla
- Distichlis spicata - Saltgrass
- Dudleya edulis - Fingerlips
- Elymus condensatus - Giant Wild Rye
- Encelia californica – California Bush Sunflower
- Epilobium canum – California Fuschia
- Enogrumum fasciculatum – California Buckwheat
- Heliotropium curassavicum var. oculatum - Alkali Heliotrope
- Heteromeles arbutifolia - Toyon
- Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii - Coastal Goldenbush
- Malosma laurina - Laurel Sumac
- Opuntia littoralis - Coastal Prickly Pear
- Peritoma arborea var. arborea - Bladderpod
- Baccharis pilularis - Dwarf Coyote Bush

Garden Palette
- Agave spp. - Agave Species
- Aloe spp. - Aloe Species
- Asclepias fascicularis - Narrow Leaf Milkweed
- Atiphep lentiformis – Big Saltbush
- Baccharis pilularis - Coyote Bush
- Bahiopis laciniata - San Diego Sunflower
- Bothriochloa barbinodis - Cane Bluestem
- Carex spissa - San Diego Sedge
- Cynodon plectrutha – Coastal Cholla
- Distichlis spicata - Saltgrass
- Dudleya edulis - Fingerlips
- Elymus condensatus - Giant Wild Rye
- Encelia californica – California Bush Sunflower
- Epilobium canum – California Fuschia
- Enogrumum fasciculatum – California Buckwheat
- Heliotropium curassavicum var. oculatum - Alkali Heliotrope
- Heteromeles arbutifolia - Toyon
- Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii - Coastal Goldenbush
- Malosma laurina - Laurel Sumac
- Opuntia littoralis - Coastal Prickly Pear
- Peritoma arborea var. arborea - Bladderpod
- Baccharis pilularis - Dwarf Coyote Bush

Native Palette
- Achillea millefolium - Yarow
- Amorpha fruticosa - False Indigobush
- Aristida purpurea - Purple Three-Awn bunchgrass
- Artemisia californica - California Sagebrush
- Asclepias fascicularis - Narrow Leaf Milkweed
- Atiphep lentiformis – Big Saltbush
- Baccharis pilularis - Coyote Bush
- Bahiopis laciniata - San Diego Sunflower
- Bothriochloa barbinodis - Cane Bluestem
- Carex spissa - San Diego Sedge
- Cynodon plectrutha – Coastal Cholla
- Distichlis spicata - Saltgrass
- Dudleya edulis - Fingerlips
- Elymus condensatus - Giant Wild Rye
- Encelia californica – California Bush Sunflower
- Epilobium canum – California Fuschia
- Enogrumum fasciculatum – California Buckwheat
- Heliotropium curassavicum var. oculatum - Alkali Heliotrope
- Heteromeles arbutifolia - Toyon
- Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii - Coastal Goldenbush
- Malosma laurina - Laurel Sumac
- Opuntia littoralis - Coastal Prickly Pear
- Peritoma arborea var. arborea - Bladderpod
- Baccharis pilularis - Dwarf Coyote Bush

Bioretention Palette
- Achillea millefolium - Yarow
- Amorpha fruticosa - False Indigobush
- Aristida purpurea - Purple Three-Awn bunchgrass
- Artemisia californica - California Sagebrush
- Asclepias fascicularis - Narrow Leaf Milkweed
- Atiphep lentiformis – Big Saltbush
- Baccharis pilularis - Coyote Bush
- Bahiopis laciniata - San Diego Sunflower
- Bothriochloa barbinodis - Cane Bluestem
- Carex spissa - San Diego Sedge
- Cynodon plectrutha – Coastal Cholla
- Distichlis spicata - Saltgrass
- Dudleya edulis - Fingerlips
- Elymus condensatus - Giant Wild Rye
- Encelia californica – California Bush Sunflower
- Epilobium canum – California Fuschia
- Enogrumum fasciculatum – California Buckwheat
- Heliotropium curassavicum var. oculatum - Alkali Heliotrope
- Heteromeles arbutifolia - Toyon
- Isocoma menziesii var. menziesii - Coastal Goldenbush
- Malosma laurina - Laurel Sumac
- Opuntia littoralis - Coastal Prickly Pear
- Peritoma arborea var. arborea - Bladderpod
- Baccharis pilularis - Dwarf Coyote Bush
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Tree Palette

Trees add beauty to their surroundings by adding color, texture, and scale to an area, softening harsh lines of buildings, framing views and contributing to the look and feel of their environment.

The historic landscape of the Mesa Neighborhood is dominated by one species of tree, Eucalyptus cladocalyx (Sugar Gum), which has been randomly planted between the existing residential structures. These majestic 40 to 70 foot tall Sugar Gums are the overlying element that gives the neighborhood its character and identity. All efforts are to be made to preserve the existing trees as a part of all future developments and must be retained within the confines of the Arboleda.

All existing trees are to be surveyed and receive a health assessment by a certified arborist prior to initiating the design. Clearly document tree species, caliper, height, general health, and structure. Retain high value trees in all developments and open spaces.

During construction, all existing trees are to be protected. Trees shall receive tree protection fencing as established by the drip line of the tree. Engage an arborist to perform periodic reviews of the trees and perform written reports in an effort to increase tree survival. In the event areas below the existing drip line are impacted by construction the arborist is to advise on treatment which may involve root pruning and/or soil decompaction.

Trees are to be reviewed annually by a local horticulturist to determine if disease, damage, or age has had any negative impacts on the trees or has created safety issues. All deadwood, hazardous limbs, and low growing limbs should be removed.

Over time, the existing Sugar Gum trees are to slowly be phased out and replaced. Below is the preferred tree palette as outlined per area.

Rustic Tree Palette
Native and adaptive tree species to be planted as informal rustic groves.
- Arbutus “Marina” - Marina Strawberry Tree
- Prosopis chilensis - Thornless Chilean Mesquite
- Geijera parviflora - Australian Willow
- Pinus torreyana - Torrey Pine
- Platanus racemosa - California Sycamore
- Platanus mexicana - Mexican Sycamore
- Quercus agrifolia - Coast Live Oak

Garden Tree Palette
Native and adaptive tree species to be planted in formal or informal applications.
- Acacia spp. - Acacia Species
- Geijera parviflora - Australian Willow
- Liquidambar styraciflua - Sweetgum
- Olea europea - Olive (fruitless varieties)
- Platanus mexicana - Mexican Sycamore
- Prosopis chilensis - Thornless Chilean Mesquite
- Quercus agrifolia - Coast Live Oak

Native Tree Palette
- Quercus agrifolia - Coast Live Oak
- Pinus torreyana - Torrey Pine
- Platanus racemosa - California Sycamore

Bioretention Tree Palette
- Chilopsis linearis - Desert Willow
- Platanus racemosa - California Sycamore
- Platanus mexicana - Mexican Sycamore
- Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra - Lance-leaf Willow
- Umbellularia californica - California Bay Laurel

Gateway Tree
- Pinus torreyana - Torrey Pine
Materials and Systems

Street Palette

Figure 5.16: Tree Plan

- Regents Street Tree (Platanus mexicana) - formal planting
- Park View Drive Tree (Platanus mexicana) - formal planting
- Gateway Tree (Pinus torreyana) - informal planting

Native Tree Palette - informal planting
Garden Tree Palette - formal & informal planting
Rustic Tree Palette - informal planting
Materials and Systems

Site Furnishings

A cohesive furnishing palette establishes a sense of place and comfort within a neighborhood. All site elements including: seating, lighting, trash receptacles, signage, and bike racks should speak to a similar aesthetic and integrate with the overall design of a space. The exception may be found in sculptural pieces that highlight prominent locations on the site.

The design must be cognoscente that the site furnishings do not hinder pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

Seating
Placement of seating should either encourage social interactions or provide respite for small groups or individuals. Shade and protection from the elements should be considered when placing furnishings.

- Fixed Seating: Fixed seating should be considered along pedestrian walkways and trails. Fixed elements of seating may be incorporated into site walls or integrated with specific architectural features.
- Movable Seating: Movable seating increases flexibility in high use areas. Consider this seating in spaces such as the Villages and the Arboleda (Porch and Grounds).

Lighting
Outdoor lighting must consider materials, placement, intensity, timing, duration, and color in the design. Refer to UC San Diego’s Outdoor Lighting Policy for established key criteria.

- Use full cutoff or fully shielded fixtures when possible to avoid excessive light pollution.
- Provide adequate and safe lighting levels in areas of pedestrian activity.
- Lighting may be used as a wayfinding element along pathways.

Trash
Locate trash and recycling containers where pedestrian activity warrants their use, such as entrances to buildings, at intersections of major walkways, and within high use areas.

- Trash and recycling receptacles should be clearly labeled.
- Receptacles should be protected from the elements with a lid.

Signage
A signage standard should be developed for the site to assist in the establishment of a cohesive aesthetic. This standard must be adhered to for all signage to assist in wayfinding and the creation of a neighborhood theme.

Bike Racks
Provide adequate numbers of bicycle racks at points of entry across the site and adjacent to amenity spaces.

- A standard u-lock style or a similar interpretation of the form should be specified for all bike racks.
- Bicycle repair stations may be included periodically along areas of significant bicycle traffic.

Sculptural
The addition of sculptural elements to the neighborhood may also serve as site furnishings.

- Both permanent and temporary art installations may be considered for the dual purpose of seating within an area.
- Special attention must be paid to compatibility in scale, material, form, and content of the sculpture with the surrounding design.

Seating
Placement of seating should either encourage social interactions or provide respite for small groups or individuals. Shade and protection from the elements should be considered when placing furnishings.

- Fixed Seating: Fixed seating should be considered along pedestrian walkways and trails. Fixed elements of seating may be incorporated into site walls or integrated with specific architectural features.
- Movable Seating: Movable seating increases flexibility in high use areas. Consider this seating in spaces such as the Villages and the Arboleda (Porch and Grounds).

Lighting
Outdoor lighting must consider materials, placement, intensity, timing, duration, and color in the design. Refer to UC San Diego’s Outdoor Lighting Policy for established key criteria.

- Use full cutoff or fully shielded fixtures when possible to avoid excessive light pollution.
- Provide adequate and safe lighting levels in areas of pedestrian activity.
- Lighting may be used as a wayfinding element along pathways.

Encourage versatile on street dining and gathering spaces with both fixed and movable options (i.e. benches and cafe seating).
How can the Mesa Neighborhood become a compact community focused on living, not driving?

Rethink how the students get around campus.

Link integrated transit solutions that combine the future San Diego Trolley, UC San Diego shuttle, and comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian networks to greatly reduce the reliance on cars.

Make transit convenient and attractive.
Transit
Connections to the campus, community and downtown

The future extension of the San Diego Trolley to the UC San Diego campus will provide direct access to other areas in the city including University Towne Center and downtown San Diego. Multiple stations will serve the campus, and the Mesa Neighborhood is conveniently located within a five minute walk from two of these future stations. Located on either end of the site, the VA Medical Center Station and the Executive Drive Station will both provide enhanced accessibility to the area. The Executive Drive station is positioned near the planned Regents Road gateway development for the Mesa Neighborhood.

- Establish clear pedestrian and bicycle connections and wayfinding from the Executive Drive Station and VA Medical Center Station

Figure 6.01: San Diego Trolley
Transit

UC San Diego campus shuttle

The Mesa Neighborhood will link into the UC San Diego comprehensive campus shuttle system providing transit connections to the larger campus community. Dedicated shuttle stops at each Mesa village are recommended to ensure maximum convenience. Consider future shuttle connections to the Executive Drive LRT Station and the VA Medical Center Station.

- Integrate convenient campus shuttle stops into each village center
- Co-locate support facilities at each village stop to establish larger mobility hubs that directly link to other transportation modes
- Shuttle stops should incorporate bike storage and bike share locations
- Incorporate protective shelters
- Integrate smart technology with travel information and alerts
One of the primary focuses of the Mesa Neighborhood plan is the creation of a walkable community. The pedestrian network links not only each village to each other, but also the Mesa Neighborhood to the larger campus, surrounding community and future transit connections. Weaving through the central Arboleda, the pedestrian network system is intended to engage the park and site landscape while strengthening the sense of community through clear connections.

A new pedestrian bridge over the canyon will provide a direct connection between Mesa and the larger UC San Diego community.

Future improvements to the La Jolla Drive interchange will allow the southwestern corner of the site to be redesigned for safe pedestrian travel.

The pedestrian network should be intuitive for users reducing the need for unnecessary wayfinding signs.

- Create an inter-connected pedestrian network
- Establish clearly defined gateways on the western pedestrian bridge and Regent’s Road
- Integrate safe pedestrian and bicycle crossings at all street crossings
- Refer to the open space section for additional details on the pedestrian network

Figure 6.04: Primary pedestrian circulation
Circulation
Primary pedestrian network

Bike and pedestrian combined
A combined bicycle and pedestrian pathway provides a gracious circulation network that is easily identifiable and intuitive for the users. When the pathway is also needed to meet the needs for emergency access through the open space system, the wider path is sized to accommodate emergency vehicles and access requirements. Refer to the emergency access plan for specific locations.

Bike and pedestrian separated
In areas of the park where buildings do not need additional emergency access, the pathway can be split into separate zones for bicycles and pedestrians. The landscape zone separating the two areas can vary in width.
The Mesa Neighborhood plan integrates a comprehensive bicycle network including dedicated bike lanes and bike paths throughout the neighborhood. The system is designed to link to the larger bicycle network on campus and adjacent city streets. The bicycle network is intended to encourage biking as a means of transportation through the development. The new pedestrian bridge linking to the Gilman overpass will provide a direct link for bikers and pedestrians from the Mesa neighborhood to the West Campus.

When the La Jolla Drive interchange is updated in the future, re-evaluate the bicycle network and connections from Mesa. Safe passages along the step slope on the site’s southwest corner will need to be incorporated.

Refer to the 2012 UC San Diego Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Planning Study and the 2013 City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan for additional considerations regarding the comprehensive bicycle network.

- Incorporate a minimum bike storage in each residential building of 1 bike spaces per bed
- Re-evaluate bike storage needs as each future project is developed
- Provide additional bike storage throughout the neighborhood. Locate storage at all village centers, campus shuttle stops, and other community resources and amenities.
- Storage should be visible and conveniently located
- Consider the integration of bike share programs on campus
- Incorporate bike repair stations

Figure 6.07: Bicycle Network
Circulation

Vehicular network

The vehicular network is designed to provide access and clear connections to all portions of the Mesa Neighborhood. Two primary vehicular entries, a north and south entry, provide direct connections to Regents Road. The alignment of the existing loop road, Miramar Street is maintained except one segment on the southern end where the road is adjusted to provide additional development potential and slow traffic.

Replace the existing internal service road with a pedestrian focused pathway system that also has capabilities to serve the emergency access needs.

The future Gilman Bridge over the I-5 Freeway will provide a new connection between the east and west campuses. A new connection to the East Campus is proposed for internal campus circulation. The connection is intended as a low-volume street for community based circulation, shuttle services, and emergency access.

The Regents Road edge of the Mesa Neighborhood will include two vehicular entrances. These entrances are intended to be clear, identifiable gateways for the Mesa Neighborhood, but are not intended to serve as larger gateway entrances for the UC San Diego East Campus. The denser edge along Regents Road requires the need for additional travel lanes at each entrance to accommodate the vehicular traffic in the first block of the neighborhood. Miramar Street to the west of the new Park View Lane will reduce in lane widths.
Circulation

Street sections

Figure 6.09: Miramar Street North, Access at Regents Road
The North signalized entrance to Miramar Street off of Regents Road is intended to be maximum four lanes. Two lanes inbound and two lanes outbound. Allow for a combined bike lane and sidewalks segregated by flow through planters.

Figure 6.10: Miramar Street South, Access at Regents Road
The South signalized entrance to Miramar Street off of Regents Road is intended to be maximum four lanes with one row of on street parking. Two lanes inbound and two lanes outbound. Allow for a combined bike lane and sidewalks segregated by flow through planters.

Activate the pedestrian zone and building ground floor.
Establish a clear gateway on Regents Road.
Provide enhanced paving at intersections to calm traffic and to enhance visual aesthetics.

Figure 6.11: Miramar Street Loop Road

The interior Miramar Street loop road is intended to be maximum three lanes with one row of on street parking. One lane inbound and one lane outbound with a center turn lane. Allow for a combined bike lane and sidewalks segregated by flow through planters. Utilize planted medians where possible to provide additional pedestrian refuge.

Figure 6.12: Regents Road

The development along Regents Road is intended to bring an active street life down to the elevation of the existing street. Enlivened with retail and other commercial uses, Regents Road will be a walkable western gateway to the Mesa neighborhood. Working with the topography that exist on the western edge of the site, underground parking will be located behind a level of active uses. The existing roadway conditions on Regents Road will remain.

The Regents Road corridor will meet the existing street level with active uses, outdoor cafes, and a vibrant street life.
The new interior north-south connector road, Park View Lane, is intended to be a Living Street (Woonerf), which is a shared pedestrian and vehicular space. The curbless street acts as an active plaza that links the Village to the adjacent Arboleda Porch, giving the appearance of one singular space.

Maximum two lanes with one row of on street parking. One lane inbound and one lane outbound. Allow for a combined bike lane and sidewalks segregated by flow through planters.

Park View Lane will create a new north-south connection through the Mesa Neighborhood. Envisioned as a woonerf, the road is intended to accommodate all users - pedestrians, bicycles, and cars in a shared space. Park View Lane will become a curbless, social space where pedestrians have priority and can safely cross from the Regents Road Village to the Porch and Arboleda. The laneway can be closed to cars for special events creating a seamless condition between the Regents Road active uses and the park.

Reduced vehicular speeds on the road allow for an increase in seating, special use areas and opportunities for social interaction. The entrance to the shared street space will be clearly identifiable so cars are aware they have entered a pedestrian priority zone.
Parking

Parking is to be provided on an incremental basis as each new development project is executed. With the transit rich aspects of the Mesa neighborhood, as well as other mobility services such as bike and car share programs, car ride services and increased walkability of the neighborhood, parking ratios should continue to be re-evaluated as with each new project.

The approach to parking includes a mix of structured parking decks, underground parking structures that work with the site’s topography, on-street parking and some limited surface parking spaces.

Parking counts for the development are based on a 0.6 parking space per bed ratio. With the future introduction of increased transit accessibility and a critical mass of neighborhood amenities within walking distance, the later phases reduce the parking count per bed. As each development phase is implemented, the parking demands should be revisited.

Figure 6.15: Parking

Figure 6.16: Parking locations

- **1** Existing structured garage ± 685 spaces
- **2** Existing structured garage ± 930 spaces
- **3** Proposed below grade garage ± 150 spaces
- **4** Proposed structured garage ± 1,300 spaces
- **5** Proposed structured garage ± 900 spaces
- **6** Proposed below grade garage ± 850 spaces
- **7** Proposed below grade garage ± 300 spaces
- **8** Proposed surface parking ± 75 spaces
- **9** Proposed below grade garage ± 300 spaces

Regent’s Roadpark

Regent’s Road
Access
Service and emergency access

Service locations are to be located away from primary building entrances, open spaces and pedestrian pathways. Service locations are to be screened from view. Where possible, integrate shared building service corridors through below grade connections.

Service access for the Regents Road edge is to be coordinated with the design of Park View Lane to ensure the pedestrian environment is not impacted by building service and deliveries.

Emergency access will primarily be located along the interconnected street network. Additional building access will be obtained through the primary pathway system.
Collection of Villages

Central to the Mesa Neighborhood plan are five unique and vibrant villages. The villages establish opportunities for greater interaction at a scale that fosters community. Creating spaces that bring people together creates a sense of identity and strengthens campus life.

Each village provides a unique collection of buildings and relationship to the Mesa landscape. The design of the village is intended to strengthen the University’s mission outlined in the UC San Diego Strategic Plan which calls for all efforts to be a student-centered, research focused, service oriented public university.
Neighborhood Identity
A collection of villages

The Mesa Neighborhood is created around the concept of village which creates smaller areas of development with shared resources, amenities, and development considerations. The neighborhood includes five distinct villages.

Within each village, the following design considerations include strategies for development, build-to lines, pedestrian circulation, places for active uses / exchange, ground floor uses, building heights and massing.
Located on the western portion of the Mesa Neighborhood, Village 1 incorporates the existing residential development, One Miramar Street Apartments, and a new housing complex to the east, Nuevo West. An expanded village center will bring the two developments together around one central area of community amenities and shuttle stop.

Nuevo West will form the primary pedestrian gateway to the entire Mesa Neighborhood from the west. The pedestrian bridge will link the east and west campus together and enter the development in an area filled with ground floor active uses.
Village 1
Organizing ideas

Key considerations
- Establish a consistent street wall on Miramar Street
- Create an active gateway linking to the pedestrian bridge
- Link One Miramar into a larger village center
- Connect courtyards to the pedestrian pathway network
- Locate active uses at key pedestrian crossings

Distinct outdoor rooms
Clearly define outdoor rooms that link together through a larger open space network

Vary building height
Stagger taller buildings and create a variation in overall building height

Active ground floors
Locate the most active uses at the gateway crossings and along primary pedestrian pathways

Community spaces and active rooftops
Integrate opportunities for interaction at all levels
Participatory roof spaces are encouraged

Figure 7.03: Village 1 Planning Concept
**Village 1**

Development concept

**Figure 7.04: Village 1 Development Concept**

- Existing buildings to remain
- Residential development opportunity
- Opportunity for special use
- Shuttle stop
- Parking garage entrance
- Pedestrian crossing

- **Primary building use**
  1. Residential
  2. Residential
  3. Residential
  4. Residential
  5. The Pub + Bridgeview Apartments
  6. Cafe / market
  7. Below grade parking
  8. Pedestrian bridge

**Figure 7.05: Village 1 Section**

- Building setback is to create an engaging street wall on Miramar Street.
- Setback to include pedestrian / bicycle pathway and streetscape.
- The primary building setbacks from the circulation network can range from 10' - 20'
- Building "top" can setback separately creating outdoor rooms at upper levels
Village 2 will complete the residential development currently underway, Mesa Nueva, with additional residential units and community amenities in Nuevo East. Located on the northern edge of the development, the village has continuous views of the central Arboleda along the southern edge. A series of interior courtyards and smaller open spaces provide residents with additional outdoor gathering spaces. Rustic corridors are positioned to provide clear circulation routes and stormwater conveyance between the developments.
Organizing ideas

Key considerations
- Establish a consistent street wall on Miramar Street
- Link the development to Mesa Nueva
- Connect courtyards to the pedestrian pathway network and adjacent rustic corridors
- Locate active uses at key pedestrian crossings

Figure 7.07: Village 2 Planning Concept

- Distinct outdoor rooms
  - Clearly define outdoor rooms that link together through a larger open space network

- Vary building height
  - Stagger taller buildings and create a variation in overall building height

- Active ground floors
  - Locate the most active uses along the primary pedestrian pathways

- Community spaces and active rooftops
  - Integrate opportunities for interaction at all levels
  - Participatory roof spaces are encouraged

Existing buildings to remain
Key build-to lines
Flexible development line
Primary pedestrian pathway
Places of exchange
Village 2 Development concept

Figure 7.08: Village 2 Development Concept

Figure 7.09: Village 2 Section

Existing buildings to remain
Residential development opportunity
Opportunity for special use
Shuttle stop
Parking garage entrance
Pedestrian crossing

Primary building use
1. Residential
2. Cafe / market
3. Residential
4. Residential
5. Residential
6. Parking

The building setback is to create an engaging street wall on Miramar Street.
Setback to include pedestrian / bicycle pathway and streetscapes.
The primary building setbacks from the circulation network can range from 10’ - 20’

Building setback can setback separately creating outdoor rooms at upper levels

The building setback is to create an engaging street wall on Miramar Street.
Setback to include pedestrian / bicycle pathway and streetscapes.
The primary building setbacks from the circulation network can range from 10’ - 20’
Village 3 includes a vibrant commercial corridor along Regents Road. The active uses are integrated throughout the village and include unique destinations of retail, fitness, gathering, food, incubator space, arts, theatre, markets and places for exchange. The new gateway and community activation is intended to be a destination for both the Mesa residents and the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Regents Road corridor will include taller buildings and increased density which correspond to nearby developments and maximize views of the park, Mesa landscape and views beyond of the West Campus and Pacific Ocean. Common amenity spaces will be integrated throughout the buildings with special uses such as the Perch on the upper levels to provide unique community spaces that capture views of the unique aspects of the Mesa Neighborhood.

The western portion of the village includes Park View Lane and the Porch which will serve as the front door for the central open space. The laneway will accommodate all users in a shared space views the street as a social space, rather than an area only for cars.

Figure 7.10: Village 3 Illustrative Plan
Village 3
Organizing ideas

Figure 7.11: Village 3 Planning Concept

Key considerations
- Establish a consistent street wall Regents Road with active uses along the length of the street
- Establish a consistent streetwall on the new shared street, Park View Lane
- Connect the development through an interconnected mid-block path
- Link the interior path and courtyard spaces to Regents Road and the Porch
- Establish clear gateways to the Mesa Neighborhood on the north and south blocks
- Integrate active uses / places of exchange throughout the ground floor
- Locate active uses at the Regents Road street level. Utilize the site’s topography to provide underground parking behind the active uses.

Distinct outdoor rooms
Clearly define outdoor rooms that link together through a larger open space network

Vary building height
Stagger taller buildings and create a variation in overall building height
Village 3
Development concept

Figure 7.12: Village 3 Development Concept

- Existing buildings to remain
- Residential development opportunity
- Opportunity for special use
- Shuttle stop
- Parking garage entrance
- Pedestrian crossing

Primary building use
1. Residential Tower
2. Grocery
3. Mixed Use
4. Residential Tower
5. Parking Structure
6. Mixed Use
7. Residential Tower
8. Mixed Use
9. Below grade parking
10. Mixed Use
11. Mixed Use
12. Residential Tower
13. Cafe / market
14. Below grade parking

Active ground floors
Locate the most active uses along the primary pedestrian pathways

Community spaces and active rooftops
Integrate opportunities for interaction at all levels
Participatory roof spaces are encouraged
Village 3
Development concept

Figure 7.13: Village 3 North / South Section

Figure 7.14: Village 3 East / West Section
Village 4 is located on the southern portion of the site adjacent to the La Jolla Village Tennis Club. The scale of the village will step down in height to correspond to the lower scaled buildings to the south. A mix of town home and stacked flat typologies, the lower scale development could be a desirable housing choice for students with families.

Other uses incorporated into the village include a relocated Early Childhood Education Center and The Fields, the urban farm for the Mesa community.
Village 4
Organizing ideas

Key considerations

- Maintain a consistent street wall on Miramar Street
- Create clear pedestrian connections to surrounding areas and through the village
- Integrate smaller scaled open spaces for the users
- Reserve a site for a relocated ECEC
- Incorporate the Fields along the southern edge

Distinct outdoor rooms
Integrate opportunities for shared outdoor common areas for families

Vary building height
Decrease building height in Village 4 to relate to the adjacent residential community

Active ground floors
Locate community centered functions central to the village

Community spaces and active rooftops
Consider opportunities to create usable outdoor spaces on upper levels
Village 4
Development concept

Figure 7.17: Village 4 Development Concept

Primary building use

1. Residential
2. Residential
3. Residential
4. Residential
5. Residential
6. Residential
7. Cafe / market
8. Parking
9. Early Childhood Education Center

Figure 7.18: Village 4 Section

Legend:
- Yellow: Pedestrian walkway
- Green: Open space
- Red: Opportunity for special use
- Gray: Roadway/surface parking

Existing buildings to remain
Residential development opportunity
Opportunity for special use
Shuttle stop
Parking garage entrance
Pedestrian crossing

The Fields
La Jolla Village Tennis Club
Lebon Drive
La Jolla Village Drive

Building stepping can be utilized to create outdoor amenity spaces

surface parking
courtyard

Miramar Street, South
Village 4
Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)

A new site for the Early Childhood Education Center had been identified on the southern portion of the Mesa neighborhood. The site is located between a new village of lower scaled residential suitable for family housing and the community farm. Easy access from Regent’s Road eliminates the need for ECEC users to drive far into the Mesa neighborhood.

The design of the new facility should incorporate the five components of creative play (inspire, imagine, build, play, and share). The center should integrate elements that foster a continued interaction and investigation with the environment.

ECEC Building
- The ECEC should be sized to meet all accreditation requirements outlined for early childhood education and the program needs identified by the ECEC staff.
- Student spaces should maximize access to natural light and outdoor areas.
- Incorporate the technology required to support emerging trends in early childhood education, as well as the research programs affiliated with the ECEC. Consider the integration of a SMART room with a sensory digital network.
- In order to maintain a compact building footprint, the building design is encouraged to locate feasible programs and support functions on a second level.

Outdoor Play Area
- The outdoor play area should be sized to meet all accreditation requirements outlined for early childhood education and the program needs identified by the ECEC staff.
- The outdoor play area can easily be divided into multiple zones for different ages as required.
- Clearly marked pedestrian crossings on Miramar Street allow the possibility for safe walks to the Arboleda.
- Refer to the Open Space guidelines for additional considerations for the outdoor areas.

Parking
- Dedicated parking for drop-off/pick-up is located in the parking lot east of the building. On-street parking on Miramar Street, and the parking lot in the rear of the adjacent housing.
- Staff and employee parking will be located in dedicated spaces in the nearby below grade garage on Regent’s Road.

Figure 7.19: ECEC Planning Concept
Village 5 is positioned to take advantage of incredible views of the Mesa landscape, both the Arboleda and the adjacent canyon. The housing will range in scales with lower scaled development adjacent to the Fields and La Jolla Tennis Club, and opportunities for taller development closer to the central park. A series of courtyards, smaller open spaces, rustic corridors and a village center provide a full range of open spaces for gathering, defined pathways, stormwater, and recreation.

Figure 7.20: Village 5 Illustrative Plan

Village 5
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Village 5
Organizing ideas

Figure 7.21: Village 5 Planning Concept

Key considerations:
- Create an interconnected pathway actived with ground floor active uses
- Maximize views to the surrounding Mesa landscape
- Connect courtyards to the pedestrian pathway network and adjacent rustic corridors
- Locate active uses at key pedestrian crossings

Village 5
Organizing ideas

Distinct outdoor rooms
Clearly define outdoor rooms of public to semi-public spaces all linked together

Vary building height
Establish a clear variation in building height
Reduce height on the southern edges

Active ground floors
Locate the most active uses in the village center and along the primary pedestrian pathways

Community spaces and active rooftops
Integrate opportunities for interaction at all levels
Participatory roof spaces are encouraged

Diagram showing Village 5 planning 
with key considerations marked.

Existing buildings to remain
Key build-to lines
Flexible development line
Primary pedestrian pathway
Places of exchange
**Village 5**

Development concept

**Figure 7.22: Village 5 Development Concept**

- **Primary building use**
  - 1. Residential
  - 2. Cafe / market
  - 3. Residential
  - 4. Residential
  - 5. Cafe / market
  - 6. Community Amenity
  - 7. Residential
  - 8. Residential
  - 9. Residential
  - 10. Residential

**Figure 7.23: Village 5 Section**

- Pedestrian walkway
- Open space
- Opportunity for special use
- Roadway/Surface parking
- Below grade parking
Development Phasing

**Total Development**
- ± 2,100 units
- ± 3,400 beds

**Components**
- 1,310 new beds / 1,080 new units
- Parking structure / 930 spaces
- Bike storage / 760 spaces
- Outdoor community amenities

**Phase 1**
Total Development after Phase 1
- ± 2,400 units
- ± 4,200 beds
- ± 475,000 new gsf

Components
- ± 800 new beds / ± 375 new units
- The pub and bridgeview apartments
- New pedestrian bridge
- Gateway crossroads
- Stormwater - rustic corridor
- Improved Miramar Street (northern segment)
- Vehicular connection to Athena Court
- Cafe / market
- Below grade parking
- Above grade parking structure (north of Mesa Nueva)
### Phasing

**Phase 2a**
Total Development after Phase 2a
- ± 3,000 units
- ± 5,300 beds
- ± 700,000 new gsf

**Phase 2b**
Total Development after Phase 2b
- ± 3,000 units
- ± 5,300 beds

---

**Components**
- ± 1,400 new beds / ± 750 new units
- Supporting amenities
- Extend pedestrian pathway
- Stormwater - connective green
- Mesa neighborhood sanitary sewer updates (confirmation required)
- Parking located in Phase 2 structured garage

---

**Components**
- The Lawn
- Play
- The Gardens
- Amphitheater
- Pavilions
Phasing

Figure 7.28: Phase 3  Regents Road North

Components
• ± 2,000 new beds / ± 1,100 new units
• Commercial and supporting amenities
• Below grade parking
• Above grade parking structure
• North / south connector road
• The Porch
• The Perch
• Complete connective pedestrian path
• Finalize Arboleda programming
• Regents Road streetscape

Bed count, dwelling units, and gsf are approximate

Phase 3
Total Development after Phase 3
• ± 3,900 units
• ± 7,000 beds
• ± 1,500,000 new gsf

Figure 7.29: Phase 4  Regents Road South

Components
• ± 600 new beds / ± 350 new units
• Commercial and supporting amenities
• Below grade parking
• South Miramar Street / Regents Road entry
• The Porch
• The Perch
• Complete connective pedestrian path
• Finalize Arboleda programming
• Regents Road streetscape

Bed count, dwelling units, and gsf are approximate

Phase 4
Total Development after Phase 4
• ± 4,300 units
• ± 7,500 beds
• ± 500,000 new gsf
Phasing

**Figure 7.30: Phase 5  Mesa South**

- ± 300 new beds / ± 125 new units
- Integrated parking
- Surface parking
- Relocated Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)
- The Fields
- Repurpose existing ECEC as The Grounds
- Partial South Miramar Street realignment connecting to ECEC

**Figure 7.31: Phase 6  Mesa West**

- ± 1,400 new beds / ± 800 new units
- Supporting amenities
- Below grade parking
- Complete South Miramar Street realignment

**Phase 5**

Total Development after Phase 5
- ± 4,000 units
- ± 7,300 beds
- ± 150,000 new gsf

**Phase 6**

Total Development after Phase 6 (full build out)
- ± 5,000 units
- ± 8,800 beds
- ± 750,000 new gsf

Bed count, dwelling units, and gsf are approximate.

Components

- ± 300 new beds / ± 125 new units
- Integrated parking
- Surface parking
- Relocated Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)
- The Fields
- Repurpose existing ECEC as The Grounds
- Partial South Miramar Street realignment connecting to ECEC

Bed count, dwelling units, and gsf are approximate.
### Incremental development approach

**Figure 7.32: Development Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Miramar</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>to remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mesa (west)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mesa (central)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>removed in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mesa (east)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mesa</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mesa</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,294</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Under Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Nueva</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,139</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,428</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 1 Nuevo West**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo West</td>
<td>± 374</td>
<td>± 943</td>
<td>± 480,000 new gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 1</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>2,465</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>4,275</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2 Nuevo East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo East</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>± 700,000 new gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 2</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>3,040</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>5,340</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2b Central Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regents North</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>± 1,500,000 new gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 3</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>3,940</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>6,940</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 4 Regents South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa South (family)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>± 150,000 new gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 5</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>4,180</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>7,370</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 5 Mesa South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Housing</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa West</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>± 750,000 new gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 6</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>5,000</strong></td>
<td>± <strong>8,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bed count, dwelling units and gross floor area are approximate.

**Total Mesa development potential**

- ± 5,000 units
- ± 8,800 beds
- ± 4,080,000 new gsf
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