

From: [Kathleen Brand](#)
To: [Alvarado SP](#)
Subject: Alvarado Specific Plan
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2019 11:50:49 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Kirt,

I would like to see all the conceptual drawings for the site. I don't believe what you have posted on the website is the only drawing the developer has completed. It is very difficult to give comment back without a thorough understanding of how the architecture fits on the site. The City's website should be the portal for accessing this information.

Your description of the project does not include an analysis of on-site parking, a count of the various types of units, and a very detailed description of the overall massing and height of the buildings with the parking garages.

After review of the one plan posted on the website, I do not agree with your assessment that the loop road would primarily function as a pedestrian promenade. The access gates are recessed into the site and the loading zones are almost in the center of the site. There should be a pedestrian walkway/trail along the creek edge as it appears on the western portion of the site, that wraps around weaves through the site. If you have been by Alterra and Pravada, the residents use the area next to the trolley tracks as a dog relief area. Providing true pedestrian and dog-friendly amenities will be an asset to the development. This ties into the "social nodes" shown on the plans, which will no more than the dog relief areas, so call them out as such and design them for that purpose.

I also think that if this is TOD development the developer and/or the City should implement the proposed bike path per the bike master plan for Alvarado from 70th Street Station to Guava. I would recommend that it be a class 4 cycle track instead of the class II proposed. We need better and more progressive bicycle infrastructure. You should eliminate any on-street parking along this site, since this is TOD there will not be a need for it. If you think people will need to park on the street, then the on-site parking should increase.

It looks like there are bulb-outs at the entrances to the development. I do not advocate for bulb-outs. They severely limit the ability to put in better bicycle infrastructure.

Regards,

Kathleen Brand

Senior Planner/Landscape Architect

Civic San Diego

401 B Street, Suite 400

San Diego, CA 92101-4298

619.533.7138

www.civicsd.com

brand@civicsd.com

CSD_email



From: [donshields66](#)
To: [Alvarado SP](#)
Subject: Alvarado Specific Plan
Date: Saturday, May 25, 2019 11:05:36 AM

Kirt,

I want to make a few comments about the project on Alvarado road near the 70th street trolley station.

The first is there going to be enough parking to keep cars off Alvarado road? There is barely a shoulder there so there is really no parking and if children are going to be living in these residences how are they protected from careless drivers on that road? Is there going to be a side walk put in as people transit from the trolley station all the way to the National University building. There are runners who use the road and could use a sidewalk. Just thinking about safety.

When all the RV's are displaced what is the plan to keep them from living on the streets of La Mesa and San Diego as some currently do?

Best Regards,
Don Shields

From: [Angela Deegan](#)
To: [Alvarado SP](#)
Subject: Comments on NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING MEETING DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
Date: Monday, June 17, 2019 9:56:38 PM

Dear Kirt,

I reviewed the NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING MEETING DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT for the Alvarado Specific Plan. Here are my scoping comments in relation to it:

- There needs to be a minimum of 20% affordable housing (in perpetuity) in this development. We desperately need more affordable housing in La Mesa, especially near transit. Lower income folks are less likely to own a car and therefore more likely to use transit. So it makes sense to site affordable homes here since it's adjacent to a trolley station.
- Because the development is next to a trolley station, provide free or heavily discounted transit passes to all residents, to ensure they develop the habit of using transit.
- Because the development is next to a trolley station, the number of parking spaces provided needs to be kept to a minimum! Certainly there should be no more than one level of parking in any of the buildings.
- Any parking spots that are provided need to have 240 Volt electric vehicle charging facilities so that use of gas-powered cars is not incentivized.
- Any parking spots provided need to be unbundled from the cost of the housing units, so that residents who wish to live car-free are not incentivized to own a car.
- Bicycle storage facilities must be provided.
- To make composting feasible and to improve the quality of life of the residents, there should be composting facilities for each of the four buildings and an area designated for a community garden where the compost can be used.
- The roofs of the buildings should have photovoltaic panels to serve the buildings.
- There should be no artificial turf! Artificial turf retains heat. It creates a “heat island” effect, which holds in heat during the day and releases it at night – not what we need in drought-prone California. Underneath, it kills healthy soil bacteria, worms and root systems. It must be watered regularly to keep it cool — water that can be better used to maintain any of several types of drought-resistant sod or lush drought-resistant planting.
- No palm trees should be included - only shade trees!

Sincerely,

Angela Deegan
La Mesa resident
619 916 9017

From: [John Suhr](#)
To: [Alvarado SP](#)
Subject: Alvarado plan details
Date: Thursday, August 8, 2019 6:08:15 PM

Is the Alvarado plan proceeding?

What are the total height of the west-most building?

Will my view of Cowles Mountain be blocked?

**Thanks,
John Suhr
7260 Saranac St.
La Mesa 91942**

From: [Greg Humora](#)
To: [Kerry Kusiak](#)
Subject: FW: Alvarado Creek Apartment Project
Date: Thursday, October 29, 2020 9:24:23 AM
Attachments: [Alvarado Creek Letter to City.docx](#)
[image001.gif](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Kerry,

FYI

Greg Humora | City Manager
City of La Mesa | 8130 Allison Avenue | La Mesa, California 91942
Phone: 619.667.1146 | Email: ghumora@cityoflamesa.us | www.cityoflamesa.us



To submit a request for service to public works click the button

From: Julie Sutton-Hayes [<mailto:jsuttonhayes@aol.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2020 5:02 PM

To: Greg Humora; Mark Arapostathis; Kristine Alessio; Akilah Weber; Colin Parent; Bill Baber

Subject: Alvarado Creek Apartment Project

Dear City officials:

Attached is my letter of opposition to the planned development, Alvarado Creek Project. I would like to go on record as being opposed along with my mom Adeline Sutton. Both of us own homes on Maryland Ave. We along with every neighbor we have spoken with oppose this project and are in agreement it is not appropriate for all the reasons I listed in my letter.

Please take the time to read it. We would like notification of all meetings or any developments as they relate to this project. This has been a terrible year for everyone and we have also encountered a death in our family. My sister and I take full time care (24/7) of my 101 year old mom so I have been unable to keep up with all of this. I am aware that I missed the 10-26 deadline to challenge the DEIR but I still want to tell all of you what we believe.

We believe in our city leaders. It is my sincerest wish that you will not sell out to big developers on this project. I respect the work you do and even if we may not agree on all issues, that is what democracy is all about. I just hope when you consider how this project will affect our city and its citizens you will not use the adage that we must sacrifice a few (we, the citizens of La Mesa) to benefit the many (people who are not even here). We may be the "few" but it is our tax dollars that have built and support this city. Some of us have been here all of our lives and paid taxes here all of our adult lives. Please don't turn our city into another El Cajon.

Overbuilding atrocities such as this project erodes of the character of our city and worries property owners in this area that are surrounded by commercial developments. How long will it be before the "sacrifice of the few to serve the many" mentality will serve to force us to sell our homes so some developer can build. At what point did this become about forgetting lifelong citizens of La Mesa in order to bring more people here. We are tired of being encroached upon. My parents and I as well invested here for our futures. We chose La Mesa because it has always been about its people and because we wanted the small town feel. Today, it is becoming harder and harder to see those values. Please restore our faith in your leadership. Please do not sell out for this project.

Respectfully,

Julie Sutton-Hayes

Julie Sutton-Hayes

jsuttonhayes@aol.com

10-25-20

City of La Mesa
Attn: Mayor Arapostathis
City Manager
Council Members
Planning Commission

Re: Alvarado Creek Specific Plan Project.

Dear Mayor, City Manager, Council and Planning Commission:

I am writing to address issues and concerns I share with many other neighbors over the construction of 950 apartments across I-8 along Alvarado Rd. I own a home on Maryland Ave that I purchased in 1986 just a few houses away from my mother's house (also on Maryland Ave). She and my dad purchased their house (where I grew up) in 1956. We have seen decades of changes, some good and some not.

We love our City. We have fought to keep the character of our neighborhood and our city that makes us the Jewel of the Hills. We are sorry to see the city inundated with apartments! We have fought to maintain the close knit community feeling that comes from neighborhoods where people know their neighbors and they watch out for one another. There is pride of ownership that is absent in many apartment settings. La Mesa is losing that appeal and quickly becoming like El Cajon using every conceivable speck of land to put up a new apartment complex.

Developers are allowed more and more concessions based upon density and affordable housing, etc. There is however, somehow still not (actually) affordable housing. Now the developer is using the fact the Trolley is basically on-site. While we understand there are established guidelines that govern processes used to decide what can and cannot be built and what is and is not allowable. There is a tremendous amount of paperwork I have been wading through to try and understand the scope and essence of this project. Frankly, I find much of it based on complete speculation as to what is actually being built. The number of units ranges from 846 units to 950 units. There may or may not be student housing. The traffic studies base their figures on 2112 residents. How did they arrive at that number? I believe that number is quite low. At 950 units the average number of residents would have to be 2.2 per unit. That is totally unrealistic. There are just too many assumptions.

Regardless of the number of units, the project is obscenely inappropriate for the two lane road that services it. I don't care what the traffic study says. Alvarado Rd, Comanche Dr, and all intersections involved were never designed to be accessed by the occupants of 950 more apartments! It is ridiculous to assume this is a viable plan. Traffic will be a disaster! Retiming of the signals, painting new lane markings or other changes listed fall sadly short of providing adequate traffic mitigation.

Access to the project from either end of Alvarado Rd. is not adequate for such a huge project. Comanche Dr for example is an extremely narrow road that winds through an area already completely built out with apartments. Most of it has parking on both sides of the street or on one side only where the road narrows near Alvarado Rd. Along that stretch, two cars can barely fit next to parked cars. Saranac and Guava are also heavily residential. Guava has no pedestrian improvements and there are huge speed bumps all along the road. There are thousands of people in these apartments and homes that already use the freeway on ramps and would have to compete with the additional traffic from this project.

Additionally, there is no consideration of the traffic that will already be generated by the 4 story mixed use apartment project on Baltimore Dr. That project involves a unit mix of 8 studios, 138 one-bedroom, 74 two-bedroom and six three bedroom units. So assuming the "Two plus One" rule, 1-2 per studio, 1-3 per one bedroom, 2-5 per two bedroom and 3-7 per 3 bedrooms; that is 226 units with the potential of 312 to 842 residents. That project offers 322 parking stalls and there is public parking offered nearby. Even that assumes only a fraction of residents will own cars. Personally, I believe that to be unrealistic as well. Any way you look at it the number of trips from those apartments is not even mentioned in the traffic study. Baltimore Dr. is already pretty backed up at times.

70th St at Alvarado Rd is already a very busy intersection. Northbound traffic from El Cajon Blvd coming down 70th St. is always backed up at peak hours already. Upon exiting I-8 from the west where the ramp meets Alvarado Rd it is very complicated. Often at rush hour traffic backs up onto the freeway now. The large influx of new traffic generated by the proposed project will make that intersection terrible and create dangerous back-ups onto I-8. Access to the eastbound ramp from Alvarado Rd would be equally problematic. It doesn't matter what the studies say, we drive that intersection now and we know how bad it already can be. The 70th street bridge traffic is notoriously bad at rush hour in both directions already.

No studies appear to have been done on the impact of traffic on Parkway Dr on the north side of the freeway. This project will cause all of us on the north side of the freeway to have access problems at both ends of Parkway Dr. no matter which direction we will be going. As we predicted, we already have additional traffic issues at peak hours because of the apartments that went in at the old Coleman College site on Parkway Dr. The westbound ramp to I-8 at Parkway Dr. is already backed up at peak hours. Additionally, when that ramp is completely backed up one can travel further to 70th St, turn left and make an immediate right turn to access the other westbound ramp to I-8. At peak hours it is difficult to get to that ramp and since there is little transition to the freeway, there is always a back-up onto the bridge now. It is not unusual to have traffic backed up along Parkway Dr all the way to Merryfellow and beyond already. Parkway Dr at Baltimore Dr is also extremely busy at peak hours. Again, no matter what any studies say, we drive these roads. Nobody can tell us there will be no significant impact. Every addition of residences adds to the problems we already have. Ask anyone who lives along Parkway Dr.

It is unfathomable that this project as it stands can even be considered at this location. The very fact there are is no way to widen Alvarado Rd. should be enough to deter the building of this project. There is absolutely no way there won't be a back-up on Alvarado Rd when people are returning home after work or when leaving in the morning. The developer asserts that there will be sufficient area within the project so that the back-up will be inside the project and not spilled out onto Alvarado Rd. Right. Fairfield was required to make a left turn storage lane on Parkway Dr. in order for residences to stage for entrance to the project and traffic still backs up at times.

The project itself seems like it is really tentative. It seems like they really haven't decided what they are building. Is it 846 or 950 units? I see they listed 4 buildings, 1 six story and 3 eight story buildings. The traffic studies say 2112 residents. Where did they materialize that figure? How many units are 3 bedroom, 2 bedroom, 1 bedroom and studios? So state they may or may not offer "parking pricing" where they "unbundle parking costs". People who own cars will just budget the \$75.00 extra for a parking space. According to the developer, "Parking is not (even) a guarantee associated with renting a unit." That in itself says there is inadequate parking. How much parking is mandatory and how much parking is actually available? Also, there is no mention of RV parking lots. The developer assumes renters will not own cars and apparently they will also not have any other types of vehicles. Often, even people who rent still have lots of "toys". Gotta park their extra cars, boats, motorhomes, trailers etc. somewhere and as history will demonstrate, if there isn't sufficient space for cars or other

vehicles and toys people will simply park on nearby streets. Well, in this case there are no nearby streets. Businesses will no doubt be battling apartment parking all the time as will the trolley station which was built with insufficient parking. When it was built, they tried to build a pedestrian bridge over I-8 so Trolley riders could park on our side of the freeway. We defeated that feature as there is nowhere for anyone to park here. The original plan included a parking lot at Merryfellow and Parkway Dr. which at the time already had 20/20 Vision on that developed site. Developers don't care if it works for existing residents. They are interested in force fitting projects where they do not belong.

The developers say they will make accommodations for alternative forms of transit like busses. The roadway will not accommodate storage lanes or cutout for busses or cabs etc. Is the developer planning to use on site property to do these things? The road is extremely narrow to begin with. Bike lanes can be painted on the roadway but it will be a very narrow and heavily travelled road. Riding a bike would not be very safe. As with many locations, just because lanes are painted drivers don't pay attention to them anyway.

So there may or may not be student housing and 3 buildings with "market rate housing". La Mesa is always saying how we need more affordable housing but I don't see any low income offerings here. What are the rents supposed to run? What are the demographics? Historically, students go together to rent apartments especially for school. Additionally, they each have a car. We have experienced issues caused by students living in neighborhoods. Noise, vandalism, parties all night and tons and tons of cars came with the "mini-dorms" we had in our neighborhoods. It was common for "mini dorms" with 5 or 6 illegal bedrooms to have 10 or 12 occupants or more. It was also common for each person and /or their friends or family to have 10 or 12 cars or more! Developers often argue that since the apartments are not low income then there will be fewer problems and since the rents will be higher most students won't be able to afford to live there. Unfortunately, multiple students will pile into one apartment and share costs. Developers say they will control the number of renters who stay in each apartment. Many argue they have a stake in the project so they will maintain a presence there. Those are empty promises and nothing prevents the developers from selling out and moving on as did Fairfield.

The developers say the student housing will attract students and faculty from SDSU. Who knows how much housing will actually be needed now? Covid has caused a paradigm shift in this country and forced remote learning. This trend may or may not stay with us. Students also like cars if they can afford it! The Trolley doesn't go many places to begin with. I know local people who attend and have attended SDSU who did not like the Trolley because they still had to walk a long way with their books etc from the station to the buildings where they attended classes.

The big sell here seems to be that transit is so near. The reality is that southern Californians love their cars. I know of residents in the apartments on Fletcher Parkway near Amaya who are Trolley riders and still own multiple cars. It is a mistake to assume that people who use mass transit use it exclusively. Just because California wants people to stop driving and use mass transit, the reality is most people here don't want that. Especially now and for who knows how long, it is dangerous to ride mass transit for fear of contamination and exposure to Covid. The San Diego Union Tribune on 10/20/2019 even before Covid published an article that Nationwide Transit Ridership had been dropping and continued to plummet. They cited that Seattle was the only major metropolitan region in the US to increase ridership in recent years.

The floods that have always plagued the project site have historically made development of any scale financially prohibitive. Those conditions still exist. The architect from Fairfield told me they had in fact done extensive studies about the site before deciding to buy the Coleman property where they did build apartments. He told me nobody would ever be able to build there (Alvarado Creek) due to the huge financial burden of controlling the flooding issues. I know, for my whole life flooding happened

there just about every year on some part of the property. I had friends who grew up in the old trailer park there. Perhaps that is why there are no plans for low income units. They need big money and ridiculous density to make the project work.

That being said, the developer is asking for their own special plan. Obviously, height variances would be required. There is nothing 6-8 stories in La Mesa outside of the National University building and this sets a dangerous precedence. La Mesa citizens and the City have not allowed projects taller than 4 stories to be built as recently as 2019.

The developer wants everything and offers nothing meaningful to mitigate the obvious issues of access and traffic. That is probably because there are no meaningful ways to mitigate the problems as the project exists. I have not even addressed noise issues. I know what kind of noise can be generated by a student residence at one house. There is no way a student building will be any different. Even if residents call the police to address noise control I know also from experience that they won't always come out. Besides, it will only be extra, unnecessary call outs for our PD taking them away from other "real life" problems.

I have not even brought up construction issues. Again, I don't care what the reports say. Noise on Alvarado Rd definitely can be heard on the north side of the freeway. We hear phones ringing over outside speakers at businesses. We hear the Trolley constantly. I had an office next to the Trolley station at Lemon and Nebo Dr. We couldn't even conduct business if the door or windows were open due to the noise. Every time any construction on the south side of I-8 across from us is going on we hear it all. Additionally, we face horrible dust from the work. Our cars are constantly covered in dirt and we must either keep our windows closed or deal with the mess from the dust. The construction will be ongoing for several years and it will be very disruptive to our daily lives. People and businesses near the site will definitely be plagued by noise and dust. I did not see any plans for mitigation as it applies to our side of the freeway. Perhaps large trees or an extension of the wall height along the freeway would be appropriate.

The land owner certainly has a right to develop this property but they are not entitled to having their own set of rules just to mitigate the problems they are facing to do so. This property has obvious problems including access and flooding. They have rights as landowners as do all of us. We all face issues with developing properties which may or may not prove to be prohibitive to our ability to build what we want. All it takes is money. Even then, if we want to build something that encroaches upon our neighbors or that does not fall within the limits of what we can build due to height variances, access issues or other obstacles we can't. We don't get to have a site specific plan. We have to reconcile the fact that our plans are not feasible. We have to realize it is not financially feasible because we have no way to make it work. We don't get a pass. We have to realize the project we have in mind is not appropriate for our property.

The only reason the project needs the density, the height, market priced rents and bonus points for proximity to transit is because it is obscenely expensive to mitigate the flooding issues. There are no low income units offered in any of the information I've seen.....because they need high rents for this to work. The landowner definitely has always had and is obviously still having problems developing this property. Other huge, successful developers have looked at the property and opted out because of the massive flooding issues. Ordinarily, the landowner would be asked to reduce density in order to reduce height, accommodate parking, or to provide space where needed. This project no doubt has no room to compromise. While we concede the landowner has rights to develop his/her property, it should not be at the expense of our citizens. If any of the rest of us have property that is not appropriate for the type of development we want to do we have to deal with it. We have to admit it is just not worth as much as we would like it to be and cut our losses. This landowner must realize this.

As our city leaders I implore you to stop this project before dangerous precedence is set. This is an election year. Show us you deserve our votes. Please don't sell out thousands of tax paying citizens for one landowner and a bunch of people who may or may not live in this project.

Respectfully,

Julie Sutton-Hayes &
Adeline Sutton

From: [Julie & Don Dement](#)
To: [Megan Wiegelman](#)
Subject: Alvarado specific proposal
Date: Monday, March 8, 2021 2:23:23 PM

One of the reasons we moved to La Mesa was to have more room to grow and enjoy the peace and quiet here .

The recent approval of large developments has made both of those things more difficult.

Nine hundred fifty apartments will most likely mean 1900 new residents and the very distinct possibility of 1900 cars despite being somewhat close to transit. Whether public transit is used or not people are still going to have vehicles and will need to park them somewhere. What facility is going to be provided for real life parking?

The elimination of affordable housing at that site is also a concern as those residents will need to resettle somewhere as well. There will they find new affordable housing?

Just thinking!

Don DeMent
50 year resident.

From: [Angela Deegan](#)
To: [Megan Wiegelman](#)
Subject: Public Comment for March 9th City Council meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 12:00:35 AM

Mayor and Councilmembers:

La Mesa needs to ensure that all new developments are built in a manner that ensures that, by default, the occupants will have as low a carbon footprint as possible. This is necessary in order to drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions and rein in the worsening climate crisis.

I'm pleased there are plans for a large new apartment building next to a trolley station in our City - i.e. the Alvarado development. It makes total sense to have dense housing by transit. However, La Mesa must get rid of parking minimums in transit priority areas, just as the City of San Diego did two years ago. Also, La Mesa must make the necessary code changes to prevent the cost of any parking spots in such developments from being bundled together with the cost of the housing units. Bundling them incentivizes car-ownership - an incentive which is particularly inappropriate for developments right next to transit.

A parking spot adds between \$30,000 to \$90,000 to the cost of a housing unit. That translates into thousands more a year in rent and mortgage payments. We need to reward people who get around without the use of a car, not punish them by forcing them to pay for a parking spot they won't use.

Also, all new developments in the City must use electricity only - no gas. Otherwise we will fail to leverage as much greenhouse gas reductions as possible from our membership of San Diego Clean Power.

Until the City makes these necessary code changes, developers must be exempted from its parking minimums. The exemptions can be contingent on providing a higher percentage of units for low income renters or installing solar, or both. I urge the City to do this for the Alvarado and other developments.

Angela Deegan

From: [David Harris](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Public Comment- Presentation on Alvarado Specific Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 3:58:12 PM

Comments from David Harris

Dear Mayor and City Councilmembers,

The Alvarado Specific Plan will enable the City to meet its regional housing needs goals by increasing the supply of multifamily housing and to potentially advance its Climate Action Plan goals by allowing higher density residential zoning adjacent to the 70th St. trolley station. In general, transit oriented development supports the CAP goal of reducing carbon emission from VMTs, not only by building in close proximity to public transit but also by the construction of safe pedestrian walkways and bicycle lanes to access the trolley station. But the "devil" is always in the details. And that is why I advise the Council subcommittee that will be involved in negotiating the agreement to review the GHG reduction measures contained in the Alvarado Specific Plan EIR and ensure that these measures are clearly delineated in the final Development Agreement. For example, the EIR states that the developer will be responsible for implementing a transit pass subsidy as well as a parking pricing policy for residents. Regarding energy efficiency, I encourage the subcommittee to offer incentives for the developer to go beyond Title 24 by including additional PV solar on the rooftop, electric heat pump systems for space and water heating, a number of EV charging stations, and bicycle storage lockers. In conclusion, Alvarado is likely to be the largest residential development within the next five years. This is a great opportunity for the City and the developer to create a future-oriented housing development that incorporates the latest eco-technology and lifestyle amenities that are necessary to meet the City's climate actions goals.

From: [Wendy Mihalic](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 9 March Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 2:08:42 PM

Good evening Mayor and Council Members.

I would like to offer some thoughts on the Alvarado Specific Plan. La Mesa has five Trolley stations. This is more than any city in the county other than the City of San Diego. So, it is encouraging to learn that a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) has been proposed near the 70th Street Trolley station. High density housing near transit is a win/win for our city. It addresses the need for more (and hopefully more affordable) housing and also helps reduce GhG emissions through the accessibility to public transit and other mobility options like walking and biking.

I am writing to encourage Council members to include provisions in the Draft Development Agreement that require the Alvarado units to be all-electric. This means no piping for gas. Building electric results in significantly lower construction costs which, presumably, would lead to more affordable housing. The benefits of all-electric go well beyond building cost and include healthier, safer homes and significant GhG reduction. CA has a strong climate commitment and building electrification has been adopted by over 40 jurisdictions in the state to support their Climate Action Plans. Our electricity is getting cleaner. Let's use it to power new homes.

Thank you

Wendy Mihalic

La Mesa Resident

From: [lisa mekenas](#)
To: [Alvarado SP](#)
Subject: NO more multi complexes in La Mesa
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 8:42:13 PM

I, as a home owner and taxpayer of La Mesa, wish to express my vote against the proposed building of this project. La Mesa already has too many units and the already traffic and infrastructure is over burdened. The density also puts danger into the area for erosion and pollution. We don't have the access and the roadways are too congested. The parking in La Mesa is overtaxed and the lack of concern by the present City Council and Mayor has destroyed the "small town feel" and La Mesa is no longer the Jewel of the Hills.

This project and the others that have over run my town directly effect my life.

Lisa and Dan Kincaid
Pomona Ave La Mesa.

From: [John Suhr](#)
To: [Kerry Kusiak](#)
Cc: [Mark Arapostathis](#); [Bill Baber](#); [Colin Parent](#); [Laura Lothian](#); [Jack Shu](#); [kristina.houck@patch.com](#); [jeff@sdnews.com](#); [lora.cicalo@sduniontribune.com](#)
Subject: Alvarado Specific Plan comments
Date: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 12:46:00 PM

Given interest rates are rising and we're probably heading into a recession will the project proceed now? If the project won't proceed why approve it now?

How can the project have no significant environmental impacts when it will be blocking uphill neighborhood views to north and east? I suggest the project be reduced to one level of parking and three floors of apartments matching other major projects around town and SETA apartments across I-8 to resolve this problem. Approving an eight story building also sets a bad precedent for the future. It's too dense.

The architect of the project named is actually a landscape architect. Is this legal? The exterior design seems amateurish.

**John Suhr
7260 Saranac St.**