

**General Plan 2020  
Interest Group Meeting Minutes  
April 23, 2001**

---

**Interest Group:**

Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Erik Bruvold	SD Economic Regional Development Corporation
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club

**Public at Large:**

Abbe Stutz	SELF
Ali Shapouni	Shapouni and Associates
Charlene Ayers	SELF
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
Constance Clover	n/a
David Pauinger	n/a
David Shilbry	n/a
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group, Chair
Harlan Lowe	n/a
Henry S. Woodhead	Tecate Chamber of Commerce, C.A.I.R.
Jerry McLees	Sweetwater Authority
Laura Houle	ESDCAR
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Pat Hanagan	SDNHM
Paul Gebert	San Diego County Water Authority

**County:**

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)  
Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)  
Tom Harron (County Counsel)  
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)  
Gisela Hernandez (DPLU)  
Elias Barbosa (DPLU)

### Public Comments -

- San Diego Union Tribune articles are continually addressing the rising home prices in the County. 78% of county residents cannot afford to buy a home in this county. There is a housing crisis today and GP2020 is taking property out of supply which makes the problem worse. You can not have increasing demand and the government (County of San Diego) decrease the supply.
- Murphy's office is planning infill and development within his district.
- GP2020 must support the fundamental idea of development following infrastructure. At last Friday's Planning Commission meeting, Interest Group members did not represent the group.

### Presentation by LeAnn Carmichael -

#### Parcelization and Constraints, Creating new Land Use maps:

- Assessor Parcel Numbers are used by DPLU to count parcels. Note that:
  - Not all Assessor Parcel Numbers mean that they are legal lots
  - Legal lots do not necessarily mean that they will be built on. Some legal lots are not built on for various reasons including; septic, access, constraints, market, owners desire, etc.
- How existing parcelization plays a role in the General Plan and Zoning update:
  - In the past, large areas in the community of Fallbrook (used as an example) have subdivided lots according to the current General Plan and Zone. Many of these lots have not been built on for various reasons.
  - Areas that are extensively subdivided into smaller lots, but are currently undeveloped, will get a General Plan and zoning designation that allows a density similar to the parcel size of the existing parcelization pattern. Therefore today's existing parcelization is taken into account when working on the new General Plan maps.
- Constraints are another factor that influence development location. Constraints can be natural or manmade environment.
  - Some constraints, such as floodways and infrastructure, are absolute constraints.
  - Variable constraints include: slope, compatibility issues, etc.
  - All constraints do not apply to every community
  - Constraints mapped on a community level & regional level.
  - Other factors that need to be considered are:
    - Road capacities – existing and planned
    - Faults – Alquist-Priolo mapped
    - Transit nodes
    - Adjacent to:
      - Tribal Gaming Facilities
      - City interface – spheres of influence
      - Airports – noise & crash hazards
    - Agricultural soils or areas of statewide importance
    - Fire/Ambulance service – areas un-served, seasonal or volunteer
    - Sheriff service
    - Distance to employment, shopping, entertainment
    - Forest Conservation Initiative that sets lot sizes in Cleveland National Forest in-holdings
    - Existing Land Use
    - Water service – CWA line
    - Groundwater model (geology, rainfall, topography) = max densities under existing Groundwater Ordinance. (peer review)

- Sewer Service
  - Biology – habitats, MSCP tier categories, species predictive model created (soil, habitat, slope, rainfall, known locations) went through peer review
- Comments
  - At the Hewlett Packard site, the transportation corridor concept will be difficult to implement because the property has various constraints. This property is an example of how constraints reduce density, but not eliminate all development.

The Interest Group's role in GP2020 -

- The group is providing input in land use designation and placement. The information provided by the Interest Group will go to the consultants and they will do the planning. The County is taking the lead in the production of the new alternative proposal.
- The current General Plan update schedule must be followed because the San Diego Board of Supervisors expects the update to be concluded by 2003.

INTEREST GROUP COMMENTS

- Some group members are opposed to being out of the GP2020 process after the consultants take over.

Concepts -

- The Department of Planning and Land Use has discussed the concepts' development with the Board of Supervisors.
- There needs to be a concept that addresses sprawl because it is a reality in the County.
  - Fallbrook is a good example of parcelization on the ground today.
- Motion to eliminate this community from concept A and leave concept B and C was discussed but not voted on.
- In order to address sprawl and parcelization, smart design and the identification of transportation corridors can attend to the current land use patterns.
- Concept B is not a bad concept as long as land use growth management tools are applied. Therefore, existing sprawl and parcelization can be addressed by controlling the expansion of this type of development.
- Some Interest Group members are against continued subdivision.
- The idea of centralized districts is supported by some members. Semi rural development should go where it already exist. Additionally, you can improve these areas by creating open space.
- The key to addressing the "semi-rural" issue is to include a geographic definition of where these designations will go.
- The argument against the previous "semi-rural" idea is that by keeping sprawl on the maps, you are encouraging it.
- Concept C is not seen as a concept, rather it is looked at as an overlay to the other two concepts.
  - This concept can be applied to any area.

Density -

- Sewer capacity was determined by the capital improvement plans that the agencies gave to the county.
- Density should be placed where community facilities are located.
- New Urbanist ideas suggest picking nodes of development.
- The group identify criteria before approaching the concepts.

Jim Whalen proposed the following approach:

- A mechanism to approach land use designation is by coming up with two approaches:
  - Rural design standards
  - Transfer Development Rights(TDR) or Purchase Development Rights(PDR)

- If the previous two approaches are used when finalizing the concepts, the Board of Supervisors will know that no one is losing out. This approach also helps preserve land and continue the needed development.
- TDRs and/or PDRs with the city
  - If this approach is used, unincorporated communities can have urban style amenities. This promotes values and there is no loss in housing if growth is directed to the cities.
  - Protection of the biological diversity is established.
  - No public money gets spent in the “served” areas, but instead that money goes to the “receiving” areas.

Gary Piro suggest the following proposal:

- The approach that the Interest Group is taking should be called a “Smart Growth” approach. This should be sent to the Board of Supervisors so that they know the group’s ideas and direction.
  - Facilities based
  - New Urbanist approach
  - Identify areas that will be preserved as rural by TDRs
  - Clustering in between is encouraged
  - TDR is a mechanism to fund
- Gary Piro sees this as a “win win” approach

- Some group members believe that TDRs, PDRs and Clustering are the only thing that will help achieve clustering and eliminate sprawl.
- The new approach requires a commitment by housing and environmental advocates.
- Requires political will to increase community centers.
- “Conserve what needs to be conserved and build what needs to be built” is an approach suggested by Matt Adams.
  - The group cannot finalize this discussion, but they can get to a conceptual vision of what the rural county should be.
  - Supports rural design standards
  - The ability to cluster needs to be supported by the Interest Group and by elected officials.

A “Smart Growth Proposal” was then voted on at the end of the meeting in an attempt to forward to the Board of Supervisors, for their upcoming meeting, an idea of the general trend of the Interest Group discussion to date. Membership began to diminish due to time, but the majority of those remaining voted to support with two in opposition. A finalized version is to be e-mailed out for the IG to review prior to dispersal to the Board.

The finalized “Smart Growth Proposal” trends in discussion summary that will be sent to the board is as follows:

- Facilities Based
- Rural preservation areas
- Targeted development areas
- Clustering
- Rural design standards
- Mechanisms for PDRs and TDRs
- Preserve sensitive Biological spaces
- Respect community character

Alternates-

- Alternates must brief the Interest Group members, and vice versa, after every Interest Group meeting. This will prevent the group from having to summarize and return to discussion items that might have been finalized at previous meetings.

Future Agenda Topics -

- Redevelopment

Requests -

- Diane Coombs requested a list of the projects that are currently being processed. DPLU will provide the group with a list of active projects.
- The Interest Group is requesting that they get to view at least one community model once the consultants have finalized that model. The group would like to critique and/or comment on one or a few communities before all of them are completed by the consultants.