

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Meeting Minutes
May 7, 2001**

Interest Group:

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

Public at Large:

Barbara Lind	WE CAN
Charlene Ayers	SELF
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
Chris Terrich	SEMBRA
David Nilson	NCCE & LS
David Shilbly	Property Owner
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
George S. Woodhead	Citizens for Individual Rights
Jerry McLees	Sweetwater Authority
Leonard Teyssier	Property Owner
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Pat Hanagan	SDNHM
Paul Gebert	San Diego County Water Authority
Ramona Salisbury	League of Women Voters
Rich Cantillgry	Sierra Club

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)

Gisela Hernandez (DPLU)

New GP2020 Project Manager -

The Department of Planning and Land Use Director, Gary Pryor, introduced General Plan 2020's new Project Manager, Ivan Holler. He joined the 2020 team last week and will lead the section to the finalization of a General Plan update.

Public Comments -

- David Shibley- Suggest that the Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) be a joint effort between private and public sector. There needs to be a clear identification of potential TDR and back country areas.

Interest Group Meeting Minutes, 4/23/01 –

- J. Whalen would like to see the names of people who are part of the meeting's discussion in the meeting minutes.
- K. Messer disagrees with the draft concept criteria that was sent out to the group. The criteria does not reflect the decisions made at the last meeting.
- G. Piro noted that at the last meeting, the group came to a general consensus on notes that were written on a flip chart. The handout that should represent what was on the board is not reflective of the decisions made at the last meeting. The minutes for all meetings should show when votes are taken, even if that decision changes at a later date.
- A. Stehly would like email attachments to be sent as plain text in addition to the attachment.

Updates –

- Alan Hoffman will be presenting on May 16, 2001 in the PERB room. This is located at 5201 Ruffin Rd, San Diego CA 92123. The Interest Group and the Steering Committee have been invited to attend.
 - Hoffman's presentation is not a meeting for either of the groups.
- The Interest Group officially requested a meeting with the Steering Committee.
- Citizen Coordinate for Century 3 is asking the Board of Supervisors for a county-wide planning moratorium. With existing buildable lots and pipelined projects, it is clear that a planning moratorium is necessary.
- Pryor noted that a planning moratorium is a state stature, for a period of 2 years, where there is no rezoning.
- A group member commented on the "active projects" list because the list duplicates SPAs, GPAs, etc.
- Gary Pryor agreed to provide the group with a list of the number of parcels that are included in the "active parcels" handout, as they relate to TMs and TPMs.

Approach Principles (see draft General Trends in Discussion, April 23, 2001 handout) -

6. Transfer Development Rights and Purchase Development Rights:

- The environmental community is concerned about the "Trends in Discussion" handout because it is promoting TDRs and PDRs.
- Group members discussed various different words and phrases that would best identify what the group is attempting to get across to the Board of Supervisors and the public.
- The farming community will not support anything if it does not have TDRs or PDRs included in the list presented to the Board of Supervisors.
 - One suggestion is to use, "mechanisms for TDRs/PDRs".
- Part of the TDR/PDR discussion was centered around possible complications related to the usage of these methods. The group must thoroughly look at potential problems that can be the result of TDRs or PDRs.
 - Transfer or purchase of credits/rights need to be furthered defined and discussed at a future meeting.

- If TDR and PDRs were easy to implement, the county would be using them today .
- This group must address principles and not focus on individual properties.
- Some group members are looking for reassurance that resources on ground will be protected and kept.
- Property value reassurance is also needed.
- Wording for PDR/TDR was positively supported by the majority of the group as follows: “use of PDRs/TDRs and other mechanisms.”
- Other group members did not understand the recommendation.
- The PDR/TDR discussion will be further discussed in detail at a later meeting.

VOTE: A common consent vote was taken on this and passed unanimously.

7. Resources:

- Discussion for this principle was referred to the Goals and Policies by Gary Pryor. He indicated that under the current goals and policies, the concerns that are being discussed by the group are already being addressed.
- The environmental community proposed, “preserve biologically sensitive areas and open space resources” and the group generally supported it.

The principles document title:

- The title for this document was thoroughly discussed by the group. The following are recommendations discussed by the group: “guiding principles”, “smart growth approach”, Interest Group discussion”. “Guiding Principles” was agreed on by the group.

Back Country Presentation- (presented by Phil Pryde, Audubon with handout labeled “a new concept D”)

- Recommends that the back country be defined by areas beyond the County Water Authority (see handout for details).
- Mechanisms are critical to preserving San Diego’s character and history
- There is general support of the CWA boundary for the back country, but there needs to be some exceptions and further discussion.
 - One exception would be a community like Ramona.

Concepts- (see revised on 5/2/2001 Draft Concept Criteria handout)

Concept A:

- Sierra Club provided a handout with the following points:
 1. High-density residential and mixed uses planned at 7.3du/ac or higher
 2. Access to Existing major roadway networks
 3. Restricted expansion of villages east of CWA boundary and Ramona
 4. Rural design standards will apply to retain community character
 5. Define limits of the Core support area
 6. “Rural Buffer-Greenbel Linkages” should be called “open space resource areas.”
 7. With residential housing scaled to employment needs (job/housing balance)
- Concept A reflects the discussion that took place at the last meeting
- Illustrations on the handout do not represent the concepts
- Concept B is not representative of last meeting’s discussion
 - K. Messer’s notes are as follows, “Concept B is the old Concept A, where it fits on the ground pattern.”
- If current roadway network is maintained, needed road improvement wont be obtained.
- A suggestion is to utilize the proposed language: “areas that have established subdivisions.”
- “Job and housing balance” can be a term used to address the concepts criteria.
- There needs to be discussion on agriculture at an upcoming meeting.
 - Rural buffer with agriculture needs to be specified

- San Diego Audubon's proposal is that concept A be 29du/ac if the property is west of the CWA and if west of CWA, the property must be "where or near such density already exist."
- There is some support for the job and housing balance approach to determining the concepts.
- There needs to be further definition of village core and roadway network.
- When discussing densities of 7-29du/ac, CWA services must also be addressed. For the most part, property East of the CWA does not support such systems.
- There is some opposition to 29du/ac because areas such as Spring Valley are adjacent to transit.
- The term "core support" is a term used in downtown areas (areas with extensive warehouses and supply services.)
- The group must define "major road" because it can mean various things.

- Motion in support of:
 - Adding Roads as Circulation Element, Rural design standards, including geographic limit line in core support, housing and job balance and rural buffer and greenbelt.

VOTE: In Favor – 11
 Opposed – 3 (D. Coombs, P. Pryde, B. Gendron)
 Abstained – 1 (E. Bowlby)
 Absent -2

- With the addition of "appropriate design standards" the vote changes to

VOTE: In Favor – 12
 Opposed – 2 (P. Pryde, B. Gendron)
 Abstained – 1 (E. Bowlby)
 Absent - 2

Concept B:

- The Interest Group must come up with tools that change the market so that San Diego's back country is not destroyed.
- There needs to be flexibility in the range of parcel sizes, but an average parcel size throughout the semi-rural.
- The 2du/ac land use designation is said to take more from land than any other method.
- There is some support in the elimination of "estates", but would not identify these areas for further subdivision.
- Motion on concept "B" by Dan Silver, seconded by Gary Piro:
 - Semi Rural addition to concept A
 - Semi- Rural uses are residential and small farm
 - Design standards apply
 - An appropriate density, such as 1du/ac, will be assigned
 - Clustering is encouraged to preserve contiguous open space, landforms and agriculture as well as providing flexibility in lot size and design
 - Semi-rural is limited
 - Sewer to support clustering

VOTE: In Favor - There was a general group consent to this motion
 Opposed - 1 (E. Bowlby)
 Abstained - 1 (B. Gendron)
 Absent – 2

Concept C:

- Some group members agree on transportation nodes, but not linear growth (corridors).
 - If nodes are kept, they must first be identified.
 - The concept should be called “Transportation Concept”, not “Transportation Overlay”.
 - The Transportation Corridor section of the concept should be deleted. Planning along a corridor is not what the group wants to see.
- Motion by Diane Coombs in support of Concept C with the elimination of corridors and language on identifying and defining nodes.

VOTE: In Favor- generally supported by the group

Opposed - 0

Abstained – 1 (E. Bowlby)

Absent – 2

- Concept C is not an overlay but a concept.

At May 21, 2001 meeting-

- SDGE can present
- Karen Messer’s Gap Analysis

Public Comments-

- There is some opposition to the public’s inability to participate in the discussion before votes.
- There should be an environmental fund that is supported by all county property owners because protecting the environment is everyone’s job.
- Land that needs to be protected can be controlled by purchasing the land.
- In concept A, no one will buy 40acres to build one house on. This concept will lead to the “slumming of San Diego County.”
- All handouts provided to group members have to be available to the public at the time of the meeting or before the meeting.
- Respect for community character must be self-determined by the communities.
- The public should be able to see what will be discussed at a meeting before the meeting takes place.
- When the public is given the opportunity to speak at the end of the meeting, half of the group members are gone.
- The job and housing balance is not a good proposition because it does not apply to back country residents.

Future Agenda Topics -

- Farming and agriculture
- Rural Design Standards

Next meeting –

Scheduled for May 21, 2001 in the County Administration Center, 7th floor tower, 12:115-2:45pm