

Attachment F

Community Plan Updates
Status and Recommendations

This attachment includes the status, outstanding issues, and recommendations for each community or subregional plan. Each plan is identified as either a *Comprehensive Update* or *Consistency Review*. Under a *Comprehensive Update*, the current community plan has been replaced based in information and goals and policies provided by the community planning or sponsor group. Under a *Consistency Review*, the current community plan has been edited to ensure its consistency with the General Plan Update. Addition revisions are included with these plans if provided by the community planning or sponsor group.

A table is provided at the end of this attachment which summarizes the minimum lot size for each community, according to General Plan land use designation. The minimum lot sizes, which are included in each community and subregional plan, are compared to the target established by the General Plan Update Interest Group.

ALPINE COMMUNITY PLAN – *Consistency Review*

The existing Alpine Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. No public comments were received regarding the Alpine Community Plan.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, but establish a special study area in the Village north of Interstate 8 and west of Tavern Road to determine the appropriate land uses and intensities that will result in an acceptable level of service to accommodate forecast traffic volumes at the Interstate 8 interchanges with Tavern Road
- Undertake a comprehensive update after the adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor editorial edits were made to background information and graphics.

BONSALL COMMUNITY PLAN – *Comprehensive Update*

A comprehensive update to the existing Bonsall Community Plan was prepared by the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group. This Community Plan emphasizes support for the agricultural and equestrian character of the community.

Issues: *Conservation Subdivision Program:* Sponsor Group had disagreed with the staff recommended policies to adapt the Conservation Subdivision Program to Bonsall's community character. The Sponsor Group had requested additional restrictions on the program, such as larger minimum lot sizes; however upon recent discussions with the Bonsall Sponsor Group they have been generally supportive of staff's draft policies.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the staff-recommended Community Plan and Conservation Subdivision Program policies, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009 as edited based on comments from public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor edits were received from the Bonsall Sponsor Group and incorporated by staff, including the addition of areas targeted for Conservation Subdivisions, additions to the Noise Section and changes to background information.

BORREGO SPRINGS COMMUNITY PLAN – *Comprehensive Update*

A subcommittee of the Borrego Springs Sponsor Group prepared a comprehensive update, including a new vision for the community that recognizes the uniqueness of this community when compared to other parts of San Diego County. Key aspects are additional policies to protect dark skies, minimize severe grading from development, and encourage decomposed granite instead of asphalt pavement in appropriate areas. The Plan establishes special studies that would transform the town center into a walkable village that promotes economic development, encourage the conversion of farmlands into less water-intensive land uses, and support environmental resource protection.

Issues: There are no significant areas of controversy; however, the two significant issues addressed include establishing a sustainable supply of water supply for the community and the preservation of Dark Skies. The Borrego Springs Sponsor Group submitted updated information regarding the Borrego Water District's efforts to address water supply issues, and the recent establishment of Borrego Springs as an International Dark Sky Community.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the Community Plan as circulated for public review July 1, 2009 as edited based on comments from public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor edits were received and incorporated from the Borrego Springs Community Planning Group and Mr. Mr. Tom Weber.

**CENTRAL MOUNTAIN SUBREGIONAL PLAN (Cuyamaca, Descanso & Pine Valley)
*Consistency Review***

The current Central Mountain Subregional Plan was revised with input from each of the community planning and sponsor groups, who jointly developed a Vision Statement for the Subregion Planning Area.

Issues: No significant issues. — One public comment requested removing a policy to discourage off-road vehicle parks in the Subregional Planning Area; however, staff disagreed that any edits were necessary.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Subregional Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.
- Complete review of the comprehensive update prepared for the Pine Valley Subregional Group Area by Pine Valley Community Planning Group.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor edits received and completed from the Descanso Community Planning Group and Cuyamaca Community Sponsor Group to update / edit background information.

**CREST, DEHESA, HARBISON CANYON, GRANITE HILLS SUBREGIONAL PLAN –
Consistency Review**

The existing Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon, Granite Hills Subregional Plan was reviewed by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update and revisions were coordinated with the Community Planning Group.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Subregional Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.
- Undertake a comprehensive update after the adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor edits to outdated background information was received and completed from the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and the Crest/Dehesa Community Planning Group.

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLAN - *Comprehensive Update*

The Fallbrook Community Planning Group prepared a comprehensive update to the Community Plan, which identifies agriculture and associated uses as important to the community, as well as the retention of Village Style architecture and community character in the Town Center. The Fallbrook Community Planning Group also provided subsequent revisions to the Community Plan and staff has been able to incorporate the primary one; however, additional revisions will need to be incorporated after the adoption of the General Plan Update.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the document circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with edits
- Continue to work with the Fallbrook Community Planning Group on additional revisions after adoption of the General Plan Update.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were received and completed from the Fallbrook Community Planning Group, with additional policies with respect to the Conservation Subdivision Program, mining activities and Floor Area Ratio.

JAMUL / DULZURA COMMUNITY PLAN – Consistency Review

The existing Jamul / Dulzura Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Planning Group.

Issues: The Community Planning Group disagrees with staff's recommendation for minimum lot size for the Semi-Rural (SR)-1 designation. The Community Planning Group wants a minimum lot size of one acre; however, staff is recommending one-half acre.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Subregional Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited based on comments from public review and including a one-half acre minimum lot size for the SR-1 designation.

Edits from Public Review:

Minor edits were received and incorporated from the Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group, including edits to clustering policies and background information.

JULIAN COMMUNITY PLAN- Consistency Review

The existing Julian Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Julian Community Planning Group. No additional comments were received regarding the Julian Community Plan when the plan was circulated for public review.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLAN- Consistency Review

The Lakeside Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. Initially the Planning Group endorsed staff's edits to the consistency review and this plan was circulated for public review in July 2009. No additional public comments were received regarding the Lakeside Community Plan. Concurrently, the Planning Group prepared a more comprehensive update that has since been reviewed by staff.

Issues: The Lakeside Planning Group now opposes the consistency review of the Lakeside Community Plan and has endorsed a draft comprehensive update. Staff reviewed the comprehensive update and provided the

Planning Group with initial comments and is awaiting a response from the Community Planning Group.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Continue to prepare additional updates to the Lakeside Community Plan and seek adoption of the comprehensive update after the adoption of the General Plan Update based on the availability of staff and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

MOUNTAIN EMPIRE SUBREGIONAL PLAN (Campo/Lake Morena, Tecate, Jacumba) – Consistency Review

The Campo / Lake Morena, Tecate, and Jacumba Community Planning and Sponsor Groups have worked with staff to develop a consistency review for the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan. Jacumba has provided updated History and Vision sections for the Community.

Issues:

- No significant issues with the Campo / Lake Morena and Jacumba Community Plans.
- The Ketcham Ranch Specific Plan description was updated to remove proposals at the request of the developers.
- In coordination with the Tecate Sponsor Group, a Special Study Area was added for Tecate and incorporated into the Plan. The Special Study Area language in the plan includes restrictions on land use intensity based on the number of vehicle trips generated on State Route 94.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Subregional Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited based on comments from public review.
- Undertake additional updates of the Campo / Lake Morena Plan following adoption of the General Plan Update based on staff availability and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were received and completed to develop the Tecate Special Study Area. (For a description and map of the Special Study Area see Attachment F: Community Mapping / Issues Report)

BOULEVARD COMMUNITY PLAN – Comprehensive Update

A comprehensive update of the existing Community Plan was prepared by the Boulevard Community Planning Group and reviewed by staff. The Boulevard Plan supports preservation of the rural and ranch nature of the community.

Issues:

Conservation Subdivision Program: Boulevard Community Planning Group wants additional restrictions on Conservation Subdivisions, such as larger minimum lot sizes to match the Rural Lands densities applied to the community. Staff recommends minimum lot sizes based on their current zoning; generally four to eight acres, with restrictions allowed based upon the Conservation Subdivision Program, such as Lot Area Averaging and Planned Residential Development. Staff further contends that lot sizes should not be increased beyond what is currently allowed by zoning because flexibility needs to be retained to achieve an appropriate yield for the parcel, which is generally a lower density than allowed by the current General Plan.

Wind Turbines: Draft Community Plan policies strongly discourage wind turbine facilities. Negative comments were received during public review concerning the negative language of these policies.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the Plan with the staff-recommended policies circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were received from stakeholders with respect to Wind Energy and Landfill policies and incorporated into the Plan.

POTRERO COMMUNITY PLAN – *Comprehensive Update*

The Potrero Community Planning Group prepared a comprehensive update to the existing Community Plan that was reviewed by staff and circulated for public review in July 2009. This Plan emphasizes resource conservation, open space, and appropriate rural-sized commercial facilities and development.

Issues: *Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP):* There are two recommendations included in the Potrero Community Plan, from the County and from the Potrero Planning Group. Similar to issues addressed in the Boulevard Community Plan, Potrero would like to increase minimum lot sizes beyond what is allowed by existing zoning. Staff disagrees that the minimum parcel size should be larger than currently allowed by zoning.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the Plan with the staff-recommended policies for the Conservation Subdivision Program.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were received from the Potrero Community Planning Group with regard to floodplains and were incorporated into the Draft Community Plan.

NORTH COUNTY METROPOLITAN SUBREGIONAL PLAN (Twin Oaks & Hidden Meadows) – Consistency Review

The existing North County Metro Subregional Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. The staff edits were reviewed by the Twin Oaks and Hidden Meadows Sponsor Groups. The Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group has recently drafted a comprehensive update for the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group Area.

Issues: *No significant issues*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- This comprehensive update of the Hidden Meadows Community Plan should follow adoption of the General Plan Update based on staff availability and resources

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

NORTH MOUNTAIN SUBREGIONAL PLAN - Consistency Review

Staff prepared a consistency review of for this Subregional Plan, with the exception of Greater Warner Spring, where a comprehensive update to their Community Plan was prepared (see below) and more comprehensive revisions to the Palomar Mountain community, as received from the Palomar Mountain Planning Organization. More comprehensive edits are anticipated in the future.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Subregional Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were made to the Conservation Subdivision Program policies, clarifying the intent of the policies.

**NORTH MOUNTAIN SUBREGIONAL PLAN (Greater Warner Springs) -
Comprehensive Update**

The Greater Warner Springs portion of the North Mountain Subregional Plan was developed by a group of citizens in the community to encourage retention and possible expansion of the community as a Rural Village.

Issues: *Off-Road Vehicles:* The Greater Warner Springs Group desired additional restrictions for off-road vehicles on private property, as well as increased noise enforcement; however, staff does not agree that additional restrictions are appropriate, and they were not incorporated.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Minor edits were received from the Greater Warner Springs Area Group and were incorporated.

OTAY SUBREGIONAL PLAN- Consistency Review

The existing Otay Subregional Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. No additional public comments were received regarding the Otay Subregional Plan.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Subregional Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

Pala - Pauma Valley Subregional Plan- Consistency Review

The existing Pala - Pauma Valley Subregional Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Sponsor Group.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

- Retain the draft Subregional Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

RAINBOW COMMUNITY PLAN- *Consistency Review*

The existing Rainbow Community Plan was edited and reviewed by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Planning Group. No additional public comments were received regarding the Rainbow Community Plan.

Issues: *Extractive Industry:* The Rainbow Community Planning group wanted to include policies that would prohibit all mining activities in the Community Planning Area. Staff cannot support the prohibition of all mining activities in the Community Planning Area because the County does not prohibit uses in communities, rather identifies what uses are allowed, and if necessary put parameters on those uses so they won't negatively impact the community.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

RAMONA COMMUNITY PLAN – *Comprehensive Update*

The Ramona Community Plan includes provisions to encourage the Town Center as the viable commercial area, the keeping of leisure animals, as well as the development of community parks and facilities. There are further refinements necessary and will follow adoption of the General Plan Update.

Issues: *Form-Based Code:* Ramona has been developing a Form Based Code for its Town Center — the framework for implementing this code should be established in the Community Plan.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

Edits were made to incorporate the foundation for implementing the Form-Based Code framework, as well as direct the Conservation Subdivision Program

SAN DIEGUITO COMMUNITY PLAN – Consistency Review

San Dieguito is comprised of unique communities, many of which are built-out specific plans. This Community Plan was updated to include additional policies and text for the each community using the best available information, but is also currently undergoing a more comprehensive update with a Subcommittee.

Issues: *No significant issues*, future refinements are needed to more comprehensively update the Community Plan.

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

July/August 2009 Public Review:

- Revisions were made, as follows: (1) including more specific regulations for the Village Core Mixed Use designation, such as setting a maximum Floor Area Ratio and (2) recognized current minimum lot size regulations in Zoning and in the Covenant of Rancho Santa Fe.
- Additional edits were made to clarify sewer policies for Rancho Santa Fe, as allowed with Draft Land Use Element Policy LU-14.4

ELFIN FOREST / HARMONY GROVE COMMUNITY PLAN) – Comprehensive Update

The Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove Community Plan retains the unique characteristics of each community as distinct areas of San Dieguito. They include policies for the protection of resources, as well as the protection of equestrian uses in Harmony Grove.

Issues: *No significant issues*.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review

The figure showing the Elfin Forest – Harmony Grove Boundary was revised to more clearly show the applicable area of this Community Plan, at the request of the Elfin Forest – Harmony Grove Town Council.

SPRING VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN – *Comprehensive Update*

The Spring Valley Community Plan is prepared for a community that will not see additional growth, except for revitalization. It addresses issues unique to a long established urbanized community, such the need for revitalized housing areas, parking, a need for code enforcement and the desire for revitalization activities in certain areas. The Plan includes a list of concerns the community has had over the years with limited planning support.

Issues: *Special Study Areas:* The Community Planning Group has identified a special study area for Caltrans property that is no longer needed for the construction State Route 54. The Community Plan identifies the uses that are appropriate for that area. Another special study area is the commercial area around Grand Avenue and Jamaica Boulevard where development is encouraged.

Affordable Housing: Community Planning Group recommended policies to restrict additional subsidized affordable housing in the community until other unincorporated communities receive their fair share.

Grandfathered Uses: Community Planning Group recommended restrictions on grandfathered uses, specifically how the uses can transfer in ownership.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review

- Added a Special Study Area for the former State Route 54 right of way lands
- Revised Affordable Housing policies to discourage using County of San Diego funding for affordable housing in Spring Valley, but not limit privately-funded affordable housing,
- Revised policies with respect to legal non-conforming (grandfathering) uses,
- Revised Conservation Subdivision Program policies for steep slope areas given Village densities.

SWEETWATER COMMUNITY PLAN- *Consistency Review*

The Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update, in coordination with the Community Planning Group.

Issues: *No significant issues.*

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

July/August 2009 Public Review

No comments were received on the Plan as circulated July/August 2009

VALLE DE ORO COMMUNITY PLAN – Consistency Review

Valle de Oro Community Plan was revised through a public process involving several public hearings early in the General Plan Update process. The revised Plan reflects the community's desire to balance urban, semi-rural, agricultural and open space uses.

Issues: *No significant issues*, minor edits were submitted by the Planning Group to update discussion and figures.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt the draft Community Plan circulated for public review July 1, 2009, as edited as a result of the public review.

July/August 2009 Public Review

- Revisions were made at the request of the Valle de Oro Community Planning Group with edits to background information, figures and some minor policy edits.
- Following the Conservation Subdivision Program Land Use Hearing, the requirement for a Major Use Permit in the Conservation Subdivision Program has been removed.

VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLAN- Consistency Review

The Valley Center Community Plan was reviewed and edited with direct input from the Community Planning Group. No additional public comments were received regarding the Valley Center Community Plan. The Community Planning Group is currently preparing a comprehensive update to the Community Plan that would be submitted for adoption after the adoption of the General Plan Update.

Issues: *No significant issues*

Staff Recommendation:

- Adopt the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, and as edited to update Specific Planning Area descriptions.
- Coordinate with the Community Planning Group to adopt a comprehensive Community Plan Update after the adoption of the General Plan Update.

July/August 2009 Public Review

Minor edits were received and completed from the Valley Center Community Planning Group, including updated minimum lot sizes for clustered development which were endorsed by the Community Planning Group on March 8, 2010.

Table 1: Minimum Lot Sizes in Community Plans							
Community	SR-1	SR-2	SR-4	SR-10	RL-20	RL-40	RL-80
<i>Targets (IG)</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>8</i>
North County Communities							
Bonsall Staff Rec.	Contains Level 1 and Qualitative Standards						
Community Rec.	Only allow Conservation Subdivisions in two specific locations						
Fallbrook	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1
North County Metro							
Twin Oaks Valley	Contains Qualitative Standards						
Hidden Meadows	Contains Qualitative Standards						
San Dieguito	Contains Level 1 and Qualitative Standards, and regulations within Rancho Santa Fe						
Elfin Forest – Harmony Grove	-	(2)	2	2	2	2	2
Pala / Pauma	No Specific Standards						
Rainbow	No Specific Standards						
Valley Center	0.5	1	2	2.5	4	6	8
Southeast County Communities							
Alpine	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2	2	2
Crest	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Jamul / Dulzura Staff Rec.	0.5	1	1	2	4	4	4
Community Rec.	1						
Lakeside / Pepper Drive - Bostonia	No Specific Standards						
Otay	No Specific Standards						
Ramona	0.5	1	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Spring Valley	Contains Qualitative Standards						
Valle de Oro	(.75)	1	2	(5)	(10)	-	-
Backcountry Communities							
Central Mountain	-	-	-	(4)	4	4	4
Cuyamaca	No Specific Standards						
Descanso	Contains Qualitative Standards						
Pine Valley	(1)	1	1	1	N/A	(8)	8
Desert / Borrego Springs	No Specific Standards						
Julian	No Specific Standards						
Mountain Empire	No Specific Standards						
Boulevard Staff Rec.	-	-	(4)	(4)	4	4	4
Community Rec.					20	40	80
Campo / Lake Morena	No Specific Standards						
Jacumba	No Specific Standards						
Potrero Staff Rec.	-	-	(4)	(4)	4	4	4
Community Rec.				8	16	16	16
Tecate	No Specific Standards						
North / Palomar Mountain	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
If Community Lot Size restriction conflicts with Interest Group Targets, they are in parentheses, however in each of these cases it is not raised as an issue to meet the goals of the Conservation Subdivision Program							