

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
August 25, 2001 – Minutes**

Revised October 20, 2001

Attendees:

George Vanek	Alpine
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Richard Whitaker	Boulevard
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/Campo
Gordon Shackelford	Lakeside
Joe Chisolm	Pala/Pauma
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Curtis Nicolaisen	Rainbow
Jim Anderson	Rainbow
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
John Hammond	Sweetwater
Richard Stringham	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center

Visitors:

Charlene Ayers	
Keith Behner	Rancho Santa Fe Assn.
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Pat Henagan	SDNHM
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Michael Menghini	Julian
Mark Price	Alpine
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods

Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Elias Barbosa (DPLU)
Sachiko Kohatsu (Supervisor Slater)

Jonathon Smulian (WRT)
Peggy Gentry (WRT)
Bob Citrano (URS)

First Agenda Item: Approval of August 11, 2001 Minutes

Second Agenda Item: Introduction to Draft Land Use Structure Maps

Ivan Holler presented the Land Use Structure map to the committee, stressing that the map is a Regional *Draft*. Two maps were displayed, one that more closely applies the concepts to Valley Center, the other that more closely follows the existing development pattern of Valley Center. For clarification, the structure map was compared to “index” page of a Thomas Bros. Guide offering a large regional view. J. Philips was concerned that each community was not given the opportunity to provide input into the production of this map. Holler assured him that this is a *draft* map in the process moving towards the Land Use Distribution map, and that County staff will take input on a more focused community-specific level. LeAnn Carmichael presented a brief overview of the Interest Group and Steering Committee Concepts, as well how the map follows the Regional Goals and Policies:

Overview of concepts:

Village Core

- High density residential and mixed uses
- Commercial
- Access to circulation
- Element roads
- Infrastructure

Core Support

- Medium density multi-family/single-family residential
- Neighborhood-scale commercial
- Industrial uses may be allowed

Semi-rural

- Residential and small farm uses
- Limited to locations with existing semi-rural pattern of development

Rural Lands

- Low residential densities
- Agricultural uses
- Public lands
- Open space easements
- Habitat corridors
- Limited circulation access
- Reliance on ground water and septic systems

Tie into Regional Goals & Policies created by the Steering Committee and endorsed by the Board:

- Direct urban growth to existing urban centers
- Environmental constraints determine density patterns
- Development directed towards existing communities
- Greenbelts established between communities
- Preserve land for agricultural uses
- Several policies relating to conservation of groundwater, sensitive habitats, floodplains & drainage

J. Ferguson was concerned that the map did not take into account constraints (especially slope) but was assured by staff that the constraint maps were used when producing the structure map and that we should not try to view this map with extreme detail.

G. Hammers brought up the point of land use controls, and no sewer expansion beyond the urban limit line. Moving away from the urban limit line paves the way to sewer expansion, how does this structure map affect the limit line and sewer? L. Carmichael explained that the regional categories have not yet been discussed, and that these concerns still need to be worked out.

D. Van Dierendonck brought up the issue of the C.W.A. boundary, and recommended that it be eliminated as a boundary in the regional categories. It should be removed as an urban limit line.

J. Phillips questioned whether the density ranges would include the slope dependant categories agreed upon for Valle de Oro, Spring Valley, and Lakeside. He also wondered that if the concepts are dependant on slope, and if any of the village core and core support have been applied to areas with steep slopes. Woods responded that regional constraints were taken into consideration, just not on a line-by-line basis. Smulian (WRT) stated that every community planning area was viewed in terms of all constraints. They also followed the Interest Group/Steering Committee's approved concepts, as well as comments from community members; although it was not a rigid application of these concepts.

D. Neirinckx felt that the "core support" area needs a more clarified definition. Public Lands should have constraints on their allowable densities. The State and City frequently buy/sell/trade land, and he is concerned that there could possibly be development with high core densities in rural areas. If it is not designated (now) as a rural reserve, then in the future we may have 10 acre parcels when it should not have such density.

G. Shackelford did not think that the concepts which guided the draft map were not valid because they were being applied to existing development patterns. Also, it is a political necessity to maintain the C.W.A. line, so Ramona should not have as much semi-rural areas that it is shown now.

L. Carmichael proposed the question to the group if 1du/10ac should be in the rural category or the semi-rural category, because it could basically go either way. Woods noted that RC20 could be semi-rural or rural depending on the when constraints (i.e. slope) are applied. L. Carmichael stated that in some communities 1/10 could be rural, so it should vary by the community.

G. Vanek recommended that Indian tribes with huge tracts of land be considered when moving on with the draft maps. It should also be publicized that people who have legal non-conforming lots will not be affected, this will take out some of the controversy of presenting a new map.

L. Glavinic felt that “greenbelt” needs to be defined more clearly. He is afraid to see how greenbelt could be interpreted if it is not clearly understood.

E. Bowlby believes that 1/20 and 1/40 should be in the rural categories, but if you add in 1/10, then you will lose structure. It becomes a huge range that that will not provide any true rural conservation, and the environmental community will not support this.

MOTION: RC10 and RC20 should have dual classifications of semi-rural and rural, subject to conditions determining the classification.
All in favor, except for Glavinic.

J. Philips said that these designations have 2 du/ac as being in the category of core-support which means that it is urban. He does not want to have urban improvements such as sidewalks, curbs, and gutters mandatory in developments in these areas because they are considered urban, and that subdivisions won’t need to have these urban improvements. Woods recommended that these concerns be written into the community plan.

Second Agenda Item: Transfer of Development Rights

Holler gave a brief introduction of TDRs and reminded the group to keep the discussion in general terms, and not about applying the TDRs to specific sending and receiving areas. N. LaMontagne presented a review the TDR program to the group. Woods mentioned that the City has shown interest in working with the unincorporated county in taking some of the population using TDRs.

R. Lenac was curious if the TDR program was a “free market” enterprise, and how private landowners would be senders and receivers. LaMontagne said that TDRs are possible amongst private parties, however these exchanges are often more difficult.

D. Neirinckx feels that the county should stay away from using TDRs altogether.

J. Chisolm believes that TDRs are a positive tool that could benefit agriculture in the county.

G. Vanek thought that the whole TDR program is controversial, and is curious about the values placed on sending and receiving areas.

D. Van Dierendonck noted that TDRs are not a “fix-all” for all of the county’s planning barriers, they are a tool that can work in some communities but every community. Interjurisdictional transfers should be considered as well, but to remember that it should be an available resource.

R. Smith preferred that density bonus programs already present within the zoning ordinance be used instead of the TDR program.

G. Hammers felt that TDRs would not be used in Potrero, and that on a regional level there is a potential for abuse.

J. Phillips described TDRs as a “burglar’s toolbox” to break into legitimate community plans, letting areas that are heavily constrained be sold as developable areas.

J. Chisolm said that TDRs maybe the only opportunity to do transfers on a regional scale. Agricultural and farm lands could really benefit from TDRs. For example, up zoning along Hwy. 78 could pay for some of the open space in other areas of the county.

G. Shackelford thought that the danger exists in the development industry wanting to develop at higher densities.

M. Morgan added that the regional structure map lacks any mention of Ag., and this component should be added. TDRs should be set up by us (planning groups) or by the county staff, we should have a land trust which would take power out of the Board of Supervisors’ hands.

Woods stated that there are benefits and dangers involved with TDRs, and that staff should look into methods of safeguards within the TDR program.

J. Fergusen noted that the Board approved the MAAC project, worth 11 million dollars of tax funds which was a bad project and that he is worried that this kind of mishap could occur in a TDR program.

Upon request, Holler agreed that he would look into questions concerning “Series 100” and bring back a clear definition of the policy for the group.

G. Jemmot does not agree with TDRs because his community (Twin Oaks) will likely be a relieving area.

❖ *Correction made at the October 20, 2001 Steering Committee meeting: name is spelled incorrectly, typing error on the word “receiving”, and stated that he expressed concern, not disagreement.*

Public Comment:

E. Bowlby expressed concerns about individuals entering into voluntary TDRs. He was also worried about TDRs being applied in a blanket fashion over large areas. Also, the city cannot support increases of density (sent from the unincorporated areas) because there is a lack of infrastructure in the city.

G. Shackelford requested a gap-analysis consisting of “deficiencies” within the process of updating the general plan.

Woods recommended a staff presentation, basically giving a GP2020 timeline: where we have started, what we have done, and where we want to go.

Third Agenda Item: Commercial Land Use Designations

N. LaMontagne gave a brief overview of the status of commercial land use designations. Commercial designations will be presented to the Steering Committee as part of a larger “Regional Land Use Framework” along with regional categories and other land use designations. Staff will be presenting proposed commercial designations with intensity standards (i.e. floor area ratios), much like residential designations use population density standards (du/acre). Committee members were asked to begin thinking about intensity standards which would best suit their communities.

Next Meeting: September 15th

Topics for discussion:

- Regional Categories