

**Steering Committee Minutes  
February 28, 2009**

**Steering Committee Members**

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Alternate</b>	<b>Community</b>
Margarette Morgan	Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Abby King		Borrego Springs
Donna Tisdale		Boulevard
Kristi Kor		Campo/Lake Morena
Jack Vandover		Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Michael Sterns		Descanso
Jim Russell	Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
Robert Frey		Hidden Meadows
Dan Neirinckx		Jamul/Dulzura
Jack Shelver		Julian
Joe Chism		Pala-Pauma
Vern Denham	Warren Larkin	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Janet Warren	Potrero
Jim Anderson	William Croker	Rainbow
Chris Anderson		Ramona
Lois Jones		San Dieguito
Lora Lowes		Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott		Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips		Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith		Valley Center

**Staff**

Devon Muto, Chief  
 Bob Citrano, DPLU Staff  
 Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff  
 Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff  
 Jennifer Wakem, DPLU Staff

**Public**

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost	Mary Allison	Lakeside
Doug Paul		Mila Bonner	Rainbow
Hank Palmer	Twin Oaks CSG	Rikki Schroeder	RMA
Helene Radzik	Ramona	Sachiko Kohatsu	Board of Supervisors District Three
Jake Christie	East County Californian	Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Janet Warren	Potrero CPG	William Crawley	Potrero CPG
Julie Bugbee	Lakeside		
Larry Johnson	Campo / Lake Morena		

Meeting Commenced at 9:04 a.m.

## I. Introductions

Mr. Muto called the meeting to order, welcomed the group and asked the group to give introductions. He reminded the committee that it is fine to have multiple community representatives at Steering Committee Meeting, as long as there is room at the table, and that there is one vote per one community. Mr. Muto informed the group that Bryan Woods was unable to attend the meeting for personal reasons.

Mr. Muto gave the group announcements on the project. He informed them that staff has received numerous comments on the Draft General Plan, and they are available on the DPLU Website, adding that staff is in the process of going through the comments and responding to them. Mr. Muto stated that staff is spending a large amount of time on the Environmental Impact Report, with public review anticipated to occur in late summer. He added that staff has been working on the Community Plans and getting back to the communities and will get things returned as quickly as possible. He made the group aware that staff is currently working on the Environmental Impact Report, making edits/responding to comments on the draft General Plan, and coordinating with the CPG's to revise Community Plans and preparing an Implementation Plan. This all has to be completed and made a part of the draft EIR's public review.

Mr. Muto informed the group that more details to the Conservation Subdivisions are being prepared and will be one of the committee's future agenda items. He also gave updates on other items that Advanced Planning has been working on, including that the Zoning Ordinance Amendment for the Meteorological (MET) Testing Facilities, bringing Farm Employee Housing Codes up to compliance, and updates to the Landscape Ordinance, a state mandate to look at water conservation. Ms. Jones asked if there was going to be a discussion on native and indigenous plants and Mr. Muto confirmed the Ordinance will include this. He stated that the most significant changes to the landscape ordinance is the requirement to provide landscaping plans for an increased number of single family homes, any new home with 5k sq. ft. of landscaping, along with increasing regulations for water budgets.

Mr. Denham commented that some landscape plans are allowed to cut down a 300-year oak tree and plant five five-gallon trees to replace them, but after 6 months the trees are dead. He said there is a lack of code enforcement on these issues. Mr. Muto stated that this is something that he needs to look into, and in some circumstances there are differences between requirements up front and continuing requirements, as well as the potential need for continued enforcement.

Mr. Russell asked about the Transfer of Development Rights programs and if they are being working on. Mr. Muto responded that DPLU is working on the Farm Program that contains equity mechanisms and that it is going to the Board of Supervisors in April. Mr. Russell also asked what they can do to increase parking standards moving forward with the new General Plan. Mr. Muto commented that he can work with Advance Planning, which is working on

updates to the Parking Manual, adding that they are primarily looking at design but are also looking at the standards. Mr. Muto stated that they can also try to address the issue in the community plan. Mr. Russell said he would like to continue the discussion, and Mr. Muto stated that in most of the cases they are community specific issues.

Mr. Russell asked about the return of the Community Plan, and if they would be getting 60 days. Mr. Muto replied yes, but informed the group that there are about three months to discuss issues early on and would like to avoid a back and forth process. Mr. Muto informed the group that we are very wide open to discussion on the Community Plans, and we are not hard and fast on these issues. Mr. Phillips stated that he has been through the experience that it was a good experience.

Mr. Shelver asked if the County will consult with the local water agencies on the revised General Plan, indicating that they have issues working with the water districts. Mr. Muto stated that we are working with the water agencies as well as the municipalities. He also stated that the updated landscaping regulations primarily will affect areas within the County Water Authority; but that he is happy to work with groundwater dependant areas and see what types of regulations may be appropriate

Mr. Jim Anderson asked if they are going to have water and parking on the agenda to discuss today and Mr. Muto said we can, informing the group that to focus discussion, staff would like to identify which issues the group would like to discuss, specific to a page, policy, or goal that is in the General Plan.

Mr. Muto also announced that the Zoning Ordinance Update for Accessory Dwelling Units was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on February 13<sup>th</sup> and staff is planning on presenting the changes to the Board of Supervisors on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Muto asked if there were any general questions about the announcements. Mr. Denham asked about the landscaping plans in specific areas, and whether native and drought tolerant landscaping would be area specific. Mr. Muto said we have recommendations for types of plants, but provide flexibility to meet the water budget. Mr. Denham stated that if you want to be fire resistant then you would not want to have pine or oak.

Ms. Morgan asked where the group is with slope dependency. Mr. Muto said that the Semi-Rural lands are slope dependant and are outlined on the Land Use Maps.

Ms. Lowes asked if there was any coordination with the Department of Environmental Health to use greywater. Mr. Muto said that staff is coordinating and looking into these efforts, and is aware of requirements to ensure greywater does not have contact with humans.

Mr. Russell commented that he appreciates the way staff handled the comments on the Draft General Plan.

II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from January 10, 2009 Steering Committee Meeting.

Mr. Muto asked the group to review the minutes and for any edits. Mr. Phillips commented that he wants to congratulate whoever prepared and reviewed the minutes. He thinks they represent the meeting fairly well.

Ms. Anderson commented that Liz Higgins asked her to correct the minutes that she is a native resident from San Diego, not Boulevard.

**Phillips: Move Approval**

**Jones: Second**

**Motion Passes 18-0-2**

### III. Discussion of Draft General Plan

Mr. Muto commented that we are moving on to the heart of the meeting with discussion on the General Plan, stating that this is their meeting and all staff is doing is trying to go through items as efficiently as possible. He informed the group that we have identified all the chapters in the Draft General Plan and can log any issues that the group would like to review, to review them in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Muto stated that we have put all of the items for discussion that were previously suggested to us by Mr. Phillips. He also said that we have made available our draft responses, but reminded the group that there are a number of comments that we are reviewing and at some point we may need to resolve some other changes. He let the group know that the Community Planning and Sponsor Group comments are about 44 pages out of the 440 pages of comment letters. He said there were a lot of comments from other agencies and jurisdictions and staff is working with them to understand what their concerns are.

Mr. Russell asked if there will be an opportunity to review the comments and staff responses. Mr. Muto said they will be posted on the GP Update website when the draft EIR goes out for public review.

Mr. Meyer said that he would like to discuss Conservation Subdivisions; Mr. Muto asked if there was a specific page or policy that he wanted to discuss. Mr. Meyer asked that since we do not allow clustering now on Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) Lands why are they allowed now. Mr. Muto stated that we can add that as a general topic, but added that FCI is not going to be addressed under the General Plan Update, but that the group can discuss Conservation Subdivisions. Mr. Meyer also stated he would like to discuss the Borrego Aquifer Policy LU-8.1, LU-14.1, and Table M-1.

Mr. Neirinckx commented that a number of the communities asked to make changes to Guiding Principle 2 and he wanted to see changes. Mr. Muto commented that it is up for discussion and many people did want to discuss that item.

Mr. Muto asked for more comments and Mr. Denham said that he thinks that when we get through Mr. Phillip's list that there will be more items to discuss.

Mr. Croker stated that the Rainbow Planning Group is concerned about water and would like to see how the group's comments are addressed on page 3-34, LU-13.2 and LU-12.1

Mr. Muto stated that we will begin working through this and if there are additional discussion items from the group.

### Guiding Principle 2 (page 2-8)

Mr. Muto indicated that we have removed the second paragraph that discusses the disassociation of parcel sizes and density and had a reference to clustering. He stated that we are going to strikeout the paragraph because it is not the appropriate place for the discussion, but he did want to have a discussion with the group on the disassociation of parcel sizes as a part of the General Plan, something that the Board of Supervisors endorsed as part of the project. Mr. Muto continued that he does not have a revised paragraph at this time, and will provide it when it is ready.

Mr. Phillips stated that he would like to comment on the issue of disassociating parcel sizes with density, stating that when this direction slid through the Board of Supervisors it was a major change in policy for the County. He added that it was not put on the agenda as a major policy shift and he was not ready to comment on it at the Board Hearing. Mr. Phillips continued that this policy will make clustering by-right from the standpoint that use permit findings may not be required, stating that he was concerned that even when the minimum lot size represents the density, a developer can change the minimum lot size in the zoning box and file a tentative map. He said that neither one of those processes requires the Use Permit findings that protect impacts to the community character. Mr. Phillips commented that he thinks that the fact that the Board endorsed this project objective was very arguable and will continue that argument to the Second District. He continued that he and the Steering Committee do not want anything that leads a path to by-right clustering. Mr. Phillips added that his group approves clustering projects frequently but that the developers are held to the findings of the Major Use Permit.

Mr. Muto stated that a rezone has to be in conformance with the General Plan and Community Plan and be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Phillips asked why lot sizes would be disassociated if the sizes can continue to be made available under Major Use Permit processes. He added that developers will be able to purchase areas with estate residential designations with two-acre minimum lot sizes, but if the minimum lot sizes are different then it turns the plan into a lie.

Ms. Tisdale said she agrees with Mr. Phillips and that there is very little support in the Steering Community for the idea of Conservation Subdivisions. Mr. Russell commented that the devil is in the details, and that Mr. Phillips is discussing clustering, not Conservation Subdivisions. Ms. Tisdale stated that clustering is Conservation Subdivisions.

Mr. Muto clarified that discussion is talking about minimum lot sizes and its relationship to density, adding that staff has had some problems in the past with an inability to process creative projects and that as part of the General Plan Update we were not going to lock ourselves in so tightly with minimum lot sizes.

Mr. Russell said that clustering in itself is not a bad thing, but that the devil is in the details. He would like to prevent developers from increasing densities using clustering. Clustering in large developments can change the community character. Mr. Russell commented that clustering can change the dynamic of how a community will vote how the community about the future, because new residents do not understand larger lot sizes with agriculture. He added that Fallbrook uses it well to provide projects that provide housing and do not destroy the community.

Mr. Muto said that disassociating minimum lot sizes does not give a project more density. Mr. Phillips said that he takes exception to that, stating that as you get into suburban areas it increases the density because you are no longer considering what has to come out of the site for roads, a 25-30% increase in density over what can be built. Mr. Muto clarified that what he meant is that staff is not overriding the density, but yes it can increase yield if there is a constraint. Mr. Phillips stated that in half, third and quarter-acre situations this increases the density 25-30%.

Ms. Morgan asked for a clear definition between the difference between clustering and Conservation Subdivisions. Mr. Muto responded that Conservation Subdivisions is a larger concept, which allows for better subdivision design and increased resource protection. He added that the goals of the Conservation Subdivision can be achieved by clustering, but it is not always the best approach. Mr. Muto also explained that we see this now in development projects, such as property being subdivided into three lots which would not necessarily be located next to each other, as long as fire protection and open space goals are achieved. Ms. Morgan asked to clarify that they are not interchangeable and Mr. Muto confirmed they are not.

Mr. Anderson stated that in a clustering project in Rainbow the developer came back, did a boundary adjustment that the planning group did not see it and that the project does not look anything like what they approved. Mr. Russell asked why they do not see boundary adjustments. Mr. Phillips said they also do not review boundary adjustments. Mr. Russell said maybe they do not see them automatically but he has seen them before. Mr. Muto responded that he can look into this, but that we are also looking at changing the boundary adjustment process and avoiding situations such as what was described in Rainbow.

Mr. Russell said he had comments on what Mr. Phillips was saying, stating that the clustering projects he sees use private roads and that you do not take out anything for private roads. Mr. Phillips said they always look at that in his subdivisions. There was some discussion on this item.

Mr. Denham, concerning Policy COS-11.3, wanted to know how much weight community input will have concerning community character for projects with clustering. Mr. Muto said

we will respond in general, then that we can talk about the specific wording when we get to this policy. He stated that if you do the clustering it depends on how they are achieving it; with Lot Area Averaging we have the findings with regard to bulk and scale as well as consistency with the Community Plan. Mr. Muto added that staff also looks to the Community Groups and the Community Plans, adding that the new Community Plans are being given more weight in the General Plan Update.

Mr. Denham stated that this policy seems to have more weight than his group would desire, and understands that the community plan can be more restrictive but wants to make sure that the implementation works when the rubber hits the road. Mr. Muto said that he wants to increase the connection to the community plan.

Mr. Jemmot stated that a long time ago Pryor and Holler made commitments where communities could set lot sizes to reflect the total density. He added that the early presentations and movie on the Conservation Subdivisions describes how the process works and what open spaces are protected, but that a problem is that one of the first negotiations are done with the developer and staff. Mr. Jemmot stated that by the time the community hears about it the wagons have been circled and the decisions have been made. He commented that if that is the way it is going to work they want none of it, saying that it can be done in a way that the community is involved in the beginning. He said the Sugarbush project in his area was described by the Planning Commission as a little bit of Mira Mesa dropped into a Rural Community.

Mr. Jemmot stated that property owners bought property and looked next door and though it was going to be large lots, but that the small lots were built next door with large walkways which are going to be run by the Homeowners Association, but he is concerned the HOA will not maintain it. Mr. Muto said his concerns are logged in as an improvement to our process, and Mr. Jemmot said that it will be an entirely new process. Mr. Muto stated they are preparing guidelines for subdivision design and are including as the first step to go talk to the Community Group. He added when he used to process projects he tells the developer to go talk to the community group and get input. Mr. Muto said that part of what is needed to improve this is to get the General Plan in place and see the process change with the General Plan.

Ms. Jones asked if it was possible to put a concept workshop in and as part of the process and as part of the workshop to involve the Community Planning Group. Mr. Muto said we can look into that. Mr. Phillips asked for clarification and Ms. Jones explained that if someone has a property they want to develop, that before they go far into a project they want to get a presentation to the group.

Mr. Phillips said it happens frequently in his community, but added that he never allows anyone to come to his group without preparations. He said he requires a concept plan be submitted to DPLU then can talk about the concept plan as a group. He said that it occurs quickly because his group meets every two weeks. Mr. Phillips added that some developers do not want to talk to us.

Ms. Jones said that is correct and a concept workshop should be put in the process. Mr. Phillips said he does not want to be forced to put a concept on anything cold turkey in front of 15 people. Mr. Muto said before we require this we will flesh it out and bring it back to the group.

Mr. Muto said he wants to get back to discussions on the Draft General Plan. Mr. Russell commented that 75% of the projects come to the group, and does not think that we have a right to demand that they go to the group of volunteers. Mr. Denham said that developers do not go to his group; he said that his group reacts to what the County of San Diego sends them.

### Policy LU-8.1

Mr. Muto said that policy LU-8.1 was the next policy identified for discussion. Mr. Meyer asked why Borrego Valley is exempted in this policy, when we know there are overdraft conditions. Mr. Muto stated that we know there are overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley and there is a long term plan being developed by the local water district to address them. He stated that unlike many of our other areas the water district is working through their issues and we not want to lock them in with the General Plan. Mr. Meyer said that currently Borrego Springs has a voluntary program, that the State says there is a 20-30 year supply and asked why there is there not a moratorium down there. Mr. Meyer stated that he thinks that this warrants a moratorium if any area does. Mr. Muto said that Borrego Springs is working on long term strategies to work on the water supply, that staff is coordinating with and would like to support them.

Mr. Muto asked if the group would like to take a position on this item. Mr. Russell stated that he does not want to discuss Borrego Springs because he does not know enough about the subject. Mr. Muto reminded the group that the purpose of this forum is to come up with a Steering Committee position on these issues. Ms. Tisdale stated that she agrees with Mr. Meyer and has concerns about the County's responsibility to the public for long term sustainability and does not want it to set a bad precedent. She added that she thinks the County should have a backup position if things fall through with the Borrego Water District.

Mr. Phillips asked if there is another place in the entire document that a whole area is excepted. He stated that it could follow that they exempt Boulevard, Potrero, or any other groundwater dependant area if someone applies pressure on the district supervisor. Mr. Muto stated that there are other cases that there are exceptions, such as which roads that we are applying the Level of Service D standard to. He stated that the alternative is if we do not want to exempt Borrego we would have to look at a looser policy to acknowledge the issues are being worked on in the area and do not think that this will be applied to different areas. Mr. Phillips said the precedent is set and could happen in the long term.

Mr. Muto asked for recommendations. Mr. Phillips stated that he agrees with Mr. Russell that it is an individual community issue and thinks it could be in the Community Plan. Mr. Russell suggested that Borrego Springs draft some wording and come back with it. Mr. O.

Smith commented that the point is where no one but Borrego Springs knows what Borrego Springs needs; he stated that unless Borrego Springs agrees with the restriction then it should come out of the General Plan.

**O. Smith: Motion that the restriction be removed from the General Plan if Borrego Springs does not agree with it**

**There was no second.**

Mr. Chism commented that he does not know about the situation in Borrego Springs, but that he does not want to put in any restrictions or try to limit what is hopefully a scientific and long term solution.

Mr. Muto commented that he would like to move the process along and entertain other motions.

Ms. Tisdale commented that her concerns are long term sustainability and viability.

**Tisdale: Motion to remove the blanket exception in Borrego Valley**

Mr. Muto added to the discussion that in the same section LU-8.4 specifically addresses Borrego Springs and that a possibility is to look at LU-8.4 and look at edits to increase its strength.

**Phillips: Second**

Mr. Phillips stated that this is a motherhood and apple pie for groundwater dependant areas and says to not put densities in that can not be supported by the groundwater supply. He added that he can not see why you would want to exempt anything, and if Borrego Springs comes up with some other to see why you would want to ever exempt anything from that requirement. He said that if Borrego Valley comes up with any other sustainable supply then they can have the densities. Mr. Denham commented that in Policy LU-8.4 it still says slow the overdrafting, and that would still deplete the water supplies.

Mr. Muto stated that there is a motion and a second and asked for discussion.

Ms. King commented that she is pleased to see that people know where Borrego Springs is. She commented that Borrego Springs appreciates the exception as they try to work through their issues and that it is a unique groundwater situation. She also stated that that a beefed up LU-8.4 would probably be agreeable to the group.

Mr. Russell commented that there is not a comment from Borrego Springs before the deadline and asked why it is an issue now that was not one before. Mr. Muto clarified that the issue was raised by Mr. Meyer. Ms. Tisdale said that her group also has a federally designated sole source aquifer, and would like protection if they could remove the words

except the Borrego Valley. Mr. Denham commented that no one is liable for groundwater mistakes when they occur.

Mr. Muto stated that the reason we felt that it should be in the policy is because the Borrego Springs Land Use Map allows for more development than their aquifer can contain. Mr. O. Smith said that there is always LU-8.4 for that issue. Mr. Muto replied that LU-8.4 does not override LU-8.1. Mr. Phillips asked why do we are planning for densities that can not be supported. Mr. Muto said we are reducing what is potentially allowed under the existing General Plan.

Mr. Muto commented that if the Steering Committee would like to take a position on Borrego Springs then it can. Mr. Phillips stated that they are taking a position on having an exception.

Mr. Russell asked if the planning group approved the map and Mr. Muto replied they did. Mr. Weber commented that the issue in Borrego Springs is not residences, but the agriculture and golf courses. Mr. Anderson stated that it is good to have a goal and scientific study to slow the drafting and asked who was responsible. Mr. Muto said that the water district is working on it and Mr. Anderson commented that they reference the water district in the policy.

Mr. Denham asked if the water from Borrego Springs is primarily from the aquifer or from whatever recharge. Ms. King confirmed that it is mostly from the aquifer and that there is very little recharge.

Mr. Muto asked for the vote to remove the exception for Borrego Springs in Policy LU-8.1

**Motion Fails 8 – 9 – 3**

**C. Anderson: Motion that LU-8.4 gets strengthened, and that the Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group work with staff and bring back language at the next Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Morgan: Second**

**Motion Passes 20-0-0**

#### Policy LU-12.1

Mr. Muto continued the meeting with policy LU-12.1, he stated that staff is making edits to policy and it will be reflected in the next iteration of the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Anderson said Rainbow stated in their comment letter that the conclusions reached on Page 3-34 are not appropriate and request that the County rewrite the statement to not take a position on the availability of water. Mr. Croker requested that the County also de-emphasize the role of the Water District and the statement that they will provide the water. Mr. Muto stated that staff is looking at rewriting the section to more comprehensively

describe the roles of the Water Districts and County Water Authority, as well as the current state of water supply.

Mr. Anderson commented that it would be helpful in LU-13.1 and 13.2 if the developers fund more reclamation. Mr. Muto stated that there are policies out there that are supportive reclaimed water and Mr. Anderson commented he would like to see the funding connection.

Mr. Muto stated that he believes that staff has addressed the concerns on LU-12.1 by replacing concurrent with “Prior to” and asked if there were any other concerns.

### Policy LU-13.2

Mr. Muto asked the group about LU-13.2 and if there were any comments on the policy. Mr. Shelver asked how anyone can identify a continuous water supply and stated that a policy such as this would make land unable to be developed. Mr. Muto said the language that is being suggested by Rainbow is a higher bar that is currently being set.

Mr. Muto asked the group to take a break and resume discussions following the meeting.

10:48 Break

Mr. Muto called the meeting to order at 11:00, he indicated that he discussed the concerns on Policy 13.2 with Rainbow during the break and they are ok with moving forward.

### Policy LU-14.5

Mr. Meyer stated that he would like know the name of the alternate sewage systems. Mr. Jemmot commented that a few years ago there was an alternative system that went into a garage. Mr. Muto stated there are some provisions in state law for regulations pertaining to alternate sewage disposal systems for use if there is an inability for on-site septic. Ms. Morgan asked if this would overtake the new state mandate involving septic and the required inspections. Mr. Muto stated that these systems would be applied for projects in a location that could not percolate or use another system. Mr. Neirinckx commented that it's his understanding there are systems other than the basic leach line, septic system and gravity pits that are used in other parts of the country and that County regulations are basically out of date. Ms. Anderson said that she is concerned about the impact of Assembly Bill 885, stating that it will impact new buildings and existing septic systems, that the homeowner is responsible for the monitoring and maintenance of the documents. She added that with updated requirements there are some existing homes that will fail and requested everyone to look into this issue.

Ms. Tisdale asked if the County submitted comments on the bill, Mr. Muto responded that he would have to look into if they did or not. Mr. Neirinckx stated that his Planning Group looked into the issue and that they noticed there were no meetings in San Diego County regarding this issue, and requested that DPLU make comments to the State requesting meetings on issues that have an impact to the community be also held in San Diego.

Ms. Anderson stated that she is not aware of any alternative septic systems that are approved through the County. Mr. Muto said his understanding is that they are not currently approved but that when the State regulations are finalized they will look at allowing them. Mr. Russell added that they are allowed, but there are a lot of requirements to go through in order for them to be installed.

Mr. Meyer asked if a developer can use this to put in a development outside of the sewer service area. Mr. Muto said this is about areas that would be served by septic, but that the septic is infeasible. Mr. Meyer said if a developer can use this to increase the density on his property. Mr. Muto said this does not have a connection to lot size, Mr. Phillips commented that it could be used because this other septic type system would be ok on lots that would not percolate. Mr. Denham commented that LU-14.4 affects the expansion of sewer and prohibits the restriction of growth inducing development.

Mr. Muto asked if there was any other discussion on sewage systems, said that he thinks it is ok without revisions unless there are any other comments and asked the group to continue with the next policy.

#### Table M-1 (Mobility Element)

Mr. Citrano explained that this table contains the road classifications that were taken to the Board of Supervisors and endorsed. Mr. Meyer asked about the right-of-way in the Light and Minor Collector roads, and asked why they are being increased. Mr. Citrano stated that the existing Light Collector row (a two-lane road with shoulder) is 60 ft. He continued that we have increased the parkway on each side of the road to 12 ft from 10 ft, as well as showing other options for getting more capacity without having to increase the number of travel lanes, such as intermittent turn lanes and raised medians. Mr. Muto noted that the road standards go into more detail and the right-of-way can be reduced under some circumstances.

Mr. Meyer also asked about the August 2, 2006 report and the light collectors that were stated to have right-of-way for 4 lane roads. Mr. Citrano said that there are a lot of State Highways on the Circulation Element designated as four lane roads today and that staff wanted to reserve the right-of-way in case more capacity is needed in the future. Mr. Phillips commented that none of this happens unless there is development along the roadway, adding that staff is not saying the County is going to condemn existing roads to document a larger right-of-way. Mr. Meyer commented that he is just suspicious when the County says they want to go past 2020.

#### Policy M-10.3

Mr. Muto stated that this is a policy many groups had concern with and that staff has rewritten the policy, Mr. Phillips said they do not want to rewrite to encourage on street parking in commercial or high density residential in his area. He stated that this is not a good policy for the unincorporated County and would like to remove the whole policy, but also

offered a rewrite to only encourage it when traffic operations and safety are not compromised.

Mr. Denham commented that on the weekends people will park trailers in front of a coffee shop in Pine Valley, which forces people who have horses to go out into the street around the trailers and creates a hazard. Ms. Lowes commented that in most of her area they do not even have sidewalks for pedestrians to walk on. She further stated that the County has often used the County roads as part of the required parking in the project and thinks the entire policy should be taken out. Ms. Margarette said there is a project in Bonsall that has insufficient parking, and that 7 times a year is going to have 16,000 to 18,00 people and only has 81 spaces.

Mr. Russell comments that he agrees with Mr. Phillips and would like to delete the policy or discourage the use of on street parking.

**Russell: Motion to rewrite to discourage on street parking or remove the policy.  
Phillips: Second**

Mr. Muto asked for discussion and asked Mr. Citrano to comment on the policy. Mr. Citrano said that there are places that certain times a year have a lot of parking need a few times a year and the remainders of the time are empty. He commented that he would like to encourage parking lots that are the right size 90% of the time, then 10% of the time encourage planning for overflow. Mr. Russell commented that Mr. Citrano supported his motion because he wants to discourage on street parking except in overflow areas. Ms. Morgan said that her project is in a rural area and that on street parking should not be encouraged on rural roads. Mr. Citrano asked about Rancho Santa Fe, which has limited parking to two hour parking through the village. Ms. Jones said that they are building underground garage in the area and there are also parking lots in the area. Mr. Muto said we think we can work with this direction and address the policy outside of the General Plan and work with the communities in specific instances.

**Motion Passes: 19-1-0**

#### Policy M-10.4

Ms. Jones understands that shared parking is a nice mechanism but can result in problems such as is occurring in Rancho Santa Fe, where people currently share a location that is now being developed as an underground garage, but the businesses that shared the parking now will no longer be able to use the facility. She commented that she would like to see a mechanism to control the shared parking. Mr. Phillips commented that there should be design review and that when the Planning Group receives the designs the shared parking is a Major Use Permit issue that looks at the overall parking requirement for the businesses. Ms. Jones said the businesses are not on the property and had made an agreement with the property owner, but there was no protective mechanism and now the property owner states that it is not his problem. Mr. Phillips stated that it should be a problem identified in the County permitting process, he said that there is shared parking all over his area and is looked

at closely, especially when businesses look at taking out parking. Mr. Muto said we have provisions in our code currently, Ms. Jones said it has not been working for Rancho Santa Fe and that she would like to see additional protection. Mr. Muto said he we will look at improving this policy get back to the group.

### Policy COS 2.1

Mr. Muto stated that Mr. Phillips would like us to change the wording in this policy from “encourage” to “require”, and that his concern is that this is a change in policy from current standards. Mr. Phillips stated that he thinks this is motherhood to “require” this policy. Mr. Muto said that is a different process, and that if someone illegally disturbs habitat then we would require them to restore or mitigate. Mr. Phillips said mitigate does not mean a thing and can occur in any location, he asked how many vernal pools have been destroyed and afterward a development plan comes in. Mr. Muto said we would be requiring enhancement and restoration of habitat when projects come into the process, adding that there is a lot of disturbed habitat and most of the time staff requires them to avoid it. Ms. Jones noted a project in San Dieguito where the developer was required to restore the wetland that was already disturbed and damaged.

Mr. Denham said that if he has a project and staff encourages him to do something then he will not want to do it, Mr. Phillips added that it has no teeth. Mr. Denham stated that it is cheaper for many of them to take the violation. Ms. Jones said that this is the same as tomato fields that are put in as agriculture that destroys the natural habitat.

**Phillips: Motion that this COS 2.1 read required  
Meyer: Second**

Mr. Russell said that if you use the word “require” then you can not build anything anywhere in the County. Mr. Phillips said that the policy assumes that there is a development involved, Mr. Russell says that there will not be any development in semi-rural and rural areas, adding that policy COS-2.2 includes “require”.

Mr. Denham asked if it would be consistent to read require, and Mr. Russell says the development in COS2.2 requires that it goes on the least sensitive areas and that it would be consistent to read “encourage”. Mr. Phillips said that he reads that if they mess up environmental assets they have to restore the development; Mr. Russell says that this would be required in a map, but that this is the General Plan Level. Mr. Phillips comments that he agrees with Mr. Russell.

**Phillips: Withdraws motion.**

### Policy COS-11.3

Mr. Muto said that the concern is with the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet requiring clustering; Mr. Phillips said that his preference is to delete it, but has offered a rewrite that says it may be considered. He added that in his Community Plan they have defined clustering and how minimum lot sizes

and density are determined. He said the bullet reads “require development through the following...Clustering of development” and he does not want that to happen in this document for any reason. He added that if the group does not want to delete it then he would like to keep the portion to add community character.

Mr. Neirinckx stated that Jamul / Dulzura made a similar comment and added community character to it. Mr. Muto said we have added Community Character to the bullet and rewrote it, but that we can also go with Mr. Phillips revisions.

**Morgan: Motion to revise bullet to read, “Clustering of development may be considered if it results in preservation of a balance of open space vistas, natural features and community character; and if it conforms with the Community Plan”**  
**Jones: second**

**Motion Passes: 19-1-0**

Mr. Denham asked if a Tentative Map is alongside a scenic highway then why is there not a flag at the start of the process to require analysis of visual impacts. Mr. Muto responded that it should be.

Page 6-10, last paragraph Housing Development

Mr. Phillips recommends removal of the paragraph.

**Russell: Motion to delete paragraph**  
**Jones: Second**

**Motion Passes: 20-0-0**

Mr. Jones commented that they felt the statement contradicted the General Plan’s Policies.

Policy S-9.4

Mr. Citrano stated that it was requested by Mr. Phillips to change from “mitigated” to “avoided”. Mr. Muto explained that we currently allow for development inside the floodplain fringe if the hazards are mitigated for by raising it outside of the floodplain or using other techniques. Mr. Muto said that avoided seems to be a little bit more onerous than these requirements. Mr. Phillips commented that this is more onerous, but eventually this direction leads to the eventual loss of floodplain and evolves into channeling the floodplain. He suggested people go to Los Angeles and see the development outside of the floodplain and would like to preserve impacts to the floodway.

Mr. Chism enquired if the proposed language change of the policy would prohibit putting a park in the floodplain? Mr. Phillips said “avoided” does not say you can never develop, it says that is the highest level of protection, but mitigate is not as effective. Mr. Chism said if

we can go back and do a better job developing the edge of floodplain, further commenting that almost everywhere currently built is near a floodplains.

Ms. Morgan said that there is a proposed river park in her community and would hate to see that they could not implement the plan to have a park, including parking lots if they could not build in the 100-year floodplain. Ms. Morgan would like to have the river park to have people enjoy this.

Ms. Tisdale asked if a lot of this issue is covered with the Limit Impact Development (LID) guidelines, and Mr. Muto responded that the guidelines are more about project design then footprint.

Ms. Jones commented that it is great to see parks and gold courses but the dilemma is that the property owners want development within the viewshed, which results in development in an area that should not be developed. Ms. Morgan stated that there has to be some kind of compromise of things that are going to be preserving the green belts, such as the river park, but not including that as something that this will deny. Mr. Phillips said a parking lot on a floodplain is the beginning of the LA flood control channels, Ms. Jones said she thinks this should be addressed more specifically in each Community Plan.

Mr. Russell asked if there is a motion, and Mr. Muto clarified that there is not a motion at this time.

**Phillips: Motion to change wording on S-9.4 to “avoided”.**

**Lowes: Second**

Mr. Russell stated that he thinks it is not reasonable to make this change in the policy, adding that he is not in favor of development in floodplains.

**Motion Fails: 8 - 10 - 2**

Ms. Morgan would like staff to look into a rewrite and Mr. Muto stated he has heard the concerns and will try.

#### Policy S-9.5

Mr. Muto asked the group to discuss S-9.5. Mr. Phillips stated he would like to delete everything after “capacity of the floodplain”

**Phillips: Motion to delete in Policy S-9.5, “unless the lot is entirely within the floodplain or when sufficient land for development on a project site is not available and where clustering is not feasible to minimize encroachment on floodplains.”**

**Jemmott: Second**

Ms. Jones stated that this is one of the first policies that the group put into place and would like to support it.

**Motion Passes: 18 – 2 – 0**

Mr. Muto stated that the concept of this meeting was to develop a Steering Committee position and asked if there was any interest from the group to make a general motion on the Draft General Plan.

**Phillips: Motion: As written, with the modifications made today, the Steering Committee supports this modified version of the Draft General Plan.**

**Russell: Second.**

Ms. Lowes asked if this was ok without seeing the rewrite. Mr. Denham asked that since the Community Planning and Sponsor Group comments were 10% if the other 90% are completely different. Mr. Muto replied that of the other 90%, 30% of them contrast with what staff and the Steering Committee have been presenting. He said there are some comments that would warrant some modifications and the additional 60% do not affect the major issues, such as technical issues that the Airport Authority or CALTRANS would bring up.

**Phillips: Revised motion to include “with the exception of rewrites that have been committed to and the Steering Committee has not yet seen”**

Mr. Phillips said he finds that the document is supportable and moves to support it. Ms. Tisdale asked if they should support it with the proposed rewrites. Ms. Jones said the Draft General Plan has been a long time coming and a lot of work staff has managed to capture much of what the committee stands for. Mr. Muto stated that he thinks a tentative or conceptual support goes a long way. Ms. Lowes and Ms. Morgan suggested using tentative support.

Mr. Phillips said that the group is going to need the motion and that the Board of Supervisors needs to know that this has made good progress and that staff is working with this Committee.

Mr. Meyer asked that after the plan is finished still allow 80% of the future growth in the eastern communities? Mr. Muto clarified that today there is a 60 % of the growth within the County Water Authority and 40% outside, and that in the new plan 80% is allowed inside the CWA and 20% outside.

**Motion Passes: 20 – 0 – 0**

#### IV. Public Comments

Ms. Tisdale announced that SDGE is having meetings on the Sunrise Powerlink in the backcountry starting March 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Muto asked for public comment. Ms. Radzik asked to clarify that the statements on page 7 of the January 10, 2009 minutes and would like clarification whether this is a new land use map and how that statement does not conflict with the community plans. Mr. Muto commented that he does not know what is being referred to here, but clarified that there can not be a conflict between the Community Plan and the General Plan.

William Crawley wanted to thank the staff and group for taking the time to put all of this together, and except for some changes to put in he thinks staff is listening.

Mr. Palmer commented on the floodplain issue, and thinks you can not build within any extent of a floodplain without affecting the flow. He added that this can be done with a mathematical model and thinks that the Resource Protection Ordinance is not sufficient.

Ms. Ayers asked about the on site septic systems and the bill that came through a few years ago. She said that Micro Septic is one of the brand names and added that there is one not working in her neighborhood near Avocado Boulevard. She also commented that two years ago there was a hearing on the Borrego Springs aquifer and it was estimated to have 20 years left due to everything under that supply is brine and can not be treated.

Ms. Ayers said there was a discussion on fire access at the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors voting on the Ordinance to delay the TIF fees. Mr. Muto explained that there was a Director's Report to the Planning Commission on how DPLU is enforcing and interpreting the secondary access law and the feedback from the Planning Commission was that they would like DPLU to be a little more flexible with the interpretations. Mr. Muto also explained that there is a Fee Deferral Program that is going to the Board of Supervisors that is looking at deferring the TIF and other fees until the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Ms. Ayers said that the County insisted that the payment be done at the beginning. Mr. Russell asked what the recommendation is and Mr. Muto said that he believes the staff recommendation is to approve deferral program and have the fee delayed to the certificate of occupancy or final inspection.

## V. Next Steps

Mr. Muto adjourned the meeting at 12:22. He stated that no meetings are scheduled and that staff will contact the group when there is one.