

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
March 5, 2002**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

Public at Large:

Bob Pinnegar	SD Association of Realtors
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Constance Clover	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
David Nilson	NCCE & LSA
David Pallinger	Ramona
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Jan Van Dierendonck	
Jeanne Pagett	
Jonathan Smullan	WRT
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Pat Flanagan	
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy
R. Ferguson	
Sachiko Kohatsu	County of SD, District 3

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Stephanie Gaines (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for February 19, 2002
- Bowlby clarified his statement on pages 4 and 5. He felt there was some confusion surrounding the discussion of the two agricultural issues (Land Use Goal III, policies B and D) and wanted to clarify that he was opposed to policy B and opposed to the words “land for” being stricken in policy D.
 - Doyle moved to approve the minutes with the aforementioned corrections. Motion seconded. Minutes approved.
- b) “Tools” Sub-committee Update
- Stehly stated that the sub-committee was continuing to meet at 10:45 am (prior to the Interest Group) and that a white paper has been prepared by Jim Whalen about some of the issues. From approximately 20 bullet points, there are about 5 “sticky” issues to be reviewed. The committee is now at the point they need Rick Pruetz, and understand he’s available. The next meeting will be by phone or in person.
- c) Non-agenda Items
- Scarborough addressed the issue of time conflicts with AIA, APA, ASLA and the motion to change the meeting date and time. She suggested waiting on changing the dates until the group has gone through the Goals and Policies and review of the map. She also suggested waiting on changing alternates, as there have been requests by members to modify their alternates, and encouraged members to continue to attend the meetings.
 - A member of the audience requested a “timeline” of events and was informed that that happens at each meeting.
 - Silver offered an ordinance he felt would be useful for the “tools” sub-committee. It is from Santa Clara County on clustering and stated how it was used successfully in that jurisdiction.
- d) Follow-up Information/Discussion
- Land Use Goal III, policy D – Carmichael clarified that there were two copies of the draft revisions to the Goals & Policies handed out at previous meetings and the staff recommendation is to strike the language *land for*.
 - Land Use Goal I, policy E – Staff reviewed the tape and flipchart to clarify whether there was a change made from *protect* to *respect*. Evidence on the tape was inconclusive as it only referred to the BIA’s proposal, which changed *preserve* to *respect* but not *protect* to *respect*. Reviewing the written copy on the flipchart also showed *preserve* replaced with *respect*, but did not show the entire policy written out. Discussion centered around the BIA’s proposal, which indicated that the change was only on *preserve* and not on *protect*.
 - Land Use Goal III, policy E – This policy was struck because agricultural land would be converted to residential, especially west of the CWA. It was found to be inconsistent with General Plan policy and is too inflexible.
 - Scarborough concluded staff’s review and stated they could be revisited as desired.
 - **Motion:** A motion and second was made to accept staff’s revision and analysis of Land Use Goal I, policy E. Respect and protect with no “s”.
 - **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 0
 - **Motion:** Scarborough clarified a motion made on Land Use Goal III, policy D, striking *land for*. Silver commented on not creating policies to establish policies. Holler suggested *Preserve and maintain agriculture*. A question arose on why staff struck *land for* and where else would agricultural uses occur. Pryor responded that the policy implies designating specific areas of land reserved only for agriculture. Bowlby stated that we need to keep the agriculture designation because agriculture gets driven out by residential, which clashes with agricultural uses. He asked why the Farm Bureau was not saying we need land for agricultural use. Stehly responded with 96-03, all land designated for agricultural uses is now under a moratorium and has been, for about 10 years. Farmers do not want land that is purely designated “agriculture” because it is inflexible and becomes worthless if the crop is worthless. Preserve the concept, the business of agriculture and the ability to farm by right in every place of the County as it has in the past. Bowlby responded that contrary to what the Farm Bureau has said, agricultural uses are permitted in those areas and that moratoriums are on residential subdivisions so we do not lose agriculture in this County. Messer commented that what you are really trying to do is preserve and maintain agricultural activity. Harron stated this should not be viewed as a residential

development vs. a farmland issue as we may want to use land as open space or MSCP and we do not want to preclude those uses. Scarborough asked if *Preserve and maintain agricultural activity* was appropriate since it places agriculture as the only industry maintained in the Goals and Policies. County Counsel's solution was to use *Preserve and maintain agriculture*. A motion was made and seconded. Bowlby stated that agricultural uses and activities can be farmers markets and vegetable trucks driving through, so we need to maintain the industry of cultivation of the crops. Without the land, we end up with parking lots and residential. Scarborough asked whether the word agriculture included cultivation. Bowlby stated that it misses the point of having "land for" agriculture. Bowlby requested to separate the motion. Motion on Land Use Goal III, policy D was to amend the language to *Preserve and maintain agriculture*.

- **Vote:** 14 – 3 – 0, motion passed.
- **Motion:** Scarborough clarified the motion made on Land Use Goal III, policy E, to strike the language entirely.
- **Vote:** 9 – 6 – 2
- **Motion:** Doyle stated there is a disconnect between Land Use goals since Land Use Goal I contains "active" language and Land Use Goal II contains "passive" language. He requested to have staff make the language more proactive without changing the meaning, i.e. adding *ensure* to Land Use Goal II and using *maintenance*, as opposed to *maintain*, in Land Use Goal III. Scarborough clarified that Doyle is challenging the grammatical content and asked if a motion could be made. Elias commented that her understanding was that the goals were an end statement, which Pryor concurred. A motion and second was made. Scarborough commented that it was clear not to change the meaning. Tabb responded that it would be very difficult for staff to make the paragraphs consistent without changing the meaning. Pryor agreed with Tabb and commented on Land Use Goal I, which originated as *A built environment* and changed to *Plan for a built environment*. Tabb suggested leaving the language as-is as it may not be possible to do. Scarborough suggested that staff come back with their proposal for committee review. Pryde suggested adding *The goal is* in front of the sentence on Land Use Goal I. Scarborough stated that staff will take it into consideration, however, the motion stands to have staff review the language without changing the meaning.
- **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 0

Agenda Item II: Draft Revisions to the Goals & Policies –

Motion:	Approved Revision:
Land Use Goal IV	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy B: Stedt proposed using the word <i>intensities</i> rather than <i>levels</i>. Motion and second was made. Chase opposed the use of the word <i>shall</i>. Messer argued for the <i>shall</i>, stating that mandating a standard is established, not an outcome. Doyle agreed with Messer and the adoption of standards. Harron spoke to different levels of standards for different uses and stated that it may not work out that way. Pryor followed with using a different set of standards depending on the intensity of activity. He suggested Harron's language of <i>Locational development standards shall be established for industrial uses</i>, giving flexibility for what we want to accomplish. Harron stated he preferred Silver's version, <i>Establish standards for the location and development of industrial use</i>. Scarborough offered <i>Establish locational and development standards for industrial uses</i>. Motion to approve and second was made. ▪ Vote: 17 – 0 – 0 	<p><i>Establish locational and development standards for industrial uses.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy C: Whalen stated that <i>non-polluting</i> was vague and moved to approve <i>Encourage industrial uses that conform with all environmental regulations and are environmentally sensitive</i>. Motion was seconded. Silver stated that uses will have to conform with regulation anyway and that industrial uses should reduce pollution and have an objective to be as clean as possible. Coombs stated that <i>encourage</i> is meaningless and that we need a word to express intent, asking what kind of industry do we want to attract. Bowlby stated that we need to keep the language in for the environment and feels the intent is to promote "benign 	<p><i>Encourage industrial uses that are environmentally sensitive.</i></p>

industry". Pryde commented there is no industry that is non-polluting, and suggested *Encourage industrial uses that are environmentally sensitive*. Whalen agreed with the modification. Stedt suggested *Establish criteria* rather than *Encourage criteria*. Scarborough commented that uses were being established, not criteria. Silver suggested *Promote industry that is the most environmentally sensitive*. Harron questioned the meaning of the policy and asked if the policy was going to be used to say we want this business as opposed to another. The policy will not prevent an applicant from starting a business but a program based on development bonds may dictate where that money is spent. Pryor gave an example of two industries – one industrial park and one high-tech park – not competing activities, but making provisions for industrial activity through the industrial subdivision of land. An open junkyard will have to mitigate far more extensively than the high-tech parks. Adams suggested keeping the original motion with an added bullet point to “promote” environmental uses. Bowlby suggested keeping staff’s recommendation. Scarborough reiterated the motion, *Encourage industrial uses that conform with environmental regulations and are environmentally sensitive* and add a new bullet stating to *Promote industrial uses that are environmentally sensitive*, then strike policy G. Stedt suggested two bullets, one to promote environmental uses and the other to speak to environmental sensitivity. Elias suggested going back to the original motion, striking the non-polluting part, so it reads *Encourage industrial uses that are environmentally sensitive*. Amendment accepted.

▪ **Vote:** 14 – 3 – 0

▪ **Policy D:** Motion and second made to accept staff’s recommendation using *shall*. A question arose on the use of *shall*. Pryor explained industry will attract auto trips and consume resources. Accessibility ensures they will not be a drain on resources. A comment was made that the term *shall* is too mandatory. Coombs argued to keep *shall* in to prevent sprawling industry. Messer supported staff and felt it is not inflexible but rather a constraint on timing because there is a need for infrastructure before industry. Doyle agreed to keep *shall*. Bowlby supported *shall* because of smart growth policies. Stedt requested to use *should* because we cannot mandate convenience. Whalen argued for *should*, giving the example of Scripps Poway Industrial Park, which provided a tax base to provide infrastructure/roads. Pryor responded that we need to look at a plan that will be optimal for industrial and employment bases, thus plan for roads, but if you already have accessibility, site industrial parks where roads already exist and can accommodate the industrial activity. Added that staff can accept either *should* or *shall*, but do not bring in industry until you have the infrastructure to go with it, which can be done through many different types of development techniques. Stedt believed *shall* may be interpreted too strictly in the future. Higgins deferred to County Counsel on *should vs. shall*.

Industrial areas shall be accessible and convenient employment centers.

▪ **Vote:** 11 – 6 – 0

▪ **Policy E:** Chase moved to amend *shall* to *should*. Whalen seconded the motion. Coombs wanted an opportunity to mention housing/employment balance. Stedt encouraged it be a separate issue. Pryor suggested taking out *demonstrated need* and replacing *residential* with *surrounding uses*. Modifications accepted.

Location of new industrial centers should be based on projected population, demonstrated need, supporting infrastructure and compatibility with surrounding uses.

▪ **Vote:** 16 – 1 – 0

▪ **Policy F:** Adams moved to accept staff’s recommendation. Motion seconded. No discussion.

Encourage industrial uses that create quality employment opportunities.

▪ **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 0

▪ **Policy G:** Adams moved to support staff’s recommendation. Motion seconded.

Promote housing and

Messer questioned why the policy was being stricken. Pryor explained for legal and negative ramifications. Coombs suggested adding a new “G” that will *Promote a balance between jobs and housing in each community*. Pryor opposed this suggestion since it suggests building an industrial park in each community. The suggestion was fine until it stated *in each community*. He added that we want a balance, not a mandatory for each community. Another suggestion was *Promote a balance between jobs and housing*. Silver commented that the County is rich in jobs and suggested *Provide more housing near existing employment centers*. Pryde suggested taking into consideration the retirement communities that do not need the jobs and housing. Adams supported the amendment of *Promote a balance between jobs and housing*. Coombs suggested *Locate employment opportunities to minimize commuting*. Messer proposed to transfer this discussion to the Housing section. Barker commented that the topic is industrial development, so the language should read *Promote housing in proximity to industrial*. It was suggested to add *commercial and industrial* since jobs and needs change. Whalen suggested *employment centers* as they are not always industrial. He also commented that the County should think about low cost housing north of Riverside’s county line and having a job center in the North County area close to that. Stedt suggested *Employment opportunities close to existing housing*. Scarborough suggested *Promote housing and employment centers in proximity to one another*.

employment centers in proximity to one another.

- **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 0

Land Use Goal V

- **Policy A:** Motion to change *shall* to *should*. Second by Whalen. Chase argued for the *shall* and commented on smart growth and transportation. Barker asked about different modes of transportation. Pryor responded that the term includes rather than precludes any type of vehicle. Stedt had a problem with mandating policies that need to be more permissive and asked for to amend *different* to *various*. Bowlby stated we need alternatives for single occupant vehicles to industrial sites and suggested using *alternatives to* instead of *different*. Scarborough called for a vote on changing *shall* to *should* and *different* to *various*.

Commercial development shall be internally and externally convenient and accessible by various modes of transportation.

- **Vote:** 7 – 9 – 1
- Doyle moved to maintain the *shall* and change *different* to *various*. Motion seconded.
- **Vote:** 16 – 1 – 0

- **Policy B:** Motion and second to accept staff’s recommendation. Coombs suggested reverting back to the original language using *require*. Whalen disagreed. Doyle suggested *promote*. County Counsel commented on *encourage*. Bowlby stated *promote* is a stronger word and asked if there are situations where pedestrian orientation is not a good idea in shopping areas. Barker commented that we are talking about neighborhood shopping centers and not regional ones. Elias agreed with Coombs’s comment of *requiring* pedestrian orientation, referring to Otay Ranch’s walkable neighborhood commercial. Adams is in favor of *promote*. Elias asked if this policy could be used to establish standards, using the example of Mission Valley and how difficult it is to cross the street. Added that we need to provide standards to place shopping in logical locations. Whalen responded that Mission Valley was built in 1966 and the remodel of Fashion Valley is walkable. Commented that you cannot do standards but can do guidelines. Doyle questioned County staff about providing guidelines. Pryor commented that staff can provide guidelines. Bowlby supports language from Elias and Pryor – need standards and guidelines for walkability. Coombs prefers stronger language that will encourage people to walk to shopping centers due to increasing density.

Establish guidelines which promote pedestrian orientation to and within neighborhood shopping areas.

- **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 0

- **Policy C:** Chase moved to amend the language with the BIA’s proposal. Motion was seconded. Discussion on difference between neighborhood and commercial.

Varying intensities of commercial

<p>Pryor responded on different levels of service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vote: 16 – 0 – 1 	<p><i>development should be established based on the market area that they are intended to serve.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy D: Stehly moved to change <i>levels</i> to <i>intensities</i>. Motion seconded. ▪ Vote: 17 – 0 – 0 	<p><i>Establish Floor Area Ratios for different intensities of commercial development.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy E: Motion to accept staff’s recommendation. Stedt was concerned with the change. He spoke of <i>demonstrated need</i> and creating a market study for every project and stated that <i>demonstrated need</i> can be removed without impacting the statement. Also, suggested using <i>population projection</i> instead of <i>existing population</i>. Stehly suggested omitting <i>viability</i>. Adams stated that <i>viability of existing commercial areas</i> goes beyond the scope of General Plan and suggested it be replaced with <i>projected market demand</i>. Chase commented we want to inhibit commercial sprawl, so we want to know the market before building. Holler commented that we could use Land Use Goal IV, policy E as a template. Amendment accepted. Coombs was concerned about Barker’s comment of projected population, to look at existing commercial in determining needs for new commercial and not drive existing commercial out. Messer commented on Carlsbad and wanted to retain <i>demonstrated need</i>. Scarborough offered consistent with <i>current market demand</i> as a substitute. Whalen stated that without shopping centers, there is no place for redevelopment; the market will drive need. Messer stated you can help the market. Pryor did not want general plan language that locks staff into doing a market analysis. If we decide to balance services, commercial service has ratios that can be applied. A separate ordinance can be used if staff needs to get into a market analysis. Motion on table and seconded. Coombs asked about developing “big box” stores. Pryor commented on community preference vs. market demand using ratios. This [process] is to try to set the platform for what to take into consideration and know the communities preferences, then the legal basis for the ordinances will follow. ▪ Vote: 17 – 0 – 0 	<p><i>Development and location of commercial centers should be based on projected population, supporting infrastructure and compatibility with surrounding uses.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy F: Pryde moved to accept staff’s recommendation. Motion was seconded. ▪ Vote: 17 – 0 – 0 	<p><i>Commercial development should be aesthetically pleasing and functionally adequate with appropriate off-street parking, internal circulation, setbacks and landscaping.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy G: Whalen moved to amend the language with <i>respect community character</i>. Motion seconded. Messer requested staff’s reaction to the policy. Pryor commented that policy G is written poorly and staff is more comfortable with the community character issue since we can establish community character and then see whether the scale and bulk of a commercial proposal will stay within that characteristic. Doyle suggested using <i>shall</i>. Bowlby agreed. Whalen commented we have gone through the shall/should issue. Pryde suggested <i>respect community needs or desires</i>. ▪ Vote: 11 – 3 – 3 	<p><i>The scale and bulk of community development should respect community character.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy H: Whalen moved staff’s recommendation. Motion seconded. Doyle suggested omitting <i>where desirable</i>. Coombs suggested replacing <i>where desirable</i> with <i>no longer viable</i>. Whalen stated that was not always desirable as 	<p><i>Promote the redevelopment of existing commercial</i></p>

an area may be demographically shifted. Bowlby suggested where needed/appropriate. Adams commented that you need flexibility to change to housing development or other. Messer suggested to maintain community viability. Whalen supported promote over encourage.

areas where appropriate.

▪ **Vote:** 16 – 0 – 0

▪ **Policy I:** Doyle moved to amend the language with *Limit speculative rezones of commercial areas to village core areas where pedestrian and transit oriented mixed use will be provided*. Tabb moved to have staff obtain a definition of speculative rezone. Motion seconded. Scarborough noted the time and Coombs moved to postpone discussion to the next meeting, which was seconded. She further requested staff to think about language that will promote mixed commercial and residential.

Staff review

Agenda Item III: Process –

- Holler stated that the map data should be returned this week and staff will analyze the maps and check for errors. Depending upon the outcome of the review, the map could be out as early as the next meeting, however he would prefer the attorney review it prior to handing out the map.
- Holler explained the handouts and why there were several different copies. Included in the handouts were Draft Goals and Policies amended by the Board of Supervisors, dated 1/10/01, described as the Steering Committee's proposed goals and policies and is provided for reference. The second handout titled Draft Revisions to General Plan 2020 Goals and Policies, dated March 2002, are staff recommended changes. The third handout, Draft Revisions to the Goals and Policies Amended by the Interest Group Committee| 2nd Review as of 2-19-02, represents actions from the Interest Group through the last meeting. The last item handed out was changes proposed from the Building Industry Association for reference. In the future, the handouts will include only the 3-column version, to alleviate confusion.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

- David Nilson commented on amending the General Plan and stated that it is very important that TDRs be established through the process.
- Dutch Van Dierendonck requested that we all vote for proposition 40.
- A member of the public commented on how people were asking whether the process was going to end and requested a timeline "from now until the end", asking what are the dates, are we behind and where are we.