

## COMMENTS

## RESPONSES



J. LAURENCE MINTIER, FAICP  
MINTIER & ASSOCIATES

### EDUCATION

Master of City Planning  
University of California, Berkeley  
Master of Public Administration  
University of California, Berkeley  
Bachelor of Arts, Political Science  
University of California, Los Angeles

### CERTIFICATIONS/ AFFILIATIONS

American Institute of Certified  
Planners, Fellow  
American Planning Association  
California Planning Roundtable, Emeritus  
Planner Emeritus Network

### EXPERIENCE

Mintier & Associates  
President  
Mintier Harnish  
Principal  
Governor's Office of  
Planning and Research  
Senior Associate  
City of Napa  
Associate Planner  
United Nations Research Institute for  
Social Development, Geneva, Switzerland  
Consultant  
International Labor Organization,  
Geneva, Switzerland  
Consultant

### PROJECTS

General plans for over 50 cities and  
counties throughout California  
Environmental impact reports for over  
15 general plans and other projects  
Zoning and subdivision ordinance revisions  
for nearly a dozen cities and counties  
Litigation support in over  
25 land use lawsuits

mintierassociates@gmail.com

**Mintier  
& Associates**  
PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Larry Mintier is President of Mintier & Associates and a Project Advisor at Mintier Harnish. He has worked for over 100 public agencies and over 60 private clients and law firms. Larry supervised his firm's work in preparing over 50 general plans, including 16 county general plans; 70 housing elements; nearly a dozen zoning and subdivision ordinances; and numerous other special studies and projects. Many of these projects involved managing multidisciplinary teams and the preparation of environmental impact reports.

Larry specializes in land use planning and policy, housing, seismic safety, intergovernmental relations, permit facilitation, and land use litigation support.

Larry is a frequent lecturer and panelist on State law and local planning practice and has taught regularly for various University of California Extension programs. He also has been retained over 25 times as a consultant and expert witness in land use litigation.

Prior to establishing Mintier Harnish in 1985, Larry worked for the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, specializing in planning, land use, and environmental issues. There he directed the preparation of California's 1980 General Plan Guidelines and 1982 revisions. He also directed other major projects, drafted and reviewed legislation, conducted training programs for local officials, and administered planning grants.

Prior to joining the Governor's Office, Larry worked as a planner for the City of Napa. His international experience includes consulting positions with the International Labor Organization and the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development in Geneva, Switzerland.

PCI7-1

### Response to Comment PCI7-1

This White Paper is a focused discussion of village principles based on the County General Plan, and applicability of stated County policies and guidelines as found in the General Plan and applicable Community Plan relative to HGV South. The paper is consistent with analyses found in the EIR as the Global Responses to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4, and General Plan/Community Plan Amendments CEQA Impact Analysis. No response is required.

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE HARMONY GROVE VILLAGE SOUTH PROPOSAL</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Prepared by J. Laurence Mintier, FAICP, Mintier &amp; Associates</i></p> <p>RSC Harmony Partners, LLC, is proposing to develop a 111-acre residential project in the Harmony Grove Village area of San Diego County. The project application package includes General Plan/Community Plan Amendments, RPO (steep slopes) wavier, specific plan, rezone, major use permit, and site plan to develop 453 single- and multi-family residential units within 229 structures and a 5,000 square foot facility that will support recreation and community uses in addition to commercial space.</p> <p>RCS Harmony Partners has retained Mintier &amp; Associates to prepare this white paper providing an independent analysis of key issues relating to the Harmony Grove Village South proposal and its relationship to the San Diego General Plan General Plan. The purpose of the white paper is to provide background and context for the County's consideration of the Harmony Grove Village South proposal in light of planning practice in California.</p> <p>The main aspects of the Harmony Grove Village South proposal considered in this white paper are the following three proposed actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A General Plan Amendment (GPA) to redesignate a portion of the property from Semi-Rural Regional Category to Village Regional Category and change the land use designation from Semi-Rural Residential 0.5 to Village Residential 10.9 and Neighborhood Commercial.</li> <li>• A Community Plan Amendment to add HGV South as an independent but compatible component of the HGV Specific Plan area, revise portions of the Community Plan text for General Plan conformance, and adjust the Village Boundary line; and</li> <li>• A Specific Plan (SP) to provide detail on proposed uses</li> </ul> <p>Although the Harmony Grove Village South proposal does propose to change land use designations, Community Plan policies, and the Village Boundary, it does not propose to change any of the principles or basic goals or policies of the countywide General Plan.</p> <p>This white paper discusses several of the key issues that have been identified during the course of project planning and public review over the last four and a half years. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature and structure of general plans</li> <li>• Internal general plan consistency</li> <li>• General plan consistency in implementation</li> <li>• Monitoring and amending the general plan</li> <li>• Community Development Model and Villages</li> </ul> <p>HGVS White Paper 1 May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<div data-bbox="268 313 457 358"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contiguity</li> <li>• Community character</li> </ul> </div> <div data-bbox="239 381 485 402"> <p><b>SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS</b></p> </div> <div data-bbox="268 407 949 1227"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The San Diego County General Plan, like most general plans, is structured as a hierarchy of policy statements ranging from the broadest, most general to the most specific. In the case of the San Diego County General Plan, Guiding Principles sit atop the hierarchy with Community Plans and implementation programs occupying the lowest tiers.</li> <li>• The San Diego County General Plan explicitly acknowledges the requirement for internal consistency, particularly in connection with Community Plans.</li> <li>• The San Diego County General Plan specifically acknowledges the nature of consistency in general plan implementation in the follow statement: "The policies contained within this General Plan were written to be a clear statement of policy but also to allow flexibility when it comes to implementation. Policies cannot be applied independently; rather, implementation of the policies must be balanced with one another and will address details such as how and when the policy is applied and any relevant exceptions."</li> <li>• The San Diego County General Plan recognizes the need for monitoring and updating the General Plan as conditions and needs change. To this end, the County's General Plan Implementation Plan provides for monitoring and amending the General Plan in four programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Annual Progress Reviews</li> <li>◦ Consistency of Land Use Map changes for consistency with General Plan goals and policies</li> <li>◦ Criteria for reviewing General Plan amendments</li> <li>◦ Updating Community Plans</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The San Diego County General Plan uses the concept of "Villages" as a key tool within a larger land use framework of a "Community Development Model" in striving to achieve a balance between resource protection and growth accommodation. As the General Plan notes: "Focusing development in and around existing unincorporated communities allows the County to maximize existing infrastructure, provides for efficient service delivery, and strengthens town center areas while preserving the rural landscape that helps define the unique character of the unincorporated County."</li> <li>• San Diego County General Plan Policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.4 clearly provide for and anticipate the designation of new villages and village expansions, both of which would require General Plan amendments.</li> </ul> </div> <div data-bbox="982 808 1043 829"> <p>PCI7-1</p> </div> <div data-bbox="239 1300 949 1321"> <div> <div>HGVS White Paper</div> <div>2</div> <div>May 22, 2018</div> </div> </div>	

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>Countywide there are more than 30 designated Villages. A diagram on Page 2-4 of the General Plan illustrates the Community Development Model concept, showing a Village in the center surrounded by Semi-Rural and Rural Lands. The Regional Categories Map (Figure LU-1) in the General Plan reveals, however, that there is no standard pattern for the Villages and that the shapes and sizes of the villages vary widely throughout the county.</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan and its various component plans have treated the Harmony Grove Village differently over time. Originally (2007), the Village was defined as consisting of four planning areas totaling 468 acres. However (in 2011), a Village Boundary line was superimposed on the Village that excluded the southern 36 acres of Area 4 consisting of the Equestrian Ranch.</p> <p>General Plan Policy LU-1.4 provides for a Village expansion where the expansion is “contiguous” to an existing or planned Village. On one hand, if Harmony Grove Village is considered to include all four Planning Areas as originally defined by the 2007 Elfin Forest/ Harmony Grove Plan, then the proposed 111-acre Harmony Grove Village South project would be literally adjacent along Country Club Drive on the west side to the Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 4). If on the other hand, the smaller Village Boundary line is used to define the existing Harmony Grove Village, the Harmony Grove Village South project is located 500 feet from the Village Boundary along Harmony Grove Road, essentially separated by Escondido Creek. In both cases the basic intent of Policy LU-1.4 is satisfied.</p> <p>General Plan Policy LU-1.4 stipulates that village expansion must be “consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area.” The proposed Harmony Grove Village South Specific Plan includes extensive policies and guidelines for site design, architectural design, and landscape design to ensure that Harmony Grove Village South will develop complementing and compatible with the existing and evolving community character of the Harmony Grove Village.</p> <p><b>NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF GENERAL PLANS</b></p> <p>State law requires every city and county in California to prepare and adopt a general plan. The general plan must be comprehensive, long term, internally consistent, and address at least seven topics or elements (i.e., land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety) (Government Code Sections 65300 et seq.) The general plan must consist of a “statement of development policies” and must include diagrams and text setting forth “objectives, principles, standards, and proposals.” (Government Code 65302) State law leaves decisions concerning the structure and format of the plan to each local government. Typically, general plans are organized in a hierarchy of policy directives with more general principles at the top of the hierarchy followed by goals and policies and land use and circulation directives (e.g., land use and circulation diagrams) and implementation measures at the bottom of the hierarchy. Compared to city general plans, county general plans have a have a special</p> <p>HGVS White Paper 3 May 22, 2018</p>	<p>PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>challenge in addressing the extensive territory and the diversity of landscapes and conditions within their geographic boundaries. Because of this, county general plans typically include multiple community plans that provide more detailed policy direction for specific subareas of the unincorporated county territory.</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan, like most general plans, is structured as a hierarchy of policy statements ranging from the broadest, most general to the most specific. In the case of the San Diego County General Plan, Guiding Principles sit atop the hierarchy with community plans and implementation programs occupying the lowest tiers.</p> <p>More specifically, the San Diego County General Plan, which was last comprehensively updated in 2011, includes the following parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Vision Statement and Guiding Principles</li> <li>• Six topical elements including goals and policies and other policy directives (e.g., land use and circulation diagrams) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Land Use</li> <li>○ Circulation (Mobility)</li> <li>○ Conservation and Open Space</li> <li>○ Housing</li> <li>○ Safety</li> <li>○ Noise</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An Implementation Chapter</li> <li>• Acronyms and Glossary</li> <li>• Appendices</li> <li>• 20+ separately bound community plans</li> </ul> <p><b>Guiding Principles</b></p> <p>At the top of the policy hierarchy in the San Diego County General Plan are ten overarching principles. The plan basically says that all the maps, goals, policies, and implementation programs of the General Plan are derived from these ten principles:</p> <p><i>Principle 1. Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 2. Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 3. Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of exiting communities when planning new housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 4. Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 5. Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and natural hazards of the land.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p> <p>HGVS White Paper                      4                      May 22, 2018</p>	

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><i>Principle 6. Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns and, when appropriate, plan for development which supports public transportation.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 7. Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 9. Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development.</i></p> <p><i>Principle 10. Recognize community and shareholder interests while striving for consensus. (SDCGP Page 2-6)</i></p> <p><b>Community Plans</b></p> <p>Community plans in the San Diego County General Plan play a particularly important role because of the great diversity of conditions and communities in the county unincorporated area.</p> <p><i>Community plans are policy plans specifically created to address the issues, characteristics, and visions of communities within the County. These diverse communities each have a distinct physical setting with a unique history, culture, character, life style, and identity. Community and subregional plans, thus provide a framework for addressing the critical issues and concerns that are unique to a community and are not reflected in the broader policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan. These goals and policies are designed to provide more precise guidance regarding the character, land uses, and densities within each community planning area. Generally, these goals and policies are more limiting and restrictive than the countywide goals and policies, consistent with State legislation for internal consistency. The Community Plans are adopted as integral parts of this General Plan but bound separately, and must be referenced in determining the types and density of land use that may be considered for any property within the community planning area. (SDCGP, Page 1-11)</i></p> <p><b>INTERNAL GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY</b></p> <p>State law requires two types of general plan consistency: internal consistency and consistency in implementation.</p> <p>This first type of consistency, sometimes referred to as "horizontal consistency," is required by Government Code Section 65300.5 as follows: "In construing the provisions of this article, the Legislature intends that the general plan and elements and parts thereof comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency."</p> <p>OPR's General Plan Guidelines (2017), supported by case law, interprets this law to require consistency in five dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equal status among elements</li> <li>• Consistency between elements</li> <li>• Consistency within elements</li> </ul> <p>HGVS White Paper 5 May 22, 2018</p>	<p>PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area plan consistency</li> <li>• Text and diagram consistency</li> </ul> <p>The San Diego County General Plan explicitly acknowledges the requirement for internal consistency, particularly in connection with community plans, as follows:</p> <p><i><b>LU-2.2 Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan.</b> Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.</i></p> <p><b>GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY IN IMPLEMENTATION</b></p> <p>The second type of consistency, often referred to as “vertical consistency,” requires that most tools and actions local governments use to implement their general plan be consistent with the general plan. Beginnings with zoning and subdivision consistency in 1971, the State Legislature and the courts have added nearly two dozen consistency requirements to the law.</p> <p>OPR’s General Plan Guidelines (2017) sets out the following general rule for consistency determinations: “An action, program, or project is consistent with the general plan if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the general plan and will not inhibit or obstruct their attainment.” (OPRGPG Page 255)</p> <p>The courts, legal experts, and planning practitioners have recognized that making consistency findings requires a broad perspective and a good faith effort to interpret policies in a reasonable manner. OPR’s General Plan Guidelines provides the following additional guidance:</p> <p><i>Any given project need not be in perfect conformity with each and every policy of the general plan if those policies are not relevant or leave the city or county room for interpretation (Sequoayah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland, (1998) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 719 (1993)). In Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332, 1341, the court held that “[t]he nature of the policy and the nature of the inconsistency are critical factors to consider.” A project is clearly inconsistent when it conflicts with one or more specific, fundamental, and mandatory policies of the general plan (Id. at p. 1342). (OPR GP, Page 255)</i></p> <p>For most discretionary decisions local governments must make formal findings of consistency with the general plan. In some cases a project approval may also require approval of a general plan amendment to maintain consistency with one more policies or aspects of the general plan. Typically in these cases, the amendment does not involve a change in the general plan’s guiding principles, goal statements, or fundamental policies, but focuses on more specific changes (e.g., change in the land use designation of a particular property) which are still consistent with higher level policy directives of the general plan.</p> <p>HGVS White Paper                      6                      May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>The courts will not overturn consistency determinations of local government unless they find the determination is arbitrary, capricious, or lacking in evidentiary support.</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan includes the following discussion of consistency in implementation:</p> <p><i>The policies contained within this General Plan were written to be a clear statement of policy but also to allow flexibility when it comes to implementation. Policies cannot be applied independently; rather, implementation of the policies must be balanced with one another and will address details such as how and when the policy is applied and any relevant exceptions. For example, a policy to conserve open space is not a mandate for preservation of 100 percent of the existing undeveloped land in the County. It must be balanced with other policies that allow development and other uses of the land. In this case, implementation of the policy in new developments will be achieved through regulations such as the Resource Protection Ordinance, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and California Environmental Quality Act, which will guide to what degree open space must be conserved. (SDCGP, Page 1-5)</i></p> <p><b>Harmony Grove Village South Consistency Analysis</b></p> <p>Two documents provide detailed analysis of the HGVS proposal's consistency with the San Diego County General Plan. As required by State law (Government Code Section 65451), the Draft Harmony Grove Village South Specific Plan contains a 24-page analysis of the consistency of the Specific Plan and other entitlements with the San Diego County General Plan (pages 107-131). Likewise, the Harmony Grove Village South Draft EIR contains a lengthy assessment of the project's consistency with the San Diego County General Plan. (Pages 3.1.6-1 to 58)</p> <p><b>MONITORING AND AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN</b></p> <p>The general plan is a dynamic public policy document with a long-term focus. While it reflects current community values, politics and conditions at the time it was adopted, these values, politics, and conditions change over time and the general plan should evolve with these changes. Tracking these changes requires local government to monitor the implementation of their general plan and to assess how well the general plan is addressing changing challenges.</p> <p>To this end, State law requires local governments to prepare and submit an annual report to their legislative body, the Office of Planning and Research, and the Department of Housing and Community Development on the status of their general plan and progress in its implementation. (Government Code section 65400(a)(2)(A)) The annual report provides the local government an opportunity to identify how effectively its plan is being implemented and what changes are appropriate to keep up with changing times and new opportunities.</p> <p>OPR's General Plan Guidelines has for many years advocated local governments undertake a thorough review of its general plan every five years and revise the document as necessary. As a practical matter, local governments have tended more typically to undertake such comprehensive reviews every ten or so years.</p> <p>HGVS White Paper 7 May 22, 2018</p>	<p>PCI7-1</p>



COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>State law provides that a local government may not amend any one of the mandatory elements of the general plan more than four times in one calendar year. (Government Code Section 65358(b)) But the law also provides that each amendment may include more than one change to the general plan. At up to four times during the year, many local governments bundle together several proposals for change, review them individually, and analyze their cumulative effects before adopting them.</p> <p>In short, California law and practice recognizes that the general plan should be regularly monitored and amended and updated as deemed appropriate by the legislative body.</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan recognizes the need for the General Plan to be monitored and updated as appropriate:</p> <p><i>The General Plan is intended to be a dynamic document and must be periodically updated to respond to changing community needs. An annual review of the plan is required to ensure that it remains relevant. Moreover, any of the Plan's mandatory elements may be amended up to four times per year. Any proposed amendment will be reviewed to ensure that the change is in the public interest and would not be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. Environmental review is required for substantive General Plan amendments.... (SDCGP, Page 1-5)</i></p> <p>The County's General Plan Implementation Plan includes four programs that speak directly to the issues of monitoring and updating:</p> <p><b>Program 1.2.1.A: General Plan Review.</b> Conduct annual progress reviews and prepare an annual status report on the implementation of the General Plan. Initiate "maintenance" amendments to the General Plan, as necessary, to resolve problems as they arise during implementation of the General Plan.</p> <p><b>Program 1.2.1.B: General Plan Amendments.</b> Limit changes to the Land Use Map through review of General Plan Amendments for consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan.</p> <p><b>Program 1.2.1.C: General Plan Amendment Guidelines.</b> Revise Board Policy I-63, General Plan Amendment and Zoning Guidelines, to reflect that amendment requests should generally conform with the guiding principles and goals and policies of the updated General Plan, including to minimize leapfrog development and to establish specific criteria for GPAs proposing expansion of areas designated Village Regional Category; provide additional public benefit to the community; and demonstrate access to available public facilities to serve the proposal. This is intended to limit unexpected demands for new water and wastewater facilities. Ensure internal procedures reflect changes to Board Policy I-63.</p> <p><b>Program 1.2.1.D: Community Plans.</b> Maintain, and update as necessary, Community Plans to identify the individual community character for each community, along with community-specific planning and design issues such as local public and fire access road networks, town center and specific area plans, and design guidelines. Community Plans, adopted as an integral part of the County's General Plan, are policy plans specifically</p> <p>HGVS White Paper 8 May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><i>created to address the issues, characteristics, and visions of communities within the County. (Pages 7 and 8)</i></p> <p>San Diego County has prepared General Plan Annual Progress Reports every year since 2012. Each of these reports documents the number and nature of general plan amendments adopted in the previous year. Some of these amendments include multiple changes, some amend community plans, and others were adopted in connection with specific development projects.</p> <p>Finally, The San Diego County General Plan Policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.4 clearly provide for and anticipate the designation of new villages and the village expansions, both of which would require General Plan amendments (see discussion below).</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MODEL AND VILLAGES</b></p> <p>As noted above, county general plans have a special challenge in terms of balancing resource protection with accommodating future growth and development. It is typical in county general plans for counties to steer growth to specific areas of the unincorporated county where there is either existing or potential capacity in facilities and services to serve new growth and where the impacts on natural resources can be minimized. This issue is typically addressed through community plans, urban, service, or community boundary lines, and criteria or policies for expansion of these communities.</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan uses the concept of "Villages" as a key tool within a larger land use framework of a "Community Development Model" in striving to achieve a balance between resource protection and growth accommodation, as described below.</p> <p><i>The [San Diego County] General Plan guides the intensity, location, and distribution of land uses in the unincorporated County through a two-tier land use framework. The first tier, <b>Regional Categories</b>, establishes a hierarchy for the overall structure and organization of development that differentiates areas by overall character and density, while the second tier, <b>Land Use Designations</b>, disaggregates these categories and provide more precise direction regarding the planned density and intensity of residential, commercial, industrial, open space, and public land uses. (SDCGP Page 3-6)</i></p> <p><i>A major component to guiding the physical planning of the County is the <b>Community Development Model</b> (discussed in Chapter 2). The Community Development Model is implemented by three regional categories— Village, Semi-Rural, and Rural Lands—that broadly reflect the different character and land use development goals of the County's developed areas, its lower-density residential and agricultural areas, and its very low-density or undeveloped rural lands (see Figure LU-1 [Regional Categories Map] at the end of the section). The Community Development Model directs the highest intensities and greatest mix of uses to <b>Village</b> areas, while directing lower-intensity uses, such as estate-style residential lots and agricultural operations, to <b>Semi-Rural</b> areas. The Semi-Rural category may effectively serve as an edge to the Village, as well as a transition to the lowest-density category, <b>Rural Lands</b>, which represents large open space areas where only limited development may occur. (SDCGP Page 3-6)</i></p> <p>HGVS White Paper 9 May 22, 2018</p>	<p>PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><i>The Village category identifies areas where a higher intensity and a wide range of land uses are established or have been planned. Typically, Village areas function as the center of community planning areas and contain the highest population and development densities. Village areas are typically served by both water and wastewater systems. Ideally, a Village would reflect a development pattern that is characterized as compact, higher density development that is located within walking distance of commercial services, employment centers, civic uses, and transit (when feasible). (SDCGP Page 3-7)</i></p> <p>The Village is a core concept and powerful tool in the San Diego County General Plan as the primary method for accommodating the county's future unincorporated growth. As the General Plan notes: "Focusing development in and around existing unincorporated communities allows the County to maximize existing infrastructure, provides for efficient service delivery, and strengthens town center areas while preserving the rural landscape that helps define the unique character of the unincorporated County" (SDCGP, Page 3-2).</p> <p>The village concept is not widely used in California general plans nor is there a standard definition of the term in planning literature. The San Diego County General Plan does not define the term "village" precisely. But in describing villages and their function, the plan identifies several characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher densities</li> <li>• Wide range of land uses</li> <li>• Typically center of the community planning area</li> <li>• Highest population and development densities</li> <li>• Typically served by water and wastewater systems</li> <li>• Compact, higher density, development located within walking distance of commercial services, employment centers, civic uses, and transit (when feasible)</li> </ul> <p>Countywide there are more than 30 designated Villages. A diagram on Page 2-4 of the General Plan illustrates the Community Development Model concept showing a Village in the center surrounded by Semi-Rural and Rural Lands. The Regional Categories Map (Figure LU-1) in the General Plan reveals, however, that there is no standard pattern for the Villages and that the shapes and sizes of the villages vary widely throughout county.</p> <p>The General Plan Land Use Element includes a goal and set of related policies concerning the implementation of the Community Development Model. Two of the policies in this section are particularly relevant to the designation and expansion of Villages:</p> <p><b><i>LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development.</i></b> <i>Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.](SDCGP Page 3-23)</i></p> <p>HGV5 White Paper                      10                      May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PC17-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><b>LU-1.4 Village Expansion.</b> Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding</li> <li>▪ Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network</li> <li>▪ Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents</li> <li>▪ The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area (SDCGP Page 3-24)</li> </ul> <p>The first of these two policies clearly countenances and anticipates the designation of new villages based on specific criteria as a means of preventing leapfrog development. The second policy clearly countenances and anticipates the expansion of existing villages, again based on specific criteria.</p> <p><b>Village versus Village Boundary</b></p> <p>In addition to the more general village concept, the San Diego County General Plan uses the term "Village Boundary" and defines it as follows: "Village Boundary—A line delineated in a Community Plan that defines the extent of a village or rural village as a means to direct future growth and identify where development should be directed. These boundaries may also serve as the basis for community specific goals and policies" (SDCGP, Page 10-32). Presumably, a Village Boundary line would encompass all the territory within its related village, but that is not the case for Harmony Grove Village.</p> <p>The San Diego County Board of Supervisors adopted the Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment in February 2007. The Harmony Grove Village plan encompasses 468 acres and is divided into following four planning areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PA 1 Village Center, 210 acres, 519 potential dwelling units</li> <li>• PA 2 Hillside, 138 acres, 124 potential units</li> <li>• The Groves, 84 acres, 95 potential units</li> <li>• Equestrian Ranch, 36 acres, 4 potential units</li> </ul> <p>The plan includes goals and policies and detailed land use, design, and landscape guidelines for each of the four planning areas.</p> <p>The San Diego County Board of Supervisors adopted the updated San Dieguito Community Plan in August 2011. Figure 4 in the plan designates all four planning areas as shown in the 2007 Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment as "Specific Plan" but excludes Planning 4 from the Village Boundary. The plan includes goals and policies that are applicable throughout the community plan area as well as to various subareas, but provides very little guidance relative to Harmony Grove Village.</p> <p>HGVS White Paper                      11                      May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>Also in 2011, the San Diego County Board of Supervisors adopted the existing Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove portion of the San Dieguito Community Plan. It is more policy plan than a development plan, consisting mostly of goals and policies for topics addressed in the General Plan but focusing on the Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove communities. The plan includes four pages of goals and policies, which are based largely on the 2007 Harmony Grove plan (Pages 48-51).</p> <p>The Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove plan in Figures 1 and 3 designates all four planning areas as shown in the 2007 Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment as "Specific Plan" but excludes Planning Area 4 from the Village Boundary. The Harmony Grove Village South proposal would amend these figures to include the 111-acre expansion area within the Village Boundary. It would also amend various policies and text of the plan to accommodate the inclusion of the Harmony Grove Village South expansion area.</p> <p>In short, the San Diego County General Plan and its various component plans have treated the Harmony Grove Village differently over time, originally identifying the Village as consisting of four Planning Areas totaling 468 acres. However, a Village Boundary line was superimposed on the village that excluded the southern 36 acres consisting of the Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 4)</p> <p><b>CONTIGUOUS</b>  Various stakeholders and commentators interested in the Harmony Grove Village South proposal have advanced different definitions of the term "contiguous" used in Policy LU-1.4. A narrower definition cited means "physically touching," while the broader definition includes the concept of "adjacency" and "nearness," when if not literally touching. In interpreting Land Use Policy LU-1.4, this may be a distinction without a difference in terms of its importance to public policy.</p> <p>On one hand, if Harmony Grove Village is considered to include all four Planning Areas as originally defined by the 2007 Elfin Forest/ Harmony Grove plan, then the proposed 111-acre Harmony Grove Village South project would be literally adjacent along Country Club Drive on the west side to the Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 4). If on the other hand, the smaller Village Boundary line is used to define the existing Harmony Grove Village, the Harmony Grove Village South project is located approximately 500 feet from the Village Boundary along Harmony Grove Road, essentially separated by Escondido Creek. In both cases the basic intent of Policy LU-1.4 is satisfied.</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY CHARACTER</b>  General Plan Policy LU-1.4 stipulates that village expansion must be "consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area."</p> <p>The San Diego County General Plan contains the following general guidance concerning community character:</p> <p><i>As the County continues to grow, it is critical that development be located, scaled, and designed to retain and enhance the qualities that distinguish its communities. Development planning must consider uses; parcel sizes; building form, scale, massing, and architecture; landscapes; and site development practices that are comparable to, or</i></p> <p>HGVS White Paper 12 May 22, 2018</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PCI7-1</p>

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><i>transition with, existing development to ensure that new development “fits” with the community. (SDCGP, Page 2-9)</i></p> <p>The General Plan defines community character as follows: “The aggregate of features and traits that form the individual nature and uniqueness of a community. The constructed and natural landmarks and surroundings that cause someone to identify with a particular place or community. This character is shaped by natural, cultural, societal, and economic forces” (SDCGP, Page 10-10).</p> <p>The community character of Harmony Grove is defined today by the surrounding rural development that has existed for decades and the new development occurring in Harmony Grove Village. The new development has been shaped by the 2007 Harmony Grove Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment and the Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove portion of the San Dieguito Community Plan. The 2007 Harmony Grove Specific Plan/General Plan Amendment contains fairly detailed guidelines for land uses, lot layout, building design, overall design, landscaping, and circulation for all four Planning Areas defined in the plan. These are the guidelines that are guiding buildout of the Harmony Grove Village, which is still in process.</p> <p>The proposed Harmony Grove Village South Specific Plan includes extensive policies and guidelines for site design, architectural design, and landscape design to ensure that Harmony Grove Village South will develop complementing and compatible with the existing and evolving community character of the Harmony Grove Village. Compatibility with the existing and evolving character would be achieved through multiple land use, design, and circulation features, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compact development with the most intense new uses within half a mile of the HGV Village Center where HGV’s highest densities are located.</li> <li>• Extension of the existing system of interconnected trails and pathways.</li> <li>• Use of consistent street trees, similar planting materials, lighting, signage, walls, fences, and architecture to provide a continuous link between HGV and HGV South.</li> <li>• Architectural design that reflects the rural character and agricultural heritage of the Harmony Grove community.</li> <li>• Smaller lot single-family development would replicate the character and design of the existing development in HGV. Multi-family housing types would be designed to appear as detached single-family homes or rustic/agricultural buildings.</li> <li>• Retention of more than half the project site (58 acres) along the southern portion of the site in very low density Semi –Rural Residential development and open space.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">* * *</p> <p>PCI7-1</p> <p>HGVS White Paper 13 May 22, 2018</p>	