General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Alexandria Elias	American Planning Association
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Constance Clover	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
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:

Ali Shahmiri	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
David Nilson	NCCE & LSA
Dave Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona Grasslands
Jeanne Pagett	
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Tim Popejoy (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

a) "Tools" Sub-committee Update
   - Larson stated that the committee re-requested to meet with Rick Pruetz to propose ideas from the sub-committee. The group has an actual recommendation produced by Jim Whalen and Dan Silver. He added that from a staff's perspective, there are two or three tasks that need to be accomplished before we get into the group's suggestions on tools.

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

Motion:	*Approved Revision:*
Land Use Goal V	
▪ **Policy I**: Higgins moved to strike the policy. Lambron seconded the motion. Coombs asked staff to elaborate on what was meant by the policy and whether it meant that if an area was zoned commercial, it could not be rezoned to mixed-use or high density housing. Holler stated that staff's position is that it is not appropriate as a General Plan policy to say to limit speculative rezones. Popejoy added that the original creators of this document was the Steering Committee, so it is not known what was meant originally by this policy. Stepner agreed that this policy does not belong in the General Plan. Coombs also added that there needs to be a policy under Land Use that provides for mixed-use development. Scarborough mentioned that it was addressed under Housing and believed there was general concurrence to have a policy address this. ▪ **Vote**: 12 – 0 – 1	*Delete*
▪ **Policy J**: Adams moved to strike the policy because he felt it was too restrictive. Clover seconded the motion. Silver stated that if we are trying to create the community core as a functional center, then we do not want to have strip commercial at highway interchanges that will draw competition and thus, *discourage* is too weak of a word. Higgins thinks that this policy should be stated as a standard rather than a policy. Coombs proposed the following language: *Commercial centers should be developed in core areas and in compact configurations, and strip commercial development should be eliminated*. The group did not agree with the suggestion. Stepner suggested changing the policy with *that reinforce and compliment the village core.* Stedt suggested adding *and core support areas*. Maker and seconder of the motion accepted the amendments. Bowlby felt that the amendment weakened the policy. Silver suggested replacing *encourage* with *preferentially place*. The group suggested using *preferentially site*. Harron stated that *encourage* does hold up in court even though it has some flexibility and suggested the group not dwell on replacing the word. Coombs stated that she was confused about *reinforce and compliment* because that type of language would create more strip commercial development in areas like Ramona. Stepner responded that this does not refer to existing conditions but rather the General Plan policies that we are going to develop. ▪ **Vote**: 13 – 2 – 0	*Preferentially site the development of commercial centers that reinforce and compliment the village core and core support areas.*
▪ **Policy K**: Stedt moved to amend the policy with the BIA's language. Tabb seconded the motion. Holler commented that he felt *infrastructure* was a better choice because it encompasses other uses. Coombs stated that the word *shall* should be used in this instance since we want adequate infrastructure. Bowlby agreed with Coombs and opposed the weakening of the policy. ▪ **Vote**: 11 – 4 – 0	*The size and location of commercial centers should be based on existing and planned infrastructure.*
Circulation Goal I	
▪ Adams moved to accept staff's recommendations on policies A, B, C, and D. Higgins seconded the motion. A request was made to move the policies separately because there were suggestions for amendments on individual policies.	

▪ **Policy A**: Pryde proposed adding *that are appropriate*. ▪ **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0 ▪ After discussing policies B, C, and D, the group suggested changing *road* to *transportation network.* This vote was carried through with the motion on policies B, C, and D.	*Establish transportation network standards that are appropriate for different community types: urban, suburban and rural.*
▪ **Policy B, C, D, E**: Bowlby suggested adding *and public transit system*. Larson disagreed with this suggestion because he felt the policy should not combine the road network and public transit system but rather have a pure public transit policy than mixing the policies. Stepner supported leaving the public transit system in because the road network is where the public transit goes or is accessed in most of the unincorporated areas. Elias thought that by leaving it in, it makes the County responsible for something they have no control over. Holler stated that Counsel preferred *design* or *plan for* instead of *ensure*. Coombs was worried about eliminating the word *ensure* because it communicates the intent that we are not going to just plan for it but rather implement it as well. Adams suggested changing *road network* to *multi-modal transportation system*. Bowlby pointed out that the policy basically restates the goal. Barker added that the policies should be supporting the goal and be more specific and thus, policy B is not necessary. Messer wanted to revert back to the original wording. Higgins stated that we need to be more specific of *multi-modal* and agreed that we could not *ensure* but could *plan for*. Adams suggested reverting back to the original wording to get rid of ambiguity. Messer stated that *public transit* should be included because we are trying to move to a new public transit orientation, so there is a need to emphasize this. Larson suggested having separate policies for roads, public transit, and multi-use – to have B, C, and D use the same language but address different types of transportation. Adams moved to separate the policies to address: roads, public transportation, trails, and multi-use. Higgins seconded the motion. It was then suggested to have policy A become the overarching policy and change *road* to *transportation network*. Coombs and Messer wanted to take advantage of Barker's offer to bring in outside information on this topic because they feel that no professional opinion was provided. Coombs felt the *trails system* was too vague and should specify pedestrian, horse, or bike. Scarborough stated that the group did not address policy C and was willing to add *design guidelines*. Pryde stated that he did not see *trails* as a means for *safe, efficient movement of people and goods*. ▪ **Vote**: 7 – 7 – 1 ▪ Larson moved to accept policies B, C, D, and E as discussed, subject to having staff create a template for the separation in policies, as discussed above, review of Barker's alternative language, and language on fees. Messer seconded the motion. ▪ **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0	**Policy B**: *Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for roads.* **Policy C**: *Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for public transportation.* **Policy D**: *Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for trails.* **Policy E**: *Plan for, maintain, and establish design guidelines for multi-use.* *Subject to staff's template, Barker's alternative language, and language on fees*

Housing Goal I

▪ **Goal**: Adams moved to amend the goal with the BIA's proposal. Stedt seconded the motion. ▪ **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0	*Housing development that respects community character and meets housing needs for a wide range of ages, income groups, abilities and diverse lifestyles with a broad range of housing types.*
▪ **Policy A**: Adams moved to amend the language with staff's recommendation. Messer and Higgins seconded the motion.	*New housing development at*

• **Vote**: 14 – 0 – 1	*urban densities should be located within or adjacent to existing urban areas.*
• **Policy B**: Stedt moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Messer asked why multi-family housing was pointed out. • **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0	*New housing developments, including multi-family housing, should respect community character.*
• **Policy C**: Stedt moved to amend the language with staff's recommendation. • **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0	*Encourage diverse and affordable housing options.*
• **Policy D**: Messer proposed "beefing" up the policy but moved staff's recommendation. She stated she would like to have a separate discussion on affordable housing at a later meeting. Stedt seconded the motion. • **Vote**: 15 – 0 – 0	*Encourage affordable housing options for agricultural workers.*
• **Policy E**: Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Silver seconded the motion. A question on the difference between *mixed-use* and *multiple use* arose. Stepner explained that mixed-use is identified as different uses within the same structure and multiple use as different uses within a number of structures on the same site. Stedt proposed *mixed-use/multiple use*. Barker stated that she wanted the policy to be broader, as there are other compatible uses besides the ones stated within the policy. Elias suggested omitting the uses. • **Vote**: 14 – 1 – 0	*Encourage mixed-use/multiple use development that respects community character.*
• **Policy F**: Messer moved to have a policy that encourages affordable housing for low-income residents. Stepner seconded the motion subject to discussion. Adams disagreed with the motion, stating that we should focus on all housing needs if we are talking about housing opportunities. Higgins stated that policy C encompasses all needs and that the Housing Element speaks directly of affordable housing. Stepner agreed that policy C covered this matter. Messer withdrew her motion.	
Safety Goal I	
• **Policy A**: Pryde moved to amend the language with staff's recommendation. • **Vote**: 13 – 0 – 2	*Development should be limited in areas of known geologic hazards.*
• **Goal**: Messer moved to amend the language with staff's recommendation. Lambron seconded the motion. Tabb felt the recommendation was unclear. Popejoy responded that he had gone through all the goals and changed them accordingly, to read as an end statement. Elias stated that she reads the original wording as an end statement more than the recommended language. Motion was placed to retain the original language. • **Vote**: 13 – 0 – 1	*Public safety and the protection of public and private property.*
• **Policy B**: Holler stated that he would like to have staff review this policy and come back to the group because this policy is covered in County ordinances. Bowlby moved to postpone discussion on this policy. Tabb seconded the motion. • **Vote**: 13 – 0 – 1	*Staff review*
• **Policy C**: Coombs asked why *shall* was used in this policy and not in others. Harron responded that it is not illegal to use *shall*, however, he recommends not using mandatory language due to conflicts. Coombs asked who was responsible for paying for the access. Harron responded that whomever is developing a home is responsible at their own expense to put one in. Adams moved to have staff	*Staff review*

review this policy. Messer seconded the motion. ▪ **Vote**: 14 – 0 – 0	
▪ **Policy D**: Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Clover seconded the motion. Pryde stated that he did not understand the new language. Adams amended his motion to *Development in floodplains shall be limited to protect lives and property*. Adams and Clover accepted the amendment. ▪ **Vote**: 13 – 1 – 0	*Development in floodplains shall be limited to protect lives and property*.
▪ **Policy E**: Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA'a proposal, stating that the new stormwater guidelines are very restrictive. Clover seconded the motion. Pryde agreed with Adams. Holler asked to table this policy.	*Staff review*
▪ **Policy F**: Adams moved to change the *shall* to *should*. Holler requested to amend the motion to strike the policy because it is a requirement already, which is covered by statute. He added that building codes are always being revised but never lessened. ▪ **Vote**: 10 – 2 – 2	*Delete*
▪ **Policy G**: Tabb moved to strike the policy since airport zones are restricted anyway. Adams seconded the motion. Harron was concerned with striking this policy because even though there are FAA and state restrictions, there have been instances of interference and enforcing these rules would constitute a taking. Motion was withdrawn. Pryde moved staff's recommendation. Coombs seconded the motion. Higgins suggested amending the language to *flight activity zones*. Stepner suggested tabling the discussion due to a possibility of internal inconsistency. Baker stated that flight activity zones were not the same as what is being discussed here. It was suggested to use *configurations* instead of *densities*. Tabb suggested adopting language subject to staff's changes. ▪ **Vote**: 9 – 3 – 2	*Limit development within airport flight activity zones to uses and configurations compatible with these zones.*

▪ **Motion**: Messer requested to establish an excessive lighting goal under Noise and moved to have County staff consider adding an ambient lighting and noise goal. Baker seconded the motion.
▪ **Vote**: 14 – 0 – 0

Agenda Item III: Process –

▪ Holler stated that the map will potentially be available on April 2nd or 16th. Adams requested to finish the Goals & Policies before reviewing the map and to consider an initial review before an official meeting to discuss the map.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

▪ Mary Allison mentioned that we should be aware of fire issues since Governor Davis is proposing a cut.
▪ Mike Thometz stated that he liked Adams's idea of getting through the Goals & Policies. He added that the median income is not downtown versus the County, but rather, all the same as the County is treated as a whole. He had a problem with the striking and/or changing of policies because it was a statute. Added that the County of San Diego is the only one not responsible for fire protection, in which they receive virtually no money.
▪ Dutch Van Dierendonck stated that the County has a responsibility to provide fire protection and have been derelict in its duties.
▪ Paul Etzel was glad that dark skies was addressed and added that ordinances can be changed by the Board of Supervisors, so he feels it should be kept as a policy.
▪ Dave Shibley stated that affordable housing is not in the context of subsidized housing. There is a lack of available land to build and if there was a goal to cluster to reduce costs, then there can be more affordable housing.