



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MANAGER'S REPORT

DATE ISSUED: February 11, 2005 REPORT NO. 05-038

ATTENTION: Land Use and Housing Committee and Planning Commission
Agenda of March 9, 2005

SUBJECT: Workshop on the General Plan Update

REFERENCE: Manager's Report Nos. 03-019, 03-115, 03-204, 03-205, 03-206, 04-149
Planning Report Nos. P-03-183, P-03-227, P-03-333, P-04-220

SUMMARY

THIS IS AN INFORMATION ITEM ONLY. NO ACTION IS REQUIRED ON THE PART OF THE COMMITTEE OR THE CITY COUNCIL.

BACKGROUND

On October 22, 2002, the City Council adopted the Strategic Framework Element as an amendment to the City's 1979 *Progress Guide and General Plan* (General Plan). This action was the first significant step in updating the City's twenty-year-old General Plan.

The Strategic Framework Element provides a new strategy for the City's future growth and development, a basis for a new Land Use Element, and a framework for updating existing policies in the General Plan.

On February 12, 2003, the Land Use and Housing Committee (LU&H) approved the General Plan Work Program which laid out the major work activities and a timeline to update the General Plan. (Attachment 1 provides a timeline overview.)

Since adoption of the work program, the Planning Department conducted a joint workshop on October 23, 2003, with LU&H and the Planning Commission, to discuss and seek input on various work products, including the new General Plan format, public outreach strategy, existing conditions data collection, draft Mobility Element policies, and draft community plan amendment/update policies. Additionally, separate workshops were conducted with LU&H and

the Planning Commission to discuss housing/industrial collocation and community plan initiation and amendment criteria. (An overview of progress made since the last joint workshop is included in Attachment 2.)

DISCUSSION

The General Plan Update effort involves incorporating and refining Strategic Framework Element and citywide community plan policies into the General Plan, consolidating the existing fourteen elements into nine, and formatting the document so that it is easy to read and web-friendly. (Attachment 3 identifies the elements and status of each.)

The questions posed in this report are generally addressed in the Strategic Framework Element. However, after two years of implementation, it has become clear that further policy refinement and expansion is necessary to clarify intent and provide direction. The questions are as follows:

1. How should housing be incorporated into areas for industrial use?
2. How can recreation policies be adjusted to address individual community needs?
3. What should be done about the ongoing community facilities deficits?
4. What policy direction can be provided in the General Plan to address the issue of consistency?
5. What role can the updated General Plan play in simplifying the community plan update process?
6. What guidance can the General Plan provide for future general and community plan amendments?

Each of the six questions are addressed below, beginning with relevant Strategic Framework and General Plan policies, followed by a description of the issue, and concluded by a list of proposals for consideration.

1. HOW SHOULD HOUSING BE INCORPORATED INTO AREAS FOR INDUSTRIAL USE?

The adopted Strategic Framework Element and General Plan contain goals and policies which require further refinement regarding the collocation of housing and employment uses.

Adopted policies in the Strategic Framework Element addressing employment land include:

- *Identify areas in Subregional Districts where collocation of employment and residential uses could occur;*
- *Limit the re-designation of employment land except where it will mitigate existing land use conflicts, or when it meets specific criteria to be established with the adoption of the Economic Prosperity Element. These criteria should relate to the availability of land to meet the City's economic development goals, parcel characteristics, adjacency to transit, and urban design; and*
- *Preserve areas for middle-income employment uses including manufacturing, research and development, distribution, and wholesale trade by limiting or excluding multiple*

tenant office uses and corporate headquarters that do not have a research and development or manufacturing component.

Adopted Strategic Framework Element policies addressing housing needs include:

- *Concentrate future residential density increases in the Regional Center, Subregional Districts, and Urban and Neighborhood Village Centers; and*
- *Establish policies to allow areas within Subregional Districts to collocate employment and higher density residential use and adopt design standards to mitigate land use conflicts.*

Since adoption of the Strategic Framework Element, several proposals to change community plan land use designations from industrial to residential have been submitted for City review. Without clear direction in the General Plan, Planning staff conducted a number of workshops and hearings on this topic. (Attachment 4 provides a history of previous actions.) Based upon input received from LU&H, Planning Commission, and various stakeholders, Planning staff is proposing that further policy direction on industrial/residential collocation be included in the General Plan Economic Prosperity Element. (The draft policy is included in Attachment 5.)

Staff is recommending and seeking input on the following proposals which are included in the draft policy:

Specify Issues to be Addressed. Any proposed community plan amendment to allow industrial/residential collocation and/or conversion would be required to address specific issues, including economic importance of the employment land, location, and public health concerns.

Discourage Residential/Industrial Collocation in Areas Most Attractive to Middle-Income Employment. These functions are characterized by manufacturing, research and development, warehousing, and distribution functions, and are key to supporting economic growth which benefits the local economy. The determination of whether land is attractive to these types of uses is based on a variety of factors including physical site characteristics, parcel size and configuration, surrounding development patterns and uses, and long-term market trends. The specification of these functions may discourage collocation and conversion in many industrially-designated lands in the northern part of the City which currently support high-technology and biotechnology manufacturing, research and development, and support uses. However, the policy would be less restrictive in employment areas characterized by predominantly office uses or where there has already been encroachment of non-industrial uses.

Require a Distance Separation to Address Public Health Concerns. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District has indicated that a required distance separation of 1,000 feet between residential and industrial property lines is adequate to allow businesses a margin of safety, whereby they could expand and change industrial processes without concern over adversely impacting new nearby residential developments. The 1,000-foot distance separation is considered large enough to severely limit the residential uses in areas where indirect impacts to human health could occur. A reduced buffer could be considered in locations where studies indicate public health would not be compromised.

2. HOW CAN RECREATION POLICIES BE ADJUSTED TO ADDRESS INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY NEEDS?

The current Recreation Element of the General Plan provides three overarching goals for recreation. Simply stated the goals are:

- *Provide a range of opportunities for all recreational activities, in an equitable manner, throughout the City;*
- *Enhance the built environment through development of an extensive and varied system of open space and recreation facilities; and*
- *Acquire and preserve all public beaches for public uses.*

These goals apply to population-based parks, resource-based parks, and other recreational accommodations such as swimming pools, plazas, and mini-parks. To achieve these goals, the General Plan established guidelines and standards. (See summary in Attachment 6.) However, the General Plan acknowledges that meeting the standards in urbanized communities is difficult and that efforts should be directed toward providing staff and facilities to compensate for acreage.

Specific policies in the Strategic Framework Element include:

- *Develop alternative methods of providing parks and recreational areas to meet the needs of urban and built-out communities, recognizing available land constraints and seizing opportunities for the creation of more accessible parks and the integration of public space and recreation; and*
- *Develop a citywide parks system master plan.*

In order to understand the existing baseline attitude of the public toward recreation facilities in the City, and to provide insights to the development of refined standards and a future park master plan, the Planning Department commissioned a Public Attitude Survey of San Diego City Parks and Recreation. Results from the survey are outlined in Attachment 7 and point to the following:

- The City as a whole has nearly all of the recreation facility-types that residents want;
- Regional parks (beaches/Balboa Park) and neighborhood parks are the most visited;
- A better distribution of specialized facilities such as dog parks, swimming pools, sports courts and skate parks is desired; and
- Residents would prefer to improve, and maintain existing facilities rather than build new facilities.

Given the overall positive response to the existing recreation facilities, the challenge will be to maintain and improve the level of satisfaction while accommodating future population growth.

In order to address this issue, the survey suggests the City develop policies that:

- Place greater resources into the maintenance and improvement of existing facilities;
- Locate recreation facilities, especially general purpose passive parks with facilities such as playgrounds, walking trails, swimming pools, or sports courts, in regions of the City perceived as lacking;
- Improve accessibility and overall maintenance of existing facilities; and
- Capitalize on the City's natural environment, beach/ocean access and open spaces.

Given the survey results, other research and public input, staff is seeking input on the following possible approaches to meeting community recreation needs:

Establish a Matrix of Standards. City staff is considering the development of a matrix/menu that provides mechanisms for meeting the recreation needs of the growing population, and would set the stage for a park master plan. (Note: a discussion of a Parks System Master Plan was held with LU&H on June 4, 2003. See Manager's Report No. 03-115 for more details.) This approach could establish a varied set of standards that would be flexible enough to meet community specific facility needs while providing a mechanism for creating equity in facilities throughout the City.

Establish Regional Service Areas. The location, distribution, and needs of recreation facilities have historically been dealt with at the community planning level. This practice locates recreation facilities based on the needs and demands of residents within the boundaries of a community planning area. Determining service areas or areas of benefit for recreation facilities would allow flexibility in meeting demands in a more reasoned manner. This approach could also provide flexibility in funding where more than one community benefits from the recreation facilities. Additionally, it could allow pooling of funds to build needed facilities.

Require Redevelopment Area Set Asides. As previously stated, the area set aside for recreation facilities in older urbanized areas is more likely to fall below the current guidelines than the area in the more recently developed master planned communities. However, blighted conditions in portions of older urbanized areas have encouraged the creation of redevelopment areas to assist in improving neighborhood viability and livability. California Redevelopment Law includes requirements for provision of affordable housing within redevelopment areas. A similar requirement for recreation facilities could be developed to achieve equity within redeveloping urbanized neighborhoods.

Establish Level of Service Standards (LOS). One mechanism for achieving a flexible set of standards that reflect community character is the LOS standard adopted by the city of Gainesville, Florida, in 2002 as part of that city's Recreation Element and outlined in Attachment 8. The standard is needs-based, facilities-driven, and land-measured. Similar to our City's existing guidelines, determination of the LOS is stated in acres per 1,000 population. The difference is that the LOS reflects the instances of use of the activity areas and the facilities necessary to satisfy the actual demand. A process would be required to determine the LOS of a community.

3. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT ONGOING COMMUNITY FACILITIES DEFICITS?

The adopted Strategic Framework Element states, "The provision of adequate infrastructure and public facilities is the key component to the entire (City of Villages) strategy." Additionally, the Strategic Framework Element and Action Plan establish the following policies and recommended actions:

- *Maintain service levels as population growth occurs;*
- *Provide public facilities and services to assure that adequate levels of service standards are attained concurrently with development;*
- *Consider alternative methods of financing to provide public facilities; and*
- *Adopt a financing strategy that identifies new revenue sources and encourages the formation of partnerships to remedy the public facilities shortfall.*

In short, the adopted Strategic Framework policy directs that new development should not make the deficit greater and that the existing \$2.1 billion deficit (2002 estimate) be addressed.

The City is continuing to collect development impact fees from new development to pay for the facilities needed to support the new development accounted for in adopted community plans. This existing policy was expanded upon in the Strategic Framework Element and will remain in the General Plan. Additionally, the Planning Department is continuing to update community facility financing plans to update needs and impact fees. However, impact fees collected do not keep pace with the growing facility need.

To keep the deficit from growing, staff is seeking input on the following options:

Maximize Use of Development Impact Fees. Explore possible modifications to development impact fee methodologies to fully address public facility needs resulting from new development. The Planning Department is actively involved with a consultant (Pacific Municipal Partners) who is currently evaluating the City's development impact fee methodologies. A report is expected in the spring and recommendations could be incorporated into General Plan policies.

Establish New Permit Findings. Establish new discretionary permit findings that address the adequacy of public facilities and infrastructure on a project by project basis. In order to make permit findings, additional exactions from development proposals may be required. For example, in the Central Urbanized Planned District Ordinance (San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 15) development proposals located more than 600 feet from a public park are required to provide additional exterior recreational space for every housing unit constructed. This model could be used to establish similar standards for police and fire service, libraries, parks and transportation improvements.

Establish New Community Plan Amendment Processing. For new development proposing a community plan amendment to exceed density or intensity specified in the community plan, require that specific issues be addressed including provisions for public facilities concurrent with need and a provision of extraordinary benefit. (A list of the issues is included in Attachment 12 under Planning Amendment Processing section.)

Establish Development Thresholds. Establish development thresholds so that additional development beyond what is accounted for in the community plan could only occur concurrent with new facilities. This could be accomplished by establishing set thresholds (perhaps numbers of housing units) in a community plan area which could not be exceeded unless specified facilities were provided. Phasing plans similar to those utilized in the former Future Urbanizing

Area could be considered. This would be done as part of a community plan and facilities financing plan update.

Note: Due to potential increases in costs, any of the above approaches could be an obstacle to new development. Additionally, this effort could impact the City's ability to meet required housing goals in accordance with state housing element laws. Further investigation would be required to determine the impact.

In order to address the estimated \$2.1 billion existing deficit in public facilities, staff is seeking input on the following recommendations from the adopted Strategic Framework Element:

Remedy existing shortfall in public facilities by considering the following:

- *Fiscal reform at the state and local level;*
- *Regionalization of infrastructure expenses;*
- *Efficient use of shared resources; and*
- *Additional user fee and revenue measures, including residential refuse collection fee, utility user tax, transient occupancy tax, and real property transfer tax.*

As an Alternative, Continue Current Systems. Collect fees from new development to build the facilities needed to support the new development. Attempt to remedy deficiencies over an extended period of time through existing resources such as Community Development Block Grant, TransNet, and other grant funding. Under this option it must be acknowledged that service levels will not be maintained as population grows and projects will be approved while facility deficits continue.

4. WHAT POLICY DIRECTION CAN BE PROVIDED IN THE GENERAL PLAN TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF CONSISTENCY?

It is the City of San Diego's practice to apply zoning that is consistent with community plan land use designations to ensure their implementation, despite the fact that state law exempts charter cities from the consistency requirement. Unfortunately, some older community plans contain somewhat ambiguous or overly broad policy direction. Additionally, land use designations and density/intensity ranges vary, sometimes significantly, from community plan to community plan. This has contributed to difficulties for staff reviewers, community residents, project proponents, and decision-makers in reaching a resolution on whether a project, even if consistent with the applied zoning regulations, implements the general (community) plan.

The General Plan update and establishment of a separate Land Use Element provides the opportunity to clearly state the City Council policy on consistency.

Staff is recommending and seeking input on the following to be included in the Land Use Element to address consistency:

Describe Consistency for Zoning and Project Conformance with Community Plans. The Land Use Element will specify that zoning will be applied to implement community plan specified: land use, range of density/intensity, and site design, as appropriate. Similarly, it will

require projects to be assessed based upon conformance with general/community plan specified: land use, range of density/intensity, site design, other general/community plan policy objectives, especially related to open space preservation, community identity, mobility, and the timing, phasing, and provision of public facilities.

Clarify Internal Consistency. The General Plan will comply with state guidelines which require that policies within a complete general (community) plan are internally consistent. Further, there will be equal status among elements, consistency between elements, consistency within elements, consistency with community plans, and consistency between text and diagrams.

Provide Matrix of Standardized Land Use Categories. Existing community land use categories in the City's adopted plans have been reviewed and combined into groupings under consistent categories. New land use categories have been drafted to allow the community to clearly designate where (and where not) particular land uses are desirable. The new, standardized land use categories will remain the same between community plans, but uses can be tailored through plan text and/or footnotes to denote emphasis. The General Plan will now provide a complete menu of land use category options to accurately reflect community needs and desires at the time of community plan updates and amendments. (Attachment 8 provides an example of commercial land use designations.)

5. WHAT ROLE CAN THE UPDATED GENERAL PLAN PLAY IN SIMPLIFYING THE COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE PROCESS?

Many of the policies in the existing General Plan are out-of-date and have limited value for providing policy direction on citywide issues. As such, community plan updates have necessarily included policy direction on issues that are more citywide, and even regional, in nature. This has had an impact on the length of time that it takes to complete a community plan update, and, therefore, how many updates can occur within a given time period.

The General Plan update provides an opportunity to simplify the community plan update process. With the assistance of interested groups, progress has been made toward refining community plan content to: reduce plan update timelines, ensure that specific guidance is included to clearly govern how development occurs in each community plan area, and to focus upon implementation.

Planning staff have reviewed community and other land use plan documents and asked community planners, planning group members, and planning consultants to provide input on how to produce an effective community plan in a reasonable time frame.

Based upon this input, staff is recommending and seeking input on the following to simplify the community plan update process:

Maintain a Two-Year Timeline. Require that all participants accept a two-year timeline with set deadlines to complete the community plan update.

Use Standardized Format. Establish a standardized outline and format for all community plans to follow. This will simply the process and narrow what can and cannot be included in a community plan. (See draft community plan outline in Attachment 10.)

Prepare Operating Procedures. Prepare standard operating procedures for the community plan update process for background, existing conditions and technical studies. This would include using and updating final existing conditions data and maps assembled in 2004.

Focus Plan Content. Focus plan content upon community-specific issues and avoid repetition of citywide and regional policies. Establish implementation as a separate Action Plan document.

An updated General Plan and streamlined community plan update process should allow community residents, business owners, civic groups, and property owners to clearly articulate how they wish their community to evolve and provide direction so that everyone understands how it should be accomplished. The inability to update and maintain community plan documents results in another consequence, the amendment process as a substitute for comprehensive review and update.

6. WHAT GUIDANCE CAN THE GENERAL PLAN PROVIDE FOR FUTURE GENERAL AND COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENTS?

In November 2003, LU&H and the Planning Commission held a joint meeting to discuss the initiation and community plan amendment process. The general consensus at that meeting was that the initiation process serves a valuable purpose for the City, applicant, and the community. Council and commission members voiced support for retention of the initiation criteria and the hearing with significant revisions. The council members and commissioners both recognized that land use plan documents require amendments from time-to-time and that the initiation process must retain some flexibility. The amendment process may also be used to identify neighborhood village centers. Frequent amendments, however, have the potential to diminish the community plan's original vision.

It is clear that revisions should focus upon strengthening the initiation criteria to ensure that amendment proposals are consistent with the overall vision of the General Plan, the Strategic Framework Element, and the community plan. The ideal initiation criteria will not only allow worthy proposals to proceed for further study and amendment processing, but serve as an impediment to those that are clearly inconsistent with the City's overarching goals and policies. Both LU&H and the Planning Commission objected to consolidated hearings or "batching" amendment requests according to geographic sectors. A blackout period or moratorium on initiations during and/or for some period after a community plan update was also suggested as a possible policy.

Staff has met with both the Land Use Element Working Group and a Community Planners Committee subcommittee to discuss potential revisions to the criteria and council and commission direction. (Subcommittee membership lists are provided in Attachment 10.) On November 18, 2004, the Planning Commission held a workshop to discuss the issues and to provide direction to Planning staff on revised initiation criteria and the plan amendment process.

Based upon input received, staff is seeking input on the following to provide guidance on community plan amendments:

Relocate Initiation Procedures. Relocate initiation procedures from the Land Development Code (LDC) to the Land Use Element. The plan amendment hearing process will remain in the LDC.

Allow Technical Initiations. Allow technical initiations for amendment requests meeting certain criteria, such as health and safety, that will not result in general/community plan policy changes.

Revise Initiation Criteria. Revise initiation criteria to ensure that proposed changes to the general/community plan be consistent with the Strategic Framework Element/Land Use Element, City of Villages strategy, and major community plan policy recommendations.

Establish Standardized Issues. Establish a standardized and required list of issues for analysis to govern the community plan amendment process. Planning Commission and City Council resolutions would reference the standardized list of issues to ensure that they are an important component in reaching a final decision to approve or deny a plan amendment.

An updated General Plan, more frequently updated community plans, and a revised plan amendment process should reduce the number of future amendment requests. The draft text that would be included in the Land Use Element is contained in Attachment 12.

CONCLUSION

Adoption of the Strategic Framework Element and Action Plan in 2002 set the stage for a comprehensive update to the City's 1979 *Progress Guide and General Plan*. The Planning Department plans to distribute an updated Draft General Plan for public review in April 2005.

As part of the General Plan update process, guiding policies in the Strategic Framework Element are being expanded and refined in specific General Plan elements. This workshop report has focused on policies specific to the Economic Prosperity, Recreation, Public Facilities and Safety, and Land Use elements. Previous reports and workshops have been focused on other elements including Mobility and Conservation. The Planning Department will continue to seek input on the policies discussed in this report as well as the additional policies that will be included in the Draft General Plan in the coming months.

A General Plan workshop on these topics is scheduled with Community Planners Committee on February 22, 2005. A workshop specific to the Economic Prosperity element is scheduled with the Planning Commission for March 10, 2005. Future workshops will be scheduled with release of the draft General Plan in spring 2005.

Respectfully submitted.



S. Gail Goldberg, AICP
Planning Director


Approved: Patricia T. Frazier
Deputy City Manager

FRAZIER/SGG/CAC/je

Attachments:

1. General Plan Update Timeline
2. General Plan Work Program Progress
3. General Plan Elements Status Table
4. Previous Actions on Collocation
5. Draft Collocation Policy
6. Existing Recreation Standards Summary Table
7. Recreation Survey Results
8. Service Standards for Parks
9. Example Land Use Designations
10. Recommended Community Plan Outline
11. Land Use Element Subcommittee Rosters
12. Draft Criteria for Community Plan Amendments
13. General Plan Strategic Framework Element (provided to PC. and LU&H members only)
14. Strategic Framework Element Action Plan (provided to PC, and LU&H members only)

General Plan Update Timeline Overview

October	2002	City Council adopts Strategic Framework Element and Action Plan
February	2003	Land Use and Housing approves General Plan Update Work Program
October	2003	LU&H/Planning Commission General Plan Workshop
February	2004	City Council selects Pilot City of Villages Projects
October	2004	Planning Commission General Plan Workshop
<hr/>		
February	2005	Joint Land Use and Housing LU&H/PC Workshop on the General Plan Update
February	2005	Community Planners Committee Workshop on the General Plan Update
Spring	2005	Tentative-Joint LU&H/ PC Workshop to review Draft General Plan Distribute Draft General Plan for public review
Spring	2005	CPC Workshop to review Draft General Plan
Summer	2005	CPC considers Draft General Plan
Summer/ Fall	2005	PC considers Draft General Plan
November	2005	City Council considers General Plan
January	2006	Begin Community Plan Update Process

General Plan Work Program Progress

Since the joint LU&H/Planning Commission General Plan workshop in October 2003, significant progress has been made on the work program including:

- The City Council selected five pilot village projects to proceed as part of the prestigious Pilot Village Program- February 2004;
- The Planning Department distributed the first annual General Plan Monitoring Report identifying work completed in implementing the Strategic Framework Element Action Plan, work to be done, and setting a baseline for quality of life and economic indicators to be monitored in the future - July 2004; and
- The Planning Department completed work with community planning groups to collect citywide existing conditions data in a GIS format that can be used for future analysis on various actions including preparing a financing strategy for public facilities and infrastructure, amending or updating community plans, updating the General Plan, and conducting future environmental analysis. Maps created through the process are available on the City's website- August 2004.
- Six public forums have been held to discuss critical issues to be addressed in the general plan update including policies for resource conservation, provisions for parks and recreation facilities, the future of retail development, financing public facilities, and meeting our housing needs:
 - June 26, 2003 *Economic Prosperity For All: How Do We Get There?* Councilmember Scott Peters, Donald Cohen, Steve Erie, Mike Madigan
 - September 25, 2003 *Breaking the Gridlock: Moving People to New Mobility Choices* William Lieberman, Dan Beal, Linda Culp, Andrew Poat
 - December 10, 2003 *What on Earth Are We Doing? How Today's Decisions on Land Use, Water & Energy Affect Our Future* Councilmember Donna Frye, Irene Stillings, Marco Gonzalez, Matthew Adams, Adam Gamboa
 - March 25, 2004 *Dollars and Sense: The Future of Commercial Development in San Diego* Councilmember Michael Zucchet, William Anderson, Alan Gin, Reg Kobzi, Carolyn Smith
 - June 17, 2004 *San Diego's Great Balancing Act: Exploring Creative Recreational Choices for the Future* Kathy Garcia, Reint Reinders, Leslie Linton, Ginny Barnes, Jim Peugh
 - September 16, 2004 *Mission Impossible? Balancing Public Facilities Needs and the Demand for More Housing* Jack McGrory, Tom Mullaney, Donald Cohen, Councilmember Toni Atkins
- Two subcommittees assembled to assist with Land Use element and policies addressing the community plan amendment and update process;
- Several e-mails have been sent to the General Plan e-mail interest list soliciting input on draft policies and elements; and
- Ad-hoc meeting conducted with various stakeholders to seek input on draft policies.

**General Plan Elements
Issues Addressed and Status**

General Plan Element	Issues to be Addressed	Status
Housing	housing supply	Final housing goals from SANDAG in process. Draft of Element 50 percent complete. Housing Element Working Group being formed to provide input. Council and HCD for adoption in latter half of 2005.
Economic Prosperity- <i>New</i> (combine Commercial, Industrial, Redevelopment elements)	collocation policy commercial designations preserving industrial land equitable development	Initial draft and stakeholder input in process. Planning Commission workshop of draft element scheduled for March 10, 2005.
Mobility (Circulation)	multi-modal congestion strategies parking policies transit priorities financing	Initial draft completed and distributed via e-mail. Work is proceeding on graphics, maps, and formatting.
Public Facilities and Safety	updated standards new facilities phasing new priorities for financing	Partial draft completed and distributed via e-mail.
Conservation (Open Space, Conservation, Energy Conservation, Cultural Resources elements)	resource conservation, pollution prevention, water quality and habitat protection	Initial draft completed and distributed via e-mail. Work is proceeding on graphics, maps, and photos to illustrate the element.
Urban Design	urban form, design for walkability, public spaces and civic architecture village and residential design guidelines	Initial text draft is completed. Partnering with the New School of Architecture to prepare graphics. Will distribute for public review with the April 2005 draft.
Recreation (Open Space, Recreation elements)	standards/options/guidelines diversity, preservation, accessibility, joint use – open space – resource parks	Four draft sections distributed for review. Public opinion survey completed September 2004. Current emphasis is to develop standards and/or guidelines.
Land Use- <i>New</i>	COV Map annexations phasing/tiers community plan format and preparation plan amendment process	Community plan format recommendations and revised plan amendment process subject of two Planning Commission Workshops. Established two public groups – professional planners and CPC subcommittee to assist in policy development. First draft to be completed by end of January 2005.
Noise (Circulation)	airports mixed use development mitigation measures	Initial draft and stakeholder/consultant input to occur via e-mail in February 2005.

Previous Actions on Collocation

Background

The maintenance of both a short-term and long-term supply of employment land is critical for the siting and expansion of businesses key to the City's economic prosperity. However, the lack of land designated for residential uses has exacerbated the City's housing crisis for both existing residents and for potential workers required by key employers. This condition, short-term market conditions affecting demand for office and industrial uses, and national trends have resulted in several requests for industrial land conversion and for industrial/residential collocation which are expected to continue. Conversion is a redesignation or change in use of an industrially-designated site to commercial, institutional, mixed-use, or residential-use. Collocation is the geographic integration of residential development into the industrial uses located on the same premises.

The Planning Department originally proposed an interim council policy to establish criteria by which industrial and residential uses could occur on the same site with a Community Plan Amendment. There was significant public outreach on the interim collocation policy. Staff presented the policy to business, health, professional and public organizations as well as the Community Planners Committee, Planning Commission and community planning groups which requested a presentation. Below is a summary of the previous actions taken.

March 2003, Planning Commission Initiation, Report Nos. P-03-057 and P-03-068 - Two community plan amendments in Mira Mesa were initiated that propose residential development within the community's Sorrento Mesa employment center.

July 17, 2003, Planning Commission Workshop, Report No. P-03-183 – A preliminary draft of the interim criteria for the conversion of industrial lands to residential-use was discussed. At the workshop, the Planning Commission requested the following additional information; a vocational analysis, the appropriate distance for a jobs/housing balance, residential density, public facilities and transit funding, types of employment uses which would be compatible, and the use of parcel size as a criterion.

August 6, 2003, City Council Committee on Land Use and Housing, Report No. 03-183 – A redraft of the interim policy based on the Planning Commission input was presented. LUH recommended consideration of the following issues; provide that there be no net loss of industrial land, the types of industrial land which would be compatible with housing, the effect of housing on industrial users, disclosure of industrial operations to potential residents, and additional requirements on residential developers to insure future residents are not impacted by the nearness of industry.

October 30, 2003, Planning Commission Hearing, Report No. P-03-333 - A draft Council Policy 600-41 with numerous revisions as specified in their motion was recommended. Some of the revisions not previously discussed included an alternate

Draft Collocation Policy

This draft policy is proposed to be included in the General Plan Economic Prosperity Element to address the issue of industrial/residential collocation and conversion. Conversion is a redesignation or change in use of an industrially-designated site to commercial, mixed-use, or residential-use. Collocation is the geographic integration of residential development into the industrial uses located on the same premises.

Policies:

- The site should not be located in an area attractive to the following industrial uses: manufacturing, research and development, wholesale distribution, and warehousing.
- Collocation or conversion may be considered in areas characterized by predominately office development, or areas in transition where encroachment of non-industrial uses has already occurred. The following issues should be analyzed when considering community plan amendments in these areas:

Site Location

- The location of the project within one-half mile of transit. The project's contribution to transit if necessary. The availability of transit when the project is complete.

Public Health

- The site's location in an employment area where incompatibilities may result regarding truck traffic, odors, noise, safety, and other external environmental effects.
- To address potential land use incompatibility, the applicant requesting a conversion to residential or mixed-uses or collocation proposals should provide the necessary information, studies, and reports which indicate whether there are any sources of toxic air contaminants or toxic substances within a quarter mile of the subject property. If so, a distance separation of 1,000 feet between the residential and industrial property lines should be required. In lieu of the 1,000-foot separation, the applicant may submit a report which provides adequate data to determine the effects upon potential future residents and whether an alternative distance separation would mitigate the effects.

Land Use

- If the proposal is requesting a commercial-use, a demonstrated need for additional commercially-designated land in the community.

- A community plan amendment which proposes densities that maximize the development potential of the land for residential purposes.

Design

- The implementation of “smart growth” policies contained in the Strategic Framework Element and Transit-Oriented Development Design Guidelines (TOD) and the incorporation of pedestrian design and connectivity into the project including pedestrian-oriented connections to adjacent properties and transit.

Affordable Housing

- The provision of housing at a cost which reflects the average wages within approximately a five-mile radius. In addition, the provision of affordable housing which meets or exceed the minimum percentage of affordable housing onsite, as specified by the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance should be required.

Public Facilities

- The project’s payment of its fair share of community facilities required to serve the additional residential units (at the time of occupancy). Concurrent processing of a public facilities financing plan amendment necessary to identify and fund needed facilities may be required.

Note: The proposed policy would apply to requests for community plan amendments only. As community plans are updated over the next several years, specific areas for collocation can be identified and evaluated. Comprehensive community plan updates, such as the one underway in Otay Mesa, will consider a variety of other factors not addressed in these guidelines and are subject to broader policy direction in the Strategic Framework Element and General Plan.

Existing Recreation Standards – Summary Table

The following table provides a brief summation of the existing guidelines and standards in the existing Recreation Element.

Recreation Facility	Basis	Guideline	Standards
Neighborhood Park	Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 acres or 5 acres (adjacent to elementary school) per 3,500-5,000 • Within ½ mile radius 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design/facilities based on population and use characteristics • Typical elements: play & picnic areas, multi-purpose courts, multi-purpose lawn areas
Community Park	Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 acres or 13 acres (adjacent to Junior H.S.) per 18,000-25,000 within 1½ mile radius • Swimming pools within parks per 50,000 residents within 1½ to 2 miles • Recreation Center per 18,000-25,000 within 1½ mile radius 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities to supplement neighborhood parks • Based on population and use characteristics • Typical elements: Athletic fields, multi-purpose courts, recreation building, lawn acres, play, picnic areas, & comfort stations
Regional Parks/Open Spaces	Resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size based on specific resource, expected use, location, & available land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located at site of distinctive scenic, natural, or cultural feature • Intended for citywide use • Developed amenities should not impair feature or resource • Portions may be devoted to neighborhood and community park needs

Although the ratios associated with population-based parks are intended to serve as a mechanism for guiding and evaluating the adequacy of parks, they are not always used that way. The acreage developed for recreation facilities in the older urbanized areas of the City are more likely to fall below the existing guidelines. Several factors, including the lack of guidelines and standards when the communities developed and the displacement that would occur with new facilities, play a part in communities where a deficit exists. Understandably, a fixed ratio of resident population to park acreage is the simplest way for communities to compare park facilities throughout the City. Incorporating the less tangible components of accessibility, supervision, and types of facilities requires a subjective analysis provided by individuals experienced in the management of recreation facilities.

Recreation Survey Results

The Public Attitude Survey of San Diego City Park and Recreation was conducted in September 2004 and was developed by Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade and Douglas, Inc. and San Diego State University. The survey was developed to evaluate satisfaction with recreation facilities, frequency of use, satisfaction of visits, and the importance of facilities. Overall, San Diego residents are satisfied with the variety and quality of the City's recreation facilities. The results are based on 305 qualified respondents which results in a six percent margin of error with a 95 percent confidence level, meaning there is a 95 percent certainty that if all adults within the City were polled the results would be plus or minus six percent of the responses identified in the survey.

Satisfaction of Visit

A combination of open and closed-ended questions were asked to determine overall satisfaction with park and recreation facilities. Questions gauged satisfaction with the number, quality, and distribution of facilities. Approximately 65 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the number, 71 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality, and 58 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the quantity (lack of dog parks, swimming pools, and skate parks skewed the results for quality downward).

Frequency of Use

Open-ended questions were asked to determine most often visited parks or recreation facilities. Respondents were asked to name the last park or recreation facility visited in the last year. The facilities most often sited as last visited are regional in nature, with Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park receiving a combined 26 percent of the responses. Asked to name *another park visited in the past year*, Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park garnered 20 percent of the responses with the remaining 80 percent generally spread out evenly among more localized recreation facilities.

Closed-ended questions were asked to determine types of recreation facilities visited and the frequency of those visits. Residents were asked how many times they had been to one of 14 types of facilities in the past year. The frequency of visits generally coincided with the level of specialization associated with the facility. The frequency of visits from most to least visited were as follows.

- Non-specialized (beaches, cultural facilities, passive parks, trails, & playgrounds)
- More specialized (sports fields, sports courts, recreation centers, gyms, & water sport areas)
- Most specialized (dog parks, swimming pools, golf courses, & skate parks)

It should be noted that there is a correlation between the number of facilities and the frequency of visits.

Importance of Facilities

A series of "trade-off" questions were asked to gauge the relative value/importance residents place on recreation facilities. To determine this, participants were given a choice of allocating \$10.00, in any manner, on the following three choices:

- Improving existing facilities;
- Increasing the operations and maintenance budgets of existing facilities; and
- Building new parks and recreation facilities.

A majority of the funds (\$7.20) were identified to be allocated toward improving existing facilities and increasing their operations and maintenance budgets, and \$2.80 was allocated toward building new parks and recreation facilities.

Survey Conclusions

In order to understand the existing baseline attitude of the public toward recreation facilities in the City and to provide insights to the development of refined standards and a future park master plan, the Planning Department commissioned a Public Attitude Survey of San Diego City Parks and Recreation. Results point to the following:

- The City as a whole has nearly all of the recreation facility-types that residents want;
- Regional parks (beaches/Balboa Park) and neighborhood parks are the most visited;
- A better distribution of specialized facilities such as dog parks, swimming pools, sports courts and skate parks is desired; and
- Residents would prefer to improve, upgrade, and maintain existing facilities rather than build new facilities.

Survey Policy Implications

Given the overall positive response to the existing recreation facilities, the challenge will be to maintain and improve the level of satisfaction while accommodating future population growth. In order to address this issue, the survey suggests the City develop policies that:

- Place greater resources into the maintenance and improvement of existing recreation facilities rather than build new facilities;
- Locate recreation facilities, especially general purpose passive parks with facilities such as playgrounds, walking trails, swimming pools, or sports courts in regions of the City perceived as lacking;
- Improve accessibility, and overall maintenance of existing facilities (perception appears to be the most direct factor in level of overall satisfaction); and
- Use to its advantage, the City's natural environment, in particular beach/ocean access and open spaces.

Note: This survey was conducted on a limited budget for the purpose of gaining an initial reading from the public. Depending upon how we proceed, a survey with a larger sample size may be needed.

Service Standard for Parks

The city of Gainesville, Florida uses a Level of Service (LOS) standard for providing recreation facilities. Rather than adhering to strict requirements for providing a fixed number of acres per population, the LOS standards provide flexibility by focusing on the facility needs of the area being served. The standards reflect the instance of use for activity areas and the facilities necessary to satisfy the actual demand. Using this type of standard results in parks and facilities that are designed and developed based on local needs and demands. As a result park acreage and the types of recreation facilities will vary from community-to-community. The following tables compare revised (Current LOS) and previous standards used by the City of Gainesville.

FACILITY	200 LOS STANDARD	CURRENT LOS
Basketball Court	1 per 4,500	1 per 4,507
Play area- Equipped	1 per 10,000	1 per 3,900
Racquetball Court	1 per 12,000	1 per 7,243
Soccer Field	1 per 11,000	1 per 7,800
Softball Field (adult)	1 per 14,000	1 per 8,450
Swimming Pool (25 YD)	1 per 75,000	1 per 33,802
Swimming Pool (50M)	1 per 85,000	1 per 50,702
Tennis Court	1 per 6,000	1 per 4,609
Trail/Greenway/Linear Corridor	1 mi. per 4,500	1 mi. per 3,900

PARK	2000 STANDARD	CURRENT LOS
Community Park	2.00 ac	2.72 ac
Local Nature/Conservation	6.00 ac	17.02 ac
Neighborhood Park	.80 ac	1.51 ac
Sports Complex	.50 ac	1.01 ac

To determine the LOS of a community would require the following generalized steps:

- Community demand for specific facilities is evaluated;
- Acreage and facilities needed to meet the demand are identified;
- Acreage for un-programmed recreation activities for the specific park classification (neighborhood or community) are identified; and
- Acreage required to meet community demand is combined with the un-programmed acreage to determine the minimum park acreage needed to meet community demand.

Example Commercial Land Use Designations

Recommended Community Plan Designations	Additional Considerations	Definitions	Allowed Intensity/Density (Building intensity range (du/ac or FAR) ¹)	Implementing Zones
Commercial Categories	Residential Use			
Neighborhood Village	Required	Provides housing in a mixed use setting and convenience shopping opportunities such as dry cleaners, grocery stores, barber shops, restaurants, small medical offices and similar types of uses for the surrounding neighborhood. Integration of commercial and residential use is emphasized, civic uses are an important component.	.25 to 2.0 FAR 15 to 29 du/ac	CN-1-1, CN-1-3
Neighborhood Commercial	Allowed	Provides local convenience shopping opportunities such as dry cleaners, grocery stores, barber shops, restaurants, small medical offices and similar types of uses for the surrounding neighborhood. May also provide housing in a mixed use setting.	.25 to 2.0 FAR 15 to 29 du/ac	CN-1-1, CN-1-2, CN-1-3
Community Village	Required	Provides housing in a mixed use setting and serves the commercial needs of the community at large, including the industrial and business areas. Integration of commercial and residential use is emphasized, civic uses are an important component. Housing, retail, professional/administrative offices, commercial recreation facilities, service businesses, and similar types of uses are allowed.	.25 to 2.0 FAR 30 to 75 du/ac	CC-1-1, CC-1-2, CC-1-3, CC-3-4, CC-3-5, CC-4-1, CC-4-2, CC-4-3, CC-4-4, CC-4-5, CC-5-1, CC-5-2, CC-5-3, CC-5-4, CC-5-5
Community Commercial	Allowed	Serves the commercial needs of the community at large, including the industrial and business areas, and may provide housing in a mixed use setting. Housing, retail, professional/administrative offices, commercial recreation facilities, service businesses, and similar types of uses are allowed.	.25 to 2.0 FAR 30 to 75 du/ac	CC-1-1, CC-1-2, CC-1-3, CC-3-4, CC-3-5, CC-4-1, CC-4-2, CC-4-3, CC-4-4, CC-4-5, CC-5-1, CC-5-2, CC-5-3, CC-5-4, CC-5-5
	Prohibited	Serves the commercial needs of the community at large, including the industrial and business areas. Retail, professional/administrative offices, commercial recreation facilities, service businesses, and similar types of uses are allowed.	.25 to 2.0 FAR	CC-2-1, CC-2-2, CC-2-3
Regional Village	Required	Serves the region with many types of uses, including housing, in a high intensity, mixed-use setting. Integration of commercial and residential use is emphasized larger, civic uses and facilities are a significant component. Uses include housing, business/professional office, commercial service, and retail uses.	.25 to 1.0 FAR 30 to 110 du/ac	CR-1-1

Regional Commercial	Allowed	Serves the region with many types of uses, including housing, in a high intensity, mixed-use setting. Uses include housing, business/professional office, commercial service, and retail	.25 to 1.0 FAR 30 to 75 du/ac	CR-1-1
	Prohibited	Serves the region with commercial, retail, office, and limited industrial uses.	.25 to 1.0 FAR	CR-2-1
Office Commercial	Allowed	Provides areas for employment uses with limited, complementary retail uses as well as medium to high density residential development in a mixed use setting.	.25 to 1.5 FAR 15 to 44 du/ac	CO-1-1, CO-1-2
Recreation Commercial	Allowed	Provides housing in a mixed use setting and areas for establishments catering to the lodging, dining, and recreational needs of both tourists and the local population. This designation is intended for areas located near employment centers and areas with recreational resources or other visitor attractions.	.25 to 2.0 FAR 30 to 75 du/ac	CV-1-1, CV-1-2
Heavy Commercial	Prohibited	Provides for retail sales, commercial services, office uses, and heavier commercial uses such as wholesale, distribution, storage and vehicular sales and service uses.	*N/A	None
Industrial Categories	Office Use			
Business Park	Permitted	This designation is appropriate in areas characterized by office development and also permitting research, product development and testing, engineering and any other basic research functions leading to new product development and manufacturing, with enhanced design features.	.25 to 3.0 FAR	IP-2-1 zone which allows office, research and development uses, and light manufacturing
Business Park Residential Permitted	Permitted	This designation would be applied in areas where both business park and residential uses are permitted in accordance with the General Plan collocation policy and criteria.	.25 to 3.0 FAR	None
Scientific Research	Prohibited	This designation is appropriate in areas where activities are limited to scientific research, product development and testing, engineering and any other basic research functions leading to new product development with only limited manufacturing. Office uses, including corporate headquarters, would not be permitted, except as accessory to the primary use or as direct support for scientific research uses.	.25 to 3.0 FAR	IP-1-1 zone which allows research and development uses and limited manufacturing.

Light Industrial	Prohibited	This designation allows a wider variety of industrial uses than the business park designation and Scientific Research designation by adding secondary industrial uses such as warehouse storage and transportation terminals and permitting a full-range of manufacturing activities. No office uses are permitted. Only limited office or commercial uses should be permitted which are accessory to the primary industrial use except in highly urbanized areas. Heavy industrial uses such as extractive and primary processing industries that have nuisance or hazardous effects are excluded. This would preserve industrial land from encroachment of commercial and office uses and help maintain competitive land prices in industrial areas.	.25 to 3.0 FAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IS zone which permits small scale industrial and commercial uses but only in small lot urbanized areas would be retained.
Heavy Industrial	Prohibited	This designation provides for industrial uses emphasizing base-sector manufacturing, warehouse and distribution, extractive, and primary processing uses with nuisance or hazardous characteristics. For reasons of health, safety, environmental effects, or welfare these uses are best segregated from other uses. The presence of non-industrial uses, particularly office uses, should be significantly limited in these areas in order to preserve land that is appropriate for large-scale industrial users.	.25 to 3.0 FAR	The IH-1-1 zone 2.0*
Public and Semi-Public Institutional Uses		Provides a designation for uses that are identified as public facilities in the community plan and which offer public services to the community. The public and semi-public facilities and institutions include: airports, community colleges, university campuses, landfills, water sanitation plants, schools, libraries, police and fire facilities, community centers.	20 + acres	Apply a zone similar to the surrounding land use and that allows for the institutional use either as a permitted use or with a conditional use permit.
Open Space		The purpose of the open space designation is to identify lands for outdoor recreation, education, and scenic and visual enjoyment and to facilitate the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands. It is intended that this designation be applied to lands where the primary use is open space.	N/A	All OC, OR and OF zones apply
Parks		This designation is applied to public parks and facilities related to recreational needs in the community.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OP-1-1 allows developed, active parks OP-2-1 allows parks for passive uses with some active uses

Agriculture		Provides for areas that are rural in character and very low density or areas where agricultural uses are predominate. This designation is intended to accommodate a wide range of agriculture and agriculture-related uses such as: dairies; horticulture nurseries and greenhouses; raising and harvesting of crops; raising, maintaining and keeping of animals; separately regulated agriculture uses; and single dwelling units when applicable.	(Low density residential estates) 1 du/10 ac - 1 du/ac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AG-1-1 requires minimum 10-acre lots • AG-1-2 requires minimum 5-acre lots • AR-1-1 requires minimum 10-acre lots • AR-1-2 requires minimum 1-acre lots and RE zones
Residential - Low		This designation accomodates both single-family and multi-family housing at the lowest density with the least intensity.	0 - 14 du/ac	All RE, RS, RX,RT and RM zones that correspond to the intended density range
Residential - Medium		This designation provides a medium density range for housing and an increased intensity of housing.	15 - 29 du/ac	
Residential - Medium High		This designation provides a medium high density range and intensity of housing.	30 - 44 du/ac	
Residential - High		This designation provides a high density range and intensity of housing.	45 - 74 du/ac	
Residential - Very High		This designation provides the highest density range and intensity for housing.	75 - 110 du/ac	

am;1/31/05

1 - Intensity is determined by reviewing the ranges provided by the Community Plans (See Land Use Designation Draft) and will ultimately be decided in the Community Plans.

Recommended Community Plan Outline

I. Introduction

- Environmental Setting
- Summary of major plan goals
- Demographic statistics and existing conditions should be established as a separate document with a link in this section

II. Legislative Framework and General Plan Relationship

- Explanation of General Plan structure, elements and relationship between it and the community plans
- Coastal section – brief description of major issues and reference to exact location of where and how each is addressed in the community plan (unnecessary if the plan includes a separate coastal section or element – see below)

III. Elements

- Land Use*
 - Residential
 - Commercial
 - Industrial
 - Coastal (if necessary and depending upon the magnitude of the resource and complexity of issues)
 - Land Use Map

*These could also be pulled out as separate elements depending upon the prevalence of particular land uses, i.e. industrial in Mira Mesa.

- Mobility
 - Street classifications (and map)
 - Street connections
 - Specific proposals for community street design
 - Transit recommendations
 - Pedestrian issues and proposals (including street lighting)
 - Bike Master Plan (as it pertains to the community)
- Regional and Community Facilities
 - Park and Recreation
 - Libraries
 - Fire and Life Safety
 - Utilities
 - Schools (public and private K-12)
 - Hospitals
 - Cemeteries
 - Airports (unless magnitude of the resource merits a separate element)
 - Landfills
 - City Operation Yards

- Post Office
- Link to the Public Facility Financing Plan
- Prioritization of facilities
- Community specific phasing plan with development thresholds
- Coastal
 - Need for separate element determined by magnitude of resource and complexity of issues and policies, i.e. La Jolla
- Conservation
 - Major open space and natural resources
 - Natural form of the community
 - Urban forest resources
 - Specific design recommendations to address the preservation of and development adjacent to sensitive lands and resources
- Community Identity Element
 - Neighborhood and community linkages (natural and manmade – this could also occur in Mobility)
 - Urban Design/Community Environment/Community Character
 - Historic, Prehistoric and Cultural Resources
 - Landmarks and signage
 - Community specific development policies, such as types of uses to be encouraged in a particular land use category, mixed use guidelines, live/work or shopkeeper units
 - Street Tree Program
- Implementation - This will be adopted as a separate document (i.e., Action Plan, Revitalization Action Plan (RAP) to allow for more detail on the identification of specific projects, timing and funding, and responsible staff/agency.)

IV. Appendices (not considered part of the community plan)

- Bound with the hard copy and links provided in the on-line version
- Anything that is subject to regular updates and revisions and/or controlled by another jurisdiction or agency

●

V. Do Not Include:

- Social Needs
- EIRS
- Plan Alternatives
- Recommended zoning maps
- City or region-wide recommendations

Land Use Element Subcommittees Rosters

Land Use Element CPC Subcommittee

Gardner, David	Uptown
Weber, Gary	Normal Heights
Germain, Eric	Tierrasanta
Hollingsworth, Tracy	Peninsula
Ilko, Bob	Scripps Miramar Ranch
Rink, Chris	Clairemont Mesa

Land Use Element Working Group

Anderson, Bill
Bridges, John
Dawe, Jim
Dumka, Bill
Gardner, David
Heidel, Lynne
Isaacson, Joan
Laub, Steve
Ruggles, Karen
Touchstone, Vicki

Draft Criteria for Community Plan Amendments

Since General Plans and land uses are not static entities, and in response to ever changing demographic, technological, environmental, and economic data, it is necessary to establish a procedure to govern how changes to the General (and community) Plan are initiated, processed, and considered. It is intended that these procedures allow for orderly, necessary and desirable change while protecting the Vision and Values expressed by the citizens of San Diego and adopted by the City Council. Only those amendments that would implement and or enhance the vision as detailed in the General Plan should be considered for approval.

Criteria for Initiation of Amendments to Land Use Plans

- **Technical Amendments.** An amendment to a land use plan will be considered as initiated without need for a public hearing if the Planning Department determines that the proposal can be classified as a Technical Amendment by meeting one or more of the following:
 - (1) The amendment is appropriate due to a map or text error and/or omission made when the land use plan was adopted or during subsequent amendments; or
 - (2) The amendment is appropriate to address other technical corrections discovered during implementation; or
 - (3) The amendment is necessary to ensure the public health, safety, or welfare; or
 - (4) The amendment is proposed to identify the location and design of a public facility already identified in the adopted Capital Improvements Program (CIP); or
 - (5) The amendment is required to comply with changes in state or federal law or applicable findings of a court of law; or
 - (6) The amendment is appropriate to revise language concerned solely with a process or procedural matter or an appendix to update information

(Technical amendments would not change policy direction of the General Plan.)

- **Initiation Criteria.** If the proposed amendment fails to fall into any of the categories listed above then the Planning Department will present the initiation to the Planning Commission and make a recommendation regarding its approval or denial based upon compliance with all of the following criteria:

- (1) The plan amendment appears to be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan and affected community plan, especially the Vision and Values as expressed in the City of Villages strategy. *(Explain how the proposed change in policy and/or land use not only complies with the General and Community Plan but implements significant goals and policies.)*
- (2) The plan amendment appears to offer an extraordinary public benefit to the community or City. *(What is the extraordinary public benefit? Explain how the proposed amendment provides or contributes to an extraordinary public benefit? How is this superior to public benefits already provided with the adopted plan (the benefit should extend beyond the project itself)? Why is the amendment necessary to achieve the extraordinary public benefit?)*
- (3) Public facilities appear to be available to serve the proposed increase in density and/or intensity, or, provision of public facilities will be addressed as a component of the amendment preparation and public hearing process. *(Proposals must provide detail on the timing and funding for necessary public facilities (i.e. public facilities financing plan amendment, development agreement, reimbursement agreement, facility construction or some other mechanism as a project component).*

Initiation of a plan amendment in no way confers adoption. Neither staff nor the Planning Commission is committed to recommend or in favor or denial of the proposed amendment. Nor is the City Council committed to adopt or deny the proposed amendment.

Plan Amendment Processing

Once the amendment is initiated either as a technical amendment or through approval at a public hearing, city staff will work with the applicant and community to process the amendment. Each plan amendment will involve a community specific set of issues identified by the community, Planning Department and Planning Commission for analysis and evaluation through the plan amendment review process. Each amendment will also be subject to the following standard list of issues based upon the vision, values, and policies established with the adoption of the City of Villages strategy:

- Level and diversity of community support
- Implementation of major goals and policies of the General Plan, City of Villages Strategy and affected community plan
- Provision of public facilities generated by the amendment, if it involves an increase or addition of residential density or commercial and/or industrial intensity, concurrent with need

- Provision of an extraordinary public benefit
- Appropriateness of the boundaries of the amendment site

Public Hearing Process

- Upon completion of the draft amendment and appropriate environmental document, the plan amendment will proceed to public hearings. Please refer to Chapter 12, Article 2, Division 1, Sections 122.0105 – 122.0107.
- The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the following factors when considering the proposed amendment:
 - Level and diversity of community support
 - Implementation of major goals and policies of the General Plan, City of Villages Strategy and affected community plan
 - Provision of public facilities generated by the amendment, if it involves an increase or addition of residential density or commercial and/or industrial intensity, concurrent with need
 - Extraordinary public benefit