

## **Responses to CPC Motions**

Over the past two years from August 2005 to the present, CPC has conducted an in depth review of Draft General Plan including numerous subcommittee and full committee meetings (see the attached list of meetings). The September 2007 Public Hearing Draft reflects the input that CPC provided over the two-year process. Some of the major edits to the Draft General Plan include the following:

- Removal of the City of Villages Map and inclusion of a new Village Propensity Map based on existing conditions (from 2005 draft);
- Renaming of the Land Use Element to Land Use and Community Planning and expansion of the community planning section to better define the roles of the General Plan and community plans as well as the role of community planning groups (from 2005 draft);
- Consolidation of public facilities policies into the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element including the deletion of Table PF-1 and replacement with a menu and revamped the priorities policies;
- Change in the population-based park standard from 2.4 to 2.8 net useable for every 1,000 residents (from 2005 draft);
- Significant revisions to the equivalency policies to limit the application of equivalencies where they have been identified through a Parks Master Plan or community plan update/amendment process;
- Substantial edits to the Conservation Element responsive to the sustainability recommendations;
- Major reorganization of the Urban Design Element (from 2005 drafts);
- Revision of the Mobility Element to reflect more emphasis on a balanced network and deletion of a section (from 2005 drafts).

The following tables identify CPC motions and staff responses for motions provided over the entire process including the latest motions on the October 2006 Draft. For clarification purposes all responses have been updated to reflect any changes to the policy numbering or edits in the current September 2007 Public Hearing Draft. In some instances, the recommended revisions could not be made. Where this occurs, staff has provided the rationale as to why the edit could not be made.

<b>Strategic Framework Element - CPC Meeting of May 22, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>Eric Germain moved to incorporate a Community Bill of Rights, as follows:</p> <p>The policies of the City of San Diego General Plan should be recognized as goals and aspirations, as aims and objectives, but not as hard requirements that all must be achieved. Some policies reflect priorities of greater concern while others reflect lower priority goals. This context must be maintained as policies are reviewed and implemented.</p> <p>City of San Diego General Plan also includes many goals and policies that can be misinterpreted if assessed in isolation. To preclude mistaken interpretation or unintended application of this General Plan, the following overriding principles are added in order to provide clarity to future readers.</p> <p>A suggestion was made to revise the motion to delete the word “overriding” from the last sentence. Mr. Germain accepted the revision to the motion. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 18-10-1.</p>	<p>A “Community Bill of Rights” was not added, but edits were made in the Strategic Framework section as well as the Land Use Element to address many of the points raised, as noted in the responses below. In addition, page SF-22 contains new language that describes the role and function of General Plan policies and community plans.</p>
<p>Eric Germain moved that the committee accept his proposal to add text under Policies, SF-1, as follows: The General Plan shall not be used as a means to compel a community to accept a reduced quality of life, or a significant change to its essential character. Such changes to a community shall only be approved when endorsed by a majority of the citizens of a community.</p> <p>Laura Riebeau suggested the entire second sentence be deleted from the motion. Mr. Germain accepted the deletion to the motion. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 25-3-1.</p>	<p>This language was partially included, but reworded to state in a positive context as follows: "Overall, the General Plan and community plans are intended to be used as a means to maintain or improve quality of life, and to respect the essential character of San Diego’s communities” (p. LU-21, and SF-22). See also Policies LU.A.2, A.5, A.7 and C.5 for policies related to public input.</p>

<b>Strategic Framework Element - CPC Meeting of May 22, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>Eric Germain moved that the committee accept his proposal to add text, under Policies, SF-3, as follows: The General Plan shall not be construed as encouraging growth in the size or scope of government, whether measured in terms of governmental departments, City staff or City-managed bureaucracy. Tracy Reed moved to delete all text after the first comma, “whether measured in terms of governmental departments, city staff or city managed bureaucracy.” Mr. Germain accepted the revision to his motion. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 20-8-1.</p>	<p>Edit was not made.</p>

## I. Land Use & Community Planning Element

<b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of March 27, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>Eric Germain moved to amend the Land Use and Community Planning Element to add policy language that village sites are to be endorsed, or supported by the community. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss and Tracy Reed. The motion was approved 17-6-1.</p>	<p>The specific wording edits calling for public or community planning group endorsement of villages was not made, as planning groups do not have decision-making authority. However, edits were made to bring more focus to the role of public input and the community planning process:</p> <p>Policy LU-A.2 and A.5 calls for village sites to be identified and reviewed with “input from recognized community planning groups and the general public”</p> <p>Revised Policy LU-A.7 .a calls for the City to consider “community character and preferences” when determining village land uses.</p> <p>Revised Discussion on p. LU-14 states that it is the “role of the community plans to refine General Plan goals and policies into site-specific recommendations that will guide the development of each community.”</p> <p>New language in LU-C.5.b is to “Include all community residents, property owners, business</p>

<p><b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of March 27, 2007</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
	<p>owners, civic groups...” and others who wish to participate in the planning process.</p>
<p>Mr. Germain moved to add the following language to create LU G.8, Page LU-32, Section G, Airport Land Use Compatibility: “Operate City-owned airports in a manner consistent with established policies that serve to mitigate airport impact on the neighboring communities and that have been agreed to by the neighboring communities.” The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss and Tracy Reed. The motion failed 12-13-1.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to amend Mr. Germain’s motion on LU G.8, Page LU-32, Section G, Airport Land Use Compatibility, to delete the text “and that have been agreed to by the neighboring communities.” The motion was approved 19-6-1.</p>	<p>LU-G.10 (formerly LU-G.7) addresses airport operations and the minimization of impacts due to the operations of military and civilian airports.</p> <p>The following text was added to the Mobility Element Section H, Airports: The City enforces aircraft weight and noise level regulations at Montgomery Field to reduce the affect of airport noise on adjacent residential areas.</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that no new villages, transportation corridors, or added density will be put in until public facilities are in place to support it. The motion was seconded by Jeff Stevens and Cynthia Conger. The motion was approved 23-0-1.</p>	<p>Several edits were made to address public facilities adequacy. Policy LU-A.1.c. calls for village sites to be designated, as appropriate “where consistent with public facilities adequacy .....</p> <p>Policy LU-A.4 states that villages are to be located on sites that can be served by existing and planned public facilities and services, including transit. Any added density, as proposed through a community plan amendment or update, would be evaluated to determine if existing or planned public facilities are adequate to accommodate the proposed increase in density.</p>

**Past CPC Comments:**

<p><b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b> (LU Element only: CPC comments refer to a February working draft)</p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to the September 2007 Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element</b></p>
<p>On p. 1, Plan Issues, shorten the sentence, to: “Land use designations are not standardized throughout the City.” The motion was approved 15-8-0.</p>	<p>The Plan Issues section of the Land Use and Community Plan Element has been removed. Plan issues will be summarized at the community plan level once updates are underway.</p>
<p><b>Subsection A.</b> Replace the word “should” with “<i>should or should not</i>” (approved 17-5-2)</p>	<p>The pertinent sentence read previously as “It is a strategy designed to allow each community to consciously determine where and how new growth should occur, and requires that new public facilities be in place as growth occurs.” This sentence has been removed. Actual village locations will be designated in the community plans with input from recognized community planning groups and the general public</p>
<p><b>Subsection A, LU-A. 2 (p. 8).</b> Add the sentence “<i>not every community will host a village</i>” (approved 18-6-0).</p>	<p>Specific village locations will be determined at the community plan level with input from the recognized community planning group and the general public. Therefore, the issue of “not every community will host a village” will be better and more specifically addressed at the community plan level. Policies LU-A.1- LU-A.5 provide policy direction to guide the future identification of village sites at the community plan level.</p>
<p><b>Subsection I, LU-I.4 (p. 37),</b> Add the clause: “<i>greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,</i>” to the text of the policy goal (approved 12-8-0).</p>	<p>Policy LU-I.4 revised as recommended.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C, p. 17,</b> Regarding the implementation of community based goals, first paragraph, add: “<i>but only when infrastructure deficits are eliminated and infrastructure occurs concurrent with further development</i>” to the end of the sentence on overall density and housing capacity (approved 19-2-0).</p>	<p>A revised Policy LU.A.1.d calls for designation of villages “where consistent with public facilities adequacy and other goals of the General Plan.” Additional discussion and policies on the evaluation of development proposals and public facilities has been relocated to Section C Evaluation of Growth, Facilities, and Services of the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element.</p>

<p><b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b>  <b>(LU Element only: CPC comments refer to a February working draft)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to the September 2007 Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection A</b>, on p. 6, “Village Categories” (Neighborhood Village Centers): The word “should” in the first sentence was changed to “<i>could</i>.” The sentence formerly read: “Neighborhood Village Centers should be located in almost every community plan area” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The edit was not made. Specific village locations will be determined at the community plan level with input from the recognized community planning group and the public-at-large. Policies LU-A.1 – LU-A.5 provide policy direction to guide the future identification of village sites at the community plan level. There is not a policy that requires villages to be sited in every community plan area.</p>
<p><b>Subsection B</b>, Policy LU-B.8, (p. 15), the word “incompatible” was added, so the policy goal reads: “Protect key employment areas from encroachment from <i>incompatible</i> non-industrial uses while providing areas for secondary employment and supporting uses.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The policy is no longer included in the Land Use and Community Planning Element. However, the discussion of the encroachment of non-industrial uses is discussed in the Economic Prosperity Element.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 16, “Community Planning” (Goals): Two words were added, so that the fourth bullet point reads: “Community plans that maintain or increase planned density of residential, <i>and employment</i>, land uses in appropriate locations.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The edit was not incorporated. However, a new subpolicy LU-C.2.a.3 was added to “evaluate employment land and designate according to their role in the community and region.”</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 21, “Community Plan Land Use Designation” Table, under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” the office use allowed was expanded so that it was not limited to corporate headquarters, and would apply to all accessory office use. (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The edit was not incorporated. “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial” allow limited office uses such as corporate headquarters, accessory office uses to the primary use or as direct support for scientific research uses. A “Business Park” designation is also proposed that would allow office uses other than just corporate headquarters or accessory uses to the primary use.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, p. 23, “Community Planning (Evaluating New Growth): In the second paragraph, second sentence, it states: “Historically, communities have not fully welcomed the idea of new growth when public facilities deficiencies exist.” An additional sentence was added: “<i>New development should not be allowed where existing public facilities are not sufficient to</i></p>	<p>Discussion and policies on the evaluation of development proposals and public facilities have been relocated to Section C <i>Evaluation of Growth, Facilities, and Services</i> of the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element. See Policies PF-C.1 – PF-C.7.</p>

<b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b> <b>(LU Element only: CPC comments refer to a February working draft)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to the September 2007 Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element</b>
<p><i>support it.</i>" (approved 24-0-0)</p>	
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 24, "Community Planning" (Community Facilities Prioritization): The words "<i>or applicable community plan</i>" were added to the sentence in the middle of the paragraph which states: "Individual new development proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>or applicable community plans</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies." (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Discussion and policies on the evaluation of development proposals and public facilities has been relocated to Section C <i>Evaluation of Growth, Facilities, and Services</i> of the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, Policy LU-C.6 (p. 25) - the words "and applicable community plan" were added, so that it reads: "Evaluate individual new development proposals to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>and applicable community plan</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies." (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>LU-C.6 was removed from the Land Use Element. Discussion and policies on the evaluation of development proposals and public facilities has been relocated to Section C <i>Evaluation of Growth, Facilities, and Services</i> of the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element.</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b> "Plan Amendment Process" Policy LU-D.7 (p. 27) – recommend deletion of the following: "Initiate a technical amendment without the need for a public Planning Commission hearing when the Planning Department determines, through a single discipline Preliminary Review, that the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure the public health, safety and welfare." (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>LU-D.6 has not been deleted. This is only pertaining to the foregoing an initiation hearing with the Planning Commission, the actual amendment would still go through public hearing process which would allow the opportunity for public input as well as input from the recognized community planning group.</p>



<b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b> <b>(LU Element only: CPC comments refer to a February working draft)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to the September 2007 Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element</b>
<b>Subsection G</b> , Policy LU-G.1 (p. 34) - to the end of the policy add: “Work with the ALUC to develop policies that are consistent with the state and federal guidelines and that balance airport land use compatibility goals with other citywide and regional goals, taking into account that public safety should be the most important consideration.” (approved 24-0-0)	All four compatibility factors are equally important (safety, air space protection, noise, and overflights). LU-G.1 was revised to add the following language: “and that emphasize the major airport land use compatibility factors”
<b>Subsection I</b> , Policy LU-I.4 (p. 37) - add the clause: “ <i>greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,</i> ” to the text of the policy. (approved 24-0-0)	Edit was made to LU-I.4.
<b>Subsection I</b> , Policy LU-I.5 (p. 37) – replace the word “Guarantee” at the beginning of the sentence with the phrase “ <i>Strive to achieve.</i> ” The policy goal formerly read: “Guarantee meaningful participation for all community residents in the siting and design of public facilities.” (approved 24-0-0)	Edit was made to LU-I.5.

## II. Mobility Element

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
The first motion is a three-part motion on maintenance standards. <u>Part 1</u> : Eric Germain moved to add a new goal, to page ME-20, Section C, Street and Freeway System, to read “ <i>Well-maintained streets and a responsive road repair program.</i> ” <u>Part 2</u> : Mr. Germain moved to add the words “ <i>and Maintenance</i> ” to the heading on page ME-21, Section C, Street and Freeway System, Discussion, so that the heading reads “Street Layout, Design, Operations <i>and Maintenance.</i> ”	Goal: “Well Maintained Streets” added to section C of the Mobility Element (note that this goal statement should have appeared as underlined text in the Draft General Plan)  Heading in subsection of Section C now reads: “Street Layout, Design, Operations and Maintenance”.  Section C, was edited to include the following



<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p><u>Part 3:</u> Mr. Germain moved to insert an additional bullet and paragraph to page ME-21, Section C, Street and Freeway System, Discussion, to read: <i>“A top priority is proper street maintenance: filling potholes, repaving damaged streets and fixing raised sidewalks. Maintenance of the road system is a critical City function with high visibility, because poorly maintained streets: 1) can cause vehicle damage, 2) can cause vehicle and pedestrian accidents, and 3) tend to accelerate further deterioration of the roadway. Service-level metrics should be established to assess the City’s ability to maintain the roadways and its responsiveness to citizen complaints.”</i> The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 19-0-1.</p>	<p>language: “Maintenance of the City’s circulation system is a critical City function that enhances safety, efficiency, and capacity of the circulation system thus enhancing mobility. Established industry metrics and benchmarking with similar municipalities, and regular assessment of system conditions form the basis for determining the level of City resources that are allocated to maintain baseline standards.”</p>
<p>Eric Germain moved to amend the paragraph on page ME-23, Section C, Street and Freeway System, ME-C.4, b., to read “Establish street maintenance as a priority, City service that adequately maintains the transportation system.” Additionally, insertion of the following text: 1) Establish minimum Levels of Service for road repair (repaving, sealing, pothole filling, curb and sidewalk repair, etc.) to ensure priority repairs are made without delay and less critical repairs are made in reasonable time. 2) Ensure that road repair concerns of lower priority are consolidated into efficient work packages, such that repair crews in the field: a) fix all reported issues in the nearby area and, b) unreported but equally significant road repair issues are also fixed by a repair crew in the area. 3) Establish road repair Levels of Service that can be measured and tracked over time, to verify City response times. City shall report regularly to the public on its ability to satisfy the minimum Levels of Service for street maintenance. 4) Establish lines of communication between City staff and the Communities (via the CPGs) to facilitate the reporting and prioritization of a community’s more significant road repair concerns. Automate via the internet, an information exchange with communities in order to facilitate the widest</p>	<p>ME-C.4 revised as follows:  Improve operations and maintenance on City streets and sidewalks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Regularly optimize traffic signal timing and coordination to improve circulation. Implement new signal and intersection technologies that improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular safety while improving overall circulation.</li> <li>b. Adequately maintain the transportation system through regular preventative maintenance and repair, and life cycle replacement.</li> <li>c. Encourage community participation in planning, assessing, and prioritizing the life cycle management of the circulation system.</li> <li>d. When new streets and sidewalks are built and as existing streets and sidewalks are modified - design, construct, operate, and maintain them to accommodate and balance service to all users/modes (including walking, bicycling, transit, high occupancy vehicles (HOVs), autos, trucks, automated waste and recycling collection vehicles, and emergency vehicles).</li> <li>e. Continue to pursue adequate maintenance of</li> </ol>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>understanding of the status of road repair and other intended changes to street design. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 19-0-1.</p>	<p>sidewalks by property owners and investigate new approaches to facilitate improved sidewalk maintenance citywide.</p>
<p>Eric Germain moved to add the following text to page ME-43, Section H, Airports, Airport Site Selection: “In the interim, the City will coordinate with the Regional Airport Authority in its efforts to maximize the passenger and flight capacity of SDIA in the current footprint of Lindbergh Field.” The motion was seconded by Laura Riebeau. The motion was approved 16-1-2</p>	<p>“Airport Site Selection” subsection was deleted. The following language was added to the San Diego International Airport subsection: “The City works with the Airport Authority, SANDAG, and the regional agencies in planning efforts to improve multi-modal ground connections and maximize the passenger, cargo, and flight capacity of SDIA.”</p>
<p>Morton Printz moved to establish a body of stakeholders for the purpose of planning the City transportation infrastructure for the century, to achieve the goals and policies of the Mobility Element of the General Plan and to facilitate land use decisions. The motion was seconded by Jim Varnadore. The motion was approved 18-0-2.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC recommend the City encourage the use of alternative transportation, but it should not be done in a manner that is detrimental to vehicular travel. An efficient transportation system should encourage improvements in <u>all</u> the various transportation modes that exist, including vehicular, mass transit, bicycle and alternative forms of transportation. Eric Germain seconded the motion. The motion was approved 19-0-1.</p>	<p>The current approach in the Mobility Element is to balance the needs for transportation improvements for all modes of travel. ME-C.9 calls for the City to “Use multimodal quality/level of service analysis guidelines to evaluate potential transportation improvements from a multi-modal perspective in order to determine optimal improvements that balance the needs of all users of the right of way”.</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC recommend that encouragement of mass transit and alternative transportation should not result in the reduction of existing parking standards and requirements in either residential or commercial areas. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 19-0-1.</p>	<p>Parking standards are contained within the Land Development Code. No changes to the parking standards are proposed concurrent with the General Plan Update. However, Policy ME-G.2 calls for the City to “Implement innovative and up-to-date parking regulations that address the vehicular and bicycle parking needs generated by development.” which could result in code amendments if data justifies such amendments.</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the installation of bicycle lanes should not result in the elimination of on-street parking. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss.</p>	<p>This edit was not made. While staff would evaluate the need for on-street parking when considering bicycle lane implementation, there</p>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>The motion was approved 13-6-1.</p>	<p>are additional factors that staff would consider. Policy ME-C.4.d states that “When new streets and sidewalks are built and as existing streets and sidewalks are modified - design, construct, operate, and maintain them to accommodate and balance service to all users/modes (including walking, bicycling, transit, High Occupancy Vehicles (HOVs), autos, trucks, automated waste and recycling collection vehicles, and emergency vehicles)”</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC recommend that bus lanes or other alternate transportation lanes should not result in removal of lanes for vehicle traffic unless there is strong support from the local community impacted, and that the loss of lanes will not result in negative impacts to traffic flow and circulation. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 17-2-1.</p>	<p>This edit was not made. While staff would strive to improve local traffic flow and circulation, staff would also consider additional broad-based public input and impacts to the multi-modal transportation system as a whole. See also ME-C.4.d</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC recommend that Community Parking Districts should not be encouraged; instead, the portion of revenue generated by parking meters and parking management should be spent directly on needed public improvements. Communities should be encouraged to set up voluntary boards, possibly as subcommittees of recognized community planning groups, to oversee the appropriate use of revenues generated in Community Parking Districts - in no case should administrative costs exceed 10% of the total revenue generated. <i>Note: The Uptown Parking District, which is held up as a model of this sort of district, presently has an annual overhead of approximately 64%.</i> Guy Preuss moved to amend the motion to add the phrase “within the individual planning areas” to the end of the first sentence, so that the sentence reads: “instead, the portion of revenue generated by parking meters and parking management should be spent directly on needed public improvements <i>within the individual planning areas.</i>” Mr. Preuss said this will guarantee that the money will be used for public improvements within the planning area. Kathy Mateer accepted the</p>	<p>No edits were made. The City continues to support the use of Community Parking Districts as a tool to implement plans and activities to alleviate parking impacts. The Community Parking District Program allows communities to harness a portion of any parking management revenue generated within the community's boundaries and then reinvest the funds in physical improvements or services that improve the traffic circulation and physical environment of that community. The program manages the distribution of a 45 percent of the revenue from parking meters and other parking related revenues to the designated parking districts. These funds are used by the districts to implement solutions to parking problems. The Community Parking Districts, on average, spent approximately 16 percent on administrative overhead in the fiscal year 2006. The Uptown Partnership, Inc. has an annual overhead of 7 percent in comparison to the full amount contracted for fiscal year 2007.</p>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>
<b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
amendment. The motion, as amended, was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 18-1-1.	
Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC recommend that absolutely no development should be permitted in the airport Approach Overlay Zone (AAOZ), which is a 50-foot safety buffer immediately below the FAA flight path to and from San Diego International Airport. The AAOZ was enacted by the City of San Diego based on a model ordinance drafted by the National Transportation Safety Board. The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 14-4-1.	New policies and revisions to existing policies in the Land Use Element section G to address airspace protection Citywide. Staff supports the AAOZ buffer and recommends that in considered as a future community plan policy.

### Previous CPC Comments.

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>
<b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b>
<b>Subsection A</b> - CPC agreed with staff's suggested reorganization.	Staff deleted this subsection from the Mobility element; the issues it contains are covered in other sections of the General Plan.
<b>Subsection B</b> Discussion (p. ME-53) – Delete the text pertaining to childhood obesity (approved 19-1-1).	Edit was made to subsection B.
ME-B.1 (p. ME-54) - Provide more balance between pedestrians and automobiles in a manner that does not worsen the service level for automobile traffic, and delete the text that follows the word "safety"(approved 15-2-3).	ME-A.1 references a Pedestrian Improvements Toolbox and calls for design that maximizes pedestrian safety and comfort.
ME-B.2 (p. ME-54) - Apply the Pedestrian Master Plan in a manner that is consistent and complimentary to each community's existing plan (consensus).	Section A discussion text now reads: "The PMP is intended to be complementary to the community plans, recognizing that not all community plans currently address pedestrian issues".
ME-B.5 (p. ME-55) – Emphasize the importance of safety issues, including protecting children from crime (consensus).	Added a new section on Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility, and a reference to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Measures in what is now policy ME-A.2.e.
<b>Subsection C</b> (p. ME-57) Overall - Revise to encourage alternative modes,	Various edits have been made, such as the revised policy ME-B.10, which replaces the

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b></p>
<p>but avoid being detrimental to automobile travel. (approved 12-9-0)</p>	<p>July 2005 Draft Policy ME-C.3.</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b> -(edits approved by consensus) ME-D.1 a,b,c, &amp; e (p. ME-63) - Add “<i>In accordance with approved community plans</i>”</p>	<p>Several policies have been edited to reference community plans. See ME- C.1 and ME-C.2.d, &amp; f</p>
<p>ME-D-6 (p. ME-64) - Edit to state “<i>Protect the safety of pedestrians and the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.</i>”</p>	<p>The revised policy now references a “Traffic Calming Toolbox” and calls for installation of traffic calming measures “to increase the safety and enhance the livability of communities.” The revised policy (now ME-C.5) is consistent with the City’s draft Traffic Calming Program Handbook.</p>
<p><b>Subsection G</b>, ME-G.1 (p. ME-70) - State that the City’s Bicycle Master Plan should be consistent and complimentary to each community’s existing plan.</p>	<p>The Discussion in the revised Bicycling section clarifies that “the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) is intended to provide a citywide perspective that is enhanced with more detailed community plan level recommendations and refinements” and the new policy ME-F.1.c. states: “Reference and refine the plan (BMP), as needed, in conjunction with community plan updates”.</p>
<p>ME-G.2 (p. ME-71) -add that a bikeway system network that is continuous and safe, while balanced with the need to preserve pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>The revised policy (now ME-F.2.a) states: "Develop a bikeway network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, improves safety, and serves important destinations.”</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME-H-2 (p. ME-75) – revise to say to the effect: “strive to achieve the efficient use of land devoted to parking through such measures as...”</p>	<p>The revised policy (now ME-G.2.b) states: “Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, shared parking, mixed-use development, and managed public parking, while still providing appropriate levels of parking.”</p>
<p>ME-H-2. a - to include the phrase “<i>existing and funded</i>” high quality transit.</p>	<p>The revised policy (now ME-G.2.a) includes the phrase “existing and funded transit with a base mid-day service frequency of ten to fifteen minutes ...”</p>
<p><b>Subsection K</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) Discussion (p. ME-84) – edit to reflect the fact most of San Diego’s air cargo comes from outside the County (Los Angeles or Mexico).</p>	<p>Section J (p. ME-48) states that "virtually all of San Diego's goods are imported from outside of the region" and the revised Airports Section (Section H) contains discussion and policies related to the need to support forecasted air</p>



<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b></p>
	<p>cargo demand.</p>
<p>ME-K.1 (p. ME-84) - add language to “<i>Support and pursue State and Federal funding for infrastructure improvements and use of...</i>”</p>	<p>The revised policy ME-K.1 calls for the City to “identify and prioritize ... projects for inclusion in the City of San Diego’s annual Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and to guide the City’s applications for regional, state or federal funds ...). See also Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element (PF) Policy PF-B.3).</p>
<p>ME-K.2 (p. ME-84) - Add “<i>port of entry</i>” to the list of transportation facilities to be preserved.</p>	<p>This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element Section J – International Trade, Maritime Trade, and Border Relations.</p>
<p>New ME-K.8 - Add a new subsection with the text: “<i>Collaborate with the Government of Mexico to plan for future border crossings, including location, technology, and preservation of the road network.</i>”</p>	<p>This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element Section J – International Trade, Maritime Trade, and Border Relations.</p>
<p><b>Subsection M</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME- M.2 – noted that staff recommends moving this to the Public Facilities Element.</p>	<p>This section (now Section K) underwent major edits to move general financing policies to the Public Facilities Element and to add additional discussion on regional coordination. Policies specific to transportation financing remain in this section.</p>
<p>ME-M-4, Policies 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12 - Edit these policies to reflect that: “It should not be a policy of the General Plan to recommend tax and fee increases. All statements and policies that suggest funds should be raised via tax or fee increases should be left to the discretion of elected representatives, and deleted from the General Plan. However, it is fully appropriate for the General Plan to recommend that the City pursue its maximum fair share of County, State and Federal funding.”</p>	<p>This topic is addressed in the revised Public Facilities Element, Section A – Public Facilities Financing.</p>
<p>ME-M.11 – Edit as follows: Establish community-based phasing thresholds that link development potential to the <u>availability of existing or planned and funded</u> transportation facilities ...and services.”</p>	<p>This policy was deleted from the Mobility Element and is addressed in the revised Public Facilities Element Section C. See Policy PF-C.4 regarding “timing and sequencing controls on new development” and PF-C.6 regarding public facility financing plans.</p>

### III. Urban Design Element

<b>CPC Recommendations on Urban Design (UD) Element made at CPC Meeting of March 27, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
Kathy Mateer moved to revise the text, under UD-5, regarding increases on density, to amend the first paragraph from “increases on density” to “changes in density.” The motion was seconded by Cynthia Conger. The motion was approved 19-1-2.	Edit was made in the Introduction.
Kathy Mateer moved to add the following text the end of both sentences of UD-22, UD-C-1, d.1, and d.2: “to minimize negative impacts on the community.” The motion was seconded and approved 14-8-1.	Edit was made in policy UD-C.1.e.1 & 2.

### Previous CPC Comments.

<b>CPC Recommendations on Urban Design (UD) Element made at CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
Section B, Discussion (p. UD-16) - Revise to state “...should contribute to the <i>creation</i> and the preservation of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place.”	Change made to the discussion section and to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet under Section B, Goals.
Section A, “General Urban Design,” Policy UD-A.1.a (p. UD-7) - The sentence “Protect the integrity of community open spaces intended for preservation,” was modified to read, “Protect the integrity of community <i>plan designated</i> open spaces.”	Change made. Policy UD-A.1.a
Section A: Policy UD-A.2.a - Add word “meadows” to the sentence, “Preserve and enhance naturally occurring features such as coastlines, rivers, creeks, canyons and ridge lines.”	Sentence restructured to refer to wetlands and riparian zones. Now Policy UD-A.1.b
Section A: Policy UD-A.13.a - Where the text states, “Provide comprehensive project sign plans”, modify to read, “Design signs as a means to communicate a unified theme and identity for the project.”	Change made. Now Policy UD-A.14.a
Section A: Policy UD-A.16.a - Revise to state, “Design projects to encourage visible space that will serve as a means to discourage and deter crime through the location of physical features, activities and people to maximize visibility.” These words replaced the phrase “encourage natural surveillance”, which was felt to be too intrusive.	Change made. Now Policy UD-A.17.a



<b>CPC Recommendations on Urban Design (UD) Element made at CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
Section B, (p. UD-16) The last sentence of the discussion read: “However, new development – whether it is in the form of infill, redevelopment, or first-time development – should contribute to the <i>preservation</i> of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place.” The words “the preservation” replaced “continuing positive evolution.”	Change made to the discussion section and to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet under Section B, Goals.
Section D, UD-D.2 - Deleted entire text which stated: “Encourage placement of active uses, such as retailers, restaurants, fitness centers, and various services, on the ground floor of buildings in areas where the greatest levels of pedestrian activity is sought.”	Repeat of Policy UD-C.1.c
Section G, Policy UD-G.1.d - Revise to state “Reinforce community pride and identity by encouraging artworks and cultural activities that celebrate, <i>but do not overwhelm</i> , the unique cultural, ethnic, historical, or other attributes of the neighborhood.”	Now Policy UD-F.1.d and did not add “but do not overwhelm” to the policy.
Section G: Policy UD-G.1 - Add policy under <i>Community Identity</i> to address involvement and oversight by community planning committees in the decision-making process regarding public art and cultural amenities.	Policy added which provides for planning group involvement. Policy UD-F.1.g
Policy UD-A.11.e - Revise to state “ <i>especially adjacent to community public viewsheds.</i> ”	Change made. Policy UD-A.12.e

#### **IV. Economic Prosperity Element**

<b>CPC Recommendations on Economic Prosperity (EP) Element made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b>
Buzz Gibbs moved that the CPC recommend the adoption of a new Land Use category, Light Industrial, Office Use Permitted, with the same list of approved uses as Light Industrial, plus allowing office uses, or amend the category Business Park, Office Use Permitted to allow warehousing, wholesale, distribution and storage. The motion was seconded by Jeff Stevens. The motion was approved 17-0-2.	Edit was not made. The General Plan land use designations are intended to provide a full menu of land use options for use in the community plan update process.

## Previous CPC Comments.

<b>CPC Recommendations on Economic Prosperity Element (EP) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p><b>Subsection A – Industrial Land Uses</b> (approved 19-1-0)            A. Goals- revise the first goal to replace ‘middle-income’ with “a full range of employment opportunities”            EP-A.2, EP-A.3, EPA-9,-various word replacements.            EP-A-8-remove subsection ‘a’ referencing when properties should be considered for redesignation from non-industrial to industrial uses. ‘a’ states that it could be considered to accommodate the expansion or retention of existing industrial uses.</p>	<p>The first goal of section A was revised, “A diversified economy with a focus on providing quality employment opportunities for all San Diegans”.            EP-A.2, etc-edits were made.</p> <p>EP-A.8- not removed due to element’s focus on retaining and expanding existing businesses where possible.</p>
<p><b>Subsection B –Commercial Land Uses</b> (approved 16-2-0)            Goals-delete goal 3 ‘new commercial development that does not impede the economic viability of existing commercial areas’.            EP-B.2-Delete ‘strongly discourage the creation of new auto oriented strip developments where parking is located between the street frontage and the buildings’.            EP-B.9-Delete policy ‘Encourage more intense commercial development in neighborhood and urban villages, transit corridors, subregional employment areas where transit is available’.            EP-B.12- put the word “viable” in the policy.            EP-B.15- add in a ratio of residential to visitor commercial use in that category.</p>	<p>Goals-were edited to state: “New commercial development that contributes positively to the economic vitality of the community and provides opportunities for new business development.”            EP-B.2 – not deleted; Now EP-B.13, “Ensure that regulations encourage uses to cluster or intensify at focal points along major arterial streets. . .”)            EP-B.9 deleted            EP-B.12 now EP-B.8 – “Retain the City’s existing neighborhood commercial activities and develop new commercial activities within walking distance of residential areas, unless proven infeasible.”            EP-B.15 now addressed in policies EP-B.15 and 16. The land use designations are now located in the Land Use Element, Table LU-4. Ratios will be addressed when visitor commercial zones are created.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C –Subregional Employment Areas</b> (adopted 18-0-0)            EP-C.9-delete policy referencing collocation in Kearny Mesa</p>	<p>EP-C.9-deleted.</p>
<p><b>Subsection D –Employment Development</b> (approved 18-1-0)            Delete entire subsection because it goes beyond the traditional land use focus of an element.</p>	<p>Did not delete section due to equitable development requirements. The subsection addresses improvement of the quality of life and opportunity for existing local residents rather than imported tech workers. (Now Section E)</p>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Economic Prosperity Element (EP) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b> <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<b>Subsection E-Education and Workforce Development</b> (approved 19-0-0) EP-E.5-delete policy which encourages the city to provide internships.	Policy deleted
<b>Subsection F-Business Development</b> (approved 19-0-0) EP-F.5- delete policy evaluating the creation of non-bank community development corporations to encourage business growth. EP-F.7-replace the word ‘first’ priority with ‘a’ priority of economic development efforts is to growth local business. EP-F.9-revise the policy to exclude reference to ‘involved in international trade’ when stating what types of businesses should receive business assistance.	EP-F.5 - deleted. EP-F.7 - deleted. EP-F.9 now EP-G.2.b. - "Expand small business assistance to include direct or referred technical and financial assistance for small emerging technology firms and firms involved in international trade."
<b>Subsection G-Military Installations</b> (approved 19-0-0) Goals- add a goal which states that the city should treat military families and their dependants as a valued part of the greater community. EP-G.2- Add reference to policy that it should apply to any future base closings.	Goals-not added because the proposed goal is too general and the city already does this.  EP-G.2 - now EP.H2 - not added.
<b>Subsection H-Economic Information and Monitoring</b> (approved 19-0-0). EP-H.1-delete ‘and for large retail establishments over 100,000 sq. ft. in size’ when indicating which projects will be subject to community economic analysis.	EP-H.1 now EP-L.3: "Prepare an Economic Market Analysis for discretionary permits involving large retail establishments over 100,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area."
<b>Subsection I-Redevelopment</b> (approved 15-4-0) Rewrite entire section (issue is with the effect of eminent domain on private property rights).	Now Section K. - Direct reference to eminent domain deleted. Section as drafted reflects California Redevelopment Law.
<b>Subsection J-International Trade and Border Relations</b> (approved 19-0-0) Add a policy to support efforts to keep borders open for commerce 24/7, 365 days/year.	Policy EP-J.8 added 'Support efforts to expand the hours of operation for the commercial port of entry at Otay Mesa to achieve greater flexibility and competitiveness for the entire border region.

## V. Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element

<b>CPC Recommendations on Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE) made at CPC Meeting of May 22, 2007</b> <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to the September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>Laura Riebeau moved that the City Planning Staff define mechanisms available to the communities which will ensure that adequate public facilities will be available at the time of need. The motion was seconded by Eric Germain. The motion was approved 27-1-1.</p>	<p>PF-A.2 identifies a menu of financing mechanisms which can be used to fund existing and future public facilities needs. PF Element Section C addresses the evaluation of growth and the provision of adequate facilities.</p>
<p>Laura Riebeau moved that the following language be added to the Public Facilities Element, Goal 3-D: “Ensure that public facilities are developed concurrent with need and require that public facilities reasonably attributable to new development will be provided by new development and not by existing residents. The motion was seconded by Eric Germain and approved 28-0-1.</p>	<p>A new goal was added and an existing goal modified in Section C goals to address the issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Adequate public facilities that are available at the time of need”</li> <li>• “Public facilities exactions that mitigate the facilities impacts that are attributable to new development”</li> </ul>
<p>Laura Riebeau moved that the priority system for Public Facilities be completely revised or deleted, so that new development is not pitted against existing neighborhoods in a priority system. The motion was seconded by Jeff Stevens. The motion was approved 22-6-1.</p>	<p>The prioritization system policy (PF-B.3) was completely revised. The policy includes factors that should be considered when assigning priorities, but does not establish a predetermined preference.</p>

### Previous CPC Comments.

<b>CPC Recommendations on Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE) made at CPC Meeting of April 25, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b>
<p><b>Introduction</b>, Delete the second, third, and fourth paragraphs and rewrite to reflect a neutral position on fiscal policy.</p>	<p>The Introduction was rewritten.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, Remove PF-C.1.d. and modify PF-C.1.h. to support appropriation from local funding sources and to remove references to Table PF-3 in PF-C.1.d and Table PF-4 in PF-C1.h.</p>	<p>Policy PF-C.1.h. was removed. Policy PF-C.1.d was removed and generally addressed in now PF-A.2.f. Table PF-3, which is now Table PF-1 is referenced in the Discussion of Subsection A.</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b>, Policy PF-D.2. reads: “Recommended fire station site area should be ¾ acre and allow room for station expansion.” The</p>	<p>The Fire-Rescue Department supported the following language: PF-D.4. Provide a minimum ¾ acre fire station</p>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE) made at CPC Meeting of April 25, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b>
<p>words “<i>If feasible,</i>” should be added to the beginning of the sentence. In urbanized communities, it may not be possible to obtain a ¾ acre site for a fire station.</p>	<p>site area and allow room for station expansion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Consider the inclusion of fire station facilities in development projects as an alternative method to the acreage guideline.</li> <li>b. Acquire sites that would allow for station expansion as opportunities allow.</li> <li>c. Gain greater utility of fire facilities by pursuing joint-use opportunities such as community meeting rooms or collocating with police, libraries, or parks where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Subsection D</b>, Policy PF-D.9. reads: “Lifeguard towers should be spaced every 1/10 of a mile or 10 towers per mile. Clarification is requested as to what the basis is for the spacing recommendation.</p>	<p>The policy has been clarified as follows: PF-D.11. Space oceanfront seasonal lifeguard towers every 1/10 of a mile or ten towers per mile</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b>, Add a new Policy (PF-D.10.) that the Fire Department coordinate and take a leadership role in the CERT program.</p>	<p>No policy edits made with a reference to the CERT program. Fire-Rescue confirmed its leadership and coordination role in the CERT program. PF-P.10 addresses the CERT program</p>
<p><b>Subsection G</b>, Policy PF-G.2.a. reads: “Conveniently locate facilities and informational guidelines to encourage waste reduction, diversion, and recycling practices.” After the words “locate facilities” the phrase “<i>including equipment storage</i>” should be added.</p>	<p>The suggested language was not incorporated into policy PF-I.2.a.</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b>, Policy PF-H.3. reads: “Recommended maximum radius of a branch service area should be approximately two miles.” <i>Population</i> as well as distance should be a factor; clarification sought on policy on placement of libraries.</p>	<p>Reference to a two mile service radius has been removed from all policies. The following policies address the planning and design of new libraries: PF-J.2., PF-J.3., PF-J.5., and PF-J.6.</p>
<p><b>Subsection I</b>, Policy PF-I.5 reads: “Schools should not be located in areas subject to excessive noise, near industrial areas, hazardous waste sites, or areas of significant motorized emissions”. The sentence should be revised to read: “Schools should not be located in areas subject to excessive noise, <i>such as</i> near industrial areas, <i>airports</i>, hazardous waste sites, or areas of significant motorized emissions.”</p> <p>CPC recommendation is to strike “such as” from the policy.</p>	<p>The policy has been edited as follows: PF-K.4. Collaborate with school districts and other education authorities in the siting of schools and educational facilities to avoid areas with: fault zones; high-voltage power lines; major underground fuel lines; landslide and flooding susceptibility; excessive noise (see Noise Element, Table NE-3); industrial areas; hazardous material sites, and significant motorized emissions.</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE) made at CPC Meeting of April 25, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (PFSSE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection J</b>, The subsection should be rewritten to also address future technologies, as existing technologies based on such things as the fiber network are becoming obsolete.</p>	<p>The policy has been edited as follows:  PF-L.8. Provide incentives for developers to pre-wire new and remodeled residential and non-residential structures to accommodate emerging technologies (fiber optic, wireless, Ethernet, digital subscriber line, voice over internet protocol, internet control panels, and many others) to allow seamless communications citywide.</p>

## VI. Recreation Element

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Recreation Element (RE) made at CPC Meeting of June 19, 2007</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p>Eric Germain moved that the CPC recommend the General Plan be amended to state that the equivalencies should be to meet no more than the 25% of the total acres, instead of 50%. The motion was seconded by Kathy Mateer. The motion was approved 16-2-2.</p>	<p>The equivalencies policies underwent significant edits, including removing the percentage guidelines and stating that equivalencies will be identified through a Parks Master Plan or in community plans. See Policy RE-F.10.</p>
<p>Kathy Mateer moved that the CPC withhold endorsement of the Recreation Element until a Parks Needs Assessment and Parks Master Plan are completed. The motion was seconded by Rick Bussell. The motion was approved 11-7-2.</p>	<p>No response necessary.</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on the Recreation Element made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Recreation Element (RE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b></p>
<p>By a vote of 17-5-0, the recommendations listed below were approved.</p>	<p>No response necessary.</p>
<p>Subsection D, “Joint Use and Cooperative Partnerships,” Policy RE-D.6 reads: “Establish a policy to address underutilized or</p>	<p>Policy RE-D.6 has been revised as follows:  “Use of underutilized or unnecessary City rights-of-</p>



<b>CPC Recommendations on the Recreation Element made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Recreation Element (RE)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b>
<p>unnecessary right-of-ways.”</p> <p>a. Direct that an inventory of those right-of-ways be maintained.</p> <p>b. Develop criteria to determine potential value for bike, pedestrian, and equestrian linkages; and for trail access to open space canyons.”</p> <p>Add a subpart (c) which states: <i>“Unused city land, including paper street right-of-ways, should be considered for use for park and open space purposes.”</i></p>	<p>way to help recreational needs, where appropriate.</p> <p>a. Develop and maintain an inventory of underutilized or unnecessary rights-of-way, including underlying ownership.</p> <p>b. Develop criteria to determine potential value of underutilized or unnecessary rights-of-way for recreational use, including bike, pedestrian, and equestrian linkages for trail access to parks and open space (and canyons), and as overlooks into open space or beaches.”</p>
<p>Subsection D, Policy RE-D.10 reads: “Develop joint use agreements with school districts to help implement population based park needs (see Table RE-3).</p> <p>a. Provide an acre for each acre, up to five acres, that a school provides for a neighborhood park.</p> <p>b. Provide an acre credit for each acre, up to seven acres, that a school provides for a community park.”</p> <p>The policy should be stated in general and non-specific terms, and not list specific acreage. Some communities may need a higher ratio of acres to gain equivalency for the benefits conferred.</p>	<p>Policy RE-D.10 was revised and acquisition and financing of joint use recreational facilities was elaborated. Policy RE-D.10 includes policies (a)-(d). Equivalencies are discussed in policy RE-F.9.</p>
<p>Subsection E, Policy RE-E.2 (e) reads: “Preserve designated, public open space corridors, such as views to Pacific Ocean, other bodies of water and significant topographic features.” The word “designated” should be deleted and the language expanded to encompass any view corridors identified in a community or park plan.</p>	<p>The edit was not incorporated to RE-E.2(c). “Designated” in this case as explained at the meeting would include any community plan or park plan view corridor, but also captures federal and state designations as well.</p>
<p>Subsection E, Policy RE-E.3 reads: “Acquire remaining private beaches in the La Jolla Community for public uses.”</p> <p>The text should be revised to read: <i>“Where, feasible, acquire remaining private beaches for public uses.”</i> The General Plan should not reference a policy goal to a single community</p>	<p>This change has been made to policy RE-E.3, and now reads:</p> <p>“RE-E.3. Acquire remaining private beaches within the City for public use.”</p>



<b>CPC Recommendations on the Recreation Element made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Recreation Element (RE)</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Draft General Plan</b>
<p>Subsection F, “Park and Recreation Guidelines,” Policy RE-F.16 reads: “Pursue joint-use agreements and facilities as a means of meeting Park and Recreation Guidelines.” A clause should be added to the end of this policy, limiting its application to situations <i>“where such Guidelines cannot be met through outright purchase or use of public land.”</i></p>	<p>The first priority in every case is to acquire the land. Where land cannot be acquired, only then will these other mechanisms be used.</p> <p>Policy RE-F.18, previously RE-F.16, now reads: “Pursue joint use agreements for recreational facilities on other public agency-owned land to help implement the population-based park acreage requirements if they meet the criteria for equivalencies (see Table RE-5 Eligible Population-Based Park Equivalencies).”</p>
<p>The current proposed standard of 2.4 of usable acres per 1,000 residents should be changed to 2.8 usable acres per 1,000 residents.</p>	<p>The park standard was changed back to the current standard and will remain 2.8 usable acres per 1,000 residents. See policy RE-F.8.</p>

## VII. Conservation Element

<b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
<p>Guy Preuss moved to edit the policy in Subsection H, “Sustainable Development and Urban Forestry,” Policy CE-H.7 (d), to explain the significance of using deciduous trees, so that the sentence reads, “Increase the use of deciduous trees, which provides shade and absorption of global warming of CO<sub>2</sub> during the hot Summer months and loose their leaves in the Winter allowing capture of radiant heat from the low-lying sun mitigating the winter cold, resulting in less energy usage to warm houses in the community. Nancy Bragado said if the committee decides to keep the deciduous language, then Guy Preuss’ proposed language is good. The motion failed for a lack of a second.</p> <p>Mike Freedman moved to remove the language “increase use of deciduous trees.” The motion</p>	<p>Policy CE-A.11.d revised to “strategically plant deciduous shade trees, evergreen trees, and drought tolerant native vegetation, as appropriate, to contribute to sustainable development goals”.</p>

<b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>  <b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>  <b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b>
was seconded and approved 20-4-2.	
<p>Leo Wilson reported that a recommendation was approved in the subcommittee meeting to add a general policy statement to CE-3, under “Purpose” to recommend the City make promoting and providing incentives for sustainable energy and green policies one of the main priorities of the General Plan and that policies and goals be strengthened to reflect this priority. It was moved and seconded to keep the existing language in the “purpose” section. The motion failed 8-15-1. Susan Thorning stated that in promoting the subcommittee’s motion, the CPC oppose any deviations or exceptions that would damage existing community character. Laura Riebau moved to accept the recommendation passed in the subcommittee meeting to add a general policy statement. The motion was seconded by and approved 20-5-1.</p>	<p>Significant edits were made to the Conservation Element Introduction and Section A to expand and strengthen the sustainability language in the General Plan. In addition, new policies related to global climate change were added. Edits related to community character are identified under the Land Use and Community Planning Element responses.</p>
<p>Leo Wilson said a motion was approved in the subcommittee meeting to add language to Section CE-B .1, g., to read: “Support and encourage community efforts to achieve a dedication of open space lands that currently are only designated as open space, reduce the administrative impediments and excessive cost of current process to convert designated open space into dedicated open space.” The motion was seconded and approved 23-1-1.</p>	<p>Existing policy CE-B.1.f addresses the dedication of open space. Further implementation measures will be identified in the Action Plan.</p>
<p>The subcommittee moved to add language to Section CE-I.5, as follows: “..including industrial buildings and commercial buildings.” Mike Freedman moved to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation. The motion was second and approved 23-0-1.</p>	<p>CE-I.5 revised to address the installation of photovoltaic panels or other forms of renewable energy production in all buildings.</p>
<p>The Chair read a motion from Eric Germain, regarding Page CE-24, Section CE-E.2, c., to delete language calling for “narrowing of street widths where possible.” The motion was seconded and approved 15-6-1.</p>	<p>Policy CE-E.2.c was revised as recommended.</p>
<p>Laura Riebeau moved to change the first</p>	<p>Section G discussion section revised as follows:</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p>sentence on Page CE-29, under Discussion, to read “San Diego County is an important region of biodiversity in the United States.” Also, the fourth sentence down, same area, delete some of the words so that the sentence will read: “Human activity is destroying ecosystems faster than nature can adapt or create new one.” The motion was seconded by Mike Freedman and approved 17-1-1.</p>	<p>San Diego County is an area of intense biodiversity richness in the United States. Many unique and endangered species are found in the San Diego region. Ensuring their survival is essential to maintaining a healthy local ecosystem. Human activity is creating a “biodiversity deficit” by destroying ecosystems faster than nature can adapt or create new ones.</p>

**Previous CPC comments.**

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Conservation Element (CE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection A</b>, “Open Space and Landform Preservation,” discussion section should provide an explanation of the differences, and definitions of, both public and private open space.</p>	<p>Definitions for “Open Space Land” and “Parks, Parkland” are included in the Glossary. Table RE-1 defines and describes the various types of parks and open space.</p>
<p><b>Subsection A:</b> Policy CE-A.3 states: “Balance the city’s housing goals and conservation goals, through the City of Villages strategy of targeting mixed-use development into the existing commercial fabric of the city.” This policy should be revised to speak more broadly; the word “commercial” should be replaced with “<i>urban</i>,” protection of vacant and open land should receive emphasis.</p>	<p>Policy CE-A.3 was deleted, as the concepts are addressed in the Land Use Element Policies LU-A.1-5 and LU-C.2. In addition, the protection of open space is called for in policies CE- B.1, CE-B-2, UD-A.1, and UD-A.2</p>
<p><b>Subsection B</b>, “Water Supply,” Policy CE-B.1 (b) After the first three words “potential groundwater resources,” the following clause should be added: “<i>with consideration for capacity and recharge.</i>”</p>	<p>Policy CE-D.1(b) incorporates this comment through the “integrated approach” language as follows:  “Manage groundwater and surface water resources and capacity through an integrated approach to meet overall water supply and resource management objectives (see also Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element, PF-H.1).”</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Conservation Element (CE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection E</b>, “Biological Diversity,” Policy CE-E.2 . The entire policy should be deleted. This issue should be discussed in the Housing Element.</p>	<p>The policy was deleted from this section, as the implementation of the City of Villages strategy is adequately covered in the Land Use Element, Section A.</p>
<p><b>Subsection E</b>, Policy CE-E.5. The word “consider” should be replaced with “<i>protect</i>.”</p>	<p>This policy (now CE-G.4) was not edited due to potential conflicts with existing, adopted regulations (“protect” was too stringent regarding environmental/floodplain regulations). The City of San Diego’s project review process requires consideration/evaluation and protection of all environmentally sensitive resources if development is proposed, consistent with the City’s MSCP/ Environmental Sensitive Lands regulations, and other related regulations. Some development in floodplains is permitted with appropriate mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b>, “Sustainable Development and Urban Forestry,” Policy CE-H.7 (d). This policy should be edited to further explain the significance of trees that lose their leaves.</p>	<p>This policy (now CE-A.11.d) was edited to read, “Strategically plant deciduous shade trees, evergreen trees, and drought tolerant native vegetation, as appropriate to contribute to sustainable development goals”.</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b>, Policy CE-H.8. Additional language should be added to exempt solar devices.</p>	<p>This policy (now CE-A.12) was edited to remove language related to “dark materials.”</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b>, in Policy CE-H.9 (Urban Forestry)- A new subpart “g.” should be added which places emphasis on water conservation in urban forestry, and the planting of drought resistant trees.</p>	<p>This policy (now CE-J.1) was edited to recognize the need to consider water conservation goals.</p>

## VIII. Noise Element

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of February 27, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Noise Element (NE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to the September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p>Under Policies, NE-D.3, the subcommittee recommended to reduce the 70-dBA CNEL to 65-dBA. Cynthia Conger moved to amend the subcommittee’s recommendations to apply only to take-off pattern from runway 27. Paul Robinson and Laura Riebeau seconded the amendment to the original motion. The amendment was approved 23-2-1.</p>	<p>Policy NE-D.3 was replaced by the former NE-D.4 and was revised to add conditions addressing future residential uses above the 65 dB CNEL San Diego International airport influence area.</p>
<p>Cynthia Conger moved to delete the last sentence from page NE-13, second paragraph, which reads: “However, noise will affect more areas as operations at SDIA increase in the future.” The motion failed for lack of a seconded.</p>	
<p>Mike Freedman moved to delete the last three words (in noise-sensitive locations) from the sentence on page NE-10, NE-B.2, so that the sentence reads: “Consider traffic calming design, traffic control measures, and low-noise pavement surface that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise.” Guy Preuss and Susan Thorning seconded the motion. The motion was approved 25-1-1.</p>	<p>NE-B.2 revised as recommended.</p>
<p>Buzz Gibbs asked that “Heavy Manufacturing” be removed from the table, on page NE-8, Table NE-3 Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines, <i>Industrial</i>. Mr. Gibbs said that 75 dBA CNEL is compatible for industrial land. Tait Galloway agreed and said it was probably a carry-over from the last draft. The motion was approved by unanimous consent.</p>	<p>Language was added to Section F, Industrial Activity Noise addressing future industrial uses in areas that are exposed to existing noise levels above the 75 dBA CNEL.</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Noise Element (NE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection A</b>, In the first sentence states, the words “residential land uses” should be changed to “<i>all land uses.</i>”</p>	<p>The first sentence of subsection A was redrafted to state: The Noise Element influences the Land Use Element policies since excessive noise affects land uses, specifically, the quality of life of people working and living in the city.</p>
<p>Figure NE-2: Changes were discussed with CPC.</p>	<p>The following edits were made (now Table NE-3): Only 3 categories used: compatible; conditionally compatible, incompatible. Included a discussion of indoor and outdoor uses for each noise compatibility category. Removed all overlap in compatibility categories. Land use categories are consistent with Land Development Code land uses. Indicated noise attenuation level.</p>
<p><b>Subsection B</b>, Policy NE-B.1 - Add “<i>and site planning</i>” after “compatible land uses.”</p>	<p>NE-B.1 was revised.</p>
<p>Policy NE-B.2 -Add “<i>with due consideration of the traffic impacts that would be created</i>” at the end of the policy.</p>	<p>NE-B.2 was revised to state, “consider traffic calming design, traffic control measures, and low noise pavement surface that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise”. See ME-C.5 regarding traffic calming.</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, Policy NE-C.1 - Add “<i>and site planning</i>” after “noise-compatible land uses.”</p>	<p>NE-C.1 was revised to state, “use site planning to help minimize exposure to noise sensitive uses to rail corridor and trolley line noise”.</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b>, Replace section with the language provide by a CPC member, Buzz Gibbs.</p>	<p>Edit was made with additional revisions to the language.</p>
<p><b>Subsection F</b>, Add new policy to state: “Provide for separation of residential and industrial uses, so that sensitive noise receptors are not in close proximity, or are buffered and insulated”</p>	<p>The following new policy NE-F.1 was added: “Provide for sufficient spatial separation between industrial uses and residential and other noise-sensitive land uses. This would include utilizing other feasible mitigation measures to reduce the noise source, such as noise attenuation methods, interrupting the noise path, or insulating the receptor to minimize the exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to excessive industrial-related noise.”</p>
<p><b>Subsection F</b>, Policy NE-F.2 and NE-F.3 Add “where possible if sensitive noise impacts are created” at the end of both policies.</p>	<p>NE-F.3 and NE-F.4 revised to reflect the affect of noise on residential uses and other noise-sensitive land uses.</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Noise Element (NE) made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Noise Element (NE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection G, Policy NE-G.2</b> Replace “Continue to” with “<i>Enforce.</i>”</p>	<p>The discussion section was edited to include “The City enforces the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, which addresses and limits excessive noise from these activities.” The General Plan should avoid having policies reference regulations, since the stated policies should be implemented by the regulations.</p>

## IX. Historic Preservation Element

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Historic Preservation (HP) made at CPC Meeting of February 27, 2006</b></p> <p><b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan Historic Preservation Element (HP)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p>It was moved, seconded and approved 25-2-2 to accept the subcommittee’s recommendations on the receiver sites.</p>	<p>Language reflecting this motion was added to Policy HP-B.3.b.: This method of preservation should be limited and used when other on-site preservation techniques are found not to be feasible.</p>

<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Historic Preservation policies made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006.</b></p> <p><b>References refer to Section L of the July 2005 Draft General Plan Conservation Element (CE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to the September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection L, “Historic and Cultural Resources,”</b> Policy CE-L.1 (c) (p. CE-24) reads: “Encourage the consideration of historic and cultural resources early in the development review process.” The word “encourage” should be replaced with “<i>require.</i>”</p>	<p>Staff does not agree with using the term “require” in a policy document. This previous policy has been replaced with HP-A.2: Fully integrate the consideration of historical and cultural resources in the larger land use planning process. The concepts of early conflict resolution between the preservation of historical resources and alternative land uses and consideration of historical and cultural resources early in the development review process have been included in the policy.</p>



<p><b>CPC Recommendations on Historic Preservation policies made at CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006.</b></p> <p><b>References refer to Section L of the July 2005 Draft General Plan Conservation Element (CE)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>References refer to the September 2007 Public Hearing Draft</b></p>
<p><b>Subsection L</b>, Policy CE-L.1 (p. CE-24) - A new subpart “h.” should be added which states: <i>“In conformance with applicable community plans, encourage the creation of historic and conservation districts.”</i></p>	<p>The discussion of historical districts has been expanded in Policy HP-A.5.b: establish historical districts where concentrations of buildings, structures, landscapes, and objects are identified.</p> <p>A discussion of conservation areas has been added to the Historic Preservation and Urban Design Elements in the October 2006 Final Draft General Plan. Specifically, HP-A.2.d: Conservation areas that are identified at the community plan level, based on historical resources surveys, may be used as an urban design tool to complement community character. (see also Urban Design Element, Policy UD-A.7.)</p>
<p><b>Subsection L</b>, Policy CE-L.5 (p. CE-25). (Public Education) reads: “Encourage public attendance at monthly Historic Resources Board meetings.” The word “encourage” should be replaced with <i>“Create a policy to encourage.”</i></p>	<p>Staff does not agree with the need to change “encourage” to “create a policy to encourage” since it is already stated as a policy in the element. Policy HP-B.1 was expanded to include increased notification of agenda items on the City's website</p>