



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE ISSUED: September 15, 2005 REPORT NO. PC-05-261

ATTENTION: Planning Commission,  
Agenda of September 22, 2005

SUBJECT: Workshop on the Draft General Plan Update

REFERENCE: Manager's Report Nos. 03-019, 03-115, 03-204, 03-205, 03-206, 04-149,  
05-038, 05-161; Planning Report Nos. P-03-183, P-03-227, P-03-333, P-  
04-220, P-05-070, P-05-183

### SUMMARY

THIS IS A WORKSHOP TO RESPOND TO DIRECTION RECEIVED FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION DURING THE WORKSHOP OF JULY 14, 2005. NO ACTION IS REQUIRED ON THE PART OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT THIS TIME.

### BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2005, the Planning Commission held a workshop covering the entire July 2005 Draft General Plan (the draft document is available online at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/gpupdate.shtml>). Commissioners had extensive comments, and asked staff to return for an additional workshop to inform the Planning Commission of those requested modifications that staff felt could be made, those with which staff had concerns, and those that needed clarification (see Attachment 1). The City Council's Committee on Land Use and Housing (LU&H) also reviewed the July 2005 Draft General Plan at their meeting of July 27, 2005 LU&H, comments are included as Attachment 2.

### DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission commented on each element of the Draft General Plan individually, as documented in Attachment 1 of this report. The attachment identifies how staff is proceeding with edits in accordance with Planning Commission direction, and where additional clarification is needed, or where staff disagrees with Planning Commission direction.

Planning Commissioners also had overall comments on the General Plan including:

- Clarify how this Draft General Plan Update will be used in everyday review and consideration of projects that come before the Planning Commission.
- Avoid being overly prescriptive; the Draft General Plan Update should state policies but not be overly detailed in how to achieve them.
- Strive for a document that will not readily become dated.
- Provide some measurable criteria to better define the village concept.
- Provide a glossary of key definitions.
- Provide a purpose and intent statement for each element before the goal statements.
- Add captions and sources to figures and tables.
- Identify where policy changes from the 1979 plan are proposed.
- Track edits made to the July 2005 draft.
- Ensure that Strategic Framework Element Action Plan items related to the Draft General Plan Update are implemented.

Staff is addressing these comments as we continue to edit the July 2005 Draft.

## CONCLUSION

Staff is seeking Planning Commission review of the overall comments listed in the body of the report, and those in Attachment 1, to ensure that they accurately reflect Planning Commission direction. Staff also requests the Planning Commission provide clarification or additional direction where requested in Attachment 1.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nancy S. Bragado  
Acting Program Manager  
Planning Department

---

S. Gail Goldberg, AICP  
Director  
Planning Department

SGG/NSB/ah

Attachments:

1. Table of Staff Responses to July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction
2. Land Use and Housing Committee Workshop Comments, dated July 27, 2005

**Strategic Framework and Land Use Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|--|---|--|
| 1.   | Add population projections and annexation policies   | Reorganization policies and the delineation of a planning area will be included in the next draft of the General Plan. Population projections, per SANDAG, will also be added |  |
| 2.   | Questioned combination of Strategic Framework Element and Land Use Element   |   | Staff is reviewing consolidation of certain General Plan Elements and will discuss with the Commission when we have a recommendation   |
| 3.   | Provide a record of changes between the Progress Guide and General Plan and the Strategic Framework Element and the 2005 General Plan                        | A record of changes is being prepared   |  |
| 4.   | Disagrees with locating community plan preparation plan policies in a separate manual. Action Plan calls for policies to be included in the Land Use Element |   | Staff is still working on the contents of the manual. Policies are already included in the General Plan relating to community plan preparation. When we complete a draft of the manual, we will be better able to discuss the relationship between the General Plan and the manual |
| 5.   | Identify uses of citywide significance per the Action Plan   | Added a draft layer of uses of citywide significance to the General Plan Land Use Map; will review with the Planning Commission   |  |
| 6.   | Provide a policy requiring an annual land use plan amendment report per the Action Plan  | X   |  |

**Strategic Framework and Land Use Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|--|---|--|
| 7.   | p. LU-33. Add a factor to policy SF-G.2 to evaluate police service response times by neighborhood rather than citywide | X   |  |
| 8.   | p. LU-33. Revise the factor in SF-G.2 that refers to existing and planned transit to remove the word “planned”         |   | Recommend continuing to reference planned transit as a contributing factor to village location and in evaluating individual development project impacts  |
| 9.   | Agrees with the BIA that some policies are too broad and some are too specific   | Staff is reviewing the element to ensure that policies are consistently written and the level of specificity is appropriate   |  |
| 10.  | Discuss on p. LU-44 how to encourage village development   | Staff is reviewing language to determine how to provide policies to encourage village development if feasible and meaningful – this may also be an Action Plan item |  |
| 11.  | Consider incentives for villages in the initiation criteria  |   | Request clarification; plan amendment criteria have been revised to allow amendments with merit to proceed   |
| 12.  | Add a criterion that acknowledges that amendments may be needed due to out of date community plans                     |   | An out-of-date plan in and of itself does not necessarily result in a supportable amendment request. Initiation should be based on supportable planning criteria that addresses the community and city-wide policy             |
| 13.  | Exempt true village projects from the initiation process   |   | Initiation is based upon a preliminary review of the amendment request to determine if the policy change is appropriate; confirmation of a true village proposal will occur through the amendment and project analysis process |

**Strategic Framework and Land Use Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|---|---|
| 14.  | Differentiate between villages that require amendments and those that simply implement community plans  |   | Proposals that implement community plans are consistent with the community plan and, therefore, do not require an amendment |
| 15.  | Include a discussion on changing demographics, especially the increasing senior population and what effect it may have on land use decisions          | Adding a discussion and demographic information to address this issue. The City of Villages strategy was based, in part, on recognition that some groups could experience decreased mobility and could benefit from well designed and located compact development |   |
| 16.  | Wants the City of Villages strategy to serve as a catalyst for redevelopment and the provision of public facilities in the older, urban neighborhoods | X   |   |
| 17.  | Concern that too much of the document is written for “this time” and that the document is too prescriptive  | Staff is evaluating language and policies to produce a more “timeless” document   |   |
| 18.  | Include overarching goal or purpose/intent statement for each element   | X   |   |
| 19.  | Confirm that all Action Plan items are linked to goals/policies   | X   |   |
| 20.  | Ensure seamless interface between General Plan and community plans  | Staff is proceeding, but would appreciate examples, additional direction  |   |
| 21.  | Community plans need to address their role in the City as a whole   | X   |   |

**Strategic Framework and Land Use Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|---|--|
| 22.  | Provide policy as a link to the Housing Element to require that minimum densities be met  | X   |  |
| 23.  | Strengthen Equitable Development policies, strengthen Environmental Justice goals   | X   |  |
| 24.  | Establish policies for amending the financing plans; reconsider policy of requiring financing plan update with each plan amendment                | X   |  |
| 25.  | Retitle Section I   | X   |  |
| 26.  | Rewrite Conclusion to avoid focus on 2005   | Staff is evaluating language to achieve a more “timeless document”                              |  |
| 27.  | Provide a better definition of a village to assist Planning Commission in distinguishing between villages and neighborhoods or mixed use projects | X   |  |
| 28.  | Consider establishing equitable development policies in all of the elements instead of just Land Use  | Staff is reviewing the document to determine which strategy is most user friendly and effective |  |

**Strategic Framework and Land Use Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>  | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b> | <b>Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b> |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 29.         | Ensure that the Balanced Communities Council Policy (CP 600-19) is properly incorporated into Equitable Development policies (p. LU-9)                                   | X                             |   |
| 30.         | Provide a policy in community plan preparation section to ensure that all community plan areas accept their fair share of development and different types of development | X                             |   |
| 31.         | Proof to ensure that numbering is correct  | X                             |   |
| 32.         | Write the policies to make it easy for the Planning Commission to use in evaluation of projects  | X                             |   |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|---|--|--|
| 33.  | pp. ME 76-79. Look at land use and transportation impacts of various airport options                                  | .  | Staff is working with the Airport Authority on the Airport Master Plan and to develop compatible airport/land use criteria. The Airport Authority is in the process of doing a comparative analysis of airport options |
| 34.  | Look at airport linkages to the rail system   | SANDAG is looking at rail and BRT airport linkages. Staff will review any study results                                |  |
| 35.  | If refer to forecasts, need to check them   | Traffic and forecast monitoring will occur through the GP Monitoring Report and SANDAG's "State of the Commute" report |  |
| 36.  | Add policy to restrict incompatible uses in the "CLUP" [now known as the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)] | Language will be added   |  |
| 37.  | Address current and future land uses; airports are support uses - current land use should drive airport decisions     |  | See Item #33   |
| 38.  | Level of service should be consistent with density and intensity of community plans                                   | Staff will add a policy to develop and use multi-modal LOS standards in plan updates and project review                |  |
| 39.  | The distribution system must meet service levels and emergency needs – catastrophes/terrorism                         | Discussion/policies on emergency planning will be added  |  |



**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|---|---|--|
| 40.  | How does the distribution system meet industrial needs?   | Staff will review the adequacy of the Goods Movement/Freight policies (Section K, pp. ME-83-85). . .                          |  |
| 41.  | Should put something in the plan that alleviates the freeway system. Need truck traffic management, delivery times, travel times, etc | Staff will review the adequacy of the Goods Movement/Freight policies (Section K, pp. ME-83-85). . .                          | Please note that more detailed regional solutions to goods movement issues, including trucking, are being developed through SANDAG. City of San Diego staff and elected officials participate on SANDAG committees and working groups where these issues are discussed |
| 42.  | pp. ME-58-60. Transit system should relieve congestion. Need policies to effect change in mode split                                  | Will add/edit policies to accomplish this   |  |
| 43.  | Need to monitor performance   | GP Monitoring report and State of the Commute report will monitor performance   |  |
| 44.  | p. ME-57. 1 <sup>st</sup> goal and policy should be to increase ridership   | Will add/edit policies to accomplish this   |  |
| 45.  | Models have fudge factors   | We will continue to use and refine the best available models  |  |
| 46.  | p. ME-58. High frequency transit should be better than 10 min. service  | Staff will remove the definition of “high quality” transit and add text stating that better than 10 minute service is desired |  |
| 47.  | p. ME-58. Potential villages should only be along high frequency routes   |   | Villages should be planned where it makes sense from a transit and land use perspective. Staff should continue to work with SANDAG to ensure that adequate service is provided and maintained over time  |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|--|---|--|
| 48.  | We aren't planning for the transit service we need   | Staff will refine the information on the Transit/Land Use Connections Map and clarify its use | City staff and elected officials influence transit planning and service delivery through transit supportive land use and transportation planning, and through participation in SANDAG and MTS meetings   |
| 49.  | p. ME-57. Reducing dependency on the auto is a reasonable goal – this is not Europe                                      | Staff agrees  |  |
| 50.  | What are incentives?<br>Define   | Definitions will be added   |  |
| 51.  | p. ME-62. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) modeling does not show that we are reducing congestion so the goal is false |   | p. ME-62 references the traffic modeling that was done for the Strategic Framework Element. Staff will update with the more recent modeling from the MOBILITY 2030 RTP, which shows a reduction in congested peak period travel conditions between 2000 and 2030 from 29% to 25% |
| 52.  | p. ME-61. Define efficient street design   | Definitions will be added   |  |
| 53.  | List streets and ratings and classifications for them all  |   | This is not possible at the General Plan level. The Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) contains information on streets. More detailed information on streets is also found in community plans   |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|--|--|--|
| 54.  | Modeling – what if the expected behavioral changes don't happen?   | Monitoring will allow for course corrections   |  |
| 55.  | Look at forecast v. actual and make corrections.   | Agreed   |  |
| 56.  | p. ME-63. Reference to RTP and Caltrans is self-referential. Don't defer to SANDAG. Say our own priorities | A policy on establishing City priorities will be added   |  |
| 57.  | On p. ME-65, ME- D.7. a, add "and eliminate those that don't"  |  | Staff does not think it is beneficial to make this edit                    |
| 58.  | Need a regional view. Need better connections – more roads should go through                               | Policies are provided to support interconnected streets. Actual street system planning, along with an analysis of site-specific impacts, occurs in community plans |  |
| 59.  | p. ME-65. Underground all utility lines  | Staff will explore this further  |  |
| 60.  | p. ME-67. Joint Trans. Operations Center is a hanging reference  | Edits will be made   |  |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested                                       |
|------|---|---|--|
| 61.  | p. ME-67. Why is real time traffic information in a City document?        | Will change to “travel” information. Better information is an important part of an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategy, so travelers can make informed choices on routes and modes of travel |  |
| 62.  | Technology is underutilized   | Drafted ITS policies (section K) seek to enhance the role of technology   |  |
| 63.  | p. ME-67-68. Add a policy on attracting transit riders in the TDM section |   | See Discussion on p. ME-68 and Policy ME-F.9. Transit is one of several auto alternatives supported by TDM plans |
| 64.  | Freight policies on p.ME-85 are impossibly broad.                         | Edits will be made  |  |
| 65.  | Correct links   | Links are active in the online version. This will be clarified in the print version   |  |
| 66.  | p. ME-88. Defers to RCP, should establish our own priorities              | RCP priorities are in the Discussion section, as a point of information. A policy will be added on establishing City priorities   |  |
| 67.  | p. ME-89. Define smart growth   | A definition will be added  |  |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|---|--|
| 68.  | Need a policy to design the services and pricing to attract ridership and achieve the highest cost recovery | Policies on increasing transit ridership will be edited, as stated above  |  |
| 69.  | Be clearer in how we measure performance, timeline and implementation                                       | This will be covered in the GP Monitoring Report  |  |
| 70.  | We need a policy that allows us to make choices to effect change  | A policy on prioritization will be added  |  |
| 71.  | p. ME-53. Add discussion on traffic calming in the Walkable Communities section                             | This section will be linked to the Streets and Freeways section, where additional traffic calming information will be added |  |
| 72.  | p. ME-74. Say tandem parking is enclosed  | X   |  |
| 73.  | Parking should be vertical  | A preference for structured parking will be stated in the Urban Design Element  |  |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|---|---|
| 74.  | Most places don't have a parking problem, they have a walking problem. Design pedestrian linkages from parking to destinations. Also bicycle linkages | This will be stated   |   |
| 75.  | Need incentive programs for walking and bicycling   | Staff will evaluate the draft GP and draft Pedestrian Master Plan for adequacy of policies, and to determine the appropriate scope for each document. The City also addresses infrastructure needs and design issues in the Bicycle Master Plan and the Land Development Code. In addition, City of San Diego staff and elected officials participate in regional incentive programs through SANDAG committees and working groups | Regarding TDM policies (Section F), incentive programs are implemented by employers   |
| 76.  | Need a more specific goal   | Edits will be made  |   |
| 77.  | p. ME – 52. Creating more walkable communities is a reasonable goal   | Staff agrees  |   |
| 78.  | Need a goal that prioritizes transit, biking, and walking over the automobile   |   | Staff will review the adequacy of the referenced sections. Overall, the Mobility Element emphasizes multi-modal solutions to congestion |

**Mobility Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction          | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 79.  | Too prescriptive and detailed | We will review the entire document to evaluate level of detail |  |
| 80.  | Landscaping is not a word     | Edits will be made   |  |
| 81.  | Parks need more parking       |  | See Response #173. Overall, the Mobility Element recommends that supply and demand solutions be sought to address parking problems |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|--|--|
| 82.  | Replace “landscaping” with “landscape”  | X  |  |
| 83.  | General comment... dictating solutions rather than policies. Some policies too prescriptive                                     | Staff is reviewing and considering those policies that appear “prescriptive” and modifying those that may be limiting other appropriate design solutions |  |
| 84.  | p. UD-92. Prefer “responding to natural base” rather than “enhancing”   | X  |  |
| 85.  | p. UD-93 replace photo with one that shows development that is subservient to environment                                       | X  |  |
| 86.  | Limit building heights and siting to maintain visual dominance of valley walls/hilltops   | X  |  |
| 87.  | p. UD-105, Policy C.12. Consider where natural buffers are needed. Interface/buffer for suburban areas                          | X  |  |
| 88.  | Illustrate a broader range of housing styles including higher density, downtown densities, more modern / authentic architecture | X  |  |
| 89.  | p. UD-113, Policy F.1 address how interconnected streets work with topography   | X  |  |



**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|------------------------|---|
| 90.  | Clarify importance of public art and public space throughout the City                             | X                      |   |
| 91.  | p. UD-91. Clarify the purpose of the element in the Intro. Quality of life                        | X                      |   |
| 92.  | Relate village to quality of life and that to scale, light, public space                          | X                      |   |
| 93.  | Remove references to repeating period architecture  | X                      |   |
| 94.  | p. UD-93. A-2.f protecting views language problematic, issue should relate to only “public” views |                        | Would like to discuss options. Point is understood with regard to creating policy that could be used to stop reasonable/permisible development. Wording is still needed to preserve views to prominent topographic features |
| 95.  | p. UD-93, A.2.d Strike part about selection of colors   | X                      |   |
| 96.  | Discuss pedestrian orientation as overriding principle at beginning of element                    | X                      |   |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|------------------------|---|
| 97.  | p. UD-96, B.2.d & e somewhat contradictory consider “full block development should be organized into .... or expressed as independent elements” | X                      |   |
| 98.  | UD-98, B.4.d use caution because may not always want to/be able to incorporate historic into new development                                    | X                      |   |
| 99.  | p. UD-99 Section C make it clear that mixed use includes residential  | X                      |   |
| 100  | p. UD-102 mixed use core... multiple use definition how many DU? Always commercial? Check ULI definition  |                        | Will review various definitions of mixed use and revise. There is concern however, about quantifying specific numbers of dwelling units. Perhaps ranges based on overall size of the mixed use core |
| 101  | p.UD-104,C.8 include upholstered design   | X                      |   |
| 102  | Balance out the provision of public space with public facilities, sometimes one use can achieve both  | X                      |   |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|--|------------------------|---|
| 103  | p. UD-106, Section D<br>Commercial corridors,<br>same as transit corridors?  | X                      |   |
| 104  | Define main streets<br>(commercial corridors<br>section)   | X                      |   |
| 105  | p. UD-107, D.1.e should<br>apply citywide  | X                      |   |
| 106  | p.UD-107, D.2.c mixed<br>use is about differentiating<br>between uses. Revise ...<br>“differentiate the<br>residential from the retail”            | X                      |   |
| 107  | Consider reorganizing<br>element into general policy<br>statements that apply<br>everywhere  | X                      |   |
| 108  | UD-109, D.9 should be<br>citywide  | X                      |   |
| 109  | Perhaps “village” could be<br>defined in part by inclusion<br>of public space/civic<br>architecture... inclusion of<br>civic spare/public facility |                        | A discussion of civic use/space should be a part of a village definition. Difficulties could arise if the definition were to be strictly applied to individual projects that might be only portions of a future village. Some discussion would be helpful |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|------------------------|--|
| 110  | Replace word “product” with another... building structure   | X                      |  |
| 111  | UD-116, F.4.h instead of “4-sided architecture” revise to refer to a uniform quality on all sides of building   | X                      |  |
| 112  | UD-116, F.5 blank wall can be beautiful w/o decorating... special colors, simple opening, consider design with care in use of color, material, landscape, selective openings... | X                      |  |
| 113  | Add another sentence in the discussion to clarify what is entailed in the public art program. Is it mandated?   | X                      |  |
| 114  | UD-96, B.2 a & e appear to be in conflict. Contrast is appropriate in modern design. Depends on full block development vs. independent development                              | X                      |  |
| 115  | UD-114, F.2.a too prescriptive, create more general policy  | X                      |  |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|--|---|---|
| 116  | Need to reorganize element.  | X   |   |
| 117  | Transit stations should be closer to destination than the closest parking space. Relate transit station to destination |   | Discussion is required. The following policies address location of transit in relation to uses.<br>1. Provide attractively designed transit stops and stations that are adjacent to the most active uses and visible from the public street. 2. Design safe, attractive, accessible, lighted, and convenient pedestrian connections from transit stops and stations to building entrances |
| 118  | Provide descriptions/credits for graphics  | X   |   |
| 119  | Define a “high design standard”  | The term “high design” will be changed to wording that is less subjective                         |   |
| 120  | p. UD-114, F.2 delete reference to small project and parcel size   | X   |   |
| 121  | p. UD-114, F.2 add text on what is needed in order to live comfortably in higher densities                             | Staff is reviewing this section and will discuss with the Commission when we have a revised draft |   |

**Urban Design Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>  | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b> | <b>Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b> |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 122         | Relocate those policies that can be citywide but keep sections that address particular types of projects | X                             |   |

**Economic Prosperity Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>  | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b>  | <b>Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| 123         | Consider locating equitable development/gentrification policies back to the redevelopment section I  | A new policy regarding resident displacement will be added               |   |
| 124         | Discuss use of public lands for public economic benefit including BRAC process, and landfills  | The discussion will be expanded  |   |
| 125         | EP-C.8, p. EP-145. Define underutilized. Add a statement regarding links to public infrastructure for village redevelopment  | EP-C.8 will be clarified accordingly                                     |   |
| 126         | Define the business incentives program, p. EP-143  | Further clarification will be added                                      |   |
| 127         | Should public benefit be defined in the General Plan or should it be left to individual redevelopment plans?   | Staff will review the use of the term public benefit in the General Plan |   |
| 128         | EP-A.6. Encouraging high tech business facilities to be geographically distributed in the city is contrary to the evidence that high tech businesses want to be clustered, p. EP-130 |  | Comment noted. Currently the vast majority of high-tech uses are located in the northern part of the City. To better balance locations of jobs and workers in the future, the central areas such as Kearny Mesa or some portions of Otay Mesa could still attract some high-tech uses |
| 129         | Make sure the redevelopment Section I is consistent with the recent US Supreme Court decision.   | It is consistent   |   |

**Economic Prosperity Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>  | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b>   | <b>Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b>  |
|-------------|--|---|--|
| 130         | Use the term “price” of housing, not “cost” of housing, p. EP-129                                  |   | As utilized, the term “cost” of housing is appropriate because it more broadly recognizes the impact to employers which is the focus of the element, rather than “price” to a given individual   |
| 131         | Discuss the economic benefits of the high price of housing   |   | The societal costs of the high price of housing to both residents (affecting basic quality of life at all levels) and its effect on businesses (which have difficulty recruiting qualified employees) detract from the general goals of the element to broaden the economic base |
| 132         | Define base sector industry  | Base sector industry is described on page EP-128. A definition will be included in the glossary   |  |
| 133         | Describe the economic indicators in the element  | The indicators will be listed   |  |
| 134         | Define what can be allowed within the 1000 ft. buffer, p. EP-131. It could be anti-smart growth    | Text will be added to state that intervening uses could include public rights-of-way, many institutional and public uses, and most commercial land uses, but should not include uses which contain a significant number of sensitive receptors      | The document does not specify a buffer, but a distance separation of 1,000 ft. is required between the residential and industrial designated property lines unless an alternative distance is determined after study   |
| 135         | The element should address the waterfront issues in the Barrio                                     | These issues may be addressed as part of the Land Use and Housing Commission request for policies related to “no net loss” of industrial land. Additional discussion regarding the significance of marine-related uses to the economy will be added |  |
| 136         | How are the existing industrial areas in the Midway-Pacific Highway area addressed in the element? | The element indicated that much of the existing industrial development in this community is obsolete, but that the eastern portion is most likely to redevelop due to its proximity to transit, p. EP-145   |  |



**Economic Prosperity Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|---|--|--|
| 137  | A policy should be added to address the need for land for emerging new technology jobs  | These issues may be addressed as part of the Land Use and Housing Commission request for policies related to “no net loss” of industrial land and will also be included in additional discussion regarding demand and availability of industrial land referenced below |  |
| 138  | Address a cross section of jobs, not just middle-income jobs                            |  | Both locally and at a national level, long term trends in market competition have driven an increasingly larger number of workers into lower-paying jobs. In 2004, more than 2/3 of the jobs created in San Diego were lower paying jobs resulting in the second worst income-to-cost-of living- ratio in the state. Conversely, we are still adding more high-wage jobs than are being lost resulting in an hour-glass economy. Therefore, the policies are directed at maintaining a middle-class in San Diego |
| 139  | Does the element address an appropriate balance of industrial uses in the City?         | Discussion will be enhanced regarding industrial land demand vs. existing availability of various types of industrial land   |  |
| 140  | Add a policy in the redevelopment Section I to encourage owner participation agreements | A policy will be added after discussion with the Redevelopment Agency  |  |
| 141  | Identify areas of citywide significance   | This issue may be addressed as part of the Land Use and Housing Commission request for policies related to “no net loss” of industrial land  |  |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|--|--|---|
| 142  | Stagger the days that libraries are closed, or have reduced hours, within a geographic area  |  | This is an operational issue that the City Manager and Library Department have been evaluating. Generally, operational matters are not included in the General Plan |
| 143  | Check fire map (Fig. PF-2. p. 178) for BMR station #48   | All maps are being reviewed  |   |
| 144  | P.188 states short life for landfills what happens after closure? Future locations?  | Will consult with the Environmental Services Department  |   |
| 145  | Need a tsunami policy  | Table PF-5, p. 205, identifies “Tsunamis and Seiches” as hazards the City must consider in all planning and development efforts. Staff will evaluate if additional information is needed |   |
| 146  | Need captions identifying where, what, and why for photos/images   | X  |   |
| 147  | p. PF-165. Policy A.2.a. should not address existing and potential villages together   | Staff will re-examine policy language  |   |
| 148  | p. PF-166 A.4. Identify what are regional capital facilities and infrastructure. What about regional infrastructure investments that are fundamental to existing | Staff will re-examine policy language  |   |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|--|---|
|      | needs and deficits?   |  |   |
| 149  | Don't say "providing leverage." Instead say "guide the prioritization" or "desired character"   | Staff will re-examine policy language                              |   |
| 150  | p. PF.167, B.1.d "not adversely affect" is not meaningful language  | Staff will re-examine policy language                              |   |
| 151  | Tables PF-3 & PF-4 (pp. 173 -174). We may have to confront certain tax increases, but there's nothing in here about efficiency, especially in response to energy, water conservation, and many other things | Staff will expand language related to efficiency                   |   |
| 152  | p. PF-175, C.4. Periodic review is too general. Define periodic review...specify a minimum...every five years or every ten years or whatever it is.   |  | It may be more appropriate to add more specificity to the Action Plan. Operational language is generally not included in the General Plan |
| 153  | p. PF-177, D.2 . Get away from minimum sizes and use performance standards. You need to remove the specific reference to acreage and  | Staff will re-examine policy language and consult with Fire-Rescue |   |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|--|---|--|
|      | have them based on standards. They may turn out to be an acreage but it needs to be based on performance   |   |  |
| 154  | p. PF-179, D.9. Lifeguard towers-do we need every 1/10 <sup>th</sup> mile? Do we meet this standard now? What is the current standard? Need to provide information on what is existing and what is being changed | Staff will research this issue and consult with Fire-Rescue   |  |
| 155  | p. PF-180, E.2. Provide response times by division since response times are collected by division  | Staff will re-examine policy language and consult with Police |  |
| 156  | p. PF-185, Figure PF-4. Provide a project list of where pipelines are located (couldn't tell from the map)   | Staff will re-examine Figure PF-4 for clarification           |  |
| 157  | p. PF-186.G. Change the title from "Waste Management" to "Waste Management Reduction and Recycling"  | Staff will re-examine section and policy language             |  |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|---|--|
| 158  | p. PF-187,G.1.d. Change “encourage” to make it mandatory or required, which would be consistent with policy CE-H.6  | Staff will address  |  |
| 159  | Check for consistency between p. 187 and p. 259   |   | Staff requests clarification on this comment                               |
| 160  | p. PF-187, G.1. Replace “Provide efficient and effective waste collection services” with “Waste and recycling collection services” to better reflect the policies | Staff will re-examine policy language   |  |
| 161  | p. PF-189. When citing information, footnote the source and date  | Staff will address  |  |
| 162  | p.PF-195 net acres .... School standards, add dates and footnotes in sidebar; cite source   | X   |  |
| 163  | p. PF-201. Disaster preparedness...Address prevention policies  | Staff will re-examine policy language and consult with Homeland Security Office |  |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|--|--|
| 164  | p.PF-180. Update police maps; some facilities missing. Be accurate  | All maps will be reviewed  |  |
| 165  | p. PF-182. Expand how use of reclaimed water be expanded. It's important to have that in to provide these backbone facilities for some renovation or new projects instead of coming back later and digging up the streets again | Staff will re-examine policy language and consult with MWWD            |  |
| 166  | p. PF-193. Promote joint use with parks, libraries, and civic facilities  | Addressed in PF-H.8. Staff will evaluate the language                  |  |
| 167  | p. PF-201. Disaster preparedness – use parks as points of gathering   | Staff will consult with Homeland Security Office on appropriate policy |  |
| 168  | Evaluate where the financial data and information on revenue sources should be located. Some information may belong in an appendix or background paper rather than in the General Plan.   | Staff will re-examine discussion and policy language.                  |  |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed                                      | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|--|---|--|
|      | Evaluate whether the goals will be implemented by the policies   |   |  |
| 169  | p. PF-172, Sec C, make sure each action/policy strengthens leverage (thresholds, punitive damages, etc.)   | Staff will re-examine policy language                       |  |
| 170  | p. 182, Sec F. Wastewater goal. Need a goal to treat all waste water. Talk about the difference between wastewater and storm water   | Staff will re-examine policy language and consult with MWWD |  |
| 171  | p. PF-203, Sec L. Seismic safety...The statement that talks about development that avoids inappropriate land uses is a double negative and is confusing. We should look at seismic risk as determining the appropriate land use. What is appropriate Land Use? | Staff will re-examine policy language                       |  |

**Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element  
 Staff Response to  
 July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>  | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b>                                     | <b>Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b> |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| 172         | p. PF-163, Include one sentence before the introduction stating that the intent of this element is to have the City [take a role in addressing the facilities shortfall] | Staff will be adding a Purpose and Intent section to all elements |   |



**Recreation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|---|------------------------|--|
| 173  | Provide additional parking in parks   |                        | Reducing useable park area to provide additional parking would be contrary to increasing recreation opportunity. However, the Mobility Element provides a parking toolbox that may be used to increase parking without reducing useable park area. The Mobility Element also contains policies geared toward increasing accessibility via transit, bicycling, and walking  |
| 174  | Include policy to address compensation for property owners whose land is designated or zoned open space |                        | Parcels that are General Plan designated open space or zoned for open space may be privately owned. Those privately held lands have permitted uses that have value   |
| 175  | Add intent purpose section at beginning of each element   | X                      |  |
| 176  | p. RE-211, Table RE-1 is confusing. Specifically, "designated open space"                               |                        | Staff will examine the table to improve clarity. The current table accurately reflects the terminology. In order to direct the reader to the appropriate definition, the terminology in Table RE-1 and within the Element will be revised to state 1.) General Plan Designated Parks and General Plan Designated Open Space and 2.) Park and Recreation Designated Parkland and Park and Recreation Dedicated Parkland |
| 177  | p. RE-218, Add to RE-C.6 walking trails as way of increasing recreation opportunity and linking parks   |                        | RE-C.6 addresses this issue in subsections (a) and (b)   |

**Recreation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|--|---|--|
| 178  | Clarify that joint use is additive to existing guidelines  |   | In reviewing the Guidelines and Standards of the existing Progress Guide and General Plan it is clear that joint use with public schools was viewed as meeting the standards and guidelines for population-based facilities. The draft General Plan continues this view and makes more stringent the acreage credit provided for joint use with schools. See Policy RE-D.10 (p. 221) and Table RE-3 (p. 228) |
| 179  | p. RE-230. Vest pocket parks can work well as part of linkages and are ideal for infill situations, add more to policy   | Staff will evaluate the adequacy of the stated policy. In practice, there has been some conflict in providing vest pocket parks as a way to meet urban park needs due to the cost of maintaining those parks. City Council Policy (700-34) Vest Pocket Park Development outlines conditions for implementing pocket parks |  |
| 180  | Address maintenance of joint use facilities  |   | Maintenance of joint use facilities is addressed through negotiations in the joint use agreements. The specifics of those agreements could be considered for inclusion in the Park Master Plan. Policy RE-D.4 (p. 220) does call for mutually agreeable, long-term joint use agreements  |
| 181  | p. RE-224, Table RE-2. Show beaches counting toward satisfying some population based park needs  |   | Is the following policy sufficient to address the concern or should an additional guideline be added? <i>Identify, quantify, and consider as fulfilling aspects of population-based park needs, for purposes of General Plan and community plan park allocation, those portions of regional parks that satisfy neighborhood park and community park guidelines</i>   |
| 182  | Encourage more creative uses for recreation areas. The ability of recreation use to be vertical based on active or passive. Creative uses in villages (e.g. building tops) | X   |  |

**Recreation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested  |
|------|---|---|---|
| 183  | Add table similar to existing Recreation Element that also includes usable, gross dedicated and designated (Park & Recreation Terminology)                            | X   |   |
| 184  | Provide map depicting dedicated and designated  |   | A revised Table RE-2 will provide date specific data for Park and Recreation dedicated and designated parks and open space lands. Policies will also be added directing that Park and Recreation designated parks and open space lands be <i>dedicated</i> , and that conversion of <i>designated</i> park and open space lands to uses not directly related to parks and open space are discouraged. Illustrating Park and Recreation dedicated and designated parks and open space lands will require amendments whenever lands are dedicated |
| 185  | Definition of multi-purpose sports field, population-based parks, resource-based parks, natural open space, amenity-based recreation facilities, and net usable acres | X   |   |
| 186  | Provide a policy to address need to transfer designated parklands and open space to dedicated parklands and open space  | X   |   |
| 187  | Provide policy to discourage conversion of designated parklands   | X   |   |
| 188  | Clearly define specialized recreation facilities  | <i>Specialized</i> recreation facilities will be replaced with <i>amenity-based</i> recreation facilities which will be further defined |   |

**Recreation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree With Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested   |
|------|--|------------------------|--|
| 189  | Provide policy to return leased parklands to recreational use                                    |                        | Needs additional discussion. There may be conflicts in proposing such a policy. For instance Council Policy currently allows up to 25% of Mission Bay to be leased to commercial uses  |
| 190  | Add SANDAG to agencies in Policy RE-D.8 (p. 220) (joint use partnerships)                        |                        | It should be noted that the list of potential joint use partners follows the statement <i>may include but is not limited to</i> . SANDAG was listed in the April Discussion Draft. However, staff received comments requesting that it be removed since it does not own property or facilities |
| 191  | p. RE-221. Clarify meaning of RE-D.10 (acre to acre credit for joint use with schools)           | X                      |  |
| 192  | Clarify how plazas and cemeteries fit into guidelines  | X                      |  |
| 193  | Identify where City is meeting guidelines  | X                      |  |
| 194  | Address whether golf courses are an appropriate use in underserved/densely populated communities |                        | Whether golf courses are appropriate recreation uses in specific communities should be determined by the affected communities. Policy RE-F.1 addresses the community involvement in updating community plans and identifying community specific recreation needs and desires                   |
| 195  | Include policy language to address preservation and expansion waterfront/beach area              | X                      |  |

**Conservation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|---|--|
| 196  | Private property rights. Should pay for land not just take it   | Policies call for pursuing funding for the acquisition of open space (CE-A.1.a), and for regulatory protection of environmentally sensitive lands (CE-A.2). Please note that the type of Open Space can influence how it is acquired. For example, under the MSCP, lands are purchased through willing sellers only |  |
| 197  | p. CE 270-271. Consider state standards for archaeological preservation   | Agreed to SHPO standards are incorporated through Historic Review/CEQA. Staff will evaluate relevant policies in the element  |  |
| 198  | p. CE 233. The first sentence of the element should say “efficient and sustainable management” or “sustainable utilization” | Agreed. In addition, “sustainable” will be added to the glossary  |  |
| 199  | P. CE 239 cite references with footnotes and source   | X   |  |
| 200  | p. CD 239. The goal should be to pursue efficiency and conservation to reduce forecasted need                               | Text will be added to emphasize the importance of efficiency and conservation   |  |
| 201  | p. CE 240 and 244. Discuss role of State Regional Water Quality Control Board   | X   |  |

**Conservation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Commission Direction</b>   | <b>Proceeding as Directed</b>   | <b>Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested</b> |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 202         | Reconcile recycling space policy on p. 259 and p. 187   |   | Staff requests clarification on this comment                                      |
| 203         | S.D. River plan and the San Pasqual River plan should be referenced   | X   |   |
| 204         | p. CE-258. It should be “sustainable buildings” not “green buildings”   | Text will indicate that sustainability is based on the Green Building Rating System Index   |   |
| 205         | p. CE-258 CE-H.2. Clarify if this is being suggested or mandated. Check with building department regarding current requirements; new Title 24 | X   |   |
| 206         | Reference the lagoons in the element  | X   |   |
| 207         | A bold statement that is part of the first sentence can help tie all the conservation sections together                                       | X   |   |
| 208         | p. 251 – need a bold statement i.e. no net loss of open space   | Staff will reevaluate goal statements, and add Purpose and Intent statements throughout the plan. Please note goals for open space lands can depend on the type of open space (community plan, natural, etc.). For example, habitat-based goals are already established under the MSCP (52,000 acres) |   |

**Conservation Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|------------------------|--|
| 209  | Revise policy CE-H.7.d. to say “Use appropriate vegetation to achieve winter solar gain where needed”   | X                      |  |
| 210  | Readdress the specificity of these types of measures in the “Sustainable Buildings and Building Materials sections” (CE-258 – 259)                      | X                      |  |
| 211  | p. CE 257. Should be clear where that we want to encourage [energy efficient] design features as much as we can and be strong that way versus mandating | X                      |  |

**Noise Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed  | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested      |
|------|--|---|---|
| 212  | Consider noise standards for educational institutions that are prohibitive or limited in some fashion  | Staff agrees that children’s schools should not be allowed in areas that are exposed to noise levels that exceed the 65 dB CNEL due to the extended periods of outdoor exposure. Limited exceptions may be provided if no other feasible sites exist to serve a community |   |
| 213  | Look at the grand jury report to see if there’s something we can learn from that   | Staff will research this report   |   |
| 214  | Clearly state “Restrict noise-sensitive land uses in high-noise areas”   | Staff will add language to state this   |   |
| 215  | Add a policy to minimize the number of at grade train crossings (possibly in the land use element or mobility)   | Staff will add language to state this. Also relates to improving safety and mobility  |   |
| 216  | Rewrite the paragraph on NE-282 to reflect completion of the Green Line (First sentence of the second paragraph “...a third line currently nearing completion...”) | Staff will revise language to state this  |   |
| 217  | Table should be written conversely. We want to restrict sensitive uses in high-noise areas... It’s the converse but it’s more powerful                             |   | The Table (Figure NE-2) is modeled after the California General Plan Guidelines |



**Noise Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|--|--|
| 218  | Children should not be subject to noise   | See response to #212.  |  |
| 219  | p. 284 “The state requires that airport operators receive a variance...” It’s a misrepresentation to have it in there. It has nothing to do with reducing noise or reducing the uses. It’s not related to noise | Staff will revise this policy along with a revised discussion of airport land use compatibility. Aviation easements serve multiple purposes: as a noise compatibility strategy; airspace projection measure, and a buyer awareness measure |  |
| 220  | Would like to see a policy that’s stronger about restricting incompatible uses not just to reduce it, mitigate it and then allow exceptions, as is written now  | Figure NE-2 (p. 279) calls out compatible, incompatible, and conditionally compatible uses. Staff will evaluate the policy language to ensure that this is reflected   |  |
| 221  | p. 284. Disagrees with previous comment. You should try to encourage compatible land use and discourage incompatible ones. Make policy stronger to reduce incompatible uses                                     | See response to #220.  |  |

**Noise Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction   | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|--|--|--|
| 222  | Thinks the document is good but if not careful, it may become a detriment to our smart growth policies   | Governor's Office of Planning and Research has developed the noise element guidelines to allow local jurisdictions the flexibility to balance noise policies with other policies and the local noise environment. The draft Noise Element considers smart growth in an urbanized area through redevelopment/infill of mixed uses. Provisions of non-sensitive land uses as noise buffers and encouraging of state regulation changes to streamline development noise impact analysis requirements have been included to facilitate smart growth. |  |
| 223  | Recognize that noise is a part of the urban environment. Too many restrictions based on noise may preclude uses that belong in places that could otherwise be mitigated. There are technological things that can be done | See response to #222   |  |
| 224  | See report by Christine Rothman  | Staff will review report.  |  |
| 225  | Elements of design may mitigate noise  | Staff agrees   |  |
| 226  | Be clear as to when  | Staff will review the policies and clarify   |  |

**Noise Element  
Staff Response to  
July 14, 2005 Planning Commission Direction**

| Item | Commission Direction  | Proceeding as Directed   | Disagree with Direction, Conflicting Direction, or Clarification Requested |
|------|---|--|--|
|      | these policies are avoiding certain areas rather than minimizing    |  |  |
| 227  | p. NE-279, Figure NE-2. Airport Authority should not drive land use | The Airport Authority, as the state mandated Airport Land Use Commission for the county, is required to work with the City and other affected jurisdictions and stakeholders to develop local airport land use compatibility policies. State law allows the City Council to overrule the ALUC with a 2/3rds majority |  |
| 228  | Balance the limits on noise.  | See response to #222   |  |

**July 27, LU&H Workshop  
Comments on the  
July 2005 Draft General Plan**

**Donna Frye**

- Economic Prosperity Element (EP)-Address working waterfront uses and truck traffic. Protect maritime uses.
- EP p. 128. Provide goal and policies for “no net loss” of industrial lands. We need to protect and maintain what we have.
- In the collocation policy-add in “no net loss of industrial lands.”
- Ensure that existing industrial areas can expand.
- Concern about trucks in the Morena area.
- EP p. 142, Mission Valley/Morena. Last sentence first paragraph, change “are” to “may be.”
- EP p. 143, EP-C.3. Concerned as to how this would be interpreted. Doesn’t want it to be an assumption that we are encouraging additional growth in Mission Valley.
- Consider an industrial overlay zone in the Subregional Districts to implement the recommended “no net loss” of industrial lands policy, and show where such lands are.
- Strategic Framework/Land Use Element (LU) p. 42. Evaluating new growth-add police to list.
- LU p. 42. First bullet, how will you analyze the water supply and distribution needs of new development? Would we look at landscape and consider how it affects water use?
- Mobility Element (ME) p. 83, ME-K.3. Need to look at protecting what is already there.
- ME p. 87, ME-L.7. Should be made stronger to ensure that an action results from the policy.
- Conservation Element (CE) p. 255. Would like stronger language in the goals.
- Clarify when green buildings are required and when they are encouraged.
- Urban Design Element (UD) p. 119. Need to address large scale festivals and events (public gatherings). Identify where they can be located.
- Recreation Element (RE). What are the changes to park standards? What happens with deficiencies? How would this impact Mission Valley? Where would the parks be in Mission Valley?

**Toni Atkins**

- Supports the policies that seek to protect community character while accommodating growth.
- Implementation of these policies requires staff, time, and money. For example: RE F.9, p. 230-“Mini-parks and Vest Pocket Parks” and RE-F.13, p. 231-“Land Purchase” have been difficult to implement.
- When the General Plan is adopted we need to be sure all departments understand and implement it.
- The Master Park Plan is important.
- CE p. 235. Designate canyons to protect them from development and encroachment.
- Supportive of village concept, but concerned that putting higher density near transit lines sometimes creates a chicken-and-egg situation. (Since transit service needs density to be successful, and density needs transit to avoid traffic impacts; but which comes first?)

- Encourage joint-use practices. Ensure that policies and implementation practices are consistent.
- ME p. 51. Planned transit is discussed. Note that the lack of transit in some areas means that density will be forced in other areas of the City; that is not fair.
- Do not let City of Villages projects skip the initiation process.
- On minimum density: should apply equitably citywide. We need a fair share provision for communities to accept new growth.
- Ensure that the General Plan adequately addresses sustainability and global warming.
- Public Facilities section: note that we haven't been able to generate enough revenue to keep up with growth.
- There are potential problems with cumulative levels of traffic. For example, new development along 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenues is happening very quickly and could result in traffic impacts.
- Development Impact Fees can help address facilities' needs.
- We need a dialogue with community groups to address parking problems and solutions. The Chamber is discussing ways to make housing more affordable, including parking, but not all of the methods may work in each community. Communities may be able to help devise solutions in their communities.
- There should be an appropriate buffer to support existing industrial development. Agrees with Donna Frye, that collocation could occur on the fringes of existing industrial development.

### **Tony Young**

- Tony Young will provide staff with notes.

### **Scott Peters**

- Mountain bikes are becoming a viable mode of transportation for getting to work. Look at section on fundability of improvements (Section M, pp. ME-88-90).
- ME p. 61. Is the Street Design Manual adequate to address Mobility Element policies? There is still too much flexibility resulting in building bad streets. Need to evaluate whether the General Plan or the Street Manual needs to do more.
- ME p. 73. Surface parking lot one of the worst methods for using land. Should have a policy to discourage them and eliminate them where possible.
- Pocket parks. Mixed message. More expensive to operate than larger parks. This provides false hope for communities. Need to get private development to provide open spaces for public uses. Understand the constraints related to pocket parks.
- All easements that the City gets for access to public facilities should include trail access.
- EP. Provide an explicit discussion of the benefits and impacts from the tourism industry.
- Define what a village is. Provide an objective test that considers housing, business area, and walkability. Demystify what a village is.
- Encourage coordination between transit agencies and strive for better service in areas that border service areas. The existing government structure makes providing transit in certain areas too difficult.
- Work to ensure that commitments to provide transit are fulfilled.
- Downtown is the hub of the transportation system. We should strive for quality projects and use them as leverage for more parks and facilities.
- Downtown needs to work for the whole City.
- Please return on November 30th.