

DATE ISSUED: February 23, 2001

REPORT NO. 01-040

ATTENTION: Committee on Land Use and Housing  
Agenda of February 28, 2001

SUBJECT: Planned District Ordinance Update Prioritization

REFERENCE: Manager's Report No. P-00-041, dated February 15, 2000 related to the  
Planned District Ordinance Update Work Program

### SUMMARY

Issue - Should the Land Use and Housing Committee establish a priority ranking for implementing Phase II of the Planned District Ordinance Work Program and direct the City Manager to begin work on Phase II?

Manager's Recommendation - Approve the proposed priority ranking for Phase II of the Planned District Ordinance Work Program and direct the City Manager to begin work on Phase II.

Code Monitoring Team - On February 14, 2001, the Code Monitoring Team voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed priority ranking for Phase II of the Planned District Ordinance Work Program.

Fiscal Impact - The PDO Work Program is budgeted in Fiscal Year 2001 as part of the Land Development Code Implementation Program. (For the La Jolla and La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinances, \$23,548 of grant money to be received from the California Coastal Commission will be utilized.)

### BACKGROUND

On February 23, 2000 the Land Use and Housing Committee approved the Planned District Ordinance (PDO) Update Work Program (see Attachment 1) and directed the City Manager to begin Phase I. Phase I focused on reformatting all of the PDOs into an organization and format that mirrors that of the Land Development Code (LDC). The PDOs will also be transferred from Municipal Code Chapter 10 into a new Chapter 15. Each PDO has been assigned a separate article within Chapter 15, and each article is organized into four distinct divisions based on the content of the four chapters of the LDC. The majority of the work for Phase I is complete and tentative hearing dates are scheduled within the next six weeks for the Planning Commission, Land Use and Housing Committee and City Council.

Phase II will entail in-depth reviews of each PDO (in order of priority) to identify opportunities to apply the regulations of the LDC whenever they can assure the type of development envisioned by community plans or to address any unique character issues identified by citizens. Many of the design concepts and development regulations contained in the LDC originated from the various PDOs. Therefore, Phase II will allow for the opportunity to comprehensively review all 19 PDOs and consolidate similar regulations. The PDO Update will be conducted with the same overarching goals that guided the development of the LDC. These include:

**Clarity** - Write regulations that are easy to understand.

**Simplicity** - Reduce the complexity of regulations.

**Consistency** - Eliminate contradictions among regulations.

**Predictability** - Make clear which regulations apply to a project.

**Objectivity** - Write regulations that mean the same thing to everyone.

**Integrity** - Develop a code framework that is internally consistent.

**Progressiveness** - Use new ideas while retaining the best of existing regulations.

**Adaptability** - Allow for tailoring of regulations to fit unique features throughout the City.

## DISCUSSION

As outlined in the approved PDO Work Program, Phase II will begin by establishing a priority ranking of all the PDOs to determine the order in which each PDO will be updated. The proposed prioritization is based on the following criteria:

1. **Community Desire** - Does the community have the desire and willingness to pursue a PDO update? This can be measured by the number of specific requests from the community and the community's commitment to the PDO Update process.
2. **Potential for Integrating LDC and PDO regulations** - Is there potential for consolidating similar LDC regulations with the PDO regulations to reduce complexity, redundancy and inconsistency among the regulations?
3. **Economic and Redevelopment Potential** - Is there potential for the PDO update to encourage economic and/or redevelopment opportunities within the community by removing unnecessary impediments?
4. **Alignment with the General Plan and Community Plans** - Is there potential for the PDO update to further the goals of the City's policy documents such as the community plans and the Strategic Framework Element of the General Plan? Additionally, is there a need to update a PDO in order to properly implement the community plan policies or the Strategic Framework Element?
5. **Improving Efficiency of Project Review** - Is there potential to improve the timelines for project review by alleviating any confusing aspects of the PDO, which often causes inconsistency in the implementation of the regulations and adds time to the review process?
6. **Volume of applications and inquires** - What is the volume of permit applications submitted in each PDO area and how many inquires does City staff receive on each PDO? If the PDO is used frequently and can be enhanced by an update, the result would be improved accuracy of project review, and a quicker response to questions from the public.
7. **Special Circumstances** - The special circumstances criteria applies to only two Planned Districts (La Jolla and La Jolla Shores). The California Coastal Commission has approved a grant to update the La Jolla and La Jolla Shores PDOs contingent on City Council's approval of the La Jolla Community Plan and LUP by June 2001.

The PDOs were all evaluated based on the prescribed set of criteria listed above and each PDO was assigned a grade of low, moderate or high in each category (see Attachment 2). For example, the San Ysidro PDO was assigned a high grade for the "Community Desire" criteria because several community members have forwarded correspondence over the past year, requesting amendments to their PDO. The Mid-City PDO was assigned a high grade for the "Potential for Integrating LDC and PDO Regulations" criteria because many of the PDO regulations could be consolidated with LDC regulations. The three downtown PDOs, Centre City, Gaslamp and Marina, were not evaluated as part of the Phase II prioritization ranking. The Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) is responsible for the implementation of the PDO regulations and will take the lead on any proposed amendments to the three PDOs in their area. Nevertheless, City staff has been working with CCDC staff to ensure a consistent format among all the PDOs.

Establishing the PDO priority ranking and determining the order in which each PDO will be updated is an important component of Phase II. Based on the current approved staffing levels for

the LDC Implementation Program (1 Program Manager, 2 Senior Planners, and 2 Junior Planners) staff is recommending the selection of three to four high ranking PDOs (depending on the complexity of required change) to begin work on immediately. It is expected that work on the selected PDOs would occur simultaneously and take an average of 12 to 18 months to complete based on the extent of community input, number of community planning group meetings, level of complexity of changes, environmental review, or additional approvals (i.e. Coastal Commission certification). The PDOs that received the highest rankings include La Jolla, La Jolla Shores, Mid-City and San Ysidro.

CONCLUSION

Development Services recommends approval of the proposed priority ranking for Phase II of the Planned District Ordinances Work Program and recommends that staff begin work on the highest ranking PDOs.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Modify the recommendation proposed for the priority ranking for Phase II of the Planned District Ordinances Work Program.
2. Deny the proposed priority ranking for Phase II of the Planned District Ordinances Work Program.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tina P. Christiansen, A.I.A.. Approved by:George I. Loveland.....  
Development Services Director... Senior Deputy City Manager

LMJ/BAM. ...

...

Note: Attachment 1 is not available in electronic format. A copy is available for review in the Office of the City Clerk.

Attachments: 1.Manager's Report No. P-00-041, dated February 15, 2000  
2.PDO Prioritization Ranking Summary

## PDO Prioritization Ranking Summary

PDOs	Criteria							
Barrio Logan	Low	Mod.	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	Low	-	9
Carmel Valley	Mod.	Mod.	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	Mod.	-	11
Cass Street	Mod.	High	Mod.	Low *	High	Low	-	12
Central Urbanized	Low	Low	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	High	-	10
Centre City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A
Gaslamp	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A
Golden Hill	Low	Mod.	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	Low	-	9
La Jolla	High	High	Mod.	Low *	High	High	High	18
La Jolla Shores	High	High	Mod.	Low *	High	High	High	18
Marina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A
Mid-City (Uptown and North Park)	High	High	High	Low *	High	High	-	16
Mission Beach	Low	Mod.	Low	Low *	Mod.	Mod.	-	9
Mission Valley	High	High	Mod.	High *	Mod.	Mod.	-	15
Mount Hope	Low	High	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	Low	-	10
Old Town	Mod.	Mod.	Mod.	Low *	Mod.	Low	-	10
Otay Mesa	Mod.	Mod.	Mod.	High *	Mod.	Low	-	12
San Ysidro	High	High	High	Low *	High	High	-	16
Southeastern	Mod.	High	High	Low *	High	High	-	15
West Lewis	Low	High	Mod.	Low *	Low	Low	-	9

High = 3 points

Mod. = 2 points....

Low = 1 point

\*Indicates that the PDOs have been evaluated only for alignment with the Community Plan update process. The PDO priority ranking will be revised when information regarding the Strategic Framework element becomes available.