



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
**REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

DATE ISSUED: January 2, 2008 REPORT NO: 07-206

ATTENTION: Natural Resources and Culture Committee  
Agenda of January 9, 2008

SUBJECT: General Plan Update Conservation and Recreation Elements

REFERENCE: **Council Report Nos.** 06-025, 06-056, 06-095, 07-194  
**Manager's Report Nos.** 03-019, 03-115, 03-204, 03-205, 03-206, 04-149,  
05-038, 05-161  
**Planning Commission Report Nos.** P-03-183, P-03-227, P-03-333,  
PC-04-220, PC-05-070, PC-05-183, PC-05-26, PC-05-304, PC-06-092,  
PC-06-149, PC-06-215, PC-06-216, PC-07-099, PC 07-158

REQUESTED ACTION:

Recommend City Council approval of the Conservation and Recreation Elements of the Draft General Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend that the City Council adopt the Public Hearing Draft General Plan Conservation and Recreation Elements (September 2007), with edits noted in **Attachment 3**, to replace the Open Space; Recreation; Conservation; and Energy Conservation Elements of the 1979 *Progress Guide and General Plan* (1979 General Plan).

SUMMARY:

**Background**

In 1999, the City of San Diego started the planning process for the Strategic Framework Element (SFE) of the General Plan. The goal of the SFE process was to establish a working vision and set of core values for the City that would guide future planning and development review efforts, and be the foundation for the comprehensive update to the 1979 General Plan. The SFE planning process integrated the work contained in planning documents generated by citizen committees,

workshops, and City Council actions from previous years. It included five phases of public outreach as follows:

- Growth projections forums;
- Growth issues forums and Citizen Committee formed to guide development of the element;
- Alternative strategies and preferred strategy selection workshops and meetings;
- Citywide community planning group workshops; and,
- Public workshops and hearings.

In October of 2002, the San Diego City Council adopted the Strategic Framework Element and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (LDR No. 40-1027; SCH No. 2001061069 dated August 27, 2002). The SFE set forth the City of Villages strategy and a comprehensive slate of citywide policies as the City's plan for growth and development. In January of 2003, following the SFE adoption, the City began the comprehensive update to the 1979 General Plan using the SFE as a guide. Since then, there have been numerous public meetings as described in the "Community Participation" section of this report.

Milestones in the General Plan Update process include:

- January 2003 - Following the SFE adoption, the City began the comprehensive General Plan Update. The Housing Element update was underway under separate cover and timeline to facilitate compliance with state requirements. Over a two year period a series of panel discussions/public forums and stakeholder meetings were held, and preliminary drafts of elements, or sections of elements, were distributed to interested parties.
- February 2004 - The City Council approved five innovative projects to become Pilot Village demonstration projects for the City of Villages strategy of smart growth in San Diego. The projects that were selected are dispersed throughout the City and represent a variety of approaches and styles to demonstrate how villages can revitalize existing neighborhoods, while retaining their individual character. The pilot villages are in various stages in the planning and development process. A Pilot Village Program Fact Sheet is provided as **Attachment 4** of this report.
- July 2004 - The General Plan Monitoring Report was prepared to fulfill an Action Plan requirement that staff monitor progress in implementing the SFE.
- April 2005 - The Discussion Draft General Plan was released for public review.
- May-June 2005 - The Discussion Draft General Plan was presented to nearly all of the community planning groups and numerous interest groups and stakeholders. Edits were made to the Discussion Draft General Plan based on written comments and comments provided at public meetings.
- July 2005 - The July 2005 Draft General Plan was released for public review. Planning Commission, Land Use and Housing Committee, community planning groups, and the public expressed concerns with this draft.
- August 2005-July 2006 - The Draft General Plan was edited based on input from the public, elected officials, and Planning Commissioners.
- May-June 2006 - Revised working drafts of the General Plan elements were posted to the City's website.

- October 2006 - The October 2006 Draft General Plan was released for public review and work began on a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the General Plan Update.
- December 5, 2006 - The Housing Element update was adopted on a separate schedule, per state law.
- April 25 2007 - The Draft PEIR was released for public review.
- June 25, 2007 - The PEIR public comment period ended.
- September 19, 2007 - The Public Hearing Draft was released.
- September 28, 2007 - The PEIR was finalized (Website posting occurred on Oct. 2, 2007).
- November 7, 2007 - The Community Planners Committee recommended approval of the Draft General Plan, with recommended edits.
- November 8, 2007 - The Planning Commission recommended City Council approval of the General Plan, with recommended edits.
- December 5, 2007 - The Land Use and Housing Committee made motions to approve the Draft General Plan and forward it to the full City Council with recommended edits.

## Overview

The Public Hearing Draft General Plan (Draft General Plan) sets out a long-range vision and comprehensive policy framework for how the City should plan for projected growth and development, provide public services, and maintain the qualities that define San Diego over the next 20 to 30 years (see **Attachment 1**). The Draft General Plan does not change land use designations or zoning on individual properties, but rather provides the framework and policy direction for future community plan updates, discretionary project review, and implementation programs.

The Draft General Plan's guiding principles are to achieve:

1. An open space network formed by parks, canyons, river valleys, habitats, beaches, and ocean;
2. Diverse residential communities formed by the open space network;
3. Compact and walkable mixed-use villages of different scales within communities;
4. Employment centers for a strong economy;
5. An integrated regional transportation network of transit, roadways, and freeways that efficiently link communities and villages to each other and to employment centers;
6. High quality, affordable, and well-maintained public facilities to serve the City's population, workers, and visitors;
7. Historic districts and sites that respect our heritage;
8. Balanced communities that offer opportunities for all San Diegans and share citywide responsibilities;
9. A clean and sustainable environment; and,
10. A high aesthetic standard.

Since less than four percent of the City's land remains vacant and available for new development, the Draft General Plan policies focus on the reinvestment in existing communities needed to support long term growth. The Draft General Plan continues to implement the adopted City of Villages strategy to focus on future housing, retail, employment uses, educational, and civic uses in mixed-use village centers of different scales. By directing growth primarily toward

village centers, the Draft General Plan supports the preservation of established residential neighborhoods and the management of growth over the long term. The pattern of development envisioned in the City of Villages strategy will not be affected by the rate of growth, but the number of villages, and the demand for development within individual villages, will be influenced by population growth pressures, public support, the rate at which infrastructure deficiencies can be remedied, and real estate market conditions. The Village Propensity Map (Land Use and Community Planning Element, Figure LU-1) illustrates existing areas that already exhibit village characteristics, and areas that may have a propensity to develop as village areas. This map does not change land use designations or zoning, nor does it require that village development occur in high propensity areas.

The City has developed the plan within the context of state requirements, regional plans and population forecasts, and the issues and needs unique to the City. California mandates that all local jurisdictions prepare a general plan that establishes policies and standards for future development, housing affordability, and resource protection. With the exception of the Housing Element, the state does not mandate when a general plan should be updated, but it does encourage jurisdictions to keep general plans current through regular updates. In addition, the state General Plan Guidelines (2003) identify 15 to 20 years as a typical time horizon for a general plan, and further states that a general plan, “based upon outdated information and projections, is not a sound basis for day-to-day decision-making and may be legally inadequate.” A general plan must include the following mandatory elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Noise, Open Space, and Safety. However, the state provides flexibility in the presentation of elements and the inclusion of optional elements that best meet the needs of a jurisdiction.

The City’s Draft General Plan is comprised of an introductory Strategic Framework section and nine elements: Land Use and Community Planning; Mobility; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services and Safety; Urban Design; Recreation; Historic Preservation; Conservation; and Noise. The update to the Housing Element was adopted by the City Council on December 5, 2006. A summary of each element, along with major issues, is provided on a Fact Sheet included as **Attachment 2** of this report.

## **General Plan Edits**

The Public Hearing Draft, dated September 2007, reflects edits made to the previously distributed October 2006 Draft General Plan. Changes to the plan are shown in strike-out/underline formatting to recognize stakeholders’ and the public’s time investment in reviewing and commenting on the October 2006 draft, and to facilitate public review. More recent staff-recommended edits to the Public Hearing Draft are shown in **Attachment 3**. Issues and edits that have garnered the most public interest related to the Conservation and Recreation Elements are discussed below.

### Climate Change

In response to public comments and Assembly Bill 32 (the Global Warming Solutions Control Act), the Draft General Plan and the PEIR were revised to more comprehensively address global

climate change. In summary, staff: (1) modified the policy language of the October 2006 Draft General Plan to expand and strengthen climate change policies; (2) incorporated the related policies into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Final EIR, to ensure that policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) are imposed on future development and City operations; (3) initiated work on a General Plan Action Plan to identify measures such as new or amended regulations, programs and incentives to implement the GHG reduction policies; and (4) made additional edits to the Public Hearing Draft as shown in **Attachment 3**. In previous drafts, climate change had been addressed more generally as a part of sustainability and air quality policies.

Specific edits to the Conservation Element include the establishment of comprehensive policies that would reduce future GHG emissions. A key new Conservation Element policy (CE-A.2) is to “reduce the City’s carbon footprint,” and to “develop and adopt new or amended regulations, programs and incentives as appropriate to implement the goals and policies set forth” related to climate change. Additional policies were added to “collaborate with climate science experts” to allow informed public decisions (CE-A.3) and to “regularly monitor and update the City’s Climate Protection Action Plan (CE-A.13).” The overall intent of these new policies is to unequivocally support climate protection actions, while retaining flexibility in the design of implementation measures which could be influenced by new scientific research, technological advances, environmental conditions, state and federal legislation, or other factors.

In addition, the Draft General Plan Land Use and Community Planning; Mobility; Urban Design; and, Public Facilities, Services and Safety elements were edited to better support GHG reduction and climate change adaptation goals. These elements contain policy language related to sustainable land use patterns, alternative modes of transportation, energy efficiency, water supply, and GHG emissions associated with landfills. The Draft General Plan also calls for the City to employ sustainable building techniques, minimize energy use, maximize waste reduction and diversion, and implement water conservation measures. The City’s efforts to reduce GHG emissions are further bolstered by existing City programs including the Sustainable Community Program, the Climate Protection Action Plan, the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Program, and numerous City Council policies addressing resource conservation and management. Overall, the plan addresses climate change through the City of Villages strategy and a wide range of resource conservation and management policies that promote sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A guide to where climate change-related policies are found in the General Plan is provided in Conservation Element Table CE-1, and provided below.

Staff has received two letters of comment related to climate change from the State Attorney General’s Office. Staff has had a constructive dialogue Deputy Attorney General Sandra Goldberg to ensure that the General Plan is in compliance with Assembly Bill 32. Both letters of comment from the state Attorney General’s office, along with staff’s responses, are provided as **Attachment 5**.

**TABLE CE-1 Issues Related to Climate Change Addressed in the General Plan**

Issues	General Plan Policy		
	Element	Section	Policy
City of Villages Strategy	Conservation	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.2
		B. Open Space and Landform Preservation	CE-B.1 through CE-B.5
	Land Use and Community Planning	A. City of Villages Strategy	LU-A.1 through LU-A.11
		H. Balanced Communities and Equitable Development	LU-H.6; LU-H.7
		I. Environmental Justice	LU-I.9 through LU-I.11
	Mobility	A. Walkable Communities	ME-A.1 through ME-A.9
		B. Transit First	ME-B.1 through ME-B.10
		F. Bicycling	ME-F.2; ME-F.4; ME-F.5
	Urban Design	K. Regional Coordination and Financing	ME-K.2; ME-K.6
		A. General Urban Design	UD-A.1; UD-A.2; UD-A.3; UD-A.9; UD-A.10
		B. Distinctive Neighborhoods and Residential Design	UD-B.5d; UD-B.6
		C. Mixed-Use Villages and Commercial Areas	UD-C.1; UD-C.4; UD-C.6; UD-C.7
Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions and Alternative Modes of Transportation	Conservation	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.1; CE-A.2; CE-A.13
		F. Air Quality	CE-F.1 through CE-F.8
		J. Urban Forestry	CE-J.4
		N. Environmental Education	CE-N.3; CE-N.5
	Land Use and Community Planning	I. Environmental Justice	LU-I.11
	Mobility	A. Walkable Communities	ME-A.8; ME-A.9
		B. Transit First	ME-B.1; ME-B.8; ME-B.9; ME-B.10
		C. Street and Freeway System	ME-C.2e; ME-C.4c
		E. Transportation Demand Management	ME-E.1 through ME-E.8;
		G. Parking Management	ME-G.5
		F. Bicycling	ME-F.5
	(GHG) (continued)	Urban Design	A. General Urban Design
Energy Efficiency	Conservation Element	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.5; CE-A.6; CE-A.8; CE-A.9; CE-A.11; CE-A.13
		F. Air Quality	CE-F.2; CE-F.3
		I. Sustainable Energy	CE-I.1 through CE-I.13
Urban Design	A. General Urban Design	UD-A.4; UD-A.5i	
Urban Heat Island Effect	Conservation	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.2; CE-A.6; CE-A.11; CE-A.12
		E. Urban Runoff Management	CE-E.2c; CE-E.d
		J. Urban Forestry	CE-J.1
	Recreation	F. Park and Recreation Guidelines	RE-F.8
Urban Design	A. General Urban Design	UD-A.8e; UD-A.12	

**TABLE CE-1 Issues Related to Climate Change Addressed in the General Plan**

Issues	General Plan Policy		
	Element	Section	Policy
Waste Management and Recycling	Conservation	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.2; CE-A.8; CE-A.9; CE-A.10
		C. Coastal Resources	CE-C.7
		D. Water Resources Management	CE-D.1; CE-D.3
		E. Urban Runoff Management	CE-E.6
		F. Air Quality	CE-F.3
		N. Environmental Education	CE-N.4; CE-N.5; CE-N.7
	Public Facilities, Services and Safety	F. Wastewater	PF-F.5
		I. Waste Management	PF-I.1 through PF-I.4
Water Management and Supply	Conservation	A. Climate Change and Sustainable Development	CE-A.2
		D. Water Resources Management	CE-D.1; CE-D.2; CE-D.4
		I. Sustainable Energy	CE-I.4; CE-I.6
	Public Facilities, Services and Safety	H. Water Infrastructure	PF-H.1 through PF-H.3

### Water Supply and Conservation

Climate change may affect San Diego’s long term water supply. The Draft General Plan addresses Water Infrastructure in the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element in Section H, and Water Resources Management in the Conservation Element in Section D. The Office of the Independent Budget Analyst (IBA) issued a report on the Draft General Plan (No. 07-115) calling for Public Facilities Element Policy PF-H.1 (e) to be modified to allow the City flexibility in the type of recycled water programs it pursues, including, but not limited to, potable water uses. The Land Use and Housing Committee endorsed the IBA recommendation.

### Wild Fire-Related Edits

At the Planning Commission hearing of November 1, 2007, Planning Commissioners asked staff to better address issues related to wildfires. Staff responded as follows:

- New discussion text added to Section D of the Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element to address San Diego’s fire propensity and to emphasize the importance of providing defensible space between open space and urban areas;
- Policy UD-A.3.p added to call for structures to be designed to be fire-resistant; and,
- Policy CE-B.6 added to call for defensible space through the management of brush and use of transitional landscaping.

These edits were approved by the Planning Commission, and the Land Use and Housing Committee, and are shown in **Attachment 3**.

### Population-Based Parks and Equivalencies

The Draft Recreation Element acknowledges that variations exist among communities with respect to the total park and recreation facilities, and population-based park acreage. As the City evolves into a fully urbanized environment and land costs rise, the need for creative solutions to

meet park and recreation needs has become increasingly important. Of primary concern is how to provide park and recreation facilities in older neighborhoods that developed prior to current park standards, where there is: limited undeveloped land readily available, a lack of funding resources to enable opportunistic acquisitions, high land costs, and dual objectives for providing affordable housing and park land. The needs of urbanized neighborhoods and the potential use of equivalencies were discussed at a joint workshop of the Planning Commission, and Park and Recreation Board on July 19, 2007. As a result of the workshop, and additional consultation with stakeholders, staff drafted edits to the Recreation Element policies that are now reflected in the Public Hearing Draft General Plan.

The Draft General Plan maintains the existing General Plan population-based park acreage, which is generally accepted to be 2.8 acres per 1,000 population, although the existing 1979 General Plan acknowledges that there is “considerable variation among the various communities (p. 312),” and calls for population-based facilities to “ideally constitute between 1.0 – 3.9 acres/1,000 population . . . (p. 316).” In previous drafts of the Recreation Element, staff had proposed a 2.4 acre per 1,000 guideline (July 2005) and introduced the concept of park “equivalencies” (October 2006). Equivalencies are alternative methods of providing recreation facilities.

Key recent edits include:

Recreation Element Tables RE-3, RE-4 and RE-5 are new and replace the previous Tables RE-3 and RE-4 from the October 2006 Draft. These new tables address park guidelines, recreational facilities, and equivalencies. More specifically:

- Table RE-3 maintains the 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents guideline, but expands the types of parks that can qualify to meet this standard and the anticipated service areas for various parks (see also Policy RE-F.8);
- Table RE-4 includes revisions to the Recreational Facilities Guidelines;
- Table RE-5 is a new table that identifies guidelines for possible equivalencies; and,
- Policy RE-F.9 has been revised to delete the “enhancements” concept, to delete the direction to prepare a new Council Policy as an interim implementation tool, and to specify that any future use of equivalencies will be location-specific to be further vetted through the Parks Master Plan or community planning efforts.

At the Land Use and Housing Committee meeting of December 5, 2007, Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) President Nancy Graham stated it is unlikely that Draft General Plan population-based park standards can be met downtown due to the limited amount of land available, and the high cost of urban land. The CCDC suggests that alternative language be added to the Draft General Plan to recognize downtown’s land constraints. Planning staff is working with CCDC on this issue.

### **Final Program Environmental Impact Report**

The Development Services Department has prepared a Final PEIR for the Draft General Plan. A PEIR, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 15168(a), is:



“An EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either geographically, as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions, in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.”

The Final PEIR describes the environmental setting for the Draft General Plan and identifies potential environmental impacts, the significance of the potential impacts, and mitigation framework to avoid or reduce potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. It also addresses cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, effects found not to be significant, irreversible environmental effects, and alternatives. The environmental setting section contains a description of the status of public facilities within the City, including detailed tables identifying park acreage by community, and extensive mapping of public facilities and/or service areas related to libraries, police facilities, fire and lifeguard facilities, and schools.

The Draft General Plan policies are designed to promote smart growth, sustainability, and environmentally responsible development. The environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Draft General Plan were found to be significant and unavoidable in all issue areas. This determination was made not because the policies themselves are considered harmful to the environment, but because there are impacts related to population growth and uncertainty related to future implementation through community plan land use designations, applied zoning, and proposed development. As such, even the No Project alternative could result in similar or worse impacts as the Draft General Plan. Since the degree of impact and applicability, feasibility, and success of mitigation framework measures cannot be adequately known for each future specific development project at the program level of analysis, program level impacts were called out as significant and unavoidable. The PEIR concludes that the full impacts of any future specific development project under the Draft General Plan can only be determined at the project level of analysis.

The Enhanced Sustainability alternative was found to meet all of the project objectives and was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Through the climate change edits described above, the City has incorporated the principal objectives of this alternative into the Draft General Plan, so that the Draft General Plan now approaches the level of impacts estimated to occur under the Enhanced Sustainability alternative. In addition, the City has incorporated the principal environmental objective of the Increased Parking Management alternative into the Draft General Plan to further reduce environment effects related to air quality and traffic.

Copies of the 38 letters of comments received on the Draft PEIR, along with staff responses, are included on the Final PEIR. Staff responses to public comments are also reflected in edits made to various sections of the Final PEIR, as well as the Draft General Plan. The revisions to the PEIR and Draft General Plan serve to clarify and amplify information and mitigation in response to public comments, but do not result in the identification of new or increased environmental impacts requiring the recirculation of the PEIR. The revisions to the draft PEIR, with the exception of a new Section 9 - Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program, are shown in strikeout/underline format.

The City is the lead agency for preparation and adoption of the Draft General Plan PEIR. This PEIR is intended for use by City decision-makers, other responsible or interested agencies and the general public in evaluating the potential environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the Draft General Plan. The PEIR is provided as **Attachment 6**, under separate cover.

### **Draft General Plan Implementation**

Implementation of the Draft General Plan will be accomplished through a broad range of legislative and regulatory actions that will ultimately influence private and public development. Key implementation tools include: community plan and facilities financing plan updates, zoning, Land Development Code (LDC) amendments, redevelopment plans, Capital Improvement Program projects, development permits, and resource conservation and management plans. Specific implementation measures that will be brought forward in early 2008 include LDC amendments to reflect changes to the plan amendment initiation criteria, and to the 1979 General Plan growth management tier system. Additional implementation actions that will follow Draft General Plan adoption include a comprehensive Infrastructure Finance Strategy; a Quimby Act/Park Fee Ordinance; additional LDC amendments and other actions (see **Attachment 7** for more information on upcoming code amendments).

When the SFE was adopted in 2002, a Five Year Action Plan was brought forward as a companion item to identify specific measures needed to implement the element. Many of the identified action items were related to completing the comprehensive General Plan Update. To close out this Five Year Action Plan, staff is in the process of preparing an updated General Plan Monitoring Report that will identify which actions have been completed, are underway, or not completed. A new General Plan Action Plan has been partially drafted and is attached to this report as an information item (see **Attachment 8**). Within 60 days subsequent to the City Council's adoption of the Draft General Plan, this new Action Plan, along with the updated General Plan Monitoring Report, will be brought forward in final form, beginning with the Planning Commission.

### **Alternatives**

The Natural Resources and Culture Committee could recommend edits to the draft Conservation and Recreation Elements of the General Plan.

### FISCAL CONSIDERATION:

The update to the Draft General Plan, with its emphasis on directing new growth to areas served by transit, will better position the City to compete for TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Funding, state bond measure Proposition 1C funds, and other smart growth funding sources. Action items identified in the General Plan Action Plan, which will be brought forward at a later date, will have fiscal impacts due to staffing and budgetary needs for the implementation of the updated Draft General Plan.

### PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION:

The Natural Resources and Culture Committee (NR&C) has not previously reviewed the Draft General Plan. On December 5, 2007 the Land Use and Housing Committee (LU&H) held an all-

day meeting to discuss the Draft General Plan. At the LU&H meeting, Councilmember Frye requested that Conservation and Recreation Elements be brought before the NR&C Committee. The Land Use and Housing Committee recommended City Council approval of the Draft General Plan, with recommended edits and identification of issues that would require additional discussion at the full City Council level. The Land Use and Housing Committee Actions for the December 5, 2007 meeting are included as **Attachment 9**.

#### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION and PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS:

Public outreach has taken place throughout the General Plan Update process. Since January 2003, over 250 workshops, forums, presentations, and working meetings have been held with community planning groups, the Community Planners Committee (CPC), the general public, and stakeholder and interest groups. Workshops and presentations have been given to the full San Diego City Council, the Land Use and Housing Committee of the City Council, and the Planning Commission (see **Attachment 10.a**). The public and stakeholders have had opportunities to both receive information and provide input on the Draft General Plan at each of these public meetings. In addition, staff has received many letters of comment, which are listed in **Attachment 10.b**.

- Community Planning Group Recommendation – On November 7, 2007, the CPC voted 13-3-3 to support the Draft General Plan as amended by various motions, which are documented in **Attachment 11**. Through Council Policy 600-9, CPC is the recognized advisory body for preparation, adoption and amendment of the Draft General Plan. The CPC has devoted a substantial amount of time to the Draft General Plan effort and has closely followed its progress. CPC's element-by-element motions on previous drafts are also recorded in **Attachment 11** of this report.
- Planning Commission Recommendation – On November 8, 2007, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend City Council approval of the General Plan Update and certification of the PEIR. The Planning Commission made separate motions on each element, with recommended edits for staff and City Council consideration, as documented in **Attachment 12**.

#### KEY STAKEHOLDERS and PROJECTED IMPACTS:

- Overall Impact – The General Plan Update is a program of citywide significance that has drawn a great deal of public comment. The Draft General Plan is a long-range policy document that does not result in direct impacts to specific properties or individuals, as there are no changes to the application of land use designations or zoning with the General Plan Update. However, some property owners are concerned that the identification of their properties on the proposed Prime Industrial Lands map will have an impact on their property rights.
- Environmental Impact – The City, as lead agency, has prepared a Final PEIR No. 104495 (SCH No. 2006091032) for the proposed Draft General Plan in accordance with the State of CEQA Guidelines. A Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program consisting of a Mitigation Framework will be implemented. However, since the degree of impact and applicability, feasibility, and success of mitigation framework measures cannot be adequately known for each future specific development project at the program level of analysis, program level impacts were called out as significant and unavoidable. The PEIR concludes that the

full impacts of any future specific development project under the Draft General Plan can only be determined at the project level of analysis.

- Housing Affordability Impact – The Draft General Plan is consistent with the adopted FY 2005-2010 Housing Element. The Housing Element identified the ongoing General Plan Update as a further step in implementing the City of Villages concept and various Housing Element action items. The Draft General Plan does not directly impact housing affordability as it does not include amendments to land uses or change planned housing capacity in the City. However, the strategy to direct housing into areas supported by public facilities and transit would provide opportunities for the development of housing at densities considered affordable.

#### CONCLUSION:

The Draft General Plan is intended to provide a strategy for future development that values the distinctiveness of San Diego’s communities while recognizing that San Diego is a major metropolis. The plan targets growth into distinctive village centers, protects the City’s canyons and open spaces, strives for a sustainable use of resources, and seeks to preserve a high quality of life for future generations. The Draft General Plan relies upon the community plans to provide the site-specific guidance that will lead to implementation of many of the Draft General Plan policies, and the continued involvement of an engaged citizenry to monitor its implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

---

William Anderson, FAICP  
Deputy Chief Operating Officer: Executive Director  
City Planning and Development

---

Nancy Bragado  
General Plan Program Manager  
City Planning & Community Investment

ANDERSON/NSB/ah

- Attachments:
1. Public Hearing Draft General Plan (distributed under separate cover and available at: <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/index.shtml>)
  2. General Plan Fact Sheet
  3. Corrections/Edits to the Public Hearing Draft
  4. Pilot Village Program Fact Sheet
  5. Attorney General Correspondence
  6. Final EIR (distributed under separate cover and available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/peir.shtml>)
  7. Memorandum on Upcoming Code Amendments
  8. Working Draft Action Plan
  9. Land Use and Housing Committee Actions
  10. Public Contact Records:
    - a) Public Meeting Log
    - b) Public Correspondence Log

11. CPC Motions Handout and Recommendations Matrix
12. Planning Commission Motions and Recommendations

Note: Due to the size of the attachments, its distribution will be limited to the Committee binders and the City website (<http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/legisdocs/index.shtml>). A copy is also available for review in the Planning Division, located in the City Administration Building, 202 C Street, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, and in the Office of the City Clerk.