

<b>Land Use and Community Planning (LU) Element - CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006</b>	<b>Staff Response (refers to Attachment 3)</b>
On p. 1, Plan Issues, shorten the sentence, to: "Land use designations are not standardized throughout the City." The motion was approved 15-8-0.	Staff has revised pertinent text in accordance with the motion. (p. 1)
<b>Subsection A.</b> Replace the word "should" with " <i>should or should not</i> " (approved 17-5-2)	The pertinent sentence currently reads "It is a strategy designed to allow each community to consciously determine where and how new growth should occur, and requires that new public facilities be in place as growth occurs." This is referring to City of Villages strategy, and staff believes that the CPC's concern is already addressed since each community will help determine <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> new growth should occur. By determining and understanding where new growth should occur, it is then understood where new growth should not occur. (p. 7)
<b>Subsection A,</b> LU-A. 2 (p. 8). Add the sentence " <i>not every community will host a village</i> " (approved 18-6-0).	It should be noted that specific village locations will be determined at the community plan level with input from the recognized community planning group. Therefore, the issue of "not every community will host a village" will be better and more specifically addressed at the community plan level. (p. 10)
<b>Subsection I,</b> LU-1.4 (p. 37), Add the clause: " <i>greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,</i> " to the text of the policy goal (approved 12-8-0).	Edit was made. (p. 45)
<b>Subsection C,</b> p. 17, Regarding the implementation of community based goals, first paragraph, add: " <i>but only when infrastructure deficits are eliminated and infrastructure occurs concurrent with further development</i> " to the end of the sentence on overall density and housing capacity (approved 19-2-0).	The Community Planning section of the LU element already addresses the issue of infrastructure and the need to ensure that new development proposals do not compound existing public facility deficiencies. The section also calls for new development to provide public facilities commensurate with their level of impact. The elimination of infrastructure deficits will take place over time as the City continues to meet its housing needs and regional share goal. (p. 23)
<b>Subsection A,</b> on p. 6, "Village Categories" (Neighborhood Village Centers): The word "should" in the first sentence was changed to " <i>could.</i> " The sentence formerly read: "Neighborhood Village Centers should be located in almost every community plan area" (approved 24-0-0)	Each of the village categories are important components of the City of Villages strategy. A Neighborhood Village Center is a fundamental type of village that should be found in almost every community based on its intent of being neighborhood-oriented and providing services to the community. Ultimately, the recognized community planning groups will be involved in identifying sites for various village centers. (p. 8)

<p><b>Subsection B</b>, Policy LU-B.8, (p. 15), the word “incompatible” was added, so the policy goal reads: “Protect key employment areas from encroachment from incompatible non-industrial uses while providing areas for secondary employment and supporting uses.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>The proposed policy is intended to protect key industrial employment areas from encroachment from multi-tenant office uses and to prevent industrial areas from becoming commercial or office oriented areas. It is important to note that there will be areas for secondary employment, supporting uses, and limited office uses that are accessory to a primary industrial use. Therefore, the requested change has not been made. (p. 20)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 16, “Community Planning” (Goals): Two words were added, so that the fourth bullet point reads: “Community plans that maintain or increase planned density of residential, <i>and employment</i>, land uses in appropriate locations.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Staff proposes language as follows: “Preserve significant industrial lands and intensify employment uses where transit is available.” Increasing intensity of employment land uses could potentially drive away base sector type uses (manufacturing, distribution, warehouses), so is not appropriate for all types of employment related uses. (p. 21)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 21, “Community Plan Land Use Designation” Table, under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” the office use allowed was expanded so that it was not limited to corporate headquarters, and would apply to all accessory office use. (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Current draft allows limited office uses under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” such as corporate headquarters, accessory office uses to the primary use or as direct support for scientific research uses. A “Business Park” designation is also proposed that would allow office uses other than just corporate headquarters or accessory uses to the primary use. Therefore, staff has not made the change. (p. 27)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, p. 23, “Community Planning (Evaluating New Growth): In the second paragraph, second sentence, it states: “Historically, communities have not fully welcomed the idea of new growth when public facilities deficiencies exist.” An additional sentence was added: “<i>New development should not be allowed where existing public facilities are not sufficient to support it.</i>” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>As stated earlier, the LU element emphasizes that new development needs to provide public facilities commensurate with their level of impact; therefore, this issue is already being addressed. (p. 30)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, on p. 24, “Community Planning” (Community Facilities Prioritization): The words “or applicable community plan” were added to the sentence in the middle of the paragraph which states: “Individual new development proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>or applicable community plans</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Staff has revised pertinent text in accordance with the motion. (p. 30)</p>
<p><b>Subsection C</b>, Policy LU-C.6 (p. 25) - the words “and applicable community plan” were added, so that it reads: “Evaluate individual new development proposals to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, <i>and applicable community plan</i>, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>Staff has revised pertinent text in accordance with the motion. (LU-C.7, p. 32)</p>
<p><b>Subsection D</b> “Plan Amendment Process” Policy LU-D.7 (p. 27) – recommend deletion of the following: “Initiate a technical amendment without the need for a public Planning Commission hearing when the Planning Department determines, through a single discipline Preliminary Review, that the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure the public health, safety and welfare.” (approved 24-0-0)</p>	<p>This is only pertaining to the initiation process, the actual amendment would still go through public hearing which would allow the opportunity for public input as well as input from the recognized community planning group. Therefore, this policy has not been deleted. (LU-D.8, p. 34)</p>
<p>Page 2 Approved 24-0-0) May 2006 - Draft</p>	
<p><b>Subsection G</b>, Policy LU-G.1 (p. 34) - to the end of the policy add: “Work with the ALUC to develop policies that are consistent with the state and federal guidelines and that balance airport land use compatibility goals with other</p>	<p>All four compatibility factors are equally important (safety, air space protection, noise, and overflights). Instead of “taking into account that public safety should be the most important consideration.” insert “and that</p>



<b>Mobility Element (ME)            CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b>	<b>Staff Response (refers to Attachment 4)</b>
<b>Subsection A</b> - CPC agreed with staff's suggested reorganization.	Staff proposed deletion of this subsection from the Mobility element; the issues it contains are covered in other sections of the General Plan.
<b>Subsection B</b> Discussion (p. ME-53) – Delete the text pertaining to childhood obesity (approved 19-1-1).	Edit was made. (p. 3)
ME-B.1 (p. ME-54) - Provide more balance between pedestrians and automobiles in a manner that does not worsen the service level for automobile traffic, and delete the text that follows the word “safety”(approved 15-2-3).	The policy (now ME-A.1) references a Pedestrian Improvements Toolbox and calls for design that maximizes pedestrian safety and comfort. (p. 4)
ME-B.2 (p. ME-54) - Apply the Pedestrian Master Plan in a manner that is consistent and complimentary to each community's existing plan (consensus).	The Discussion text now reads: “The PMP is intended to be complementary to the community plans, recognizing that not all community plans currently address pedestrian issues.” (p. 4)
ME-B.5 (p. ME-55) – Emphasize the importance of safety issues, including protecting children from crime (consensus).	Added a new section on Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility, and a reference to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Measures in what is now policy ME-A.2.e. (p. 4)
<b>Subsection C</b> (p. ME-57) Overall - Revise to encourage alternative modes, but avoid being detrimental to automobile travel. (approved 12-9-0)	Various edits have been made, such as the revised policy ME-B.9, which replaces the July 2005 Draft policy ME-C.3 (p. 9)
<b>Subsection D</b> -(edits approved by consensus) ME-D.1 a,b,c, & e (p. ME-63) - Add “ <i>In accordance with approved community plans</i> ”	Several policies have been edited to reference community plans (pp. 11-12, policies ME- C.1, ME-C.2.d, and ME-C.3.)
ME-D-6 (p. ME-64) - Edit to state “ <i>Protect the safety of pedestrians and the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.</i> ”	The revised policy now references a “Traffic Calming Toolbox” and calls for installation of traffic calming measures “to increase the safety and enhance the livability of communities.” The revised policy (now ME-C.5) is consistent with the City's draft Traffic Calming Program Handbook (p. 12).
<b>Subsection G</b> , ME-G.1 (p. ME-70) - State that the City's Bicycle Master Plan should be consistent and complimentary to each community's existing plan.	The Discussion in the revised Bicycling section clarifies that “the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) is intended to provide a citywide perspective that is enhanced with more detailed community plan level recommendations and refinements” and the new policy ME-F.1.c. states: “Reference and refine the plan (BMP), as needed, in conjunction with community plan updates.” (pp. 18-19).

<p>ME-G.2 (p. ME-71) - add that a bikeway system network that is continuous and safe, while balanced with the need to preserve pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>The revised policy (now ME-F.2.a) states: "Develop a bikeway network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, improves safety, and serves important destinations." (p. 19).</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME-H-2 (p. ME-75) – revise to say to the effect: “strive to achieve the efficient use of land devoted to parking through such measures as...”</p>	<p>The revised policy (now ME-G.2.b) states: “Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures and shared use, while still providing appropriate levels of parking.” (p. 21)</p>
<p>ME-H-2. a - to include the phrase “<i>existing and funded</i>” high quality transit.</p>	<p>This edit was made (p. 21, revised policy ME-G.2.a)</p>
<p><b>Subsection K</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) Discussion (p. ME-84) – edit to reflect the fact most of San Diego’s air cargo comes from outside the County (Los Angeles or Mexico).</p>	<p>Edits do not specifically reflect CPC language, but the revised Airports Section contains discussion and policies related to the need to support forecasted air cargo demand. (pp. 23-26)</p>
<p>ME-K.1 (p. ME-84) - add language to “<i>Support and pursue State and Federal funding for infrastructure improvements and use of...</i>”</p>	<p>This topic is addressed in the revised Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element (PFSS).</p>
<p>ME-K.2 (p. ME-84) - Add “<i>port of entry</i>” to the list of transportation facilities to be preserved.</p>	<p>This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element.</p>
<p>New ME-K.8 - Add a new subsection with the text: “<i>Collaborate with the Government of Mexico to plan for future border crossings, including location, technology, and preservation of the road network.</i>”</p>	<p>This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element.</p>
<p><b>Subsection M</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME- M.2 – noted that staff recommends moving this to the Public Facilities Element.</p>	
<p>ME-M-4, Policies 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12 - Edit these policies to reflect the following: “It should not be a policy of the General Plan to recommend tax and fee increases. All statements and policies that suggest funds should be raised via tax or fee increases should be left to the discretion of elected representatives, and deleted from the General Plan. However, it is fully appropriate for the General Plan to recommend that the City pursue its maximum fair share of County, State and Federal funding.”</p>	<p>This topic is addressed in the revised Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element (PFSS).</p>
<p>ME-M.11 - Add the phrase “<i>to the availability of existing or planned and funded transportation facilities.</i>”</p>	<p>This topic is addressed in the revised PFSS element.</p>

Urban Design (UD) Element CPC Meeting of February 28, 2006	Staff Response (refers to Attachment 5)
Section B, Discussion - Revise to state "...should contribute to the <i>creation</i> and the preservation of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place."	Change made to the discussion section and to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet under Section B, Goals.
Section A, "General Urban Design," Policy UD-A.1.a - The sentence "Protect the integrity of community open spaces intended for preservation," was modified to read, "Protect the integrity of community <i>plan designated</i> open spaces."	Change made. Policy UD-A.1.a
Section A: Policy UD-A.2.a - Add word "meadows" to the sentence, "Preserve and enhance naturally occurring features such as coastlines, rivers, creeks, canyons and ridge lines."	Sentence restructured to refer to wetlands and riparian zones. Policy UD-A.2.a
Section A: Policy UD-A.13.a - Where the text states, "Provide comprehensive project sign plans", modify to read, "Design signs as a means to communicate a unified theme and identity for the project."	Change made. Policy UD-A.14.a
Section A: Policy UD-A.16.a - Revise to state, "Design projects to encourage visible space that will serve as a means to discourage and deter crime through the location of physical features, activities and people to maximize visibility." These words replaced the phrase "encourage natural surveillance", which was felt to be too intrusive.	Change made. Policy UD-A.17.a
Section B, The last sentence of the discussion read: "However, new development – whether it is in the form of infill, redevelopment, or first-time development – should contribute to the <i>preservation</i> of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place." The words "the preservation" replaced "continuing positive evolution."	Change made to the discussion section and to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet under Section B, Goals.
Section D, UD-D.2 - Deleted entire text which stated: "Encourage placement of active uses, such as retailers, restaurants, fitness centers, and various services, on the ground floor of buildings in areas where the greatest levels of pedestrian activity is sought."	Repeat of Policy UD-C.1.c
Section G, Policy UD-G.1.d - Revise to state "Reinforce community pride and identity by encouraging artworks and cultural activities that celebrate, <i>but do not overwhelm</i> , the unique cultural, ethnic, historical, or other attributes of the neighborhood."	Change made. Policy UD-F.1
Section G: Policy UD-G.1 - Add policy under <i>Community Identity</i> to address involvement and oversight by community planning committees in the decision-making process regarding public art and cultural amenities.	Policy added which provides for planning group involvement. Policy UD-F.1.g
Policy UD-A.11.e - Revise to state " <i>especially adjacent to community public viewsheds</i> ."	Change made. Policy UD-A.12.e

<b>Conservation Element (CE) Historic Preservation (HP) Element (was reviewed by CPC as Section L of the CE) CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>	<b>Staff Response (refers to Attachment 6)</b>
<b>Subsection A</b> , “Open Space and Landform Preservation,” (p. CE-3) the discussion section should provide an explanation of the differences, and definitions of, both public and private open space.	The definitions for public and private open space will be included in the final glossary, consistent with established Council Policy (600-23, 700-17, etc.). Section A has also been revised to distinguish between “public” and “private” types of open space (page 3).
<b>Subsection A</b> : Policy CE-A.3 (p. CE-4) should be revised to speak more broadly; the word “commercial” should be replaced with “ <i>urban</i> ,” protection of vacant and open land should receive emphasis.	Policy CE-A.3 has been revised as follows (page 6):  “CE-A.3. Balance the city’s housing goals and conservation goals, through the City of Villages strategy of targeting mixed-use development into the existing urban fabric of the city.”  The protection of open space is stated in policies CE-A.1, CE-A-2, and CE-A.4. (page 7)
<b>Subsection B</b> , “Water Supply,” Policy CE-B.1 (b) (p. CE-6) - After the first three words “potential groundwater resources,” the following clause should be added: “ <i>with consideration for capacity and recharge</i> .”	Policy CE-B.1(b) has been revised as follows (page 9): “b. Manage groundwater and surface water resources and capacity through an integrated approach to meet overall water supply and resource management objectives (see also Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element, PF-H.1).”
<b>Subsection E</b> , “Biological Diversity,” Policy CE-E.2 (p. CE-12). The entire policy should be deleted. This issue should be discussed in the Housing Element.	Staff did not make this change (page 19). The City of Villages strategy for compact growth reduces urban sprawl and associated pressure on undeveloped land. It is an integral component of implementing the Conservation Element and warrants a separate policy in this element.
<b>Subsection E</b> , Policy CE-E.5 (p. CE-12). The word “consider” should be replaced with “ <i>protect</i> .”	Staff did not make this change due to potential conflicts with existing, adopted regulations (“protect” was too stringent regarding environmental/floodplain regulations). The city of San Diego’s project review process requires consideration/evaluation and protection of all environmentally sensitive resources if development is proposed, consistent with the city’s MSCP/ESL and other related regulations. Some development in floodplains is permitted with appropriate mitigation.
<b>Subsection H</b> , “Sustainable Development and Urban Forestry,” Policy CE-H.7 (d) (p. CE-17). This policy should be edited to further explain the significance of trees that lose their leaves.	The explanation was provided to CPC at the meeting that deciduous trees (as opposed to evergreen trees) naturally lose leaves seasonally-this helps from a landscape maintenance, water usage, and overall conservation perspective (page 24).

<p><b>Subsection H</b>, Policy CE-H.8 (p. CE-17). Additional language should be added to exempt solar devices.</p>	<p>Staff did not make this change (page 24); such an exemption is not appropriate at the General Plan level. Policies to address alternative energy sources (including photovoltaic cells) are provided in CE-G.3, CE-G.4., CE-G.5. (page 21), CE-H.1., and CE-H.2 (page 23).</p>
<p><b>Subsection H</b>, in Policy CE-H.9 (Urban Forestry, p. CE-17) - A new subpart “g.” should be added which places emphasis on water conservation in urban forestry, and the planting of drought resistant trees.</p>	<p>Staff did not make this specific change (page 25) to policy CE-H.9. Sustainable landscaping and the emphasis on drought-tolerant species are set forth in policy CE-H.7. Additionally, policy CE-H.9. (b) calls for community street tree master plans, which will determine the appropriate type of species for each community, guided by the tenets in CE-H.7 (page 24).</p>

<b>Historic Preservation (HP) Element (was reviewed by CPC as Section L of the CE) CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>	<b>Refers to Draft Historic Preservation Element (HP) Attachment 7</b>
<p><b>Subsection L</b>, “Historic and Cultural Resources,” Policy CE-L.1 (c) (p. CE-24) reads: “Encourage the consideration of historic and cultural resources early in the development review process.” The word “encourage” should be replaced with “<i>require.</i>”</p>	<p>Subsection L, “Historic and Cultural Resources” has been deleted from the Conservation Element and has been reformatted into the Historic Preservation Element. Staff does not agree with the comment and believes that the term “encourage” is more appropriate for a policy document than the term “require.”</p>
<p><b>Subsection L</b>, Policy CE-L.1 (p. CE-24) - A new subpart “h.” should be added which states: “<i>In conformance with applicable community plans, encourage the creation of historic and conservation districts.</i>”</p>	<p>Subsection L, “Historic and Cultural Resources” has been deleted from the Conservation Element and has been reformatted into the Historic Preservation Element. A discussion of conservation areas has been added to the Historic Preservation and Urban Design Elements.</p>
<p><b>Subsection L</b>, Policy CE-L.5 (p. CE-25). (Public Education) reads: “Encourage public attendance at monthly Historic Resources Board meetings.” The word “encourage” should be replaced with “<i>Create a policy to encourage.</i>”</p>	<p>Subsection L, “Historic and Cultural Resources” has been deleted from the Conservation Element and has been reformatted into the Historic Preservation Element. Staff does not agree with the need to change “encourage” to “create a policy to encourage” since it is already stated as a policy in the element.</p>

<b>Noise Element (NE)                      CPC Meeting of January 24, 2006</b>	<b>Staff Response (refers to Attachment 8)</b>
<b>Subsection A</b> , In the first sentence states, the words “residential land uses” should be changed to “ <i>all land uses.</i> ”	The sentence was redrafted to state: The Noise Element affects the Land Use and Community Planning Element since excessive noise affects land uses, specifically, the quality of life of people working and living in the city. (p. 4)
Figure NE-2: Changes were discussed with CPC.	The following edits were made: Only 3 categories used: compatible; conditionally compatible, incompatible. Included a discussion of indoor and outdoor uses for each noise compatibility category. Removed all overlap in compatibility categories. Land use categories are consistent with Land Development Code land uses. Indicated noise attenuation level. (pp.5, 6)
<b>Subsection B</b> , Policy NE-B.1 - Add “ <i>and site planning</i> ” after “compatible land uses.”	Edit was made. (p. 7)
Policy NE-B.2 -Add “ <i>with due consideration of the traffic impacts that would be created</i> ” at the end of the policy.	Edit was made. (p. 7)
<b>Subsection C</b> , Policy NE-C.1 - Add “ <i>and site planning</i> ” after “noise-compatible land uses.”	Edit was made. (p. 8)
<b>Subsection D</b> , Replace section with the language provide by a CPC member, Buzz Gibbs.	Edit was made. (pp. 9 - 11)
<b>Subsection F</b> , Add new policy to state: “Provide for separation of residential and industrial uses, so that sensitive noise receptors are not in close proximity, or are buffered and insulated”	The following new policy was added: “Provide for sufficient spatial separation between industrial uses and residential and other noise-sensitive land uses or utilize other feasible mitigation measures to reduce the noise source, interrupt the noise path, or insulate the receptor to minimize the exposure of residential and other noise-sensitive land uses to excessive industrial- related noise.” (p. 13)
<b>Subsection F</b> , Policy NE-F.2 and NE-F.3 Add “where possible if sensitive noise impacts are created” at the end of both policies.	The following language was added to both policies (now NE-F3 & NE-F4): “where it affects residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.” (p. 13)
<b>Subsection G</b> , Policy NE-G.2 Replace “Continue to” with “ <i>Enforce.</i> ”	The discussion section was edited to include enforcement of the city’s noise ordinance. Wanted to avoid having policies reference regulations, since the stated policies should implemented by the regulations. (p. 14)