General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
September 10, 2001
Revised September 24, 2001

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Lee Vance	Building Industry Association
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Michael Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Tom Acuña	American Planning Association

Public at Large:

Allison Rolfe	SD Audubon Society
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	SDAR/Ramona Chamber of Commerce
David Pallinger	Ramona
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Kay LeMenager	ESDCAOR
Lisa Haws	
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall Sponsor Group
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Rosemary Rowan (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Bob Citrano (BRW Consultant)
Peggy Gentry (WRT Consultant)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

a) Minutes for August 27, 2001
   - Committee was not prepared to discuss changes on the minutes. Minutes were not approved and will be placed on the agenda for the September 24th meeting.

b) Field Trip
   - L. Higgins stated that a decision to have another field trip is dependent upon what can get accomplished. D. Silver stated that a tour is not top priority and that he will not be available on September 17th nor any other alternating Monday. K. Scarborough tabled the discussion for the end of the meeting.

Agenda Item III: Regional Categories –

Presentation by Rosemary Rowan

- The regional categories are essentially a conceptual level that goes into the land use element. Currently, we have regional categories which some of the existing categories do not match up with the concepts that this committee has been working on. As we are revising our land use element, we are looking at those categories and we approached this in a fairly analytical fashion and looked at a lot of different options including keeping the existing ones, one that uses exactly the concepts developed by this group as regional categories, and actually came up with a recommendation that largely does that but there are some differences and exceptions. We want the regional categories to create a link between the proposed concepts for this project and the land use element which is what staff, developers and land use owners use everyday to make decisions and we want it to provide a framework for implementing the goals of the project.
- How it is somewhat different from either existing or what you proposed is that it does incorporate input from staff and the Steering Committee. R. Rowan focused on the recommended categories because the other two are things that this committee is more familiar with. Option 2 is the Interest Group concepts and option 3 is the existing categories. The recommended categories have a regional system that very much incorporate a lot of the concepts that have been developed for this project: village core, village core support or remainder of the village, and we are looking at the idea of having a village limit line which will go around and be used to define the development area for every community whether they are east or west of the CWA line. The village limit line will typically be around the village and the village core but can also include areas that were defined as potential development areas that will allow communities to expand within the next 20 to 25 years. The semi-rural estates is very similar to what the group has been calling semi-rural. So we essentially go from high to medium density to semi-rural to rural lands.
- One of the differences from this proposed system and the structure map is in the rural lands. East of CWA, some of the yellow areas are areas that are currently parcelized for 1 du/10 ac, we have those in rural land east of the CWA. That means that some of the yellow areas seen on the map would turn green. Also, we need to identify what we call future development areas, which are essentially areas targeted for future growth where an increase in density would only be accomplished by purchasing TDRs. We also would like to have two categories that are not either in the existing system or your proposed system, that is areas that the County has limited or no jurisdiction. These in some cases are very large areas of land and we feel that the map needs to graphically tell people that, for example, the marine bases, the Indian reservations, the national and state forests. We would like to identify those graphically and also address issues that are pertinent to those areas, for example, there are inholdings.

Questions/Issues

- E. Bowlby asked why the designation for an 8 acre parcel was in the rural category instead of the semi-rural since we currently have the designation in a semi-urban category and would contribute to sprawl. R. Rowan responded that the reason the 1 du/10 ac category was in rural lands is to do the opposite of what E. Bowlby had stated and that it would be retained in rural land areas so that it does not densify more east of the CWA.
    - ***Clarification made at the September 24, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:*** *E. Bowlby was talking about why do we have a 10 acre category rather than an 8 acre category. We currently have a designation of 8 acre and it is a semi-urban category that would contribute to sprawl.*
- D. Silver asked how does this eviscerate our concepts. R. Rowan found this question to be confusing because the concepts are so embedded in this. Yes, you have village core and villages within A, B, C, and D, however your village core description is essentially the same in A and B but different in D. This does not get into those detailed descriptions.
- D. Silver asked that if one of their primary purposes is to create an edge around the town, how does the addition of 10 and 20 acre subdivisions and the introduction of 20 and 40 acre subdivisions east of CWA maintain the edge, which was the fundamental purpose of their concepts. K. Scarborough took note of the question and requested that all input be taken from the group because of the fact that the product is only a draft and will be presented again.
- G. Piro asked if it was possible to include areas in permanent conservation, i.e. easements, in the new color for limited or no jurisdiction in order to see which lands are permanently preserved. R. Rowan stated that the goal in doing this was to create some general categories and some things are going to need to be handled by overlays.
- G. Piro asked for an explanation of those areas that would only have densities through the use of TDRs. R. Rowan stated that we need to begin to look at potential receiving areas and where they would be, where future development would be, if it would be a slight extension of the urban limit line and where it will be. These areas have not been identified yet.
- I. Holler mentioned that this was staff's first run through on an analysis comparison of the categories that have come out of the land use concepts and looking at our existing categories and looking for areas where we identify the gap or some other designation that is needed.
- D. Silver thinks that these categories are so fundamentally different from the concepts and needed to get an explanation of why.
- B. Tabb asked why there was a staff recommendation that is different from the ones that the group has been working on. I. Holler responded that there were certain categories that needed some sort of acknowledgement like areas of limited or no jurisdiction or perhaps the inclusion of a village limit line that might have parts of three different categories in it.
- R. Rowan stated that there is a typo in option 2 under semi-rural. 1 du/10 acres should be listed so that a range between 1 du/acre and 1 du/10 acres is listed.
- E. Bowlby stated that their concepts in the rural lands were not 20 and 40 acres but rather 80 and 160 outside the core area. When you say that these regional categories are reflective of their concepts, feels staff missed the concepts considerably.

<u>Agenda Item IV: Structure Map –</u>

- J. Whalen stated that when the group came up with the concepts and the semi-rural estates category, it was their understanding that there was an intention that that be a recognition of existing development patterns but that would not be in all cases, semi-rural estates so he believes that that needs to be worked out.
- P. Pryde stated three concerns: he had never intended for village core densities to be used east of the CWA line and would like to get rid of any mention of village core east of the CWA; 2) originally, concept D was 80 to 160; and 3) under the future development, residential density range, he would prefer not using the CWA line.
    - ***Correction made at the September 24, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:*** *The statement should be: …he would prefer that this regional category not be used east of the CWA line.*

- D. Silver addressed J. Whalen's concern over what was meant by semi-rural, which was large lot, sprawl type of development, which is a direction we do not want to go. The fact that the proposed policy says it would discourage the expansion west of CWA is a fundamental change from their concepts. The introduction of estates into rural resource land is another problem.
- T. Barker stated that a big problem is that it is green and that it might be helpful if the rural lands are pale green and the state and national forests become bright green to make a distinction. She had asked why we were making a recommended category page. Feels should go forward with two options because it is hard enough to get consensus from the group as is. K. Scarborough stated that it was her sense that the group could do this, however it will postpone the inevitable, which is ultimately one map that the Board approves.
- B. Tabb feels that there is a problem because there is a fundamental misunderstanding of the designation of semi-rural. His understanding was that it looks at existing development patterns on the ground but it does not limit semi-rural just to where it exists but to areas in between. Questioned where all the back-country units are going to go, emphasizing that it cannot go into the red (core support) areas. D. Silver replied with the exception of holes, consolidations, and adjustments B. Tabb is talking about but his concept is that there might be some intensification of uses within the semi-rural west of the CWA.
- L. Vance asked what the impacts are going to be on individual lots that conform now but will not conform later if semi-rural changes to 4 acres or higher. I. Holler responded that they would still have a legal building site.
- E. Bowlby feels that we need to look towards the definition that would make sense and should look at the parcels 20 acres or greater to find the line for that category.
- K. Scarborough mentioned that the group needs to get the language correct because we are talking about concepts and that we also need to look at the map and get the lines in the right place.
- J. Whalen stated that the development community, after having discussions amongst themselves, feels that the red (core support) and brown (village core) areas are not big enough.
- A. Stehly stated that there are a lot of parcels out there in the green (rural) and so receiving areas need to be within the planning areas and cannot be just west of the line.
- D. Silver thought that the group would be better off discussing east and west separately and to limiting it to existing, on the ground development and to infill. Had four points: 1) limiting it to areas of existing construction (on ground, pattern development) and not parcelization; 2) allowing for infilling holes and border consolidation; 3) allowing or encouraging clustering; and 4) establish a baseline to get a density bonus. There is a strong sense that east of the CWA, there should not be more people out there but rather sparsely populated. However, if you do this, how do you make a TDR program work? We may need a PDR program.
- E. Bowlby stated that one of the things we learned from Alt. 3 and the analysis done on it was that we do not have the infrastructure so the problem with TDRs is that we will not be able to plan for it. Semi-rural is a non-distinct line and is rather a sprawl area.
- J. Whalen stated that because of the low density in semi-rural estate areas, what works for 1 acre zoning works for 3 acre zoning. In terms of the population target, people need to come to the reality that there are going to be births over deaths and people who are going to want to live in the county over the city, so we should try to provide as much housing as possible.
- D. Coombs stated that it was her assumption that we were still talking about a plan for 2020 and the population target is still the 660,000 number. I. Holler replied that the Board said there may be some flexibility in that number.
- D. Coombs stated that she was worried about having semi-rural as a receiving area and is questioning the premise that we cannot find places in core areas for future population growth. She refers back to Alan Hoffman's idea that if you were to make alternative transit viable, you need to have your population within a certain distance of a station.
- P. Pryde asked if a TDR program was really needed east of the line because he feels PDRs would be fine.
- J. Whalen stated that the group may need to consider a two phase program, one for transit and one for semi-rural. We may need to amend the original concepts and have semi-rural

circumscribed so people are comfortable with it and have another focal technique to go into the core.

- A. Stehly feels that PDRs are fine for existing development but there is still a need for TDRs because of downzones.
- K. Scarborough wanted to refer to D. Silver's four points to modify option 1 of the draft regional categories:
  - ⇒ Limit to areas of existing construction, on ground pattern development and not parcelization
  - ⇒ Allow for infilling holes/border consolidation – group is concerned with the definition of infill
  - ⇒ Clustering
  - ⇒ Baseline zoning
- K. Messer thought that the map reflected existing patterns well and supported the idea of infill sprawl but had a question of why you would change the baseline zoning. G. Piro replied that if you lowered the baseline marginally and wanted to develop in the same sprawling pattern, it would be more expensive since the baseline is gone.
- M. Stepner was concerned with lowering the baseline in areas we would want density and TDRs. He stated that it was not a proven concept and would prefer to leave it alone.
- D. Coombs feels that the group is not yet there in their common understanding and acceptance of these concepts to begin applying them at this point in time.
- G. Piro stated that he cannot support that homes on the ground will not be included in the semi-rural category. K. Scarborough replied that her understanding was that existing construction sets the pattern as if to get the ball rolling. Then you determine the border consolidation and filling in the holes that are consistent with good planning principles in what the ultimate node should look like.
- L. Higgins asked where do you define how many units are on the ground between yellow and green. Where is the percentage of built-out to define the change in the category. A. Barling replied that he shot for 90% of that area being developed. The yellow basically, east of the CWA, had to be 90%. I. Holler stated that it really is not the best strategy to look for an overall percentage but rather an overall pattern.
- B. Gendron believed that staff was going to bring back a map from the changes stated last week. K. Scarborough responded in clarification. For the full Interest Group Committee's benefit, the environmental group met with staff and there were some areas that LeAnn Carmichael had said that there had been some mapping errors. There was no debate or direction on what areas should be green. We have yet to decide how the group would like to direct staff to take the concepts into the detailed land use distribution map and that is something we need to discuss further. That is the direction she sees the group trying to articulate through the definition of semi-rural to staff as they take their pencil to the next layer of detail and not in what LeAnn was saying to clarify the concept map but rather taking it to the next layer of detail.
- K. Scarborough agreed that there needs to be some sense on or words, if not percentage, to try to define what the group is thinking to define semi-rural. B. Tabb responded that it is the community groups that should make that call.
- D. Silver stated that he would like to see the group try to keep the green, green and intensify the yellow as a way of having to accommodate units to limit sprawl.
- K. Messer feel that we need some assurance that this is not just additional units in addition to all those little lots in the green. We need our transfer mechanism to move units out of the green into the yellow and then we would be happy intensifying the yellow to assure the actual pattern that occurs goes into the yellow and not into the green.
- D. Coombs stated that she cannot support the direction that the group is going in. She feels that the group is expanding the village or village core densities. Her major concern is, however, that the group is accepting as a premise that we must do this in order to accommodate population projections and no one has shown her that that is going to be necessary. She stated that she is not ready to accept the premise or to set up a competing area for the core to put future densities at this point in time. She thinks that we need to prepare a plan that says this is what the County should look like and then come up with a

toolbox to implement, including incentives to put density where it belongs and not to come up with competing areas that will almost divert the goals that the group has been talking about for months.

- B. Tabb reiterated that the yellow as applied by staff took the on use development pattern and stopped at that point. He would like to see the land use patterns further refined.
- M. Johnson stated that he could not support all the yellow because it seems to him that it is weighted in the wrong area of the city in terms of the concentration of population. He feels that the infill discussion and population in Valley Center and Fallbrook is continuing sprawl.
- E. Bowlby stated that he sees semi-rural becoming core support and that D. Coombs is right on target as it is a bulging of the core area.
- L. Higgins stated that we need to take into consideration housing costs before raising the costs of land.
- K. Messer felt that M. Johnson's comments were right on target in that infrastructure costs, up there, are a lot more. She supports intensifying yellow if it takes units off of the green.
- K. Scarborough sees where the group is currently residing is kind of straddling regional categories and the eight points on the structure map. We took "b" first, which was semi-rural, but we got there by seeing staff's response to the regional categories. She would like to continue this discussion at the next meeting so that people can continue their mindframe from moving from conceptual to detail. We need to get detail mapped but we also need to agree on conceptual language that will live beyond this group.

Agenda Item II: Logistics (Continued) –

b. Field Trip
    - C. Chase requested that the tour remain as scheduled on Monday, September 17th since it was decided to not hold a regular meeting as proposed. A field trip to North County was agreed upon.

Handout –

Staff brought the "Report on the Potential Impacts of Tribal Gaming on Northern and Eastern Gaming" in response to a request at the last meeting for a list of all tribes.

Public Comments –

- D. Van Dierendonck stated that SPAs have not been mentioned. There are approximately 11,000 to 12,000 acres of SPAs in Ramona and we are vitally concerned about what they are, where they are going to go, and what they are going to do. There is no way we can sit here and work with this committee and the rest of the Steering Committee if we do not address the problem or the opportunity presented by those SPAs. He feels that he has a moral responsibilities to the owners of those SPAs, as well as, to the community that he lives in to make sure that SPAs are included in anything that we do. K. Scarborough responded that SPAs are on our agenda, marked as "a", however we did not get to it today.
- B. McDonald stated that he was disappointed by the map. He was expecting to get one map for each concept and was looking forward to seeing how concept A compared to concept B, etc. He thinks that what we are dealing with now is sort of a hodge podge of different concepts as County staff deals with how they fit onto the map. He thinks the problem with the semi-rural areas is concept B, which is where we get the concentric rings and sprawl. He also added that in order to make transportation and infrastructure work, we really need to focus growth into the existing villages. We really should try to target growth in the red areas and not the yellow areas.