# COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

## PLANNING REPORT

FINAL

**DATE:** June 18, 2014 **02**

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**SUBJECT:** 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (DISTRICTS: ALL)

**Overview**
This is a Board of Supervisors directed effort to address inconsistencies, omissions, and other issues that have been discovered since the General Plan was adopted in 2011. This General Plan Clean-Up General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Rezone includes proposed changes to the Land Use Map (with corresponding zoning and Regional Category changes when necessary for consistency), Land Use Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, Safety Element, Mobility Element Network, Glossary, and community/subregional plans.

**Recommendation(s)**
**PLANNING COMMISSION**
The Planning Commission accepted the Planning & Development Services recommendations and requests that the Board of Supervisors (Board):

1. Review and consider the information contained in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), dated August 3, 2011, on file with Planning & Development Services (PDS) as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001, and the Addendum thereto, dated January 24, 2014, on file with PDS as GPA 12-007, prior to making its decision on the project.

2. Adopt the attached Resolution entitled A RESOLUTION OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTING THE 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT; GPA 12-007 (Attachment A, on file with the Clerk of the Board).

3. Adopt the attached Form of Ordinance entitled AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (Attachment C, on file with the Clerk of the Board).

**SUBJECT:** 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (DISTRICTS: ALL)

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**
The Department concurs with the Planning Commission Recommendations.

**Fiscal Impact**
There is no fiscal impact associated with today's requested actions on the General Plan Clean-Up GPA and Rezone. There will be no change in net General Fund costs and no additional staff years

**Business Impact Statement**
N/A

**Advisory Board Statement**
The Draft Plan for the General Plan Clean-Up was distributed to Community Planning and Sponsor Groups (CPGs/CSGs) in April 2013. CPGs/CSGs reviewed and provided recommendations on the proposed amendments throughout the spring and summer of 2013. In addition, staff attended meetings of the CPGs/CSGs in Borrego Springs, Rainbow, San Dieguito, and Spring Valley to discuss proposed community plan policy revisions, in addition to the other items in the project. Staff generally received support for the project, from the CPGs/CSGs who provided recommendations. The Borrego Springs CSG was opposed to the policy revisions proposed for their Community Plan; however, the rest of the community plan policy revisions in the current plan were supported by the corresponding CPGs/CSGs. Each of the individual CPG/CSG recommendations received by staff can be found in Attachment E.

**Involved Parties**
This is a County-initiated GPA and Rezone.

**Planning Commission Vote**
On January 24, 2014, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the project, by a vote of 6-0-1 (Ayes: Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Woods; Noes: none; Absent: Reiss).

**BACKGROUND:**
As part of the August 3, 2011 (1), adoption of the General Plan Update, the Board directed staff to bring forward a 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a GPA. The Board deliberations, motion, and vote directing a clean-up process occurred during the April 13, 2011 (1), Board hearing.

The General Plan Update was prepared over the course of many years, with much of the analysis occurring on a macro scale. Considering the large scope of the update, it was inevitable that oversights requiring correction would be found during the implementation process. Examples include typos, incorrect references, missing table information, and the need to clarify or revise certain policies and definitions in the General Plan and community plans. The Clean-Up process also provides a convenient mechanism for handling changed circumstances that affect the General Plan, including changes in State law, or changes in property ownership (public – private) that result in outdated Land Use designations.

The Clean-Up process is only intended for minor changes or additions to the General Plan that

do not result in additional environmental impacts. Therefore, project changes qualifying for the Clean-Up only require an Addendum to the previously certified General Plan Update EIR. An Addendum may be prepared when significant environmental impacts were previously analyzed, no new significant environmental impacts will result from the project, and only minor changes or additions to the previously certified EIR are needed.

**Project Description**

This GPA and Rezone includes proposed revisions to the General Plan Land Use Map (with corresponding zoning and Regional Category changes when necessary for consistency), Land Use Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, Safety Element, Mobility Element Network, Glossary, and seven community/subregional plans. All of the proposed changes in the GPA are described in detail in Attachment B, and briefly discussed below.

A. Land Use Map

The types of Land Use Map changes included in this Clean-Up include the following:

- Mapping errors – Corrections to fix mapping errors that were missed during the General Plan Update process. An example of this type of change is ME101, which involves privately-owned parcels that were mistakenly designated as Public Agency Lands (PAL) in the General Plan Update.

- Ownership changes – Assigning appropriate Land Use designations to account for changes in ownership from public to private or vice versa. This category includes recent open space acquisitions by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). An example of this type of change is JD101, which involves a parcel that was recently sold by the Otay Water District and is now in private ownership.

- Minor CPG/CSG requests – Minor CPG/CSG-requested revisions may be included in certain circumstances, when the group feels its General Plan Update recommendation and subsequent Land Use mapping for a property were in error. These types of requests can only be included in the staff recommended changes when they are consistent with the General Plan goals and policies (including community plan policies), and the environmental analysis results in a finding that the change can be included in an Addendum to the General Plan EIR. The staff recommendation only has one example of this type of request. The AL101 proposal involves a Land Use designation change from Limited Impact Industrial to Rural Commercial (along with a corresponding change to commercial zoning) for two parcels just off the freeway ramp, adjacent to Village Residential in Alpine.

The Clean-Up GPA proposes to change Land Use designations for 98 parcels in 25 distinct areas, covering 2,782 acres within 13 communities in the unincorporated county. These proposed Land Use designation changes would reduce the number of estimated potential dwelling units allowed in these areas by 390, compared to the estimated potential density associated with the existing General Plan designations. Most of this reduction in potential dwelling units is attributed to the open space acquisitions that have occurred subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan Update. Table 1 below provides the existing and proposed Land Use designations, category of change, acreage totals, and unit yield analysis for each of

the proposed Land Use Map changes in the Clean-Up.

Table 1 - General Plan Clean-Up Land Use Map Change Acreages and Unit Yield Analysis

| ID | Community | Parcels | Acreage | General Plan Designation | | # Dwelling Units[1] | | Category of Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed | |
| AL101 | Alpine | 2 | 1.5 | I-1 | C-4 | Industrial | Commercial | Minor CPG Request |
| CD101 | Crest-Dehesa | 8 | 226 | RL-20 | OS-C | 11 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| CM101 | Central Mountain | 3 | 40.5 | RL-80/C-2 | OS-C | 3 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| JD101 | Jamul-Dulzura | 1 | 8 | P/SP | SR-2 | 0 | 3 | Ownership Change |
| JL101 | Julian | 1 | 2.2 | SR-10/C-4 | SR-10 | 1 | 1 | Mapping Error |
| LS101 | Lakeside | 1 | 1.4 | P/SP | SR-1 | 0 | 1 | Ownership Change |
| LS102 | Lakeside | 2 | 1 | P/SP | C-1 | 0 | Commercial | Ownership Change |
| LS103 | Lakeside | 1 | 158 | RL-40 | OS-C | 3 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| LS104 | Lakeside | 6 | 112 | RL-40 | OS-C | 2 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| LS105 | Lakeside | 1 | 14 | P/SP | OS-R | 0 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| ME101 | Mountain Empire | 20 | 250 | PAL | RL-40/SR-10 | 20 | 20 | Mapping Error |
| ME103 | Mountain Empire | 2 | 21 | SR-4 | P/SP | 4 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| ME104 | Mountain Empire | 1 | 1.2 | C-4 | C-4/SR-4 | 1 | 1 | Mapping Error |
| RB4 | Rainbow | 1 | 6 | RL-20 | GC | 1 | Commercial | Mapping Error |
| RB101 | Rainbow | 1 | 86 | PAL | TL | 0 | N/A | Ownership Change |
| RB102 | Rainbow | 1 | 93 | RL-40 | OS-C | 2 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| RM101 | Ramona | 11 | 806 | RL-40 | OS-C | 20 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| SD101 | San Dieguito | 1 | 3 | OS-C | P/SP | 0 | 0 | Mapping Error |
| SD104 | San Dieguito | 2 | 0.5 | SR-2 | P/SP | 2 | 0 | Mapping Error |
| SD105 | San Dieguito | 1 | 3 | P/SP | SR-2 | 0 | 1 | Ownership Change |
| SV101 | Spring Valley | 1 | 0.5 | VR-15 | C-3 | 6 | Commercial | Mapping Error |
| VDO102 | Valle De Oro | 2 | 4 | P/SP | I-1 | 0 | Industrial | Ownership Change |
| VDO103 | Valle De Oro | 15 | 26 | VR-2 | SR-0.5 | 46 | 35 | Mapping Error |
| VDO104 | Valle De Oro | 1 | 7 | P/SP | I-1 | 0 | Industrial | Ownership Change |
| VC102 | Valley Center | 12 | 910 | SR-2/RL-20 | OS-C | 330 | 0 | Ownership Change |
| **Total** | | **98** | **2782** | | | **452** | **62** | |

[1]**Existing and proposed dwelling units are conservative estimates and are based on parcel size and slope data for slope dependent designations. The estimates do not consider other planning and development constraints that could further reduce actual unit yield.**

B. Zoning Ordinance

Eighteen of the 25 proposed Land Use Map changes also involve changes to the associated zoning use regulation and/or the zoning development designators (e.g., setback, minimum lot size, maximum height). These zoning changes are necessary to maintain consistency with the corresponding Land Use designation changes. Additional information on the zoning changes

is provided in Attachments B and C.

C. Land Use Element

Proposed changes to the Land Use Element are described in detail in Attachment B, Section 4.1, and include:

- A clarification to emphasize that private roads are not excluded from the gross acreage calculations, used to determine allowable residential density.
- A clarification adding an incentive for underground parking when offsite parking is not feasible. The incentive would involve a slight increase in allowed floor area ratio (FAR) within the Village Core Mixed Use designation when underground parking is provided (0.7 maximum FAR to 1.3 maximum FAR), consistent with the increase allowed for offsite parking.
- A corrected page number reference for discussion of the Community Development Model.
- A corrected policy reference related to floodplain mapping.
- The addition of clarifying language to define planning terms ("transportation node" and "urban limit line") as used in two policies.

In addition, an amendment is proposed in accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 244, which was enacted in October 2011. SB 244 requires cities and counties to review and update their General Plan Land Use Element to identify disadvantaged unincorporated legacy communities concurrent with the requirement to update their Housing Element. An amendment to the Land Use Element is proposed that provides the following:

- The SB 244 definition of a disadvantaged unincorporated legacy community.
- The methodology used to determine if any SB 244 disadvantaged unincorporated legacy communities exist within the unincorporated county.
- A report indicating that there are no SB 244 disadvantaged unincorporated legacy communities in the unincorporated county.

D. Conservation and Open Space Element

Proposed changes to the Conservation and Open Space Element are described in Attachment B, Section 4.1 and include: (1) correction of a typo in Policy COS-6.2; (2) correction of the designated buffer width from a MRZ-2 mineral resource zone; and (3) changes to the Scenic Highways Table for consistency with the scenic highways identified in the Bonsall Community Plan.

E. Safety Element

Described further in Attachment B, Section 4.1, there is one proposed change to the Safety Element to include a Land Use designation that was left out of Table S-1, which details fire

protection service travel time standards for the various designations.

F. Acronyms and Glossary

Also described further in Attachment B, Section 4.1, there is one proposed change to the Acronyms and Glossary section of the General Plan, to revise the definition of transit nodes.

G. Mobility Element Network Appendix

Revisions to the General Plan Mobility Element Network Appendix include corrections to fix typographical errors, mapping inconsistencies, and incorrect designations, improvements, or segment boundaries. Minor CPG/CSG requests for modified road classifications that comply with initial CPG/CSG intentions that were not clearly conveyed are also included.

Section 4.2 of Attachment B provides detailed descriptions of corrections to road names, segment boundaries, designations (e.g., 4.1A-Major Road, 2.2E-Light Collector), improvements (e.g., turn lanes, reduced shoulder, raised median), and/or missing map information for the following roads:

- Bonsall – Olive Hill Road and Osborne Street
- Central Mountain – Boulder Creek Road
- Desert – State Route 78
- Fallbrook – Ammunition Road, West/East Mission Road, and Old Highway 395
- Julian – Boulder Creek Road
- Lakeside – El Monte Road and Mast Boulevard/Riverside Drive
- Mountain Empire – Sweeny Pass Road/S2
- North County Metro – Champagne Boulevard
- Pendleton-De Luz – De Luz Road
- Ramona – Highland Valley Road
- Spring Valley – Austin Drive, Avocado Boulevard, and Del Rio Road
- Sweetwater – San Miguel Road
- Valle De Oro – Avocado Boulevard
- Valley Center – Lilac Road

H. Community/Subregional Plans

Revisions and additions to community and subregional plans are proposed to address inconsistencies with State law, the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, or other existing County regulations. In addition, there is one new subregional plan policy included per Board direction, and a revision to a policy that was mistakenly left out of a subregional plan adopted with the General Plan Update.

In the hierarchy of County planning regulations, community and subregional plans are considered part of the General Plan, and take precedence over zoning regulations; however, it is important to reference General Plan Policy LU-2.2 and Zoning Ordinance Section 1003 (see Attachment E for the full text of this policy and this section), which discuss handling any inconsistencies.

General Plan Policy LU-2.2 establishes community plan policies as part of the General Plan, and requires community plan policies to be internally consistent with the General Plan. Zoning Ordinance Section 1003 requires regulations in the Zoning Ordinance to be amended within a reasonable time if there are inconsistencies with the adopted General Plan (of which, community plans are a part). If the community plan policies that are inconsistent with the Zoning Ordinance are not revised, the County must amend the Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with the community plan policies at issue.

To address inconsistency issues, PDS staff coordinated with County Counsel to identify potentially inconsistent policies. PDS staff then worked with CPGs/CSGs on proposed revisions that would make the identified policies consistent, while maintaining the integrity of the community's intentions with the policy, to the extent possible. Additional discussion of the outreach efforts with community planning groups is provided later in this report. CPG/CSG recommendations on policy revisions and other applicable changes in this project are included in Attachment E.

Section 4.3 of Attachment B includes the proposed strikeout/underline revisions to existing community and subregional plan policies, three additional proposed policies that would be new to the North Mountain Subregional Plan and the Rainbow Community Plan, and also includes a rationale for each proposed revision or policy addition. The following changes are proposed for community/subregional plans:

- Borrego Springs – proposed revisions to policies related to landscaping plans, height limits, and noise-producing facilities.
- Jamul-Dulzura – a proposed revision related to clustering minimum lot sizes.
- North Mountain – a proposed revision related to grading, and a Board-directed new policy related to planning for a small area of potential additional commercial acreage.
- Rainbow – two proposed new policies related to biological mitigation and protection of agricultural operations; and two proposed revisions to existing polices related to biological mitigation and protection of agricultural operations.
- San Dieguito (Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove portion) – proposed revisions to policies related to commercial and industrial uses, clustering minimum lot sizes, and biological mitigation.
- Spring Valley – revisions to policies related to clustering minimum lot sizes and minimum parking requirements.
- Sweetwater – a revision to a policy related to agricultural grading, and the addition of text

and a map to identify the Sweetwater Village.

**General Plan Consistency**
Each proposed change associated with the project was analyzed for conformance with the guiding principles and policies of the General Plan, and found to be in conformance. Appendix B-1 of Attachment B provides an overview and analysis of each proposed Land Use Map change and highlights one of the General Plan policies that directly relates to the need for the Land Use Map change. Below is an example of the General Plan conformance findings:

| General Plan Component | Explanation of GPA Conformance |
|---|---|
| **Policy LU-6.2 – Reducing Development Pressures.** Assign lowest-density or lowest–intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources | *Several of the Land Use Map changes demonstrate improved consistency with the intent of this policy. JL101 proposes to remove the commercially designated portion of a parcel used for residential in an area with highly sensitive habitats and resident concerns over groundwater overdrafts. VDO103 proposes a lower density, slope-dependent designation in an area of extensive steep slopes and sensitive Coastal sage scrub vegetation, adjacent to the Sweetwater River floodplain. CD101, CM101, LS103, LS104, RB102, RM101, and VC102 all involve a change to Open Space-Conservation for recent open space acquisitions of large stretches of sensitive lands by the County Department of Parks and Recreation and Caltrans.* |

**Community Plan Consistency**
Government Code 65359 dictates that community plans affected by a GPA shall be reviewed and amended as necessary to make the community plan consistent with the General Plan. Staff reviewed community and subregional plans and found that the proposed changes are consistent with the applicable community and subregional plans.

**Zoning Ordinance Consistency**
Tied to this GPA is Rezone 13-002, which includes proposed zoning use regulation and development designator changes for 18 of the 25 proposed Land Use Map changes. These zoning changes are necessary for consistency with the proposed General Plan Land Use designation changes. Staff reviewed the proposed zoning for the GPA for consistency with the proposed Land Use designations in accordance with the Compatibility Matrix in Zoning Ordinance Section 2050. No other revisions to the Zoning Ordinance are proposed, as the remainder of the changes would not result in Zoning Ordinance inconsistency issues.

As discussed previously, revisions and additions to community/subregional plans are proposed with the project to correct inconsistencies. Some of these revisions and additions serve the purpose of removing inconsistencies with the Zoning Ordinance.

**Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Update**
The TIF program provides funding for construction of transportation facilities needed to support traffic generated by new development and to meet State law requirements. The Land Use Map and Mobility Element Network changes associated with this General Plan Clean-Up GPA would necessitate a future update of the TIF Program for the associated Community Planning Areas and

the three TIF regions. The TIF update would result in adjusted fee rates for new development in the unincorporated county. There are other privately-initiated GPAs and County-initiated GPAs currently in process that would also require consideration in a future TIF update. Staff has started the process of conditioning privately-initiated GPAs to provide 'fair share' contribution funding toward a TIF program update. Additional funding has been appropriated to cover the County's contribution toward the TIF update. This funding has been included in the Fiscal Year 2014-2015 budget for Planning & Development Services. When any GPA is approved, staff will assess the associated Land Use Map and Mobility Element changes, in relation to the timing of the next TIF update, in order to remain in compliance with State Mitigation Fee Act regulations.

**PROJECT ISSUES:**

**Planning/Sponsor Group Review of Proposed Changes to Community and Subregional Plans**

There are seven planning areas with proposed community plan revisions and/or additions in the project. The results of the CPG/CSG reviews of these changes are as follows:

- One subregional planning area (North Mountain) is not represented by a planning/sponsor group.
- One CPG Chair (Sweetwater) supported the changes and felt they were so minor that the group did not need to vote on it.
- Four of the groups (Jamul-Dulzura, Rainbow, San Dieguito, and Spring Valley) voted to support the changes after working with staff to craft the language that is now included as part of the staff recommendation.
- The Borrego Springs CSG voted to oppose the proposed changes for their Community Plan. Prior to staff's attendance at the informational CSG meeting on this project, staff had worked with the community plan subcommittee to develop language that was supported by those in attendance at the subcommittee meeting; however, the proposed language was not supported in the vote at the subsequent CSG meeting. The proposed language is still included as part of the staff recommendation because it removes the inconsistency issues.

CPG/CSG minutes, recommendation forms, and other correspondence are provided in Attachment E.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS:**

The project has been reviewed in compliance with CEQA and the project qualifies for an Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR under CEQA Section 15164. An EIR Addendum dated January 24, 2014, has been prepared for the project and is on file with PDS. There are no changes in the project, no changes in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and no new information which results in a new significant environmental effect or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect since the certification of the previous EIR for the project dated August 3, 2011, on file with PDS as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001. See the EIR Addendum and CEQA Findings for more information (Attachment D).

**SUBJECT:** 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (DISTRICTS: ALL)

**PREVIOUS ACTIONS:**
As part of the August 3, 2011 (1), adoption of the General Plan Update, the Board directed staff to bring forward a 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a GPA. The Board deliberations, motion, and vote directing a clean-up process occurred during the April 13, 2011 (1), Board hearing.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**
Changes to an adopted General Plan must follow the process specified in Government Code Section 65350, which includes evaluation and analysis, public and agency review, Planning Commission review, and Board approval. Staff conducted public outreach that included three separate notifications to all property owners subject to proposed Land Use Map changes, two separate notifications to neighbors within 300 feet of proposed Land Use Map changes, a 45-day public and agency review and comment period, SB18 tribal outreach and consultation, and staff attendance at CPG/CSG meetings.

In addition to public outreach, PDS coordinated with the County Departments of Public Works, General Services, and Parks and Recreation. Below is a summary of outreach efforts.

A. Notification to property owners and neighbors within 300 feet of proposed Land Use Map changes.

- On November 15, 2012, an initial mailed notice was sent to owners of property where staff was proposing Land Use Map changes. The notice detailed the proposed new Land Use designation, with information on allowed density and other regulations associated with the designations, and details on how to get more information on the project.

- On April 3, 2013, a second notice was sent to property owners and an initial notice was sent to neighboring property owners within 300 feet of the proposed Land Use Map changes. This notice included information and web links related to the release of the Draft Plan for the project and the start of the public review and comment period.

- On January 10, 2014, and June 6, 2014, Planning Commission and Board hearing notices were mailed to property owners and the neighboring property owners within 300 feet of the proposed Land Use Map changes. These notices provided the staff recommendations for changed Land Use designations and changes in zoning, in addition to information on the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors hearings.

B. Web Page - At the initiation of the GPA, a web page was established to provide the most current information on the GPA as it progressed through the planning phases: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013GPBiAnnualClnUp.html.

C. eBlast - PDS publishes a monthly electronic newsletter to provide specific information on department accomplishments, major development projects, and County-initiated projects, such as this GPA. Information on this GPA was included in the April 2013 and January 2014 PDS eBlasts. Property owners affected by the GPA and other interested parties are encouraged to sign up to receive this email.

D. Public and Agency Review - In addition to the property owner notifications discussed above,

an email notification was sent in April 2013 to CPGs/CSGs, the PDS agency list, and the full PDS email notification list of interested parties that subscribe to the department's GovDelivery notifications. This notification included a link to the web site with information on the project and the full Draft Plan for the GPA. In addition, this notification provided information on the 45-day public review period for comments on the Draft Plan. Public review comments and other correspondence on the project can be found in Attachment E.

E. Tribal Consultation - All tribal governments in the San Diego region were notified in February 2013 about the changes proposed in this GPA in accordance with Government Code Section 65352. As a result of these notifications, representatives from the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians requested a consultation meeting, which was held on May 15, 2013. In addition, letters were received from the Pala Band of Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, noting that they did not request a consultation meeting and did not have any concerns with the proposed project. The referenced letters can be found in Attachment E.

**DEPARTMENT REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **General Plan and Zoning Ordinance** – The proposed project is consistent with the guiding principles, goals, and policies of the General Plan, and the guidelines for implementing and amending the General Plan. In addition, the proposed zoning changes that are included for General Plan and zoning consistency would implement zoning use regulations and zoning development designators that are appropriate for the corresponding General Plan Land Use designations.

2. **Community/Subregional Plans** – The project includes proposed revisions and additions to some policies in community and subregional plans. These revisions and additions are proposed to address inconsistency issues with the General Plan, zoning, or other County regulations. Community-specific Land Use Map and zoning changes are consistent with each applicable community or subregional plan.

3. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** – The project has been reviewed in compliance with CEQA and the project qualifies for an Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR under CEQA Section 15164**.**

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Aghassi

SARAH E. AGHASSI
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

**SUBJECT:** 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (DISTRICTS: ALL)

ATTACHMENT(S)

**SUBJECT:** 2013 GENERAL PLAN CLEAN-UP GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE; GPA 12-007; REZ 13-002 (DISTRICTS: ALL)

## AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION SHEET

**REQUIRES FOUR VOTES:** [ ] Yes [x] No

**WRITTEN DISCLOSURE PER COUNTY CHARTER SECTION 1000.1 REQUIRED**
[ ] Yes [x] No

**PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS:**
As part of the August 3, 2011 (1), adoption of the General Plan Update, the Board directed staff to bring forward a 'clean-up' every two years in the form of a GPA. The Board deliberations, motion, and vote directing a clean-up process occurred during the April 13, 2011 (1), Board hearing.

**BOARD POLICIES APPLICABLE:**
N/A

**BOARD POLICY STATEMENTS:**
N/A

**MANDATORY COMPLIANCE:**
N/A

**ORACLE AWARD NUMBER(S) AND CONTRACT AND/OR REQUISITION NUMBER(S):**
N/A

**ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT:** Planning & Development Services

**OTHER CONCURRENCES(S):** N/A

**CONTACT PERSON(S):**


| | |
|---|---|
| Mark Wardlaw | Kevin Johnston |
| Name | Name |
| 858-694-2692 | 858-694-3084 |
| Phone | Phone |
| Mark.Wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov | Kevin.Johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov |
| E-mail | E-mail |

This page intentionally left blank