



COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

LAND USE AGENDA ITEM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GREG COX
First District

DIANNE JACOB
Second District

KRISTIN GASPAR
Third District

RON ROBERTS
Fourth District

BILL HORN
Fifth District

DATE: September 12, 2018

XX

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT

PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

OVERVIEW

This is a County of San Diego-initiated effort to analyze proposed General Plan land use designation changes associated with 41 Property Specific Requests (PSRs) that were raised during public testimony of the General Plan Update, but not adopted as part of the update. The Board of Supervisors (Board) direction for these PSRs occurred on June 20, 2012 (3) and June 27, 2012 (10). In addition, the area of the former Champagne Gardens Specific Plan has been included for the Board to consider options for updating land use designations in this area of an expired Specific Plan. Zoning changes are also included when necessary for consistency.

The proposed changes are analyzed as part of 23 Analysis Areas. The Analysis Areas consist of a single PSR or multiple PSRs and sometimes include surrounding properties for context. In total, the Analysis Areas cover 882 parcels over approximately 9,336 acres located in the Bonsall, Crest/Dehesa, Desert, Fallbrook, Mountain Empire, North County Metro (including Twin Oaks and Hidden Meadows), Pala/Pauma, San Dieguito, and Valley Center Community Planning Areas (CPAs). The Project also includes changes to the General Plan Mobility Element and the Valley Center Community Plan.

There are multiple alternatives identified for each Analysis Area. Today's request is for the Board to provide direction with regard to each of the Analysis Areas, in order for staff to prepare a Resolution (General Plan changes), Form of Ordinance (zoning changes), General Plan Conformance Findings, and CEQA Findings, for consideration at a future hearing later this year. This direction to prepare supporting documentation is not meant to constitute final approval of any of the options presented at today's hearing, as the Board may provide different direction at any time in the future. The majority of the content of these documents that will be prepared will depend on the Board's input for each Analysis Area, including the Board finding consistency with applicable General Plan policies for each Analysis Area map option selected.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

RECOMMENDATION(S)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. Receive this report and provide direction to staff with regard to each Analysis Area for use in the preparation of a Final Resolution, CEQA Findings for the certification of the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), Statements of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, and the Form of Ordinance. The Planning Commission's recommendations for each Analysis Area are provided to the Board through this Board Letter, supporting materials, and staff's presentation.

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT

N/A

ADVISORY BOARD STATEMENT

Community Planning/Sponsor Group (CPG/CSG) recommendations for each Analysis Area are provided in Attachment G.

INVOLVED PARTIES

This is a County of San Diego-initiated General Plan Amendment and Rezone.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE

Planning Commission recommendations for each Analysis Area are summarized in this Board Letter and provided in Attachment I.

BACKGROUND

On August 3, 2011 (1), the Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted the General Plan Update. On January 11, 2012 (4), the Board directed staff to evaluate 56 separate property requests for land use designation changes that were raised during public testimony of the General Plan Update and not adopted as part of the update. These requests are known as Property Specific Requests (PSRs).

To evaluate the requests, 23 Analysis Areas consisting of a single PSR or multiple PSRs with the same or similar land use designation changes were defined to establish a context for evaluation. In some cases, surrounding properties were included and evaluated within the Analysis Areas. The Board held additional workshop hearings in the summer of 2012 to receive staff analysis and provided direction for this General Plan Amendment (GPA). Of the 56 PSRs referred for further evaluation in January 2012, the Board directed staff to analyze 47 PSRs through the GPA process. Four PSRs were grouped and processed under a separate GPA approved by the Board on June 18, 2014 (3). Two PSRs were later withdrawn by the property owners. In 2014 staff began the current PSRs GPA evaluation and released the Notice of Preparation in December 2015.

Early in this process, property owners within the Champagne Gardens Specific Plan Area contacted the County of San Diego (County) to correct conflicts with the expired Champagne Gardens Specific Plan (Champagne Gardens) and the current General Plan land use and zoning

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

designations. This area is included in this GPA and Rezone, and map options are provided for consideration. Today, 23 Analysis Areas remain for further consideration by the Board.

Methodology and Analysis

The analysis of these 23 areas is more detailed and site specific than was done for the General Plan update, which was a programmatic document covering the entire unincorporated County. A specific analysis for each of the proposed land use changes was conducted, which included an evaluation of the potential carrying capacity of the land, and physical site constraints including steep slopes, wetlands, sensitive habitats, agricultural lands, and fire safety. This analysis also included review of infrastructure and public services for sewer, water, and fire protection services. All of this went into development of alternatives and recommendations on the PSR project in consideration of the 32 General Plan Polices related to land use and development patterns that were used to evaluate each of the Analysis Areas.

To balance community, environmental, and economic interests, staff gathered data, assessed the land use changes for conformance to the General Plan and community plans, and conducted public outreach. For additional information on this public outreach process and opportunities for input, there is additional description in the Public Input section on page 11. Community Planning/Sponsor Group (CPG/CSG) recommendations for each Analysis Area are provided in Attachment G.

Based on Board direction, staff evaluated the carrying capacity of the proposed Land Use Map changes by Analysis Area based on the context of surrounding land use, topography, site constraints, access options, and infrastructure, among other components that included:

- Site constraints analysis involved evaluation of the locations and feasibility implications of potential wetlands, other sensitive habitats, wildlife corridors, steep slopes, floodplains/floodways, agricultural lands, fire hazards, and factors limiting fire clearing and other fire protection measures;
- Public services for water, sewer, and fire protection; and
- Changed circumstances, such as the Champagne Gardens Specific Plan expiration.

Infrastructure reports were prepared and input from service districts was received to assess existing public and private roads, and extent of existing fire, water, and wastewater service areas. After the initial data collection, Planning & Development Services (PDS) staff coordinated with other County departments to gather input on applicable analysis topics, public projects, and other issues within, and nearby the Analysis Areas. Any potential impacts to County facilities, policies or programs from or to the Analysis Areas were considered. PDS received input from the Departments of Public Works; Parks and Recreation; Environmental Health; General Services; and Agriculture, Weights and Measures.

County staff visited each Analysis Area, gathering site data, photos, and assessing property characteristics to inform stakeholder outreach and analysis of applicable General Plan policies. Staff assessed physical conditions, connectivity and the potential for public or private roads as access routes in and around Analysis Areas. This assessment included existing width of roads, topography and landform, feasibility of widening existing private roads to meet fire access standards, and opportunities for new and/or secondary access. Site visits also included evaluation

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

of the extent of wetlands and vegetation communities (to compare with GIS layers), assessment of the extent of current agricultural operations, existing buffering of different land use types, and evaluation potential impacts to aesthetic resources.

This publically-initiated project is a “stand-alone” GPA and Rezone, with no associated development applications/proposals. In addition to analyzing physical site features, infrastructure, and services, a policy analysis was conducted which considered 32 General Plan policies that apply to a “stand-alone” GPA and Rezone. Staff developed a list of criteria that could be used in the evaluation of each applicable policy. For example, the applicable Policy LU-1.1 calls for assigning land use designations in accordance with the Community Development Model, which is explained under General Plan Guiding Principle 2 and considers proximity to existing infrastructure, services, and jobs. Criteria developed for the review of this policy included: the current Regional Category applied; the extent of existing infrastructure and services available; a comparison to the existing land uses and land use designations in the vicinity; and the proximity to the nearest Village, commercial areas, and major job centers. To address the criteria associated with each applicable policy, factual information was provided under a consistent approach. These preliminary policy reviews were combined with planning and environmental graphics (including 3D aerials) and site photos to make up the Analysis Area Policy Analysis Reports (provided in Attachment D). These reports helped to inform the public outreach process and frame the discussions at Community Planning/Sponsor Group (CPG/CSG) meetings for the project, as discussed further in the Public Input section below. Final policy consistency determinations were not made until public input was received and the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) analysis was prepared.

At today’s hearing, staff is seeking input from the Board of Supervisors (Board) with regard to each PSR Analysis Area, for use in the preparation of a Resolution (General Plan changes), Form of Ordinance (zoning changes), General Plan Conformance Findings, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings, for consideration at a future hearing later this year. For each Analysis Area, staff has prepared a presentation for the Board and are prepared for the Board to accept public testimony, and provide direction to staff for the Analysis Area. After Board input is received for each Analysis Area, staff will prepare the documents noted above. As attachments to this Board Letter, staff has provided a sample Resolution, Form of Ordinance, and CEQA Findings, based on staff recommendations.

Project Description

The GPA and Rezone will include proposed changes to General Plan land use designations for 41 PSRs and Champagne Gardens within 23 Analysis Areas. The Project will also include zoning changes when necessary for consistency, a proposed revision to Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8, and changes to the Mobility Element of the General Plan. The proposed changes cover approximately 882 parcels over 9,336 acres. Nineteen of the Analysis Areas are located within Supervisorial District 5, three are located within District 2 and one is located within District 3.

Proposed Project Maps – The Proposed Project Maps include the land use designations directed by the Board for analysis in most cases. The Proposed Project Maps are the highest

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

density/intensity options and represent an increase of 1,826 potential units above the unit capacity established by 2011 General Plan.

Alternative Maps – Alternative Maps are provided for most Analysis Areas. Based on site and policy analyses, Alternative Maps represent an increase of 662 potential units above the unit capacity established by 2011 General Plan.

Subsequent Environmental Impact Report – CEQA requires an analysis of potential environmental impacts and a reasonable range of alternatives that reduce environmental impacts. A draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) has been prepared for the project and evaluates the Proposed Project Maps and Alternative Maps. The SEIR includes a review of environmental impacts and a site specific analysis of development constraints, proximity to infrastructure, and General Plan conformance for the policies applicable to CEQA review.

Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 – Proposed land use modifications for the Eastern Champagne Gardens area require revisions to the Residential Policy 8 of the Valley Center Community Plan. The existing policy limits minimum lot sizes for projects proposing clustering. A change to this policy is sought to provide additional clustering flexibility in the proposed Semi-Rural designations in both the Proposed Project Map and Alternative Maps for Eastern Champagne Gardens.

Mobility Element - The Project includes revisions to the General Plan Mobility Element to accept certain segments at a deficient Level of Service (LOS). The revision would apply to the Mobility Element *Table M-4: Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified*. The criteria for accepting a Mobility Element road segment with a deficient LOS is provided under Policy M-2.1 of the Mobility Element. The revisions to Table M-4 of the Mobility Element and the supporting rationales for accepting deficient LOS acceptance are provided in Attachment A, Exhibit B.

At buildout, the Proposed Project Maps and Alternative Maps are anticipated to impact the following roadway segments for which the Mobility Element has not identified or accepted to operate at deficient LOS (LOS E or LOS F) under the buildout of the adopted General Plan:

- Old Highway 395 between the Fallbrook/Bonsall boundary and West Lilac Road (LOS E),
- Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road West and the Fallbrook/Bonsall boundary (LOS E), and
- Lilac Road between Couser Canyon Road and Keys Creek Road (LOS E).

The Proposed Project is anticipated to impact one State Highway segment, SR-76 between Valley Center Road and South Grade Road (LOS E), for which the Mobility Element has not identified or accepted to operate at LOS E or LOS F under the buildout of the adopted General Plan. Additionally, the Proposed Project is anticipated to impact Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road East and Dulin Road West (LOS E) for which the Mobility Element has accepted as operating at a deficient LOS under buildout of the adopted General Plan.

Climate Action Plan Implementation – The Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment is not included in the inventory or projections for the San Diego County Climate Action Plan. If approved, subsequent development projects will be required to address greenhouse gas (GHG)

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

impacts. Implementation will be through application of a Zoning Special Area Designator (D Designator) for any properties that receive an increase in allowed residential density or increase in allowed development intensity (commercial or industrial changes) as a result of this Project.

The D designator will require future projects to analyze GHG emissions associated with their project during future discretionary and CEQA review. There are two options for future projects to comply with this D designator. The first option is that mitigation for the difference in projected GHG emissions will be required to ensure no net increase in GHG emissions from the estimated emissions associated with the 2011 adopted land use designation and zoning. The second option is to mitigate all project emissions to net zero, to achieve no net increase over existing conditions associated with the property (i.e., carbon neutrality).

Consistency with Local and State Regulations

1. General Plan Consistency

Each Analysis Area in the General Plan Amendment (GPA) has been analyzed for conformance with the applicable policies of the General Plan, which serve to implement the General Plan’s guiding principles and goals. Attachment C provides a General Plan conformance review for each Analysis Area. To adopt any map options where staff has found General Plan policy inconsistencies, the Board would need to make determinations to find consistency or propose policy amendments as part of direction to staff on a future GPA (delaying any changes for Analysis Areas with inconsistency issues). No changes to General Plan policies are proposed with the current project.

2. Community Plan Consistency

Government Code 65359 requires that community plans affected by a GPA be reviewed and amended as necessary to make the community plan consistent with the General Plan. Attachment C provides a community plan conformance review for each Analysis Area. To adopt any of the map options where staff has found community plan inconsistencies, decision-makers would need to make determinations to find consistency or propose policy amendments as part of direction to staff on a future GPA (delaying any changes for Analysis Areas with inconsistency issues). No changes are proposed for community plans with the current Project, except for the proposed revision to Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8, as discussed earlier in this report.

3. Zoning Ordinance Consistency

Zoning use regulation and/or zoning development designator changes are proposed for each of the Analysis Areas as REZ 14-006. Certain Zoning Designators are determined consistent with General Plan land use designations (Compatibility Matrix in Zoning Ordinance Section 2050). Changes are proposed to ensure consistency with the proposed General Plan land use designation changes.

4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

A Program EIR (PEIR) for the General Plan Update was certified on August 3, 2011. A Draft Subsequent EIR (SEIR) to the General Plan Update PEIR was prepared for the PSRs GPA, dated June 2018. The Draft SEIR focused on the impacts associated with the Proposed Project Map changes and Alternative Map changes associated with the PSRs GPA.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

CEQA requires a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in the SEIR that would reduce impacts in comparison to the Proposed Project. As discussed in the Project Description section, Alternative Maps are provided for almost all Analysis Areas. These were developed in consideration of site and policy analysis, draft SEIR analysis of impacts associated with the Proposed Project Maps, and public input.

PROJECT ISSUES

Summary of Recommendations

Table 1 of this Board Letter identifies the land use designations for the Existing Map, the Proposed Project Map options and the Alternative Map options by Analysis Area. Community Planning/Sponsor Group (CPG/CSG) recommendations, Planning Commission recommendations, and staff recommendations are also shown. Table 2 shows the potential dwelling units associated with all of the options. Overall, staff recommends approval of the Proposed Project Map for five Analysis Areas; approval of the Alternative Map for 13 Analysis Areas; and no changes to the existing General Plan Map for five Analysis Areas. For nine of the 23 analysis areas, staff, the CPG/CSG and Planning Commission are in agreement.

Overview of Analysis Areas

Summary evaluations of each Analysis Area are included in the Analysis Area Summary Reports in Attachment B. A brief narrative review of issues affecting the staff recommendations for each Analysis Area is provided in the Introduction Section of Attachment B, followed by individual Summary Report documents for each Analysis Area. The first page of each Summary Report provides brief dot points of the staff recommendation rationale for the particular Analysis Area. A complete General Plan conformance review is provided in Attachment C. Analysis Area Policy Analysis Reports are provided in Attachment D, which include constraint maps/graphics and information related to criteria for each applicable policy.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

A Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) has been prepared for this project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations dated June 2018 has also been prepared. These documents are on file with PDS as Environmental Review Log No. 12-00-003. As the Board of Supervisors (Board) is only providing direction to staff at this time, in the preparation of final documents, there is no need to certify the SEIR at this stage of the hearing process. It is anticipated that the Board will take action on these items at a future hearing, although the Board will be able to modify any direction that is provided today. Therefore, the Board will not be taking any final actions today, and will make the appropriate CEQA determinations when final decisions are made and final documents are adopted at a later date.

PREVIOUS ACTIONS

On June 20, 2012 (3), and June 27, 2012 (10), the Board directed the Chief Administrative Officer to include the following Property Specific Request Analysis Areas in a General Plan Amendment: BO18+, CD14, DS8, DS24, FB2+, FB17, FB19+, FB21+, ME26, ME30A, NC3A, NC18A, NC22, NC37, NC38+, PP30, SD15, VC7+, VC51, VC57+, and VC67.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

Table 1: PSR Analysis Area Options and Recommendations - PSRs GPA/ REZ

#	PSR ANALYSIS AREA	LAND USE DESIGNATIONS (OPTIONS)			RECOMMENDATIONS ^A		
		EXISTING GENERAL PLAN	PROPOSED PROJECT MAP	ALTERNATIVE MAP	CPG/CSG	STAFF	Planning Commission
Bonsall Community Planning Area							
1	BO18+	SR-10	SR-4	SR-4/SR-10	Existing	Alternative	Proposed
Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Community Planning Area							
2	CD14	SR-1/ RL20	SR-2/RL-20	SR-2/RL-20	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative
Desert Subregional Planning Area							
3	DS8	VR-2	VR-4.3	VR-2.9	Existing	Existing	Existing
4	DS24	SR-10	SR-1	SR-1/SR-10	Existing	Existing	Alternative
Fallbrook Community Planning Area							
5	FB2+	RL-20/ RL-40	SR-4/RL-20	RL-20	All SR-10	Alternative	Proposed
6	FB17	SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	Existing	Alternative	Existing
7	FB19+	RL-20	SR-10	N/A	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed
8	FB21+	RL-20	SR-10	SR-10/R-L20	Proposed	Existing	Alternative
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area							
9	ME26	RL-20	SR-10	N/A	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed
10	ME30A	RL-40	SR-4/RL-40	SR-10/RL-40	Proposed	Alternative	Proposed
North County Metro Subregional Planning Area							
11	NC3A	RL-20	SR-10	SR-10/RL-20	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed
12	NC18A	SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	N/A ^B	Alternative	Existing
13	NC22	SR-10	SR-1/SR-10	SR-4/SR-10	Existing	Existing	Existing
14	NC37	SR-10	SR-4	SR-4/SR-10	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative
15	NC38+	SR-2	SR-1	SR-1/SR-2	Existing	Alternative	Proposed
Pala Pauma Community Planning Area							
16	PP30	RL-40	SR-2/RL-40	SR-10/RL-40	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative
San Dieguito Community Planning Area							
17	SD15	SR-1	C-1/ VR-10.9/ SR-0.5 ^C	C-1/SR-10	Existing	Proposed	Proposed
Valley Center Community Planning Area							
18	VC7+	SR-4	SR-2	SR-2/SR-4	Existing	Alternative	Only VC20A & B
19	VC51	RL-20	SR-4	SR-4/RL-20	Existing	Alternative	Alternative
20	VC57+	SR-4	SR-2	SR-2/SR-4	Existing	Alternative	Alternative
21	VC67	SR-2	I-2 ^D	I-2/SR-2	Proposed	Existing	Existing
Former Champagne Gardens Specific Plan							
22	Western Champagne Gardens ^E	SPA/RL-20	SR-10/C-4	SR-10/C-4	Proposed/ Alternative (same)	Proposed/ Alternative (same)	Proposed/ Alternative (same)
23	Eastern Champagne Gardens ^E	SPA	SR-2/SR-4	SR-4	Proposed & Alternative ^F	Alternative	Proposed

- A. The Recommendations in the table are abbreviated. Existing = Existing General Plan Map; Alternative = Alternative Map; and Proposed = Proposed Project Map.
- B. The NC18A Analysis Area is in an area of North County Metro that is not represented by a CPG or CSG.
- C. The Board direction for analysis was General Commercial with no additional density. The applicant was allowed to submit a new request in 2015, which became the Proposed Project Map. See the Attachment B Introduction for additional explanation.
- D. The Board direction on VC67 was to attempt to find a resolution to the issues raised as part of the GPA process. A resolution other than a change to an industrial designation was not identified with the owner.
- E. The Champagne Gardens Analysis Areas were added outside of the original workshops for the PSR program. The map options were developed in working with stakeholders. Western Champagne Gardens is in the Bonsall Community Planning Area. Eastern Champagne Gardens is in both the Valley Center (VC) and Hidden Meadows (NC Metro Subregion) planning areas. The Valley Center CPG recommended the Alternative Map and the Hidden Meadows CSG recommended the Proposed Project Map.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

Table 2: PSR Analysis Areas - Potential Dwelling Units by Alternative

#	PSR / Analysis Area ID	LAND USE DESIGNATIONS		NUMBER OF PARCELS	NUMBER OF ACRES	POTENTIAL DWELLING UNITS (Per Option)			RECOMMENDATIONS		
		EXISTING GENERAL PLAN	PROPOSED PROJECT MAP			EXISTING GENERAL PLAN	PROPOSED PROJECT MAP	ALTERNATIVE MAP	CPG/CSG	STAFF	PC
Bonsall Community Planning Area											
1	BO18+	SR-10	SR-4	120	921	129	196	165	129	165	196
Crest/Dehesa/Harblson Canyon/Granite Hills Community Planning Area											
2	CD14	SR-1/RL-20	SR-2/RL-20	10	101	10	17	14	14	14	14
Desert Subregional Planning Area											
3	DS8	VR-2	VR-4.3	3	169	337	726	489	337	337	337
4	DS24	SR-10	SR-1	2	169	16	169	34	16	16	34
Desert Subtotal				5	338	353	895	523	353	353	371
Fallbrook Community Planning Area											
5	FB2+	RL-20/RL-40	SR-4/RL-20	23	491	26	42	37	37 ^A	37	42
6	FB17	SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	6	107	49	82	64	49	64	49
7	FB19+	RL-20	SR-10	61	579	61	62	-	62	62	62
8	FB21+	RL-20	SR-10	52	679	61	68	63	68	61	63
Fallbrook Subtotal				142	1,856	197	254	164	179	224	216
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area											
9	ME26	RL-20	SR-10	15	678	33	59	-	59	59	59
10	ME30A	RL-40	SR-4/RL-20	1	262	6	35	16	35	16	35
Mountain Empire Subtotal				16	940	39	94	16	94	75	94
North County Metro Subregional Planning Area											
11	NC3A	RL-20	SR-10	48	1,015	66	77	69	77	77	77
12	NC18A	SR-2	SR-1/SR-2	5	93	43	77	57	57 ^A	57	43
13	NC22	SR-10	SR-1/SR-10	17	154	21	73	28	21	21	21
14	NC37	SR-10	SR-4	15	158	19	31	31	31	31	31
15	NC38+	SR-2	SR-1	8	77	37	75	64	37	64	75
North County Metro Subtotal				93	1,497	186	333	249	166	250	247
Pala Pauma Community Planning Area											
16	PP30	RL-40	SR-2/RL-40	11	518	12	134	31	31	31	31
San Dieguito Community Planning Area											
17	SD15 ^B	SR-1	GC/VR-10.9 /SR-0.5	1	69	61	362	80	61	362	362
Valley Center Community Planning Area											
18	VC7+	SR-4	SR-2	233	1,465	366	619	507	366	507	396
19	VC51	RL-20	SR-4	14	166	14	27	17	14	17	17
20	VC57+	SR-4	SR-2	217	1,337	374	605	524	374	524	524
21	VC67 ^C	SR-2	I-2	6	13	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valley Center Subtotal				470	2,981	754	1,251	1,048	754	1,048	937
Former Champagne Gardens Specific Plan											
22	Western Champagne Gardens	SPA/RL-20	SR-10/C-4	8	44	1	8 ^D	8 ^D	8 ^D	8 ^D	8 ^D
23	Eastern Champagne Gardens	SPA	SR-2	6	71	0	24 ^D	12 ^D	24 ^D	12 ^D	12 ^D
Former Champagne Gardens Subtotal				14	115	1	32	20	32	20	20
Totals				882	9,336	1,742	3,568	2,310	1,907	2,542	2,488

- A. FB2+ and NC18A are using the Staff Recommendation for the purposes of this table. For FB2+, the CPG recommended an alternative not analyzed, and NC18A does not have CPG/CSG representation.
- B. The Board direction for analysis was General Commercial with no additional density (this is now the 2012 Board Letter Alt – a fourth option not shown here). The applicant was allowed to submit a new request in 2015 (this is the Proposed Project Map).
- C. No residential units are shown, as the proposed change is to Medium Impact Industrial.
- D. The approximate increase in potential dwelling units (DUs) for Champagne Gardens properties is based on the difference between the Proposed Project Map (or Alternative Map in that column) for CG properties in the current GPA and the existing Specific Plan Area designation (mapping error) with a 0 density on the Land Use Map. CG7 is the exception, with a current designation of RL-20.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

PUBLIC INPUT

Staff conducted consistent and frequent communication with property owners within and adjacent to the Analysis Areas, the Community Planning and Sponsor Groups (CPG/CSG), and other stakeholders throughout this project. Starting in 2016, public meetings for the Property Specific Request (PSR) Analysis Areas were held. Analysis Area Policy Analysis Reports were distributed to CPGs/CSGs, owners, and interested stakeholders. Meetings were first held with property owners to discuss any feedback on references to their property. After property owner meetings, staff presented the project and analysis findings to the applicable CPG/CSG and addressed questions and concerns. CPGs/CSGs and all stakeholders had the opportunity to provide input on potential alternative maps for Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) analysis. Planning & Development Services staff attended 28 CPG/CSG meetings on the project (including subcommittee meetings) to discuss the project analysis and answer questions. The final CPG/CSG recommendations are provided in Attachment G.

Additional outreach was conducted for the Western Champagne Gardens and Eastern Champagne Gardens Analysis Areas to develop land use designation and zoning options for decision makers to consider that would replace the Specific Plan Area designations and zoning in this area of an expired Specific Plan. Throughout 2015, staff held meetings with property owners, stakeholders, and CPGs/CSGs (in the three applicable planning areas of Bonsall, Valley Center, and Hidden Meadows) to discuss opportunities and constraints, applicable General Plan and community plan policies, and issues affecting feasibility. CPGs/CSGs and stakeholders had the opportunity to provide initial input on the development of General Plan and zoning map options, and then to provide a final recommendation after the map options were finalized. Analysis of planning and environmental issues affecting Champagne Gardens resulted in three map options for the area, as shown in Attachment B. The proposed revision to Residential Policy 8 of the Valley Center Community Plan was added for clustering flexibility in the Semi-Rural designations proposed in both the Proposed Project Map and Alternative Maps for Champagne Gardens.

Interested individuals and organizations were updated regularly through email and a dedicated website. Emails provided project updates, including links to the Policy Analysis Reports, in advance of public meetings to discuss the project.

Tribal governments in the San Diego region were notified about the changes proposed in the General Plan Amendment (GPA) and offered consultation meetings. As a result of these notifications, correspondence was received from three tribal governments and one consultation meeting was held. No requests for modifications to the project were made as there are no development applications or proposals associated with the project. Tribes were also provided the draft SEIR document in accordance with AB52.

Legal notices are required prior to public hearings when considering changes to an adopted General Plan. Planning & Development Services followed the process specified in Government Code Section 65350, which includes evaluation and analysis, public and agency review, Planning Commission review, and Board of Supervisors (Board) approval.

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)


Written notifications were mailed to property owners throughout the process as indicated below:

- On November 15, 2012, an initial notice was mailed to all Analysis Area property owners to provide notification of the Board direction for the GPA.
- On December 3, 2015, a mailed notice of the proposed GPA and Notice of Preparation for the SEIR was sent to all PSR and Champagne Gardens Analysis Area property owners, neighbors within 300 feet of properties proposed for changes in the project, agencies who should receive notice in accordance with Government Code section 65350, other interested parties requesting mailed notification, and CPGs/CSGs in areas of proposed changes.
- On December 14, 2017, a mailed notice of the proposed GPA and notice of availability for public review of the Draft SEIR was sent to all the individuals, agencies and organizations who received the 2015 notice. Updated Assessor record property owner information was used to reach new property owners.
- On June 8, 2018, and August 30, 2018, Planning Commission and Board hearing notices were mailed to all the individuals, agencies and organizations who received the 2017 notice (with updated property owner information).

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO STRATEGIC PLAN

Today's actions support the Strategic Initiative of Sustainable Environments/Thriving in the County of San Diego's 2018-2023 Strategic Plan by ensuring that San Diego is a vibrant region with planning, development, infrastructure, and services that strengthen the local economy.

Respectfully submitted,



SARAH E. AGHASSI
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT(S)

Attachment A – A Resolution of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors Adopting the Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment; GPA 12-005 (Staff Recommended Resolution)

Attachment A-1 – A Resolution of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors Adopting the Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment; GPA 12-005 (Proposed Project Map Options Resolution)

Attachment A-2 – A Resolution of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors Adopting the Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment; GPA 12-005 (Alternative Map Options Resolution)

Attachment B – Analysis Area Summary Reports

Attachment C – General Plan Conformance Findings

Attachment D – Analysis Area Policy Analysis Reports

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

Attachment E – AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE [GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006] [Staff Recommended Ordinance]

Attachment E-1 – AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE [GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006] [Proposed Project Map Options Ordinance]

Attachment E-2 – AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RELATED TO THE PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE [GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006] [Alternative Map Options Ordinance]

Attachment F – Environmental Findings and Documentation

Attachment G – Community Planning/Sponsor Group Recommendations

Attachment H – Correspondence

Attachment I – Planning Commission Recommendation Votes

SUBJECT: PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS UPDATE AND PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION (DISTRICTS: 2, 3 & 5)

AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION SHEET

REQUIRES FOUR VOTES: Yes No

WRITTEN DISCLOSURE PER COUNTY CHARTER SECTION 1000.1 REQUIRED

Yes No

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS:

On June 20, 2012 (3) and June 27, 2012 (10), the Board directed the Chief Administrative Officer to include the following PSR Analysis Areas in a General Plan Amendment: BO18+, CD14, DS8, DS24, FB2+, FB17, FB19+, FB21+, ME26, ME30A, NC3A, NC18A, NC22, NC37, NC38+, PP30, SD15, VC7+, VC51, VC57+, and VC67.

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 CONCURRENCE(S): Department of Public Works

CONTACT PERSON(S):

Mark Wardlaw

Name
858-694-2962

Phone
Mark.Wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov

E-mail

Rami Talleh

Name
858-495-5475

Phone
Rami.Talleh@sdcounty.ca.gov

E-mail