

STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING AND LAND USE MATTERS
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2012
Board of Supervisors North Chamber
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 310, San Diego, California

REGULAR SESSION – Regular Meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

Present: Supervisors Ron Roberts, Chairman; Greg Cox, Vice Chairman; Dianne Jacob; Pam Slater-Price; Bill Horn; also David C. Hall, Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Approval of Statement of Board of Supervisor’s Proceedings/Minutes for the Meetings of May 2, 2012 and May 9, 2012.

ACTION:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Cox, seconded by Supervisor Horn, the Board of Supervisors approved the Statement of Proceedings/Minutes for the Meetings of May 2, 2012 and May 9, 2012.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts

NOTICE: THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MAY TAKE ANY ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THE ITEMS INCLUDED ON THIS AGENDA. RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY COUNTY STAFF DO NOT LIMIT ACTIONS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MAY TAKE. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SHOULD NOT RELY UPON THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE BOARD LETTER AS DETERMINATIVE OF THE ACTION THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MAY TAKE ON A PARTICULAR MATTER.

Board of Supervisors’ Agenda Items

-
3. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT WORKPLAN OPTIONS FOR PROPERTY
SPECIFIC REQUESTS
(4 VOTES)

3. SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT WORKPLAN OPTIONS FOR PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS (DISTRICTS: ALL)

OVERVIEW:

During a workshop held January 9 through January 11, 2012 (1), the Board of Supervisors considered over 137 private property owner requests to modify the County of San Diego's General Plan land use designations. 56 requests were referred back to staff by the Board for further evaluation. Actions directed by the Board varied between requests but included steps such as determining if a modified request was available that could be consistent with the General Plan Guiding Principles, obtaining community planning group input, determining what larger study areas (if any) required consideration in making changes to the plan, notifying potentially affected property owners, and developing workplan options for amending the General Plan. This report responds to Board direction related to the private property owner requests property owners, and developing workplan options for amending the General Plan. This report responds to Board direction related to the private property owner requests.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funds for this request are not included in the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Operational Plan for the Department of Planning and Land Use. If approved, this request will result in costs of up to \$1,560,000 for implementation of the workplan and General Plan amendments. The funding source is General Fund fund balance available. There is no annual cost and no additional staff years.

Adoption of a General Plan Amendment that changes the General Plan's land use map and/or Mobility Element network could likely impact the Transportation Impact Fee program. The more substantial the change, the greater the need to revise/update the Transportation Impact Fee program to ensure that this program remains consistent with the adopted General Plan. Based on the cost for previous Transportation Impact Fee Program updates, these additional costs could range from an estimated \$150,000 to \$750,000 depending on the extent of changes and complexity of the General Plan Amendment. Also, the restudy of the floodway mapping related to Unresolved Request VC67, as discussed in the Background, is estimated at \$50,000. Additional funding would be needed to fund these updates.

BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT:

N/A

RECOMMENDATION:

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. Receive this report of staff's evaluation of property specific requests.
2. Provide direction to staff on whether or not to take any specific action on any request such as initiation of a General Plan Amendment.
3. Establish appropriations of up to \$1,560,000 in Fiscal Year 2011-12 for

implementation of the workplan and associated General Plan Amendments based on General Fund fund balance available. (4 VOTES)

3.1 ACTION – VERY LOW COMPLEXITY CATEGORY:

Noting for the record that an errata has been submitted with two changes to Attachment A, “Property Requests Analysis” as follows:

FB21, FB22, FB23 and Study Area; The Complexity Category was incorrectly noted as “Low” – the updated attachment correctly states the category as “Very Low.”

NC18A; The Complexity Category was incorrectly noted as “Low” – the updated attachment correctly states the category as “Medium.”

On MOTION of Supervisor Jacob, Seconded by Supervisor Cox, the Board of Supervisors referred the staff evaluated changes associated with the Property Specific Requests in the “Very Low Complexity” category (CD14; FB19, 25, 26 & Study Area; FB21, 22, 23 & Study Area; ME31; NM16; RM15 & Study Area; SD2 & Study Area; and SV17.) to the Chief Administrative Officer to be included in the workplan for the FCI amendment and General Plan cleanup process.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Horn

NOES: Roberts

3.2 ACTION –LOW COMPLEXITY CATEGORY:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the Board of Supervisors referred the staff evaluated changes associated with Property Specific Requests in the “Low Complexity” category (FB2, 18 & Study Area; ME26 & Study Area; NC3-A and Study Area; and NC37 and Study Area), excepting Property Specific Requests JL5 and LS27, to the Chief Administrative Officer to process a general plan amendment for those items.

AYES: Cox, Roberts, Horn

NOES: Jacob, Slater-Price

3.3 ACTION – MEDIUM COMPLEXITY CATEGORY:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the Board of Supervisors referred the staff evaluated changes associated with Property Specific Requests in the “Medium Complexity” category (BO18, 20, 22, 29, 32, 33 & Study Area; FB17; ME30-A; NC18-A; NC38, 41, 48 & Study Area; SD15; and VC51 & Study Area), excepting Property Specific Request LS7-A, to the Chief Administrative Officer to process a general plan amendment for those items.

AYES: Cox, Roberts, Horn

NOES: Jacob, Slater-Price

There being no motion and no objection, the Board of Supervisors continued this item to the June 27, 2012 Board of Supervisors meeting at 9:00 a.m.

There being no further business, the Board adjourned at 5:10 p.m. in memory of Dottie Martin and David Gomez.

THOMAS J. PASTUSZKA
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego, State of California

Consent: Santos

Discussion: Panfil

NOTE: This Statement of Proceedings sets forth all actions taken by the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors on the matters stated, but not necessarily the chronological sequence in which the matters were taken up.