CAP Update Workshop - Smart Growth Alternative

Workshop Poll and Q&A Summary

This document provides a summary of responses from the live interactive poll questions and combines topics from the Q&A portion of the meeting, which was held June 30, 2021 at 6:00.

What is your understanding of a CEQA Alternative? / ¿Qué grado de comprensión tiene usted sobre una alternativa al CEQA?

Understanding of CEQA Alternatives was evenly split between the 12 participants who responded to this question.

Level of CEQA Alternative Understanding	Number of Responders
Not at all	4
Somewhat	4
High	4
Very High	4

What are areas in the unincorporated county that you consider Smart Growth? / ¿Cuáles son las áreas del condado no incorporado que usted considera áreas de Crecimiento Inteligente?

Responders noted specific areas within the county, including east, south, north, and county island. Additionally, responders noted characteristics of areas they consider Smart Growth, like proximity to transit, away from wildfire risk, and in village cores where infill density can be increased.

Specific Communities
4S Ranch
Borrego Springs
Bostonia
Casa de Oro
Ramona
Rancho San Diego
San Marcos
Sweetwater
General Characteristics
Amenable terrain (not steep slopes because construction emissions)
Close to existing and planned transit
Aligned with SANDAG's regional plan
Close to job centers
There are no unincorporated areas that are "smart"
Where infill/higher density is possible
Away from wildfire hazard areas
Village urban core to protect sprawl into agricultural lands
What about the need for housing in rural/agricultural areas?

What incentives would you propose to encourage growth in Smart Growth areas? / ¿Qué incentivos propondría para fomentar el crecimiento en áreas de Crecimiento Inteligente?

Proposed incentives included the areas of the built environment, CEQA and compliance, transportation, and monetary incentives. Multi-family units and increased density was a main suggestion and streamlining permitting and CEQA compliance was mentioned multiple times as well. Financing options and tax incentives were suggested as monetary incentives to encourage growth in Smart Growth areas.

Built Environment
Multi-Family Units
Allow higher densities in smart growth areas.
Allow more multi-family units (build higher/in fill)
Require developers to get proof of private fire insurance BEFORE getting permit to build
multi use lots with 15% affordable housing in single family and commercial lots
Cost/fee reduction for low/mod income/senior housing/multi-family.
Remove restrictions on multi-family housing
Support addition of agricultural housing in rural areas
increase height limit in smart growth areas.
Allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs)
CEQA/Compliance
Ceqa compliance would be easier in these areas
Expedited and streamlined CEQA processing.
Streamlining approvals and permits
Programmatic EIRs for community plan
Reduced VMT mitigation
Transportation
Smart growth in areas consistent w/SANDAG mobility hubs, provide incentives
No internal combustion engine vehicles allowed
Monetary Incentives
Tax incentives
Economic development
Help with managing flood engineering/plan costs
Financing
Other
Truly smart growth is not in unincorporated

Community microgrid solar/wind

Community garden/farm

What dis-incentives would you propose to encourage growth in Smart Growth areas? / ¿Qué desincentivos propondría para fomentar el crecimiento en áreas de Crecimiento Inteligente?

Proposed Smart Growth dis-incentives included the areas of CEQA and compliance, fees, the built environment, and agriculture and conservation. Inverse to Smart Growth incentives, dis-incentives included increased compliance and permit requirements and fees.

CEQA/Compliance

Thorough staff review of hazards and biology analysis in Cega

OPR compliant SB 743 implementation.

Refuse permits

High VMT mitigation

Fees

Very very heavy added costs/fees as disincentive

Tighten regulations and add fees

Fees for fire suppression

VMT fee

Built Environment

Lifecycle rebuilding emissions analysis to meet carbon neutrality standards for next century.

Simply do not approve development which exceeds in any way original 2011 limitations

Make clear boundaries showing areas that aren't smart growth and refuse permits or create really steep regs tied to water/land use

Study the real association of land value for raw land to theoretical density. Did the properties down zoned in 2011 lose value and if so how much? There should be enough land sales before 1998 when the plan started, 2011 when it was adopted, and now.

Agriculture & Conservation

Farm owners should be connected to potential buyers or leasees who will continue to farm the land; Ensure quota of available water for regional agricultural use

Water limits

Other

Require educational program participation about issues/risks.