

## ATTACHMENT 3

### *General Plan Update Committee Survey Responses*

<p>1. It is understood that the San Diego Region will experience additional population growth in the future. Most of that additional growth will be from the natural increase of our existing population. Instead of planning for more than our anticipated growth, Escondido’s General Plan Update should only plan for the smallest amount of future growth that is required by State Law and Regional Plans.</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Rankings:</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Votes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-5 = very strongly disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-4 = strongly disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-3 = disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-2 = mildly disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-1 = somewhat disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 = neutral</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+1 = somewhat agree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+2 = mildly agree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+3 = agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+4 = strongly agree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+5 = very strongly agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(2)</td> </tr> </table>	Rankings:	Votes	-5 = very strongly disagree	(5)	-4 = strongly disagree	(1)	-3 = disagree	(4)	-2 = mildly disagree	(1)	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	0 = neutral		+1 = somewhat agree		+2 = mildly agree		+3 = agree	(1)	+4 = strongly agree		+5 = very strongly agree	(2)	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 100%;">Committee Average -2.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-top: 1px solid black;">Committee Range -5 to +5</td> </tr> </table>	Committee Average -2.07	Committee Range -5 to +5
Rankings:	Votes																											
-5 = very strongly disagree	(5)																											
-4 = strongly disagree	(1)																											
-3 = disagree	(4)																											
-2 = mildly disagree	(1)																											
-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)																											
0 = neutral																												
+1 = somewhat agree																												
+2 = mildly agree																												
+3 = agree	(1)																											
+4 = strongly agree																												
+5 = very strongly agree	(2)																											
Committee Average -2.07																												
Committee Range -5 to +5																												
<p>Question #1 Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ My concerns about development in the urban core are the availability of the types of residences that will appeal to those that wish to live there. For example, I see this mostly as a location for young, single professionals, or married without children, but most especially for the empty nesters and retired. We need single level development for the seniors. If we don’t provide the right mix of housing types, our urban core will become rentals which we do not need.</li> <li>❖ If by “plan” you mean “allow,” then I mildly agree. If by “plan” you mean “provide services and facilities for,” then I mildly agree. (Staff Comment: the intent of “plan” was to mean provide services and facilities for).</li> <li>❖ I think we should plan for the growth in population that we anticipate/envision and plan for services and facilities that will be needed to accommodate that growth.</li> <li>❖ I believe that if you artificially hold down growth (i.e. via a restrictive GP) you end up with the wrong kind of growth.</li> <li>❖ Don’t necessarily believe “most of additional growth will be from the natural increase”. Many of those born here leave the area after graduation (high school) – the cost of living is extremely high in San Diego County. <b>Question:</b> What are the penalties for not meeting “State Law &amp; Regional Plans?”</li> </ul>																												
<p>2. The General Plan Update should direct future population growth to the Downtown and <a href="#">Smart Growth Areas</a> (i.e. along Escondido Boulevard north of Felicita Avenue, and along Valley Parkway west of Midway Drive) rather than in existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Rankings:</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Votes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-5 = very strongly disagree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>-4 = strongly disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-3 = disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-2 = mildly disagree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>-1 = somewhat disagree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 = neutral</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+1 = somewhat agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+2 = mildly agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+3 = agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+4 = strongly agree</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+5 = very strongly agree</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(4)</td> </tr> </table>	Rankings:	Votes	-5 = very strongly disagree		-4 = strongly disagree	(1)	-3 = disagree	(1)	-2 = mildly disagree		-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	0 = neutral	(1)	+1 = somewhat agree	(2)	+2 = mildly agree	(1)	+3 = agree	(4)	+4 = strongly agree		+5 = very strongly agree	(4)	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 100%;">Committee Average +1.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-top: 1px solid black;">Committee Range -4 to +5</td> </tr> </table>	Committee Average +1.87	Committee Range -4 to +5
Rankings:	Votes																											
-5 = very strongly disagree																												
-4 = strongly disagree	(1)																											
-3 = disagree	(1)																											
-2 = mildly disagree																												
-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)																											
0 = neutral	(1)																											
+1 = somewhat agree	(2)																											
+2 = mildly agree	(1)																											
+3 = agree	(4)																											
+4 = strongly agree																												
+5 = very strongly agree	(4)																											
Committee Average +1.87																												
Committee Range -4 to +5																												

Question #2 Comments:

- ❖ Young married couples will not stay in Escondido if we do not have single family neighborhoods. It is part of the American dream to own that first home and a yard for the kids to play in. We are not living in reality if we plan everything around “if we build it they will come.” We need to be careful what we wish for.
- ❖ If by “future population growth” you mean “any additions to the current build-out population,” then I mildly agree. If by “future population growth” you mean “any addition to the current population,” then I strongly disagree. (Staff Comment: “future population growth” is intended to mean additions to the current build-out population.)
- ❖ The increase in population growth over current General Plan build-out projections should be accommodated and/or directed into the “Smart Growth Areas.”
- ❖ We also need to look at older neighborhoods and create opportunities for redevelopment in those neighborhoods. Whether it’s commercial/high tech or just new homes on larger lots or some other mixed use. We also need to look at areas outside the current City limits that are conducive to single family housing.
- ❖ The GP Update should not concentrate on Downtown & SGA and essentially eliminate the possibility in “existing residential neighborhoods.”
- ❖ To gain voter approval there must be guidelines regarding development of “Smart Growth Areas.” There are many instances in San Diego County and in Escondido where “Smart Growth” developments are put where the infrastructure is woefully lacking thus degrading the quality of life for all residents.

3. Increased development opportunities in the Downtown and Smart Growth Areas will allow for a wider range of housing types (i.e. town homes, condominiums, flats, apartments, shopkeeper units, mixed use, etc.) necessary to meet future needs.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree -4 = strongly disagree -3 = disagree -2 = mildly disagree -1 = somewhat disagree 0 = neutral +1 = somewhat agree +2 = mildly agree +3 = agree +4 = strongly agree +5 = very strongly agree	(2) (2) (5) (6)	+3.13           Committee Range 0 to +5

Question #3 Comments:

- ❖ We need to channel growth to Smart Growth Areas in addition to surrounding areas. People still want and need yards and garages and I don’t think the new GP should preclude this type of development.
- ❖ I somewhat agree. I believe those housing types can be integrated into existing neighborhoods – giving the neighborhood a mix of residents.
- ❖ The new General Plan needs to have regulations on denser multi-story projects as to open space areas and adequate landscaping. I fear in years to come many of the developments in “Smart Growth” areas will become ghettos. Many of the current developments have nothing but buildings built out to the sidewalk, postage stamp areas of plantings and a plethora of cement and asphalt.



**Population and Neighborhood Character**

<p>1. The State forecasts population projections that each region is required to accept. The San Diego Association of Governments works with Escondido to negotiate the city’s “fair share” of the region’s anticipated growth. Almost two-thirds of the growth will be generated by natural increase from Escondido’s local population; the remaining increase will be from people moving into our area. It is responsible to plan for this anticipated growth? <i>Note: Although not known at this time, Escondido’s fair share is anticipated to be between 2,000 and 4,000 dwelling unit above the current General Plan which is approximately 6,000 – 12,000 additional persons).</i></p>	<p>Rankings:</p> <p>-5 = very strongly disagree (1)</p> <p>-4 = strongly disagree (1)</p> <p>-3 = disagree</p> <p>-2 = mildly disagree</p> <p>-1 = somewhat disagree</p> <p>0 = neutral (2)</p> <p>+1 = somewhat agree</p> <p>+2 = mildly agree</p> <p>+3 = agree (3)</p> <p>+4 = strongly agree (1)</p> <p>+5 = very strongly agree (6)</p> <p>No comment (1)</p>	<p>Votes</p>	<p>Committee Average</p> <p>+2.43</p>
			<p>Committee Range</p> <p>-5 to +5</p>

Question #1 Comments:

- ❖ I believe it is responsible to plan for future growth.
- ❖ Planning for this growth is the responsible thing to do
- ❖ Of Course it’s “responsible.” However, whose definition of “fair share” should the residents (who live with the results of bad development & good development, of course) accept? **Question:** Whose definition of “fair share” will Escondido accept? **Question:** What are the penalties if the City does not meet SANDAG’s “fair share” expectations?
- ❖ I would like to see in print the text of laws that allow the State and SANDAG to dictate to Escondido the amount of future growth it must supply. Also, regarding build-out in the new General Plan, it should be not more than 165,000. In the existing General Plan it is 135,000 to 165,000. I suggest that to stay under 165,000 the follow policy be used – when increased density is allowed in certain planning areas (“Smart Growth” areas, downtown, etc.) other areas should have decreased density.

**Population and Neighborhood Character**

<p>2. Planned growth should be directed to “Smart Growth” areas that are located in the City’s urban core where existing infrastructure, transit opportunities, and support services exist (such as in the Downtown area, along South Escondido Boulevard, and East Valley Parkway) and <u>not</u> in established single family neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Rankings:</p> <p>-5 = very strongly disagree</p> <p>-4 = strongly disagree (2)</p> <p>-3 = disagree (2)</p> <p>-2 = mildly disagree</p> <p>-1 = somewhat disagree</p> <p>0 = neutral (1)</p> <p>+1 = somewhat agree (1)</p> <p>+2 = mildly agree (1)</p> <p>+3 = agree (2)</p> <p>+4 = strongly agree (1)</p> <p>+5 = very strongly agree (5)</p>	<p>Votes</p>	<p>Committee Average</p> <p>+1.60</p>
			<p>Committee Range</p> <p>-4 to +5</p>

Question #2 Comments:

- ❖ Growth in addition to the existing General Plan should be focused in “Smart Growth” areas.
- ❖ Existing infrastructure has to be adequate.
- ❖ Definitely, maximizing existing infrastructure is idea. However, it would be short-sighted to “direct” planned growth to the areas referenced, while essentially ignoring the needs and possibilities of planned growth development in the “established single family neighborhoods.” SFR’s have needs that can be met through development. While the Country is looking at reducing commute times/emissions/etc, SFR’s could do well with business amenities (dry cleaner, grocery store, coffee shop) within walking distance. The addition of “high quality” multi-family housing (for purchase) would put a diverse group of individuals in SFR neighborhoods – allowing for a mix of individuals/ideas.
- ❖ If by “future population growth” you mean “any additions to the current build-out population,” then I mildly agree. If by “future population growth” you mean “any addition to the current population,” then I strongly disagree. (Staff Comment: “future population growth” is intended to mean additions to the current build-out population.)
- ❖ I agree with this, but at the same time, we need to be looking at outlying areas that may not even be within the established City limits. We also should plan for the redevelopment of existing established neighborhoods.
- ❖ Except to the extent that some existing single family zoning may be located adjacent to transit, commercial, industrial, etc.
- ❖ We need to allow for infill development.

**Population and Neighborhood Character**

3. Escondido’s Downtown should be targeted for the largest share of planned growth as long as the higher density and intensity of development is marketable, that sufficient water, sewer, and park land can be provided, and that the historic character can be maintained.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(1)	+1.93
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree	(1)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral	(2)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree	(1)	
	+3 = agree	(5)	
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(3)	
			Committee Range -5 to +5

Question #3 Comments:

- ❖ I don’t know enough about the pluses and minuses of each area in order to make an intelligent answer.
- ❖ I agree, although I would not want historic character to be such a dominant force that it keeps development from happening.
- ❖ We should not “target” downtown. Currently, our water supply, sewer capacity, public safety personnel, and library/recreation facilities are lacking! Escondido’s target for development should focus on business development – cleaning up the existing virtually useless and undesirable office/commercial space in the downtown area – and those spaces with absentee landlords/owners. Escondido’s target should focus on economic development – business development which brings revenue into our city...versus residential development (providing overall little revenue in comparison) and which brings people who need services that the City is struggling to provide.





***Population and Neighborhood Character***

8. The General Plan allows residential clustering so that single family homes can be built on smaller lots in order to preserve open space, steep slopes, and other unique features. The General Plan Update should clarify existing clustering policies.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree		+2.53
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree	(1)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	
	0 = neutral	(1)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(4)	
	+2 = mildly agree		Committee Range
	+3 = agree		-3 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(2)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(6)	

Question #8 Comments:

- ❖ Developers currently can skirt the residential clustering provisions whereby they end up with more homes and preservation does not take place. I want improved clustering policies.
- ❖ I believe the GP clustering provisions work as they are.
- ❖ The GP should clarify. Often, recent development has planned for open space that is unusable or initially deemed human use prohibited (which indicates that this privilege is being used to the advantage of developers vs. the advantage of those residents which are to be served by the open space).

***Population and Neighborhood Character***

9. Rather than designating new commercial areas (such as along I-15, or in the Bear Valley Parkway/San Pasqual Valley Road area) the General Plan should establish policies that reinforce existing commercial areas.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(1)	-0.07
	-4 = strongly disagree	(2)	
	-3 = disagree	(4)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	
	0 = neutral	(1)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree		Committee Range
	+3 = agree		-5 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(4)	

Question #9 Comments:

- ❖ We need to designate new areas for high end commercial/incubator/high tech.
- ❖ “Smart Growth” areas may provide opportunity for new commercial development.
- ❖ That would be short-sighted – Especially, since the GP is intended as a forward thinking document – covering a 20-year period, with periodic minor updates. This is more than a minor update!
- ❖ Mixed use should be encouraged.
- ❖ I’m concerned that you mean “new commercial or industrial areas.” We have way too much commercial zoning. Where that property is in the smart growth areas, it should be up zoned to mixed use, commercial and residential. Other (and maybe some of the above) should also be considered for a change to light industrial. We need more industrial and to promote the re-development of our older industrial areas. To the extent that multi-family zoning is in smart growth area, and/or re-development would be desirable, increased density should also be considered. The suggestion that multi-family can be re-developed by reducing the density should be ignored. The particular intersection you reference is a lightning rod for debate. How we address that is going to be a challenge.





Question #14 Comments:

- ❖ Definitely. The standards should be maintained. Unfortunately, these standards are not being met! The update should include stricter language regarding the “ability to serve” new students generated as a direct result of new residential development.
- ❖ There appears to be a serious problem here. According to information I was given, the school districts say they cannot accommodate future growth. They are already using portable classrooms. It seems that this Q of L needs to be improved.

**General Plan Boundaries and Land Use**

15. The Update should discourage expanding the limits of the General Plan beyond its current boundary and should re-examine outlying areas that propose urban densities that appear to be infeasible or have become inappropriate.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(2)	-1.07
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree	(3)	
	-2 = mildly disagree	(1)	
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	
	0 = neutral	(4)	
	+1 = somewhat agree		
	+2 = mildly agree	(2)	Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(1)	-5 to +3
	+4 = strongly agree		
	+5 = very strongly agree		
	No Comment	(1)	

Question #15 Comments:

- ❖ I generally disagree with the first half but agree with the second half.
- ❖ I don't think the update should discourage expanding the limits. I think it should be reviewed to determine if the existing limits are practical, suitable, etc. We have to consider the growth requirements SANDAG & the State has placed on Escondido.
- ❖ There are two separate questions here: 1) The Update should discourage expanding the limits of the General Plan beyond its current boundary: mildly agree. 2) The Update should re-examine outlying areas that propose urban densities that appear to be infeasible or have become inappropriate: Disagree
- ❖ I disagree. I believe we need to be looking to expand our general plan area and we should be reexamining the outlying area for potential development.

**General Plan Boundaries and Land Use**

16. The Updated General Plan should incorporate the State Mandated Housing Element Update that addresses Escondido's housing needs which is required to be completed by December 2012.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(2)	+2.0
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree		
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral	(2)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(2)	Committee Range
	+2 = mildly agree		-5 to +5
	+3 = agree	(3)	
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(5)	

Question #16 Comments:

- ❖ I think the plan should reflect the expectations. **Question:** What is the definition of “incorporate” in this circumstance (statement posed)?
- ❖ I want to see the text of this mandate.
- ❖ If it’s required by the state, we should do it now.
- ❖ I don’t fully understand this requirement.

**General Plan Boundaries and Land Use**

17. The Update should expand the amount of employment lands to provide jobs for local residents.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(2)	+1.64
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree		
	-2 = mildly disagree	(1)	
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral	(1)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree		Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(2)	-5 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(2)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(4)	
	No Response	(1)	

Question #17 Comment:

- ❖ Unfortunately, I think the City has lagged to a fault. This goal is already part of the GP and has not been the focus of recent council members.

**General Plan Boundaries and Land Use**

18. Residential and non-residential land uses should have clear provisions regarding intensity (i.e. building height, lot coverage, etc.) and capacity (i.e. water, sewer demand, etc.).	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(1)	+0.93
	-4 = strongly disagree	(1)	
	-3 = disagree	(1)	
	-2 = mildly disagree	(1)	
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral	(2)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree		Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(6)	-5 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(1)	

Question #18 Comments:

- ❖ Some of these don’t seem practical.
- ❖ Zoning vs. General Plan question – impact on CUP uses.
- ❖ In addition to these “clear provisions” there should be policies in place which prevent the development which do not meet the provisions of the GP.
- ❖ Again, I think we need flexibility. Perhaps we can build ranges into the general plan, but to me a General Plan should be general.

### General Plan Boundaries and Land Use

19. General Plan land use changes should be considered only if they specifically address goals of the update.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(2)	-1.21
	-4 = strongly disagree	(2)	
	-3 = disagree	(2)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(2)	
	0 = neutral	(3)	
	+1 = somewhat agree		
	+2 = mildly agree		
	+3 = agree	(3)	
	+4 = strongly agree		
	+5 = very strongly agree		
	No Response	(1)	
Committee Range -5 to +3			
Question #19 Comments:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ General Plan land use changes should be considered also to keep buildout at fewer than 165,000.</li> <li>❖ I believe that we need to take a look at the entire land use element of the general plan for inconsistencies and also for future redevelopment opportunities.</li> <li>❖ Disagree. <b>Question:</b> Who determines if the changes are specific to the update? I would hope that these changes would be a concerted effort with a variety of voices and community input.</li> </ul>			

### Municipal Facilities and Services

20. The <a href="#">Hale Avenue Resource Recovery Facility</a> (Escondido's sewer treatment facility) and supporting infrastructure must be carefully sized to match Escondido's planned growth.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree		+3.53
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree		
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral		
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree	(1)	
	+3 = agree	(7)	
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(5)	
Committee Range +1 to +5			
Question #20 Comments:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Based on the population projections/expectations, it is obvious that HARRF cannot meet the needs of future development. The City acknowledged they have capacity for about 5,000 more homes.</li> <li>❖ In addition to being carefully sized to match, planned growth must pay its fair share for the cost of any improvements to the HARRF and supporting infrastructure.</li> <li>❖ Along with exploring other opportunities within the City with regard to treatment and reclamation.</li> </ul>			

***Municipal Facilities and Services***

21. Sewer service boundaries that define the limits of where sewer lines should be extended should be developed as a means of better estimating sewer demand.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average +2.21
	-5 = very strongly disagree -4 = strongly disagree -3 = disagree -2 = mildly disagree -1 = somewhat disagree 0 = neutral +1 = somewhat agree +2 = mildly agree +3 = agree +4 = strongly agree +5 = very strongly agree No Response	(1)     (3) (1)  (5) (2) (2) (1)	Committee Range -3 to +5

Question #21 Comments:

- ❖ Not sure how establishing service boundaries has anything to do with measuring demand. Demand should be measured by number of units or SF or something else rather than where a service boundary lies.
- ❖ As long as it doesn't cost a great deal of money for the study/consultant.

***Municipal Facilities and Services***

22. Wastewater treatment facilities should be developed that recognize the value of water and maximize its re-use.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average +4.40
	-5 = very strongly disagree -4 = strongly disagree -3 = disagree -2 = mildly disagree -1 = somewhat disagree 0 = neutral +1 = somewhat agree +2 = mildly agree +3 = agree +4 = strongly agree +5 = very strongly agree	        (4) (1) (10)	Committee Range +3 to +5

Question #22 Comment:

- ❖ Escondido is currently using only 1/3 of their allowed recycled water capabilities (mgd allowances)

***Municipal Facilities and Services***

23. The Update should study a reasonable range of wastewater disposal options but eliminate those with little potential because since they will increase study costs and require more time.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average +2.13
	-5 = very strongly disagree -4 = strongly disagree -3 = disagree -2 = mildly disagree -1 = somewhat disagree 0 = neutral +1 = somewhat agree +2 = mildly agree +3 = agree +4 = strongly agree +5 = very strongly agree	(1)    (2) (2) (1)  (3) (3) (3)	Committee Range -3 to +5

Question #23 Comments:

- ❖ Any idea should only be studied until the first benchmark: is it practical? Impractical ideas should then be dropped.
- ❖ The City should study these options. However, the city should refrain from exorbitant consultant fees/studies and then be unable to finance any improvement options. Don't deplete the funds with the study and fail to act on the ultimate goal.
- ❖ I agree that we should study a reasonable range of options. I don't agree with eliminating options because we don't want to spend the time or money.

**Growth Management**

24. The General Plan should provide the flexibility to allow <u>some</u> development to proceed even though non-critical deficiencies may exist (i.e. parkland, libraries, etc.) but <u>restrict</u> development where there are critical deficiencies (i.e. sewer, water, etc.).	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(3)	+0.53
	-4 = strongly disagree	(1)	
	-3 = disagree	(1)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	
	0 = neutral		
	+1 = somewhat agree		
	+2 = mildly agree	(2)	Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(4)	-5 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree		
	+5 = very strongly agree	(3)	

Question #24 Comments:

- ❖ I like the idea of providing flexibility. I don't like the idea of cart blanch restricting because of deficiencies. Deficiencies can be generated by tweaking various factors and inputs. We need flexibility.
- ❖ Absolutely NOT! That is currently happening. Historically, our schools & students have been forced into over-crowded conditions.

**Growth Management**

25. Water conservation measures should be incorporated so that no additional water will be required to serve future growth beyond what is needed in Escondido's current General Plan buildout.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree	(3)	-0.33
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree	(3)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(2)	
	0 = neutral	(1)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree	(1)	Committee Range
	+3 = agree		-5 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(2)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(2)	

Question #25 Comments:

- ❖ Conservation should mean re-use of water so that no net increase of raw water is required.
- ❖ Water conservation measures should be incorporated in the General Plan, but should not be foisted on new development nor used as a growth control tool.
- ❖ That doesn't make sense considering our population will exceed "current GP buildout". Unless the City adopts the same population limits as is currently reflected in the GP, we will be forced to provide water for additional growth – this proposition could be detrimental to the business/development community. The question is too broad and doesn't reflect relevant factors.
- ❖ I agree that water conservation measures should be incorporated. I do not believe that we should utilize water conservation to hamper future growth and or our fair share of growth.





Question #30 Comments:

- ❖ It should also look at increasing certain roadway widths to accommodate the additional “smart growth” areas.
- ❖ If reclassification of Circulation Element Streets is warranted, whether as a downgrade or upgrade, it could be considered.
- ❖ What about upgrading them where conditions warrant reclassification?
- ❖ That’s already happening – to the dismay of many residents! Nobody likes waiting in traffic. This kind of mindset does nothing for our “Green” Efforts!

***Parks & Open Space***

31. The Update should incorporate <a href="#">region-wide habitat planning efforts</a> that contribute to the maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem health while maintaining quality of life and economic growth opportunities.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree		+1.67
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree	(1)	
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree	(1)	
	0 = neutral	(5)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree		Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(3)	-3 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(1)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(3)	

Question #31 Comments:

- ❖ Yes, these efforts should be incorporated – AND then acted upon!
- ❖ I’m not sure what this really means. Let’s make sure Escondido gets taken care of first.
- ❖ We should coordinate our efforts with the regional plan, but given the history of that effort, we should not put our community planning at jeopardy.
- ❖ The Update should absolutely consider regional planning efforts, but should not be held hostage by them.

***Parks & Open Space***

32. The Update should address passive and active recreational facility needs in the Downtown area in an efficient and sustainable manner to respond to the changing needs of the community.	Rankings:	Votes	Committee Average
	-5 = very strongly disagree		+3.50
	-4 = strongly disagree		
	-3 = disagree		
	-2 = mildly disagree		
	-1 = somewhat disagree		
	0 = neutral	(1)	
	+1 = somewhat agree	(1)	
	+2 = mildly agree	(1)	Committee Range
	+3 = agree	(3)	+0 to +5
	+4 = strongly agree	(3)	
	+5 = very strongly agree	(5)	
	No response	(1)	

Question #32 Comment:

- ❖ As well, the update should address the same throughout the City. The Westside is lacking passive & active recreational facilities – they are still waiting for their neighborhood park (which has been once again delayed).

Citizen's Committee General Comments:

- ❖ Many of these questions require either more information to be answered. It is my hope the task force will have the opportunity to discuss and modify many of these positions from the statements we see here.
- ❖ I do not intend to sound negative or harsh. I am trying to state what I know and what I believe. I am excited to hear the other voices and staff about the changes and such this update will experience. I appreciate the hard work of city staff and council members. Looking forward to our meetings and hope there will be many!
- ❖ Please consider having the members of this committee, as a group, tour the City on the North, South, East and West. The purpose would be to see all the areas in our City that need improvement. If the City chooses the "Downtown" to be the center of the Universe, as least we may be able to understand that we need all of our areas to be in the best of shape, we are all part of the whole.
- ❖ My ranking of "0" generally means I need more information before I form an opinion.
- ❖ The possibility of a stadium being built in Escondido could change the current approach to a General Plan.