

ATTACHMENT 2
SUMMARY OF GENERAL PLAN ISSUE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Long Term Population Needs Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) The General Plan Update should plan for at least Escondido’s fair share, and possibly more, of the regional growth that is forecasted for 2050.</p>	<p>ACTION (10/22/09):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The City should accept a “Fair Share” of the anticipated 70,000 unit-shortfall (approximately 2,500 units for Escondido) -0- votes 2) The City should accept no units; Escondido is already too crowded and as a result no density increases should occur -3- votes 3) The City should determine what densities are needed to meet community goals and determine what densities are appropriate to meet those goals –unanimous- <p>(Kildoo; absent)</p>
<p>2) Any forecasted growth that can’t be accommodated in the Downtown should be directed to prioritized Smart Growth Areas rather than studying all Smart Growth Areas, increasing the density of land use categories on a citywide basis (i.e. changing Suburban (3.3 du/ac) to Urban 1 (6.3du/ac.), or expanding the boundaries of the General Plan.</p>	<p>ACTION (10/22/09):</p> <p>No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Smart Growth should also include jobs, not just residential densities 2) There was no interest in increasing densities in established neighborhoods outside the Smart Growth Areas 3) The City should evaluate redevelopment opportunities in deteriorated areas and revisit Quality of Life standards for possible refinement in areas where increased density is proposed 4) Consideration should be given to determine what goal the city wanted to accomplish in terms of providing employment land when evaluating ownership patterns, numbers of owners, existing improvements, redevelopment overlays, lot consolidation, financial feasibility, compatibility with surrounding areas, etc., all of which would have a bearing on how quickly the area could be developed for employment uses. <p>(Kildoo; absent)</p>

General Plan Boundaries and Land Use Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) Lands suitable for the creation of new employment areas should be studied as Part of the Update even to the extent they involve changing residential land to an employment category.</p>	<p>ACTION (11/05/09): No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Additional employment lands were needed and should be studied in the General Plan Update, including the potential conversion of existing, deteriorated residential areas 2) No specific target number of acres should be established as a goal; rather, the criteria for evaluating suitability for employment lands should include: a) the existing environmental conditions; b) whether the area is blighted; and, c) the status of the existing infrastructure 3) Design and development standards should be set high as necessary to produce the desired goals. High standards just for their own sake could be counterproductive. For example, too high landscaping standards or setbacks in the industrial areas could impede job creation. 4) There was no need for staff to perform extensive technical studies to substantiate the need for expanding employment lands in the General Plan Update; it is in the community's best interest. <p>Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting concerned that rights of property owners be protected in "blighted, deteriorated areas." (Wells; absent)</p>
<p>2) Rather than designating new commercial areas (such as along I-15 or in the area of Bear Valley and San Pasqual), the General Plan should continue policies of reinforcing existing commercial areas.</p>	<p>ACTION (11/05/09): No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mixed-use occurring on the same site, but not necessarily in the same building would be important to ensure compatibility between land uses (i.e. residential and entertainment, etc). 2) Smart Growth areas should be where mixed-use is focused and it should be compact and pedestrian oriented. <p>(Wells; absent)</p>

General Plan Quality of Life Standards Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
1) Existing Quality of Life Standards should be modified to ensure they address forecasted needs as follows:	
FIRE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current language that acknowledges averaging of response times to achieve compliance in 90% of calls for service ■ <i>Add General Plan Policies to address taller and compact development in Smart Growth Areas</i> 	ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)
POLICE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current Quality of Life Standard 	ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)
CIRCULATION: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify current QOL language to include instances where Level of Service lower than “C” will be accepted particularly in high density, infill areas based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compact and vertical nature of Smart Growth that generates additional congestion ▪ Lower levels of service is considered appropriate in many communities with urban components ■ <i>Streets that will never be widened to their current designations should be downgraded in recognition of their environmental constraints (even though some surrounding streets may experience more traffic).</i> 	ACTION (12/17/09): Endorsed by Committee (Vote 10:2) Paul, Prazeau opposed by citing the current QOL language as sufficient for addressing the amendment (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action ACTION (11/19/09): Unanimously endorsed that traffic and Circulation Quality of Life alternatives in Smart Growth Areas should be further evaluated to assess their status (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed that staff evaluate the Circulation Element and report back identifying specified streets with reasons why downgrading should be considered (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)
SCHOOLS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain QOL current language ■ <i>Clarify current General Plan Policies regarding:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Current provisions for joint-use facilities and coordination of City capital improvement projects with school construction.</i> ▪ <i>Minimum acreage requirements for school construction</i> 	ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee to remove minimum acreage requirements (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)

<p>WATER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify General Plan QOL language reducing current “600 gallons per day” to “540 gallons per day” to better reflect the state’s conservation goals. ■ <i>Include General Plan Policies clarifying “Equivalent Dwelling Unit” water demand for non-residential uses.</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action</p>
<p>WASTEWATER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current QOL language ■ <i>Amend General Plan Policies to reflect:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Regional Water Quality Control Board amended policies regarding re-use</i> ▪ <i>“Equivalent Dwelling Unit” provisions that clarify non-residential sewer demand.</i> ▪ <i>Maximized use of reclaimed water</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION (12/17-09): Unanimously endorse staff consideration with the provision that reclaimed water be prioritized for local use (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)</p>
<p>PARKS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify QOL language to create an Urban Park Standard that would include the expansion of Grape Day Park and supplemental public recreational facilities that are not developed in a park setting (i.e. exercise courses, walking paths, public plazas, promenades, River Walk, dog parks, etc.) ■ <i>Amend General Plan Policies to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Work with school districts to expand availability and maximize joint use opportunities when negotiating city / school improvements.</i> ▪ <i>Encourage clustering open space within private development into functional areas, and/or connect private open space with public facilities to maximize recreational opportunities.</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent)</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Velasco; absent)</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee to reference the proposed language in Specific Plan and / or Zoning Design Guidelines rather than the General Plan (Velasco; absent)</p>
<p>AIR QUALITY:</p> <p>Incorporate language that addresses compliance with regional Green House Gas / CO2 equivalents consistent with AB 32 and SB 375 rather than attempting to address State and Federal standards dealing with a large air basin that extends beyond the General Plan boundaries. Such measures would be developed in a future Climate Action Plan coordinated with the General Plan Update and is anticipated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accommodate facilities for alternative fuel vehicles ▪ Facilitate transit ▪ Promote local agriculture ▪ Maintain and update city’s traffic signal synchronization plan 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimous to concur with the intent of the amendment but to review final language before endorsing. (Velasco; absent)</p>

<p>OPEN SPACE: Maintain QOL current language except to delete last sentence: “Density transfers shall be permitted to preserve such lands as established in the land-use designation.</p>	<p>ACTION: (01/21/10) Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bowman, Guthrie, Ross; absent)</p>
<p>LIBRARY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify current QOL language based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technological changes in information access & delivery ▪ Trends in patronage, staffing and space needs ■ <i>Eliminate polices referencing driving distances to libraries to determine branch facilities.</i> ■ <i>Maintain flexibility for satisfying space needs with a combination of branch libraries and/or a main facility.</i> 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimous to endorse recommendation, in addition to consider joint use with school and other public / private partnerships to maximize programs. (Velasco; absent)</p>
<p>ECONOMIC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supplement Economic QOL Standard with a separate comprehensive Economic Element in the General Plan to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide direction concerning future economic growth of the community ▪ Direct the community’s future economic growth and performance ▪ Define an economic strategy necessary to ensure competitiveness within the region. 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Velasco; absent)</p>
<p>General Plan Transportation & Mobility Discussion Issues:</p>	<p>Committee Recommendation</p>
<p>1) NCTD Rail Extension: The extension of rail to the Westfield’s Shopping Town should be studied for inclusion in the Circulation Element. STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study rail extension to Westfield’s to coordinate with Regional Transportation Plan ▪ Supplement Circulation Element policies to incorporate rail & bus rapid transit facilities and associated station amenities along the route and at Westfield’s. 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Velasco; absent)</p>
<p>2) California High Speed Rail: Land Use changes around the potential High Speed Rail should be deferred until more details are known. STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include language calling for monitoring and coordinating rail efforts; refine General Plan polices to identify appropriate land uses around transit stations that promote Escondido as a destination for employment and entertainment rather than for development of large-scale parking facilities. ▪ Do not make land use decisions at this time in anticipation of future alignment or station locations. 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Endorsed by Committee (Vote 13:1) Paul, no citing that there should be more direction in the General Plan as to where the alignment and station should be located, but supported policies to identify appropriate land uses around transit stations promoting Escondido as a destination for employment and entertainment rather than for development of large-scale parking facilities. (Velasco; absent)</p>

General Plan Growth Management Discussion Issues	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) Growth Management: The General Plan’s growth management system should ensure minimum service levels are maintained but provide for some level of development to proceed even to the extent that some, non-critical, infrastructure deficiencies exist.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simplifying existing “tier” system by replacing with policies calling for a more functional application identifying deficiencies in specific geographic areas. ▪ Incorporating policies relating development approvals / permits to remaining capacities. ▪ Incorporating policies providing guidance for when and how critical deficiency areas should be established. ▪ Maintaining policies allowing projects to advance in critical deficiency areas subject to Development Agreements that correct deficiencies. 	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee to replace the current Growth Management provisions with a more workable solution. (Bowman, Guthrie, Ross; absent)</p>
<p>2) Water Supply: In light of the issues with long-term water supply, the General Plan Update should establish some water use parameters to constrain planning efforts. One example would be to stay within the water use projections of the current General Plan.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish an updated standard of 540 GPD Quality of Life Standard as a maximum. The Water Master Plan would be the tool for establishing water use parameters that do not exceed the QOL Standard. 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl; absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that long term supply accommodates planned buildout. 	<p>ACTION: Endorsed by Committee to plan for the community’s water needs based on the desired vision for buildout, incorporate appropriate water conservation, and not on an artificial cap. Vote: 10:1; Stahl, no (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent). Stahl stated she opposed exceeding the current buildout.</p> <p>ACTION (Failed): The General Plan should include policies regulating the issuance of residential building permits during times of water shortage; which is determined to mean when conservation is mandated for existing residents (i.e. Level 2 Drought Conditions). Vote 5:6 (Bailey, Ferguson, Hudson, Jackson, Masson, Velasco; no, Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>

<p>Proposition “S” Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Proposition “S” should be eliminated in its entirety concurrently with the General Plan Update. <p>STAFF Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Place on ballot as a separate item. ■ Link Prop “S” to the vote on the General Plan. 	<p>ACTION (12/05/09):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The City should not consider Proposition “S” as part of the General Plan Update – 5 votes 2) The City should consider Proposition “S” as part of the General Plan Update – 0 votes 3) It is too early to decide on this matter at this time; discussion on Proposition “S” should be deferred to a later meeting of the committee – 6 votes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Do not place an item on the Ballot pertaining to Prop “S.” 	<p>ACTION (01/07/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Velasco; absent)</p>
<p>Additional General Plan Update Discussion Issues</p>	<p>Committee Recommendation</p>
<p>The status of undeveloped Specific Planning Areas should be further evaluated.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendation: All Specific Planning Areas will be reviewed and updated to reflect their current status, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SPAs #1, 3, 6 should reflect buildout ▪ SPAs #7, 11 are designated as open space 	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent)</p>
<p>Density in the Smart Growth Areas should be increased in exchange for reduced density elsewhere</p> <p>STAFF Recommendation: Smart Growth areas should be evaluated for feasible and desirable density increases without regard to any potential density reductions elsewhere in the General Plan consistent with Committee recommended action on 10/22/09 (Discussion Issue #1 Action on page 1).</p>	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Endorse staff recommendation. Vote 7:4; Cameron, Paul, Prazeau, Stahl, no; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Directly link density reductions in outlying areas to increases in the urban core on a one-to-one basis (i.e. one unit reduction from outlying areas equals one unit increase in the urban core). Vote: 1:10; Stahl, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Link density reductions in outlying areas to a higher corresponding number of increased units (to be determined) in the urban core. Vote: 2:9; Paul, Prazeau, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>

	<p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Examine Daley Ranch and Valley View SPAs for potential reductions to their densities. Vote 3:8, Paul, Prazeau, Stahl, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>
<p>Annexation Policies should be amended to promote annexation</p> <p>STAFF Recommendation: Amend policies to promote the orderly expansion of Escondido’s corporate boundaries to facilitate the efficient provision of municipal services.</p>	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Consider more proactive policies for annexation throughout the community. Vote: 9:2; Prazeau, Stahl, no; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10): Consider proactive annexation policies that may include the provision of municipal services in deficiency areas without requiring property owners to finance improvements in areas that address city goals and visions. Vote: 9:2; Prazeau, Stahl, no; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10): Revisit annexation fees to determine their appropriateness for accommodating the General Plan’s goals and vision. Vote: 9:2; Prazeau, Stahl, no. Prazeau commented that the annexation fees should not be reduced; newly annexed residents should fund improvements to correct their facility impacts. (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Retain current General Plan Policy without making changes. Vote: 1:10; Stahl, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Amend General Plan to include proactive policies for annexing “county islands.” Vote: 4:7; Cameron, Paul, Prazeau, Velasco, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p> <p>ACTION (01/21/10) (Failed): Retain annexation fees and not reduce them. Vote: 2:9; Prazeau, Stahl, yes. Paul stated that flexibility regarding fees may be needed when the city is pursuing an annexation in order to fulfill a goal or vision. (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>

<p>Clustering Policies should be clarified</p> <p>STAFF Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify provisions regarding minimum lot widths, setbacks, building separations, and unit bulk 	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bowman, Guthrie, Ross; absent)</p>
<p></p>	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Unanimously endorsed by Committee to delete policy language requiring that at least 50% of all residential lots must back up to open space areas, provided that in no event shall the reduction of lot sizes for clustered projects exceed the open space areas within the development. (Bowman, Guthrie, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate language pertaining to maximizing the density or yield of clustered projects 	<p>ACTION (01/21/10) (<i>Failed</i>): Retain the current language in Clustering Policy D1.3: “Clustering is not intended to maximize the density or yield, or to circumvent the existing zoning.” Vote: 2:8; Prazeau, Stahl, yes; (Bowman, Guthrie, Hudson, Kildoo, Ross; absent). Note: No affirmative vote to eliminate the language pertaining to maximizing the density or yield was recorded. Staff interprets the direction of the majority consensus to eliminate the text.</p>
<p>Smart Growth Policies in relation to setbacks, open space and recreational amenities should be included in the General Plan</p> <p>STAFF Recommendation: Issues related to setbacks, open space, and recreational amenities should be resolved with design guidelines and specific project conditions, consistent with Committee recommended action on 01/07/10 (Parks Action on page 4).</p>	<p>ACTION (01/21/10): Endorse staff recommendation. Vote 8:1:1; Stahl, no; Prazeau, abstained; (Bowman, Guthrie, Hudson, Kildoo, Ross; absent).</p>