



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: MAY 17, 2016

ITEM NUMBER: **PH-1**

SUBJECT: 2015-2035 GENERAL PLAN AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) - SCH# 2015111068

DATE: MAY 5, 2016

FROM: PLANNING DIVISION/DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

PRESENTATION BY: CLAIRE FLYNN, AICP AND LAURA STETSON AICP, MIG

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: MINOO ASHABI, PRINCIPAL PLANNER
(714) 754-5610 minoo.ashabi@costamesaca.gov

RECOMMENDATION

- Receive overview presentation of General Plan and Draft EIR and public comments; and,
- Continue to City Council Meeting of June 7, 2016.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves the following:

- **2015-2035 General Plan** – an update to current General Plan including all ten elements with the incorporation of the 2013-2021 Housing Element which was adopted in 2014. The proposed amendments are related to: Land Use, Circulation, Growth Management, Conservation Element, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, Safety, Community Design, and Historical and Cultural Resources.
- **Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)** - This is a Program EIR prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, which allows for the preparation of a Program EIR for a series of actions that can be characterized as a single project.

BACKGROUND

The State of California requires every city and county to prepare and adopt a comprehensive general plan that is “an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies” to address all issues that affect the physical development of the community, as well as land outside its boundaries that potentially affect long-term planning (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.). The role of a general plan is to act as a “constitution” for development, the foundation upon which all land use and related decisions are based.

Bicycle Master Plan

One of the outcomes of the workshops in 2015 was the formation of the Bikeway and Walkability Committee, composed of 13 members appointed by the City Council. The Committee was tasked with crafting the goals, objectives, policies, and programs for the City’s first Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Community members and decision makers involved in the process expressed that Costa Mesa should have transportation and recreational infrastructure that easily accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians. A conceptual Bike Master Plan has been developed that is included in the draft Circulation Element. Following a detailed analysis and public review of the proposed facilities, a final Bicycle Master Plan will be incorporated into the Circulation Element. New bicycle facilities and amenities will be added to complement the established bicycle network.

Direction from City Council on October 6, 2015

On October 6, 2015, the City Council considered the proposed land use alternatives and provided direction on the proposed land uses. Minutes of the City Council meeting with specific votes on each item could be accessed at the following link:

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=19968>

Four Planning Commission Hearings

On March 14, 2016, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the General Plan and received public comments on the proposed draft 2015-2035 General Plan and DEIR. The meeting was continued to March 28, 2016 to allow additional consideration of the proposed General Plan.

On March 28, 2016, the Planning Commission held a second public hearing and received additional public comments. The meeting was continued to April 11, 2016 for further review. A detailed discussion of public comments was included.

On April 11, 2016, the Planning Commission held a third public hearing. Issues discussed at the meeting are included with more detail in this report.

On April 25, 2016, the Planning Commission held a fourth public hearing and recommended that the City Council certify the DEIR and adopt the 2015-2035 General Plan.

Previous Planning Commission reports could be accessed at the following links:

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/ftp/planningcommission/agenda/2016/2016-03-14/PH-1.pdf>

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/ftp/planningcommission/agenda/2016/2016-03-28/PH-1.pdf>

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/ftp/planningcommission/agenda/2016/2016-04-11/PH-1.pdf>

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/ftp/planningcommission/agenda/2016/2016-04-25/PH-3.pdf>

ANALYSIS

2015-2035 General Plan

The proposed amendments includes revisions to all elements of the 2000 General Plan except the 2013-2021 Housing Element which was adopted in 2014. Those elements affected are Land Use, Circulation, Growth Management, Conservation Element, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, Safety, Community Design, and Historic and Cultural Resources.

The primary focus of the General Plan Amendments is to: 1) update the Land Use Policy Map to target revitalization efforts; 2) ensure that the Circulation Element comports with the amended land use plan, incorporates “complete streets” strategies, and addresses all current planning laws; and 3) update all other elements to incorporate provisions that respond to State laws adopted since 2002 (the adoption date of the current General Plan). The City has established 2035 as the horizon year for the amended General Plan, meaning that 2035 represents the year by which the City would expect that the General Plan’s policies and programs would be realized and a new comprehensive review of the plan may be warranted.

The following land use changes are proposed that affect four percent of the overall land uses in the City:

- A new land use designation (Multi-Use Center) that applies to the Fairview Development Center
- Two new land use overlays (Residential Incentive Overlay Zone and Harbor Mixed Use))
- Site-specific FAR of 0.64 for the Segerstrom Home Ranch site
- Site-specific density of 80 dwelling units per acre for Sakioka Lot 2
- Amended General Plan designation of Commercial Center and site specific FAR of 0.54 to 0.64 for the LA Times site

For these focus areas, the proposed project description and land use changes are included as Attachment 1.

Key Topics

The following is a summary of key issues discussed during public hearings:

1) When did the General Plan Update Process start, and what's been done so far?

The City's General Plan was adopted in January 2002. The City entered into a contract with Hogle Ireland/ MIG in 2012. During 2012-2015, the City conducted an in-depth community engagement process "The Great Reach" that involved a broad and diverse constituency to refine the community vision and to identify where targeted change was warranted and desired. Great Reach events included 10 community workshops held early in the General Plan development process and widely attended by residents, property owners, the development community, and social service interests. The topics discussed varied by workshop, with intensive sessions focused on land use, parks and open spaces, traffic, bicycling, and community safety. From these workshops, the exchange of ideas helped identify strongly held community values and aspirations.

The Great Reach included a series of workshops and study sessions held in 2014 and 2015: three joint City Council/Planning Commission workshops, three study sessions with City Council, and one study session with Planning Commission. From the workshops and study sessions, the community decided upon a refined Vision statement which emphasized the widely held desire to resolve targeted land use and mobility issues as the anchoring point for the 2035 General Plan. The vision statements are included in the Introduction Chapter of the 2015-2035 General Plan.

A summary of all events and public input is available on the City's Website at this link:

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/index.aspx?page=1994>

2) The original focus areas for change for the General Plan Update comprised what extent of the City?

Approximately 20 percent of the City area was studied for land use changes at the beginning. Through the public hearing process and as directed by City Council, the final draft includes areas relating to about 4 percent of the land in the City. These changes are focused primary on the north side of 405 Freeway and along Harbor Blvd. and Newport Blvd. corridors.

3) When were the final draft General Plan and DEIR released for public review?

The Draft 2015-2035 General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report was released for a 45-day public review on March 4th. The public review comment period for the DEIR was completed on April 18th; however, City Council could receive additional comments on the General Plan during public hearings. The Final Responses to Comments document is pending and will be available at the next Council meeting for review/consideration.

4) How many comment letters were received and how were the questions and comments addressed?

At the time of the Planning Commission hearing on April 25, 2016, staff received a total of 43 comment letters on the Draft General Plan that are included as Attachment 1. Comments that were directly related to the DEIR were included in the DRAFT Response to Comments document included as Attachment 2. Staff is in the process of identifying any comment letters that may have been transmitted through the City's website but unfortunately not delivered (or received) due to technical computer issues. Any letters received on the Draft EIR during the comment period will be responded by the planning consultants.

5) Is Fairview Park being "repurposed" as part of General Plan Update?

All references to Fairview Park being repurposed have been removed from the Draft General Plan. The 2015-2035 General Plan includes Fairview Park under Open Space Land Use as currently assigned and does not change the current land use designation or the Fairview Park Master Plan. The Fairview Park Master Plan was adopted by City Council as a tool for the orderly implementation of the approved improvements for Fairview Park. Changes to the Fairview Park Master Plan are considered in compliance with City Council Policy 500-11, Implementation Procedures for the Fairview Park Master Plan. The Fairview Park Citizens Advisory Committee reviews the Master Plan and recommends revisions or changes to the Master Plan. The Committee is currently on-hold pending the completion of the update of the City's Open Space Master Plan of Parks and Recreation.

The demand for sports fields will continue to be an issue now and in the future as will other key issues described in the Open Space Element. The City's Open Space Master Plan of Parks and Recreation (OSMP) is a document that is based on the adopted General Plan. It answers, among an extensive number of parks and recreation questions, questions relative to the current and future demands for sports fields. The OSMP needs to be updated regularly to take into account population and use changes. The OSMP is currently being updated and will utilize a number of tools to determine the needs of the community including telephone surveys, community meetings, stakeholder interviews and public meetings.

6) How is "Park Level of Service" and "Park Accessibility" determined?

Several residential neighborhoods in Costa Mesa are more than one-quarter and one-half-mile pedestrian walking distance to public neighborhood and community parks. These neighborhoods include the Westside residential district generally along Victoria Street and Placentia Avenue, the Eastside residential district along 19th and 20th Streets, the residential area northeast of the Mesa Verde Country Club, and the Halecrest residential neighborhood. The Halecrest area does include a private park, Halecrest Park, which requires a membership to access the recreation facilities. These areas should be considered priorities areas for future parks. Other small underserved areas should also be considered as well.

Additionally, large apartment and condominium complexes provide private recreational facilities for their residents and are maintained under management groups or homeowner associations.

Figure OSR-2 of the Draft Open Space Element differs from the current General Plan in that it provides a more accurate representation of access/proximity to parks based on actual walking distance of a park user. The map does not depict distance “as the crow flies.” This map shows the half and quarter mile in walking distance vs. a radius map since there may be physical barriers in place (walls, etc.).

7) Is there a requirement to provide affordable units?

The proposed 2015-2035 does not include mandates for affordable housing. Advocates of affordable housing propose that the increased densities in the Residential Incentives Overlays and the Fairview Park Multi-Use Center designation should be allowed in exchange for a percentage of affordable housing. As a policy decision, the City Council may choose to recommend new land use policies related to affordable housing and consider an affordable housing component as part of the Residential Incentive Overlays.

8) What is planned for Fairview Developmental Center?

The proposed Multi-Use Center Urban Plan allows a site-specific density up to 25 du/acre for Shannon’s Mountain and a maximum 15 du/acre for the remaining site area for housing development. The City Council was aware of the October 6, 2015 letter from the State Department of General Services at the time the draft land use plan was recommended for inclusion in the Draft General Plan and direction was provided to prepare the Draft EIR based upon the recommended land use plan. The State DGS has indicated that a Request for Proposals for a potential home builder is still pending for Shannon’s Mountain. Higher densities were not considered in the traffic report for the Draft General Plan and DEIR, and any increase in density could have traffic implications that would need further study, both in terms of access and trip generation.

9) What are the maximum densities proposed for overlay districts and incentive zones?

- 40 dwelling units per acre: The Residential Incentive Overlay creates opportunities for residential development at strategic locations along Harbor Boulevard and Newport Boulevard. Housing within the Residential Incentive Overlay is limited to a maximum density of 40 units per acre.
- 20 dwelling units per acre within a mixed-use development: The Harbor Mixed-Use Overlay Zone promotes mixed-use development along select locations of Harbor Boulevard. A maximum of 20 dwelling units per acre would be allowed for the residential component within a mixed-use development.

10) How can the apparent loss or miscalculation of approximately 5,000 units of low density housing be accounted for?

Staff verified that the housing estimates in the General Plan Update are accurate and consistent with data provided by the Center of Demographic Research and the State Department of Finance. The overall total number of housing units is correct; the discrepancy appears to be associated with the identification of single-family and multi-family units. The current General Plan used the Low Density zoning designation to estimate the number of single family units, and this methodology overstated the number of single-family residences. With the proposed General Plan, more accurate aerial and GIS data was used to count the actual existing dwelling units by parcel and by type (single family versus multi-family units).

11) How was the Traffic Study conducted and how much increase in traffic is expected with the proposed 2015-2035 General Plan?

For the General Plan update, two future land use scenarios were analyzed, one based on the current General Plan Land Use Element and the other based on the proposed General Plan update. The land use database is applied in the traffic model to produce AM peak hour, PM peak hour and daily vehicle traffic generation estimates. The traffic generation estimates are based on the type of land use (e.g., housing, retail, office, hotel, schools, recreational, etc.) and organized by defined zones to account for the specific location of each type of land use in the city. The comparison of the current General Plan buildout condition to the proposed land uses shows an increase of approximately one percent as noted in the table below.

Land Use Type	Existing Conditions		Previous General Plan Buildout		Proposed General Plan Buildout	
	Amount	Daily Trips	Amount	Daily Trips	Amount	Daily Trips
Residential	42,623 DU	329,083	48,859 DU	372,815	51,894 DU	393,297
<i>Increase vs. Existing</i>			6,236 DU	43,732	9,271 DU	64,214
Commercial (a)	31,847 TSF	593,164	37,139 TSF	733,690	37,446 TSF	740,071
<i>Increase vs. Existing</i>			5,292 TSF	140,526	5,599 TSF	146,907
Miscellaneous (b)	--	96,543	--	122,620	--	110,772
<i>Increase vs. Existing</i>				26,077		14,229
Total Daily Trips		1,018,790		1,229,125		1,244,140
<i>Increase vs. Existing</i>				210,335 (+21%)		225,350 (+22%)
(a) Includes retail, office and industrial land uses.			Abbreviations: DU – dwelling unit			
(b) Includes schools, colleges, hotels, motels, hospitals, churches, golf courses, parks, fairgrounds, agriculture, etc.			TSF – thousand square feet			

12) Is the proposed 2015-2035 General Plan financially feasible?

A market analysis was prepared by The Natelson Dale Group Inc. (TNDG) to address the following questions:

- Will there be enough market demand for the development amounts proposed in the General Plan to actually be built over the next 20 years?
- And will there be a balance between cost of City services and projected revenues?

For residential, industrial and hotel development, there will be enough market demand to fully “build out” the General Plan capacity by 2035. For retail development, TNDG projects that the City will reach 85% of the potential development capacity by 2035. For office development, TNDG projects that the City will reach 78% of the potential development capacity by 2035.

The primary purpose of the of the Fiscal Impact Model was to ensure that the proposed General Plan update will result in a Citywide land use mix that is fiscally balanced for the City. Based on the General Plan land use mix TNDG projects that the General Fund will achieve a surplus of \$3.1 million per year at buildout.

General Fund	FY 2014-2015 Actual	Projected Budget at Buildout (2015 \$)	Percentage Change Through Buildout
Total Revenues	\$113.0 million	\$128.1 million	13%
Total Expenditures	\$109.4 million	\$125.0 million	14%
Net Fiscal Cash Flow	\$3.6 million	\$3.1 million	

13) Are the traffic assumptions in the Fiscal Impact Report consistent with the Citywide traffic analysis prepared for the Circulation Element?

The land use assumptions in the traffic model and the Fiscal Model were aligned and are consistent. The Planning Commission received a Revised Financial Feasibility report from The Natelson Dale Group Inc. (TNDG) with respect to traffic data on April 25, 2016. The discrepancies between trip generation considered in the traffic analysis and the Fiscal Analysis Report were addressed and the revised report and the consultant’s bio are included as Attachment 4.

Stantec provided clarification on the one percent overall increase on ADTs and the methodology used to run the traffic model which is included as Attachment 5.

14) CEQA requires that an EIR examine alternatives to the project that are capable of reducing or eliminating the unavoidable significant effects. What were the alternatives considered with the DEIR?

In addition to the proposed land uses, the Draft EIR evaluates four project alternatives:

- Alternative No. 1 - No Project/No Build Alternative (current General Plan)
- Alternative No. 2 – Fairview Development Center site remaining as a Public/Institutional land use
- Alternative No. 3 - LA Times site remaining an Industrial Park land use

- Alternative No. 4 - Segerstrom Home Ranch site remaining at the current development capacity of 0.40 Floor Area Ratio

The analysis indicates that Alternative 1 could result in the elimination of the significant air quality and greenhouse gas impacts associated with the General Plan Amendments. However, as required by the State CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, another alternative must be identified. Alternative 2 has the potential to result in marginally reduced environmental impacts relative to those associated with the proposed project. None of the four alternatives fully achieves the objectives of the proposed project.

Public Comments

The following includes the public and Planning Commission comments and staff responses provided during Planning Commission hearings:

15) Were sports fields within school properties considered in meeting community needs?

Response: Consistent with previous assessments, the sports fields that are under a current joint use agreement with the City were considered; if these agreements become null and void, these facilities will no longer be available.

16) Affordable housing at Fairview Developmental Center Site – The proposed density of 25 du/acre at the Fairview Developmental Center will not provide for affordable housing projects. A high density of 40 du/acre should be considered to allow greater opportunities for affordable housing. Based on letter dated October 6, 2015 from State Department of General Services, the State is requesting that the City allow a maximum density of 40 du/acre for Shannon’s Mountain project.

Response: Based on direction from the City Council, the proposed Multi-Use Center Urban Plan allows a site-specific density up to 25 du/acre for Shannon’s Mountain and a maximum 15 du/acre for the remaining site area for housing development. The City Council was aware of the October 6, 2015 letter at the time the draft land use plan was recommended for inclusion in the Draft General Plan and direction was provided to prepare the Draft EIR based upon the recommended land use plan. The State DGS has indicated that a Request for Proposals for a potential home builder is still pending for Shannon’s Mountain. Higher densities were not considered in the traffic report for the Draft General Plan and DEIR, and any increase in density could have traffic implications that would need further study, both in terms of access and trip generation.

Inclusionary Housing Requirements – To address affordable housing issues, the City should be requiring affordable housing for lower incomes in conjunction with the incentives overlays proposed for Harbor Boulevard and Newport Boulevard that allow higher densities. Not providing affordable housing and removing motel rooms that are the last housing choice for lower income groups could lead to more homelessness in the City.

Response: An affordable housing requirement would require policy direction from the City Council in order to be included in the General Plan.

With regard to transitional housing, according to the CEO's office, the City has been funding three (3) non-profit organizations over the last few years which are providing transitional and rapid re-housing services to the homeless and low income community. Mercy House, Collette's Children's Home and Families Forward serve populations as diverse as single men who are in recovery, as well as emergency and transitional shelters for families with children. Over the past three (3) years, 102 households have been assisted with this type of housing.

The City has committed to funding these sorts of housing projects with CDBG funds for over 25 years. These organizations also take direct referrals from city Outreach Workers to ensure that a streamlined service delivery system exists so that the most vulnerable have access to outreach services on a priority basis.

- 17) **Proposed Land Uses** – There was a request to show the comparison of the Proposed General Plan to the Current General Plan in relationship to the overall change by land use types within the City.

Response: The following shows the comparison of the current conditions in relation to existing and proposed General Plan update:

Land Use	Units	Existing	Current GP	Proposed GP
1. Low Density Residential	DU	14,210	14,788	14,791
2. Medium Density Residential	DU	4,370	4,791	4,992
3. High Density Residential	DU	23,593	28,830	31,661
5. Age Qualified Housing	DU	450	450	450
6. General Office	TSF	7,112	8,820	10,675
7. Medical Office	TSF	112	112	112
8. General Commercial	TSF	5,601	7,337	7,299
9. Regional Commercial	TSF	4,140	4,640	4,640
10. Light Industrial	TSF	13,087	13,108	12,704
11. Golf Course	Acre	535	535	535
12. Elementary/Middle School	Student	7,385	8,067	8,067
13. High School	Student	4,590	4,998	4,998
14. College/University	Student	25,990	26,286	26,286
15. Public Facility	Acre	176	176	228
16. Fairgrounds	Acre	150	150	150
17. Storage	TSF	1,171	877	530
18. City Hall	TSF	133	133	133
19. Performance Theater	TSF	585	691	691
20. Convalescent Care	Bed	448	448	448
21. Hospital	Bed	472	472	122
22. Hotel	Room	1,877	2,077	2,077
23. Motel	Room	2,272	2,272	946
24. Auto Dealership	TSF	491	491	491
25. Passive Park	Acre	592	592	618

Land Use	Units	Existing	Current GP	Proposed GP
26. Agriculture	Acre	72	0	0
27. Religious Facility	TSF	555	555	555
28. Vacant	Acre	18	6	6
29. Museum	TSF		140	140
30. Home Ranch Trip Cap	TSF		759	0
31. Sakioka Lot 2	TSF		862	862
32. OCC Master plan	SG		100	100
	Total			
	DU	42,623	48,859	51,894
	TSF	32,987	38,525	38,832
	ACRE	1543	1459	1537
	STUDENT	37,965	39,351	39,351
	BED	920	920	570
	ROOM	4,149	4,349	3,023
	SG		100	100

18) Open Space Element – the following items were noted by one speaker:

- OSR Pages 14 – Clarification of the underserved areas that appear to be inaccurately represented with extended radius beyond a ¼ mile is requested. This issue was also included in the March 14, 2016 Planning Commission report.

Response: This comment was addressed with the March 14, 2016 staff report, Figure OSR-2 is accurate and differs from the current General Plan in that it provides a more accurate representation of access/proximity to parks based on actual walking distance of a park user. The map does not depict distance “as the crow flies.” This map shows the half and quarter mile in walking distance vs. a radius map since there may be physical barriers in place (walls, etc.). Therefore, the underserved areas are accurately depicted and the parkland per person ratio is accurately calculated.

19) Cultural Resources Element – the following were requested:

- Add section 11.2 of the current General Plan referred to as Relationship to Other General Plan Elements.

Response: The Introduction chapter of the Draft General Plan, on page I-2, states the requirement under State law for the internal consistency of the General Plan, which means that the Historical and Cultural Resources Element relates to and is consistent with all other elements, even given the optional nature of this particular element.

- Remove LACM-3267 and JDC- CM-2 sites from the list of paleontological resources.

Response: The member of the public making this comment did not provide specific reasons why these resources should be eliminated from the inventories. Staff will follow up appropriately to determine whether the resources should

continue to be included or not. Such determination would not have any bearing on the element's goals and policies.

- With the 1999 survey approximately 60 properties were documented on the State Inventory Forms (DPR523 forms); however, only 29 are identified as significant federal, state and/or local historic resources. Consider adding all noted 60 properties to the list of significant resources.

Response: The City welcomes additional information from the public that would enable staff to update the list.

- Add previously noted Objectives HCR- 1A.2 through HCR-1A.6 to the Cultural Resources Element – these are correctly noted in the DEIR. Keep the policies that require monitoring of the site during construction for sites that are reasonably suspected to contain resources.

Response: The mitigation measures cited are routinely included as conditions of project approval. If directed by the City Council, these measures could be included as General Plan policies.

- 20) Traffic Studies** – Clarification regarding the validity and current timing of traffic data in the traffic reports was requested.

Response: Major new traffic studies were conducted for the General Plan update. The General Plan is prepared for the next 20 years and includes development potential for important areas of the City such as the 19th Street and Newport Blvd. intersection which is considered the downtown area.

- 21) Cumulative Impacts** – The cumulative impacts of the proposed densities should be considered; projects may also increase additional density with density bonus provisions.

Response: Over time, project applicants may request density bonuses for development projects. However, the City receives few such requests even though the legislation providing for density bonuses has been in effect for many years. To include an estimation as to the number of additional units that could be provided as density bonus units over the 20-year lifetime of the General Plan would involve speculation. As stated in Section 15145 (Speculation) of the CEQA Guidelines, if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, that condition should be noted and no further analysis is required. This circumstance applies to including density bonus units as part of the EIR analysis.

- 22) General Plan Land Use Policy for maximum four stories height** – Reference to current Policy LU-1C.2 that allows a maximum of four stories, except for special purpose housing such as elderly, affordable or student housing. The proposed Policy LU-2.8 has added language as underlined below:

“Limit building height to four stories above grade south of the I-405 Freeway, except for special purpose housing, such as elderly, affordable, or student housing, unless otherwise approved by a General Plan”

amendment. (A four-story/five-level parking structure with roof deck parking on the fifth level is considered a four-story structure.)”

Response: A new building height can be proposed and approved via a General Plan amendment at any time. This language does not promote or encourage amendments but merely notes a fact that could happen through a future general plan amendment.

- 23) Required Amenities for three and four story townhomes** – It was recommended that the new three and four story homes be required to: 1) install elevators or dumbwaiters for moving groceries, etc. to upper levels, 2) include a central vacuum system, and 3) provide a private roof deck to suffice for private open space.

The General Plan does not include detailed requirements for developments in Urban Plan areas. These could be considered as recommended amenities to be included in the Urban Plans or conditions of approval as deemed appropriate per project.

DRAFT 2015-2035 GENERAL PLAN

The proposed amendments include revisions to all elements of the 2000 General Plan except the 2013-2021 Housing Element which was adopted in 2014. Those elements affected are Land Use, Circulation, Growth Management, Conservation Element, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, Safety, Community Design, and Historic and Cultural Resources.

The primary focus of the General Plan Amendments is to: 1) update the Land Use Policy Map to target revitalization efforts; 2) ensure that the Circulation Element comports with the amended land use plan, incorporates “complete streets” strategies, and addresses all current planning laws; and 3) update all other elements to incorporate provisions that respond to State laws adopted since 2002 (the adoption date of the current General Plan). The City has established 2035 as the horizon year for the amended General Plan, meaning that 2035 represents the year by which the City would expect that the General Plan’s policies and programs would be realized and a new comprehensive review of the plan may be warranted.

Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) - SCH# 2015111068

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., § 15000 et seq.). This DEIR is a Program EIR prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. Section 15168 allows for the preparation of a Program EIR for a series of actions that can be characterized as a single project.

The Draft EIR includes an analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with the long-term implementation of the updated General Plan in relation to the following environmental topics.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Air Quality • Cultural Resources • Geology and Soils • Greenhouse Gas Emissions • Hazards and Hazardous Materials • Hydrology and Water Quality • Land Use and Planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise • Population and Housing • Public Services • Recreation • Transportation/Circulation • Utilities and Service Systems
---	---

Unavoidable significant impacts have been identified with regard to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Sites exist within the City that are listed as hazardous waste facilities, hazardous waste properties, and/or hazardous waste disposal sites, as enumerated under California Government Code 65962.5.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Notice of Preparation was released on November 16, 2015. All public comments received during the 30-day review period is accessible at the following link:

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/ftp/generalplan2015-2035/Appendix%20B%20-%20Notice%20of%20Preparation.pdf>

Responses to Comments - Draft EIR

Public Comment Period

On March 4, 2016, the City released the draft 2015-2035 General Plan and DEIR for a 45-day public review until April 18, 2016. Both documents were available on the City's Website at the following link:

<http://www.costamesaca.gov/index.aspx?page=1994>

As required by CEQA, all public hearing comments and correspondence received during the 45-day public review period are included in Attachment 3, and addressed in the draft "Response to comments" document included as Attachment 2.

CONCLUSION

The General Plan update process started in 2012. During the past three years, there were many workshops and study sessions that provided opportunities to obtain public input and discuss major land use and traffic issues. The draft 2015-2035 General Plan is a compilation of the revisions approved by the Council and updates in compliance with the latest state and regional requirements such as the Complete Street component. Most goals, policies and objectives have remained unchanged. The major land use changes are proposed for four percent of the City's overall area, which if implemented, is anticipated to be supported by the circulation improvements within the General Plan time frame.

MINOO ASHABI, AIA
Principal Planner

CLAIRE FLYNN, AICP
Assistant Director
Development Services

GARY ARMSTRONG, AICP
Director of Economic Development &
Development Services / Deputy CEO

- Attachments:
1. [Draft General Plan including all Errata \(under separate cover\)](#)
 2. [Draft Response to Comments \(under separate cover\)](#)
 3. [Correspondence Submitted on General Plan and DEIR](#)
 4. [Memos from The Natelson Dale Group](#)
 5. [Memo from Stantec](#)
 6. [Verbal Comments at Planning Commission Hearings](#)