SANDAG

401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900
Fax (619) 699-1905
www.sandag.org

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

RESIDENTIAL LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE

The Residential Land Inventory Task Force may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, April 14, 2009

1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

SANDAG, 8th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact:

Monika Clark	Marney Cox
(619) 699-1925	(619) 699-1930
mcl@sandag.org	mco@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS

- REVIEW OF EAST SUBURBAN MAPS AND ASSOCIATED INFORMATION

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

RESIDENTIAL LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE

Tuesday, April 14, 2009

ITEM #   **RECOMMENDATION**

  1.   WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

+2.   SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 5, 2009, MEETING   INFORMATION

The March 5, 2009, meeting notes/summary is attached for Task Force review. Staff will go over any changes that were suggested by the Task Force at the March meeting.

  3.   SMART GROWTH OPPORUNITY AREAS (Stephan Vance)   DISCUSSION

SANDAG staff will provide an overview of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOA), including how the areas were selected, what SGOAs are seeking to accomplish in terms of land use and transportation coordination, and what is being done to encourage development in SGOAs.

  4.   REVIEW OF EAST SUBURBAN MAPS AND ASSOCIATED   DISCUSSION
        INFORMATION (Marney Cox, Andrew Gordon, Monika Clark)

Maps from the cities of El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Poway, and Santee will be available for review. Task Force members are encouraged to comment on the maps and associated codes in the geographies they are most familiar with. Staff also will present summary statistics for each code by geography.

  5.   ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT STEPS   INFORMATION

The next meeting date for the Residential Land Task Force is Thursday, May 14, 2009, at 9:30 a.m. At this meeting the Task Force will review maps from the cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Escondido, Oceanside, San Marcos, Solana Beach, and Vista.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

April 14, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF MARCH 5, 2009, RESIDENTIAL LAND INVENTORY
TASK FORCE MEETING

File Number 2001100

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Bob Campbell, Co-Chair, City of Vista, welcomed the attendees and thanked the members for their help in the inventory process. Mr. Campbell then led the self-introductions.

AGENDA ITEM #2: SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 29, 2009 MEETING

Marney Cox, SANDAG, asked the members to review the minutes from the previous meeting to verify that all information was captured.

Monika Clark, SANDAG, followed up with some changes to the coding scheme and flowchart that were suggested by the Task Force at the January meeting. Ms. Clark noted the changes made to the flowchart first, stating that changes were made to the "Development Pipeline" and "Developed Land" Categories. Ms. Clark told the group that changes were based upon the discussion between Russ Valone, MarketPointe Realty Advisors, and Task Force members. The former "Planned" category was renamed to "Pending" and was kept as "Short Term Available." The "Approved" category was changed to "Immediately Available."

Ms. Clark also explained that the categories from the MarketPointe database (LandTracker) that make up the "Pending" and "Approved" codes were modified to reflect suggested changes from the Task Force. Previously, only projects that were in LandTracker's "Planning" and "Specific Plan" designations went into the "Pending" category. The "Tentative Approval" designation, which was formerly in the "Approved" section, was moved into the "Pending" category. The "Approved" section now only includes "Final Map" and "Final Approval" designations. The new codes were provided as a handout.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, asked for clarification about "Tentative Approval." Susan Baldwin, SANDAG, stated that "Tentative Approval" indicated that a project had a Tentative Map approved.

Mr. Batchelder also stated that some of the timelines in the "Pending" category were aggressive; that there are projects in the "Planning" and "Specific Plan" stages that will not be developed in one to three years and that large Master Plan communities will take substantially longer. Mr. Batchelder commented that environmental mitigation requirements could add delays to the development timeframe. Mr. Cox stated that the project does not necessarily have to develop in that timeframe but that the opportunity to develop in the timeframe exists.

Mr. Batchelder indicated that the timeframes make sense for small-scale developments; however, large-scale Master Plan-type communities will have a longer timeframe for development because of mitigation and infrastructure requirements. Cynthia Haas, City of Carlsbad, suggested having another category timeframe for large-scale Master Plan-type developments. Mr. Batchelder suggested that for large scale developments in the "Development Pipeline," projects in the "Planning" and "Specific Plan" stages would have a timeframe longer than three years, and projects in the "Tentative Approval" stage would have a timeframe of one to three years. Ms. Haas commented that Master Plan communities usually take ten or more years before the first development occurs because merchant builders may begin the development process after the approval of the Master Plan.

Mr. Cox suggested that Master Plan communities or developments larger than 500 acres in the "Pending" category would have a timeframe of "Long-Term" (3 or more years). Matt Adams, BIA, suggested an additional category within "Pending" for Environmental Review, since Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) can take up to 48 months. Mr. Cox said that the LandTracker data did not have the level of detail required to distinguish whether a project had completed an EIR or not.

Mr. Batchelder agreed with the timeframes but suggested further discussion and information would be needed to set an appropriate parcel size cut-off point, as something as small as 100 acres could fit the criteria. Mr. Batchelder also stated that large-scale developments fall into the "Immediately Available" (1 year or less) category when they have reached "Final Approval" or "Final Map."

Mr. Cox verified with the Task Force that large-scale developments that are in the "Planning" and "Specific Plan" stage fall into the "Long-Term Available" (3 or more years) timeframe, large-scale developments in the "Tentative Map" stage fall into the "Short-Term Available" (1 to 3 years) timeframe and large-scale developments in the "Final Map" and "Final Approval" stage fall into the "Immediately Available" (1 year or less) timeframe. Mr. Cox would like to find an exact size cut-off point for projects to fall into the "large scale development" pipeline.

Mr. Cox asked how many parcels are actually "large-scale developments." Mr. Batchelder stated that most of Chula Vista's vacant lands are designated Master Planned communities according to the Series 12 Regional Growth Forecast: about 1,300 acres.

Mr. Cox stated that staff would look at the definitions provided with the LandTracker data to determine how to categorize large-scale developments. It was requested to circulate these determinations prior to the next Residential Land Inventory Task Force meeting.

Barbara Redlitz, City of Escondido, asked if the sphere of influence should be included in the inventory process. Mr. Cox stated that most information in the SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast includes the sphere of influence and it would be included as well.

AGENDA ITEM #3: CLASSIFYING REDEVELOPMENT IN THE DRAFT CODING SCHEME

Mr. Cox stated that special attention should be drawn to redevelopment and infill projects because vacant land is become increasingly scarce and it is possible that a substantial amount of redevelopment and infill land exists.

Mr. Adams suggested that infill projects and redevelopment projects could take even longer because "community receptivity" could lead to significant pushback during the planning process.

Andrew Poat, EDC, said that his organization is interested in the infill and redevelopment potential because of the push towards Smart Growth and mixed-use projects. Mr. Poat stated that they would be interested in advocating for more infill and redevelopment projects and suggesting policy to update infrastructure to make these projects possible.

Mr. Cox suggested that there is a need to classify redevelopment differently; to identify parcels that are not in a Redevelopment Area and those that are. It is also important to note that the timeframes associated with these two different types of redevelopment could be different, since Redevelopment Agencies act as advocates for redevelopment projects and can help facilitate the "community receptivity" issue described by Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams suggested that downtown San Diego could be used as an example of Redevelopment Areas' ability to quickly facilitate redevelopment projects. Initially, downtown San Diego had very few people living there and redevelopment projects were processed easily. Today, however, more people live in downtown San Diego and there is less community receptivity for redevelopment projects. Mr. Adams anticipates more pushback and greater resistance for redevelopment projects in the future.

Mr. Cox suggested that market forces will steer developers towards redevelopment potential and Redevelopment Areas that have less community resistance and that, in the future, could then prevent projects from stalling due to resistance.

Mr. Poat stated that EDC's view is that developers avoid redevelopment and Redevelopment Areas because of poor infrastructure and the costs associated with improving infrastructure to make redevelopment projects happen. Mr. Poat noted that Smart Growth areas might need to be targeted for infrastructure improvements to facilitate redevelopment. Mr. Poat emphasized the need to encourage redevelopment in Smart Growth areas to coincide with transit strategies and transit corridors.

Mr. Adams suggested a more global discussion about redevelopment timeframes because of a host of issues ranging from infrastructure to community receptivity to local jurisdiction requirements and market influences.

Mr. Cox re-emphasized the need to distinguish between redevelopment, infill projects, and Redevelopment Areas. Mr. Batchelder stated that redevelopment in a Redevelopment Area would not necessarily be faster and should stay in the "Long-Term Available" (3 or more years) category.

Ms. Haas said that redevelopment in a Redevelopment Area could be developed sooner as long as the developer accepts the plans for the project at the site and asks for little public assistance. Mr. Cox clarified that the parcels that do not have plans or proposals associated with them yet. A parcel in a redevelopment area that has a proposal or plan would be captured in the "Development Pipeline" under the "Redevelopment" category.

The Task Force agreed that placing infill, underutilized, and Redevelopment Areas into the "Long-Term Available" category was reasonable.

AGENDA ITEM #4: REVIEW OF SOUTH BAY MAPS AND INFORMATION

Ms. Clark led the team in reviewing example maps: one from Imperial Beach and two from Chula Vista. The maps showed the different Market Status codes of the selected areas.

Andrew Gordon, SANDAG, explained the map codes and color scheme, and that the final maps will not show as many codes because some will be combined. The codes shown on the maps are intended for Task Force members to see the different classifications and determine which are most important and should be shown on the final publication.

Ms. Clark asked the Task Force members which codes could be collapsed on the maps or expanded. Ms. Clark also asked if the maps should differentiate between parcels in redevelopment areas and infill redevelopment.

Mr. Batchelder stated that for capacity reasons <u>it would be beneficial to differentiate by color between Redevelopment Areas and infill redevelopment on the maps</u>. Mr. Adams stated that it makes it easier for the development community to know where Redevelopment Areas are because developers can work off the Master EIR for the Redevelopment Area and would be more likely to target those areas.

Ms. Haas asked what the purpose was for having "Development Pipeline" projects shown on the map because they will be developed. Mr. Cox stated that it is because they are in the process of developing and that there still is the possibility that another developer could purchase the land and/or the plans for the site.

Ms. Baldwin suggested that not all redevelopment parcels may be long-term, some smaller parcels could develop in less than three years, and placing all redevelopment in the "Long-Term Available" timeframe captures those parcels incorrectly. Mr. Adams stated that most parcels would be long-term except a few, but there is no way to distinguish which are long-term and which are short-term.

Ms. Redlitz asked for clarification about the different codes on the map. Mr. Batchelder explained that the codes reflect what is on the ground, not zoning conformity. As in the Imperial Beach map example, multifamily housing is dispersed among single family homes, reflecting an opportunity to change land use from single family to multifamily, allowing redevelopment or infill projects to convert single family homes to multifamily.

Mr. Batchelder explained that in the Chula Vista map example, a Master Planned community had an approved Final Map two years ago, but infrastructure and grading permits are still ongoing and subdivision of the parcels into individual lots has yet to occur. Mr. Batchelder used the map to illustrate that large-scale developments require longer than three years before the first unit is developed.

Ms. Clark reviewed the tables with the Task Force members. Ms. Clark explained that the maps will have fewer codes and colors and the tables will have the maximum detail showing all status codes and categories. Mr. Cox explained the final publication will have both maps and tables, the tables will have full detail, and the maps will show the different timeframes and development status categories.

Ms. Redlitz suggested collapsing developed single family and developed multifamily on the maps into one category since the land has no availability for further development. Michael Schuerman suggested keeping it for the sake of context and reference. Mark Brunette, City of Santee, agreed it would be good to distinguish between multi-family and single family for the job-housing balance aspect of the project.

AGENDA ITEM #5: ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT STEPS:

Several requests were made to move the next Residential Land Inventory meeting, which was originally scheduled for April 9, 2009, at 9:30 a.m., to another date due to Spring Break for many students and the Easter holiday. It was tentatively agreed upon by the group to move the date to April 16, 2009. *(NOTE: The Task Force meeting date is now confirmed for Tuesday, April 14, 2009, at 1:30 p.m.)*