



**NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Corrected Minutes: April 17, 2012 – 6:30 PM**  
<http://www.northparkplanning.org>  
**2901 NORTH PARK WAY, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR**

**I. Called to order: 6:31 p.m.**

**II. Members in attendance (15):** Rene Vidales, Cheryl Dye, Vicki Granowitz, Carl Moczydlowsky, Lucky Morrison, Dang Nguyen (late 6:46, left 8:17), Brandon Hilpert, Peter Hill, Rick Pyles, David Cohen, Dionne Carlson, Robert Barry, Roger Lewis (late 6:58), Omar Passons (left 8:17), Steven Wiliamson

**III. Modifications to & Adoption of the 01/17/12 Agenda.**

- Pull Alabama Road Lumps from the Consent Agenda

**MOTION TO ADOPTDA: Dye/Carlson 13-0-0 (Lewis, Nguyen Not Present)**

**IV. Chair's Report/CPC**

- Lori Zapf, District 6 Councilmember, Chair of LUHC of City Council attended. 6-7 CPCs have asked her to take on the utility box issue. Betsy McCoullough (ex-deputy director of community planning) is reviewing council policies to be updated or consistent with the general plan. CPC subcommittee is working with Betsy to review sections in respect to CPGs and Parks and Recreation.
- Rob Steppke was reappointed to the Balboa Park Committee
- Election Issue/Bylaw Update – City attorney update from Marlon in May. Updates to the bylaws following the election is necessary. Rob Steppke, Beth Swersie, Vicki Granowitz and Rene Vidales are forming a subcommittee to update the bylaws.

**V. Approval of Previous NPPC Minutes:**

- February 21, 2012 – Modification of January minutes is not possible since they were submitted by Christy Scannell **MOTION Hill/Hilpert 11-0-3 (Moczydlowsky, Williamson, Passons abstaining)**
- March 20, 2012 – **Motion to approve as modified: Hilpert/Carlson 12-1-2 (Cohen voting no, Passons and Williamson abstaining, not seated on the board)**

**VI. Treasurer's Report.**

1. Balance \$647.02

**VII. Planner's Report - Marlon Pangilinan 619.235.5293; [mpangilinan@sandiego.gov](mailto:mpangilinan@sandiego.gov)**

- Update Community Plan Process; No report
- Dye – emailed Marlon regarding questions on the community plan update.
  - Will the specific elements be presented in May along with their respective outlines?
  - Will the Plan organize guidelines by neighborhood or by the entire community?
  - Will the Plan propose Overlay Zones?
  - What scope will the Economic Prosperity element cover? The Manual leaves that wide open.

## VII. Announcements & Non Agenda Public Comment

- **North Park Main Street** - Nominated and sat new board members. Meeting times are unchanged. Approved a budget for marketing for the festival of the arts. Had a presentation on Jack-in-the-Box. Looking to change trash updates. Business owners are looking to form a security patrol – agendize for a future larger presentation. Continue to work on validation and a list of businesses associated with parking issues.
- **NPCA** – Bird Park Concerts are coming and are looking for fundraising and volunteers; Annual elections are coming up at 3090 Polk (at Illinois) on April 25th – accepting candidates.
- **Mayor’s Budget Briefing April 18 Herbert Hoover HS & May 1 Kearny HS** [www.sandiego.gov](http://www.sandiego.gov)
- **SOHO Twilight Tour and Reception April 20 - 6-8 pm ]**
- **MISSION HILLS HERITAGE Saturday, April 21, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.** - “Cradle to Grave,” a docent-led walking tour hosted by Mission Hills Heritage (MHH), Tour explores the core area of Mission Hills in its infancy, 100 years ago, includes a nursery ,school, church, cemetery, century-old homes. Tickets are \$10 for MHH members; \$15 for non-members. Info & starting location e-mail [info@missionhillsheritage.org](mailto:info@missionhillsheritage.org) or phone (619) 497-1193.
- **Prop B Debate Comprehensive Pension Reform Initiative Reform or Fiscal Debate April 26, 7:30 & 8:30 pm Joyce Beers Community Center 3900 Vermont Ave** [lindaperine@yahoo.com](mailto:lindaperine@yahoo.com) for more info.
- **Committee of 100 – preservation group in Balboa Park. Annual Meeting May 25, 2012, 11:30-1:30.**
- **Adam Cook** - Bluefoot Bar CUP participated in a conflict resolution with neighbors and will be putting out a quarterly newsletter for continued work with the neighbors.
- **Carlson** – Saturday and Sunday is the Adams Avenue unplugged, in Normal Heights and Kensington. Saturday the 21st is the Kensington (and behi) garage sale.
- **Vidales** – Governing magazine top 10 that will be built - 3rd port of entry at Otay. Top 5 that will never be built – CAHSR

## IX. Elected Official Reports

- **Katherine Fortner, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congressional District 53,** [Katherine.Fortner@mail.house.gov](mailto:Katherine.Fortner@mail.house.gov) - voted against the FY13 Budget Proposal and supported the democratic proposal instead. Supporting numerous grants and initiatives. Accepting submissions for congressional art competition for high school students. Deadline is April 27th for entries.
- **Lindsey Masukawa, Hon. Toni Atkins, State Assembly District 76,** [Lindsey.Masukawa@asm.ca.gov](mailto:Lindsey.Masukawa@asm.ca.gov) - looking for support for the middle class scholarship act for families that fall just outside of FAFSA and Pell grants. Distributed a flyer on how to lobby for or against bills. Community coffee at Lestats June 21 at 5:00pm. Tax filing assistance available. Budget is ~\$1B more than anticipated. May revise on budget.
- **Anthony Bernal, Hon. Todd Gloria, Councilmember District 3** [ABernal@sandiego.gov](mailto:ABernal@sandiego.gov) - Opened Jefferson Elementary joint use facility. May 18th budget hearing followed by Council review. Redevelopment oversight committee has been established - next Wednesday is the first meeting. Bike to work day is in May, dovetails with new Bike Corrals.
  - Lewis – would like to know the process for oversight and accessibility for community members for specific line items that impact specific projects or community.

## X. Subcommittee Reports

- A. Urban Design/Project Review, Robert Barry, Cheryl Dye - NP Adult Community Center, 6:00pm 1st Monday. Next meeting May 7, 2012** – Discussed Plaza de Panama issues. Carlson residence is an action item.

B. **Public Facilities/Public Art, Dionne Carlson, Rene Vidales – NP Adult Community Center, 6:00 pm, 2nd Wednesday. Next meeting May 9, 2012** – discussed roads lumps, bumps, humps. North Park gateway and entry monument– Omar to lead effort. Also discussed Plaza de Panama.

C. **Utility Boxes, Cheryl Dye, Dang Nguyen - meetings on an as needed basis** – working with Councilmember Gloria to have issue agendized on LUHC. May 9<sup>th</sup> the utility box issue will be on the LUHC agenda. Councilmember Lightner has asked the City Attorney to look into additional funding options for undergrounding.

#### XI. Liaisons Reports

- **Balboa Park Committee - Rob Steppke:** Did not meet in April. Will be taking action on Plaza de Panama at May 3rd meeting.
- **Maintenance Assessment District - Lucky Morrison: Met April 9th** – Lucky elected chair, Beth Swersie is secretary. Looked at moving trash pickup to weekends. Discussed manning booth at upcoming festival of the arts. Discussed additional tree planting and reductions of tree trimming. Switzer Canyon funding to be repositioned to the MAD.
- **NP Mini Park - Roger Lewis/Vicki Granowitz:** Concern about funding and the general development have been expressed. Park and Recreation does not have ownership. Real Estate assets has ownership. Permitting an event at the mini-park would have to go through Real Estate. Issues regarding permits for an event would need non-toxic paint assurances. Tree selection for the park is an issue. Planters being labeled Storm Drain Planters may be an issue – called that for potential funding options. General Development Plan is going forward. Issue could come before the Park & Rec Board could be included on an agenda possibly on consent.

#### XII. Consent Agenda

Alabama Street road lumps pulled from Consent and moved to Action Item A.

#### XIII. Action Items

- A. Proposal to install three road lumps on the 3500 block of Alabama Street. Signed petition indicates residents representing approximately 82% of the property frontage and neighboring properties along the subject portion of the street are in support of this proposal. (Members PF/PA 4/11/12: Carlson, Vidales, Morrison, Hill, Passons, Williamson, Bonn, Callen) **MOTION: To support the speed lumps on Alabama Street from Upas St. to Dwight St. as proposed in the 82% petition approval sketch, with the exception that the southerly lump be located outside of narrow property frontages, as long as the overall lump system is efficient for traffic calming purposes. Carlson/Cohen 15-0-0**
- B. **Carlson Residence # 274225, 2330 29th St located in the canyon.** SDP for a 2200 sf house on a 1700 sf lot, 2 levels, below allowed height limits, 2-car carport, 15 cu yds. will be removed. Access is by a walkway of natural materials. SDFD approved the house since it will be sprinklered, along with 1-hour walls and 20 minute windows; is sensitive to the canyon with a small retaining wall. The existing pecan & oak trees will remain; native plants will be used to reduce fire risk & will be in conformance with City Policies on steep hillsides. Applicant agreed to meet with adjacent neighbors on site. (4/2/12 UDPR Barry, Dye, Bonn, Callen, Granowitz, Hill, Pyles)
- a. Randy Hanna Architects, Hanna, Gabriel, Wells - Presenting. Owner's intent to do a low impact canyon home. Design evolved around saving large trees. Majority of the windows face the canyon, privacy for owners and neighbors. Quite a bit lower than existing grade of the surrounding houses. Concrete siding and zinc roof for muted color plan to mimic the canyons.

- b. Lewis – concerned that we don't have the final assessment letter and the mitigation for the environmentally sensitive lands, water run-off, etc. Hard to vote on issues without these items completed. Canyon oversight committee is frustrated with the decision process and lack of oversight to the city process
- c. Cohen – is there a variance required. No but a site development permit due to the environmentally sensitive lands (steep hillsides).
- d. Carlson – many of the issues were vetted at the sub-committee level including grading and species issues.
- e. Moczydlowsky – is there a schedule impact? A – unknown
- f. Dye – are you okay with tabling? A – Unknown but it will cause additional cost to the owner.

**Motion: To support approval of the SDP and the project based upon the design's environmental sensitivity, the specimen trees shown in current plans being retained, and native plants being used to meet the requirements for steep hillsides. Hilpert/Carlson 12-3-0 (Moczydlowsky/Lewis/Williamson voting no)**

**C. Plaza de Panama, Circulation & Parking Structure Project SDP - Chair recused and left the meeting due to voting on this issue on another board (Chair steps down turns meeting over to Vice Chair Vidales)**

- a. City staff needs the Planning committee to vote on the Plaza de Panama SDP. Get historical committee actions from Rene. Urban Design subcommittee and Public Facilities has provided a proposed motion to the board.

**MOTION: Following nearly two years of attending the applicant's presentations, studying, analyzing and debating the Proposed Plaza de Panama, Circulation and Parking Structure Project, The North Park Planning Committee finds the following:**

**1) Per the General Plan Land Use element, Sec LU-D.10, the proposed Plan Amendments must be "consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan and Community Plan" NPPC finds that there are basic inconsistencies with existing goals and policies adopted within the City's General Plan, Balboa Park Master Plan and Central Mesa Precise Plan, as outlined in detail in NPPC's March 14, 2012 letter to Mayor Sanders. Key issues include:**

- a. An intrusive bypass bridge and road in non-compliance with the General Plan's Historic Preservation, Urban Design, and Recreation Elements in terms of historic preservation goals
- b. Excessive and unnecessary grading and use of retaining walls and other elements
- c. Overtly project-specific amendments which jeopardize future approval of superior alternatives should the proposed project not go forward
- d. Inappropriate use of the plan amendment process for fundamental land use changes that merit comprehensive plan updates.
- e. Introducing parking fees at the Organ Pavilion parking garage that will create significant impacts to the surrounding no-fee parking lots;
- f. Creating substantial general fund liabilities for City taxpayers to repay the parking garage bonds if the project's estimated parking garage occupancy levels of 77% cannot be sustained.

**2) Proposed circulation and parking designs are in conflict with current regional park best practices which encourage relocation of centralized parking and related traffic to the park's exterior, combined with investment in Traffic Demand Management techniques within the park's interior**

3) The three findings required by Municipal Code 126.0504 for any project to be approved or conditionally approved for a Site Development Permit (SDP) cannot be made to justify the project's adverse impacts, specifically related to historic resources

a. The proposed project will adversely affect the applicable land use plan(s). The applicant's SDP findings fail to acknowledge the General Plan's applicability to the project and thus fail to acknowledge non-compliance with the General Plan's Historic Preservation, Urban Design, and Recreation element goals, as has been concluded by City staff and documented in the Draft EIR.

b. The proposed project will be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare by increasing pedestrian and vehicle conflicts in the Alcazar Garden and Cabrillo Bridge/new bypass road intersection, and by relocating existing disabled parking from the Plaza de Panama to more than 800 feet away from the museum core

c. The proposed project will not comply with Land Development Code regulations (Chapters 11, 12, 13, and 14) because it will cause significant unmitigable impacts to historic resources and does not qualify for a deviation from Historical Resources Regulations under §143.0260(c).

For these reasons the North Park Planning Committee opposes the proposed Balboa Park Master Plan Amendment, Central Mesa Precise Plan Amendment, Site Development Permit and Balboa Park Plaza de Panama Circulation and Parking Structure Project. Vidales/Lewis 11-1-0 (Cohen voting no, Granowitz recused)

**Chair rejoins Board & conducts meeting.**

**D. The Brown Act** - The Brown Act requires that the NPPC doesn't engage in serial meetings, reply all is one way to avoid violations. Public speaking also requires that you indicate that you are speaking as an individual but indicate that you are a member of the NPPC.

**E. Jack in the Box Update - Roger Lewis:** Waiting for the final assessment letter with the notice on the CDP hearing. JIB held a community meeting. Existing lease has seven years remaining; they have four additional five-year renewal options.

#### **XIV. Unfinished & Future Agenda Items**

- Cohen wants regular updates on proposed changes to the NPPC Bylaw.
  - a. Chair confirms that is the plan & is consistent with model used during last bylaw update.
- Dye –would like the Community Plan Update as an Action Item.

#### **XV. Next Meeting Date: May 15, 2012**

#### **XVI. MOTION to ADJOURN: Vidales/Granowitz 13-0-0 (left). Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.**

Submitted by: Carl Moczydlowsky

## **Questions Submitted (By Cheryl Dye) On Behalf Of the NPPC Regarding The Greater North Park Community Plan Update's Structure & Scope & Marlon's Responses**

### **A. March 8, 2012 - Questions to Marlon via email**

Based on Kelly Broughton's Feb 29 email, the NPPC now has an updated timeframe for the NPCPU process. However, we have not yet received any information related to the Plan's proposed structure or content. I and others have some questions regarding the timing and coordination of the development of the Com. Plan Update's elements, policies, strategies and prioritizations. It appears from Mr. Broughton's email that NPPC will be receiving City presentations regarding the "Land Use/Zoning Maps" and "Zoning Implementation Program" in April/May and September, respectively. *But we will not be receiving the actual Draft Plans until February 2013 - some 12 months from now.* Our concern is that the NPPC have the opportunity to weigh in on the *basic structure and components* of the Plan prior to getting too far down the road with a *Draft Plan* that it creates hardship for either the Board or staff to make structural or strategic modifications. We would like to take advantage of this 12 month timeframe to get a jump on our review and input. But to do that we need some upfront information.

We would like to ask the City to provide the NPPC the following info:

1. Clarification regarding the **Plan's structure**: i.e. will it include Goals/Objectives/Actions? Accountable parties? Action Item Timeframes? Required/Available Resources?
2. A copy of the **proposed Index of GNPCPU Elements** with a definition/scope for each (there was a lot of workshop discussion regarding how the elements were to be broken out - e.g. Conservation? Sustainability? Neither -with sustainability measures integrated throughout all the elements?; Parks and recreation? Public Facilities/ Parks? Recreation? Open space? Arts and culture? Arts, culture and entertainment? Economic Prosperity?)
3. A general **outline of each element's content including key proposed policies/strategies**

*Is this info currently available? If not, how soon do you think it could be made available? Could a presentation be made at the April NPPC meeting?*

While this has been an ongoing concern, a recent discussion regarding *integration of the Sustainable North Park Main Street (SNPMS) implementation program guidelines into the NPCPU framework* has prompted this specific request. An SNPMS ad hoc committee is just beginning the process of coordinating SNPMS policy with future NPCPU policy. However it is apparent that we need the items listed above in order to proceed. (Having the requested info would also be helpful for other ongoing strategic planning efforts, such as the utility box undergrounding project, potentially the NPMS public art strategic planning effort, etc.)

---

### **Marlon's responses to Mr. 8 questions**

1. **Clarification regarding the Plan's structure: i.e. will it include Goals/Objectives/Actions? Accountable parties? Action Item Timeframes? Required/Available Resources?**  
The format of the Community Plan Updates (CPU) will be based primarily on the Community Plan Update Preparation Manual. Accountable parties, action item timeframes, resources, etc. will be found in the Implementation Section at the end of each plan. For all our CPU's it is our desire to standardize their format so that they follow the General Plan, are consistent, and allow for usability. However, we can and plan to accommodate elements such as an "Arts and Culture Element" to capture topics that are of concern to each individual community. For example the Draft Barrio Logan Community Plan Update includes an Arts and Culture Element. The following are links to the Draft Barrio Logan and Draft Otay Mesa Community Plan Updates that should give you an idea regarding the plan format:  
  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/barriologanupdate/>  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/otaymesa/cpu/documents/>
2. **A copy of the proposed Index of GNPCPU Elements with a definition/scope for each (there was a lot of workshop discussion regarding how the elements were to be broken out - e.g. Conservation? Sustainability? Neither -with sustainability measures integrated throughout**

**all the elements?; Parks and recreation? Public Facilities/ Parks? Recreation? Open space? Arts and culture? Arts, culture and entertainment? Economic Prosperity?**

Previously, I've provided a listing of how the existing Greater North Park Community Plan elements translate to the elements in the General Plan (*See Below*). When we go out to the community this May to validate Plan Land Use we can present these again along with definitions and the scope of each element so that the community has an opportunity to confirm the listing.

3. **A general outline of each element's content including key proposed policies/strategies. Is this info currently available? If not, how soon do you think it could be made available? Could a presentation be made at the April NPPC meeting?**

We are in the process of outlining as well as drafting goals for each of the elements for all three CPU's so this information is not currently available yet. However, we intend to have this information to present at the May meeting.

In relation to the Sustainable North Park Main Street Project and other strategic planning efforts, my understanding is that main objective was to determine what and how the ideas in each of these efforts translate into community plan language. This can still occur without regard to a formal community plan format structure, because these ideas would either be translated into goals or recommendations.

---

### Existing GNPCPU Elements and Corresponding General Plan Elements

2008 General Plan Element	Existing 1988 Greater North Park Community Plan Elements	Corresponding 2008 General Plan Elements
Land Use & Community Planning Element (LUE)	Housing Element	LUE
Mobility Element (ME)	Commercial Element	LUE/EPE
Urban Design Element (UDE)	Transportation & Circulation Element	ME
Economic Prosperity Element (EPE)	Community Facilities Element	PFFSE
Public Facilities, Services & Safety Element (PFSSE)	Park & Recreation Element	RE
Recreation Element (RE)	Open Space Element	RE
Conservation Element (CE)	Conservation Element	CE
Noise Element (NE)	Cultural & Heritage Resources Element	HPE
Historic Preservation Element (HPE)	Urban Design Element	UDE

#### B. Questions asked of Marlon at the March 20, 2012 NPPC Meeting<sup>1</sup>

1. Will the **specific elements** be presented in May along with their respective outlines?
  2. Will the Plan organize **guidelines by neighborhood or by the entire community?**
  3. Will the Plan propose **Overlay Zones?**
  4. **What scope will the Economic Prosperity element cover?** The Manual leaves that wide open.
- 

#### C. March 25, 2012 - Questions to Marlon via email

<sup>1</sup> NPPC requested to submit questions in writing

1. The City's Community Plan Process Manual (CPPM) requires an Existing Conditions report be prepared as the foundation for preparing updated Plan goals, objectives, and actions, and indicates that *the Draft Existing Conditions report will be presented at a Public Workshop and to the NPPC.* **When is the Draft Existing Conditions report planned to be presented?**
2. **Will the Existing Conditions Report identify all relevant Greater North Park and neighborhood/special district "legacy" plans and policies** (e.g. land use, urban design, mobility, public facilities, historic designations, redevelopment, sustainability, etc.) **will it address how these existing documents will inform proposed new plans and policies?**<sup>2</sup>
3. The CPPM calls for the preparation of a *Draft Outline for each Plan Element, and for identification of sections (topics/issues) that will be included within each element early in the Plan's development process (prior to drafting the plan).* **We understand that staff will bring the Draft Land Use and Zoning plans, as well as a Draft listing of specific Plan Elements and their respective goals to the NPPC this May. Will the May presentation include an outline of the proposed sections within each Element? If not, when will a Draft outline of Element sections be available?**
4. **Will the May presentation lay out a process and schedule for NPPC and general public feedback concerning proposed Elements, goals, and sections (topics)?**
5. *The CPPM calls for the Urban Design Element to include a "Distinct Neighborhoods" section describing neighborhood characteristics, identifying potential conservation areas, and providing design policies and guidelines (e.g. "pedestrian improvements, streetscaping, landscaping, alleys, parking, building design"). "Design Guidelines may be organized by area, neighborhood or as overall community guidelines."* **Does the City plan to organize GNP Design Guidelines by area or neighborhood, or communitywide only?**<sup>3</sup>
6. The CPPM states *"Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones (CPIOZ) are an optional tool to provide additional design guidelines for potential village areas or commercial corridors. Coordination with the code update staff of DSD should begin early to identify if special zoning is needed to implement design recommendations."* **Will the CPIOZ option be discussed as part of the land use/ zoning maps presentation in May? Are Overlay Zones currently envisioned?** (e.g. for guidelines related to NP Urban Village?; NPMS BID?; El Cajon Blvd BID? 30<sup>th</sup> Street corridor? Courtyard Residential? Public Art District? Public Spaces/ Pocket Parks? Urban Agriculture? )
7. The CPPM allows for the Economic Prosperity Element to be a "stand-alone element or part of the Land Use Element", and identifies topics to include: "commercial areas, industrial areas, business improvement, and other (eg redevelopment, employment, visitor services)." **We understand that Economic Prosperity will be a stand-alone element of the NP Plan. The scope of the Economic Prosperity element is minimally defined. Consistent with #2, will the NPPC receive an outline of proposed sections for this Element in May?** We would like to get a general idea of what level of strategic planning and action items are envisioned within this context. **Also, what form of targeted outreach is planned to local business, business associations, realtors, and developers/investors, as well as to relevant City resources such as Small Business Office, permitting, code enforcement, law enforcement, San Diego Arts Commission, and others?**
8. **Will the North Park Pilot Pedestrian Plan prepared by the City be integrated into the CPU?**

---

<sup>2</sup> (As you know, a listing of "Legacy Design Plans, Projects and Advisories" was previously developed and submitted by NPPC member Roger Lewis. Also, in 2010 I prepared a comprehensive Community Profile for NPMS that encompasses Greater North Park as well as the NPMS BID district. While now somewhat dated, this profile covers a broad range of "existing conditions" information, including planning and development guidelines, that might be of interest, and is available on the NPMS website. The Sustainable NPMS Plan is now complete and also available. Mr. Lewis' inventory of relevant reports and the Table of Contents for the GNP Community Profile are attached FYI)

<sup>3</sup> These guidelines may include the following topics: Pedestrian movement; sidewalk styles; Street furniture; sidewalk cafes; Alleys; Parking areas; Street landscaping (parkways, medians; gateways); Design examples and graphics



**(New) GNPCPU Elements Matrix: Potential Elements Per Workshops**

<b>2008 GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS PER MARLON'S LIST</b>	<b>CORRESPONDING 1988 NPCP ELEMENTS</b>	<b>POTENTIAL 2012 NPCP ELEMENTS - PER NPCPU WORKSHOPS</b>
Land Use and Community Planning Element	Housing Element; AND Commercial Element	Land Use Element
Mobility Element	Transportation/Circulation Element	Mobility Element
Urban Design Element	Urban Design Element	Urban Design Element <sup>4</sup>
Economic Prosperity	Commercial Element AND Land Use Element	Economic Prosperity Element
Public Facilities, Services & Safety Element	Community Facilities Element	Parks & Public Facilities Element? Parks & Open Space Element?
Recreation Element	Parks & Recreation Element; AND Open Space Element	Recreation Element? Parks & Recreation Element?
Conservation Element	Conservation Element	Conservation Element which includes Sustainability strategies?? Two separate Conservation and Sustainability Elements? Conservation Element only and weave sustainability strategies throughout all elements?
Noise Element	<i>None</i>	
Historic Preservation Element	Cultural & Heritage Resources Element	Cultural & Heritage Element which includes Historic Preservation? Cultural Element and separate Historic Preservation Element?
		Arts & Culture Element? Arts, Culture & Entertainment Element? <sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Will the Urban Design Element recommend strategies community wide or by neighborhood?

<sup>5</sup> Will the Arts Element recommend strategies community wide or by neighborhood?