

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE JANUARY 2009 LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AS RECOMMENDED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON APRIL 15, 2009

Changes proposed by the Planning Commission at its April 25, 2009 hearing are shown in stikeout (deleted text) and double underline (added or revised text).

1. Reduce General Plan residential buildout while meeting 2014 housing objectives.

Recommendations:

- 1.1 Modify the Proposed General Plan Land Use map (Figure 2.1) and descriptions of Special Planning Areas to reduce the housing capacity surplus shown in Table 5.Y in the following ways. It is recommended that General Plan development capacity be reduced so as to show a surplus of no less than 35 to 50 dwelling units for the Extremely Low, Very Low, and Low Income household categories. Showing no or very little surplus in these categories will tend to raise questions by HCD as to whether the City can actually meet its fair share housing needs, with a focus on the City's development standards and the ability of developers to achieve maximum allowable densities. It is also recommended that the City not rely on use of underdeveloped parcels to meet fair share needs due to the difficulty of demonstrating the feasibility of developing affordable housing on such parcels.
 - a. Eliminate the proposed re-designation of vacant lands from High to Very High Density.
 - b. Re-designate the area proposed for Senior Housing south of City Hall to provide as a Special Planning Area, permitting half the site to be developed at medium density (0-9 du/ac) and the other half to be developed as Senior Housing (0-25 du/ac). Result: Reduce the buildout of this site from 491 dwelling units to 335 units.
 - c. Reduce the buildout of Special Planning Area D from 1,163 to 1,067 dwelling units as shown.

Special Planning Area D Land Use Concept	
Land Use	Acres
Institutional	14.83
Low Density Residential (0 to 4 du/ac)	80.27
High Density Residential (0 to 13 du/ac)	10.23
Park	4.95
Parking Structure	7.27
Parks / Open Space	55.09
Retail / Mixed Use	102.81
Roadway	2.22
Senior Citizen Housing (0 to 25 du/ac)	8.52
Trail	13.62
TOTAL	299.81

Special Planning Area D Residential Concept and Resulting Affordability						
	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Low Density				32	289	321
High Density				66	67	133
Very High Density (w/in Mixed Use)	100	100	200			400
Senior Housing	53	53	107			213

The net effect of these revisions on the affordability of future housing within Loma Linda will be as follows.

General Plan Residential Development Potential as Proposed April 2009					
	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
Existing Surplus, January 2009	149	149	176	4	606
Proposed Revisions					
335 units south of City Hall	-62	-61	-121	22	66
Reduce buildout of SPA D	-28	-28	-56	-18	-62
High Density on Cole Street	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed Surplus April 2009	59	60	-1	8	610

1.2 Revise the first paragraph under Section 2.2.7.4 to read as follows:

... The visual prominence, large size (299.81 acres), and multiple ownerships of this area require a comprehensive approach to its planning in order to accomplish a rational land use pattern. It has therefore been designated as a Special Planning Area.

1.3 Revise the Guiding Policy for Special Planning Area D under Section 2.2.7.4 to read as follows:

This area is intended to be characterized by horizontal and vertical mixed use developed along the frontages of Redlands Boulevard and California Street, including commercial, office, structured parking, and up to 400 very high density residential dwelling units. Religious assembly uses are also anticipated along Redlands Boulevard and California Street. (Also see the discussion regarding adaptive reuse of historic homes associated with the orange groves in the Community Design Element.)

If the existing school at the corner of Redlands Boulevard and California Street should cease to be used as an educational facility, then the possibility of adaptive reuse of the buildings for professional and medical offices, as well as low intensity commercial and

restaurant use, should be explored (also see adaptive reuse section in the Community Design Element).

Single-family residential uses should be placed towards the central, western, and southern portions of the Redlands Boulevard/California Street Special Planning Area, with multi-family development permitted toward the interior of the area as conceptually shown in Figure 2.3. New residential uses in proximity to existing, historical residential uses along Mission Road should be compatible in density and scale to the historic residential uses (although not necessarily the same), since the General Plan intends for these existing residences to remain. Overall, the pattern of land use should reflect the pattern and mix of uses identified in Figure 2.3.

The General Plan envisions establishment of a heritage park within the Redlands Boulevard/California Street Special Planning Area, providing passive recreational uses within an historic setting, consisting of examples of local historic architecture. This vision includes relocating historic homes into the park, and establishing a local heritage/cultural museum, as well as adapting the structures for use for civic and cultural events, as well as for use by local civic and cultural organizations.

The General Plan's vision for this area is a "livable, walkable community" with a high level of amenities for residents, such as parks, trails and paseos, and other recreational uses, exhibiting a high level of design quality. Another key concept for this area is development of a large, sports-oriented community park to assist Loma Linda in achieving its desired park acreage to population ratio.

1.4 Replace Table 2.B, Special Planning Area D Proposed Development Scenario, with the following table.

Land Use	Acres	Maximum Dwelling Units
Institutional	14.83	
Residential		
Low Density Residential (0 to 4 du/ac)	80.27	321
High Density Residential (0 to 13 du/ac)	10.23	133
Senior Citizen Housing (0 to 25 du/ac)	8.52	213
Park	4.95	
Parking Structure	7.27	
Parks / Open Space	55.09	
Retail / Mixed Use	102.81	400
Backbone Roadways	2.22	
Trails	13.62	
TOTAL	299.81	1,067

1.5 Replace Figure 2.3, Conceptual Development Scenario Special Planning D with the attached figure.

1.6 Revise Implementing Policy j for Special Planning Area D to read as follows:

j. Under no circumstances shall a residential structure or the residential portion of a mixed use structure be permitted to exceed 35 feet in height.

1.7 Revise Implementing Policy k for Special Planning Area D to read as follows:

k. The maximum allowable number of residential units within Special Planning Area D shall be 1,067.

1.8 Revise Implementing Policy q5 for Special Planning Area D to read as follows:

5. Under no circumstances shall a residential structure or the residential portion of a mixed use structure be permitted to exceed 35 feet in height.

1.9 Insert Text for Special Planning Area G to read as follows.

2.2.2.7 Special Planning Area G (South of City Hall)

This area consists of approximately 20 acres located south of City Hall between Loma Linda Drive and Mountain View Avenue. This area is intended to take advantage of the location of the Senior Center portion of the City Hall complex, and provide a transition between higher intensity uses to the north and single family neighborhoods to the south. Primary vehicular access to this area should be taken from Loma Linda Drive and Mountain View Avenue, with limited access from Lawton Avenue.

Guiding Policy for the South of City Hall Special Planning Area

The intended use for Special Planning Area G is a mix of medium density (0-9 du/ac) and senior citizen (0-25 du/ac) housing. It is intended that age-restricted senior housing be located within the interior and northern portions of the area, designed to provide direct pedestrian access to the City's Senior Center. Medium density housing is to be provided as a buffer to medium and low density neighborhoods to the west, east, and south.

Implementing Policies for Special Planning Area G

- a. Provide for development of approximately 10 acres each of Senior Housing (0-25 du/ac) and Medium Density (0-9 du/ac), with senior housing located within the interior and northern portions of the area, and provided with direct pedestrian access to the City's Senior Center. Medium density housing is to be provided as a buffer to medium and low density neighborhoods to the west, east, and south.
- b. Permit a maximum total of 335 dwelling units (652 people, assuming 2.44 persons per dwelling unit for medium density and 1.8 persons per dwelling unit for senior housing).
- c. Cluster parking areas away from street frontages to emphasize the pedestrian-oriented nature of onsite development.
- d. Limit all residential buildings to a maximum height of 35 feet.
- e. Senior housing and medium density residential development shall provide appropriate open space and recreation areas for the use of its residents.
- f. A minimum of 25 percent of the Special Planning Area shall be retained in open space.

1.10 Revise statistical tables and land use map(s) based on Planning Commission recommendations on 1.1 – 1.9, above.

2. Strengthen environmental and traffic impact mitigation policies:

- Increase recreational open space;
- Water supply (demonstrate supply and tie new project to availability);
- Biological resources;
- Flood management (specific standards);
- Parks; and
- Traffic.

Recommendation:

2.1 Add a new Implementing Policy to Section 9.2.10.6, Trails, to read as follows:

- e. Limit allowable on-trail activities to those that are consistent with protection of the environmental values of adjacent lands.

2.2 Revise Figure 9.2 to reflect South Hills trails system as proposed by the Trails Committee and adopted by the City Council.

2.3 Modify Implementing Policy 9.6.2 e to read as follows:

- e. Through the development review process, require that water supply capacity is available or will be available prior to approval of a development project. Do not approve projects for which assured water supply is not available.

2.4 Add new Implementing Policies to Section 9.4.4, Biological Resources, to read as follows:

- f. Require the landscape design of developments adjacent to areas of preserved biological resources to avoid the use of invasive species which could negatively impact the value of the preserved resource.
- g. Cooperate with the State and Federal agencies to encourage preserving streams and creeks in the south hills area in their natural state in order to maintain their value as percolation and recharge areas, natural habitat, scenic resources, and recreation corridors. Where such preservation is not technically and financially feasible, require appropriate mitigation for the loss or modification of a creek or stream.

2.5 Add a new Section 9.2.8.3 to the Open Space and Conservation Element to read as follows:

9.2.8.3 Landform Grading

- a. Blend cut-and fill slopes with existing natural contours to avoid tall manufactured slopes and steep embankments that could lead to soil erosion and silting of lower slopes.
- b. Require manufactured slopes shall be landform graded, except within bedrock, where manufactured slopes in excess of 10 vertical feet feasibly cannot be avoided. "Landform grading" is a contour grading method which creates artificial slopes with curves and varying slope ratios in the horizontal and vertical planes designed to simulate the appearance of surrounding natural terrain (as illustrated below). Grading plans shall identify which slopes are to be landform graded and which are to be conventionally graded.
- c. Design roadway improvements within hillside areas to be designed to minimize grading.

2.6 Modify the performance standard in Section 10.2.4.2. to read as follows:

Provide sufficient facilities development to protect structures designed for human occupancy and roadways identified as evacuation routes from inundation during the 100-year flood event. Do not approve projects where adequate flood protection to meet this standard is not available.

2.7 Modify the first bullet point under Implementation Measure 11.1 f to read as follows:

- Complete a recreational needs assessment inventory and update the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Ensure in this Master Plan that parks and recreation facilities are developed with facilities appropriate to all ages, including athletic fields, active play areas, passive open space, tot lots, and picnic areas. In addition, this Master Plan needs to provide for achieving the City objective of 2.5 acres of

neighborhood park land and 2.5 acres of community park land (5.0 acres total) per 1,000 population and for the distribution of park areas throughout the community, including, to the extent feasible, development of open space linkages between parks.

2.8 Add new Implementing Policies to Section 6.10.1 to read as follows:

- w. Place ultimate responsibility for mitigating the impacts of future growth and development, including construction of a new and widened roadways, as well as intersection improvements, with individual development projects. The City's Capital Improvements Program will be used primarily to address the impacts of the existing development, and to facilitate adopted economic development programs.
- x. Ensure that development projects pay applicable traffic mitigation fees and provide appropriate participation in relation to improvements for routes of regional significance.
- y. Within hillside areas, develop roads to standards appropriate to the character and topography of the area. In addition, provide for dispersion of traffic dispersion so as to prohibit direct alignment or new roadways with Whittier Avenue, Bryn Mawr Avenue, or Wellesley Avenue.

3. Resolve roadway improvement "concurrency" policies.


Recommendation:

3.1 Revise Implementing Policy c in Section 6.10.1 of the Transportation Element to read as follows:

- c. Where the payment of fees is accepted as mitigation in lieu of actual construction of physical improvements, such fee payment shall be considered to be adequate mitigation if, at the time of project approval, a public agency has programmed construction of the improvements needed to meet City LOS standards to commence at or prior to the time that the proposed project is anticipated to cause or contribute to the deterioration of traffic levels of service below City standards¹. Notwithstanding the above, developments impacting the California/Redlands, Benton/Barton, and Anderson/Redlands intersections or requiring the realignment of Orange Street shall be conditioned to require the provision of needed physical improvements rather than payment of fair share fees.

¹ Generally, this would be considered to be opening day of the project (first occupancy), unless a traffic study approved by the City identifies a later date.

² "Existing" levels of service and the level of service standard to be applied to the project is to be determined at the time an application is deemed complete and an initial study pursuant to the requirements of CEQA is prepared, and not at the time of project approval.



4. Provide for mitigation of impacts created by Loma Linda projects on roadway facilities maintained by other jurisdictions, including Caltrans facilities.

Recommendation:

4.1 Revise Intergovernmental Coordination and Community Involvement Program Section 11.2 b to read as follows:

b. Coordinate Transportation Planning and Facilities Funding

The City of Loma Linda will work with Caltrans, SANBAG, and the Cities of Colton, Redlands and San Bernardino to coordinate transportation facilities and facilities funding. Coordination efforts will include:

- Updating and providing information to other agencies on the status of development projects and roadway facilities;
- Encouraging and supporting the activities of San Bernardino County and Riverside County and cities to the east and south of Loma Linda to increase employment in their communities and thereby reduce the need for commuters to travel through Loma Linda on their way to the Los Angeles area;
- Coordinating revisions to the City's circulation and bicycle plans with regional circulation and planning efforts;
- Mutually requiring developments that are not subject to a local Nexus Study to provide mitigation for impacts created to another jurisdiction's local roadway system; and
- Working to establish a feasible sub-regional system for the payment of fees to Caltrans as mitigation for the impacts of new development on area freeways.

5. Provide for increased FAR (0.75) for hospitality uses in a way that will only apply at this time to proposed hotel on Redlands Boulevard (January 13, 2009 GPA).

Recommendation:

5.1 Modify Section 2.2.3.1 to read as follows:

The intent of the commercial designation is to provide for the shopping and commercial service needs of the residential community, the workers who are employed within Loma Linda, and those who visit the city, such as to receive health care. Examples of the intended nature of development within the commercial category include shopping centers, in-line shops, specialty shops, and stand-alone commercial uses. The Commercial land use designation also allows office uses and religious assembly uses to be incorporated into commercial development (e.g., offices in small storefronts, a cluster of office suites within a larger shopping center, or religious assembly uses in buildings originally designed for commercial uses) if the dominant character of the overall development remains commercial. The maximum allowable density for the Commercial designation is 0.5 FAR (0.75 for hotel uses as provided for in Implementing Policy 2.2.4.1 "c," below).

5.2 Modify Commercial/Office Implementing Policy "c" in Section 2.2.4.1 to read as follows:

- c. Encourage a greater variety of visitor/service commercial uses to better serve the community (e.g., hotels and extended-stay suites that include special event facilities to hold conventions, corporate events, weddings, etc., particularly along Redlands Boulevard, car wash/detailing facilities, service stations, etc.).
 - On sites where a proposed hotel facility cannot feasibly provide appropriate and desirable amenities and parking with an FAR of 0.50 or less, the City may permit an increase in the allowable floor area ratio up to a maximum FAR of 0.75, if the City determines that the resulting development would be compatible with surrounding existing and planned development.

5.3 Modify Section 11.1 a 5 to read as follows:

5. Revise the text of the zoning ordinance to reflect the provisions of the adopted General Plan in relation to the following issues:
 - Establish density standards in General Plan for low- and medium-density residential.
 - Modify zoning standards to reflect appropriate locations for churches and schools as set forth in the General Plan Land Use Element.
 - Establish zones and set standards for the South Hills, Business Park, Health Care, City Facilities, and Recreation land use designations which reflect standards set forth in the General Plan.
 - Establish provisions for the transfer of densities in relation to the development of the South Hills and adjacent bench area.
 - Amend Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.16 (Development Standards) to include design standards for new development established in the Community Design Element of the General Plan.
 - Develop standards for provision of amenities within multi-family development projects.
 - In the hillside zones, require implementation of fire protection measures, such as fire sprinklers and non-combustible roofing for the areas of high fire hazard.
 - Incorporate policies and measures implementing the E Street Locally Preferred Alternative in the zoning ordinance to provide incentives for sensitively designed higher intensity/density transit supportive developments within proximity of E Street Locally Preferred Alternative station(s). Potential

incentives may include density bonuses, floor area ratio increases, building height increases, reduced parking requirements with a parking study, and expedited review, as appropriate.

- Incorporate requirements for a discretionary City approval for increases in the maximum allowable floor area ration permitted in Commercial/Office Implementing Policy 2.2.4.1 c.

6. Ensure that the 1996 Hillside Initiative is properly incorporated, including correction of the 1996 Initiative boundary.

Recommendation:

6.1 Modify the Measure V text on Page 1-8 to read as follows:

On November 7, 2006, the voters of the City of Loma Linda passed Ballot Measure V. Measure V states that “the purpose and intent of this initiative measure is to amend the Loma Linda General Plan by the addition of a new growth management element designed to establish principles of managed growth that will preserve, enhance, and maintain the special quality of life valued by this community, including the protection of hillside areas, preservation of open space, and maintenance of safe, quiet residential areas so that future development within the City will occur in a way that promotes the social and economic well-being of the entire community.”

With the adoption of Measure V, Chapter 2A has been added to the 2006 General Plan. Additionally, the 2006 General Plan has been updated to maintain internal consistency with Measure V. Text from Measure V has been identified in this General Plan by using italicized text; any italicized text in this General Plan requires a vote of the people for amendment. In addition, General Plan text adopted in any other vote of the people (including, but not limited to, the City’s 1996 Hillside Initiative and Measure T) will be similarly shown in italicized text, indicated that it may only be amended by vote of the people of Loma Linda.

The comprehensive General Plan consists of a number of parts called elements. This approach provides for a systematic analysis of the community’s planning functions. It must be constantly remembered, however, that all of the elements are intricately woven together and a significant change in one could affect them all. Chapter 2A, “Growth Management Element,” augments and updates the provisions of this Planning Element with regard to land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, circulation, housing, and conservation and open space provisions. To the extent that any inconsistency exists, the provisions of Chapter 2A control. Any provision of this element that is inconsistent with any provision of Chapter 2A is null and void.

6.2 Add the following goal at the end of Page 2-2 in the Land Use Element:

- *Preserve and protect designated hillside areas in a portion of the south hills area of the City designated as “Hillside Conservation” on the General Plan Land Use Element Map.*

6.3 Modify Section 2.2.1.1 to read as follows:

2.2.1.1 Hillside Conservation (0 – 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres)

This category is intended to provide for very low density single-family residential homes in the Hillside Conservation Area. The allowable density for this category ranges from zero to one dwelling units per 10 acres with a potential bonus up to one dwelling unit per 5 acres where all of the following criteria are met. The maximum anticipated population for this designation is 2.4 persons per ten acres with a potential increase up to 2.4 persons per 5 acres where all of the following criteria are met.

- (1) *The project is clustered, provided that in no event shall a lot size less than 2.5 acres in size be permitted;*
- (2) *The City determines that, to the maximum extent feasible, all development, including roads and utility extensions, is kept off the north facing slopes of the hillsides, which comprise the prime view from Downtown Loma Linda;*
- (3) *The need for extensions of streets and other utilities and services is minimized;*
- (4) *Significant natural areas, view areas, and habitats are preserved and set aside as permanent open space and/or conservation areas; and*
- (5) *Provision is made for riding and hiking trails as called for by applicable City Plans.*

6.4 Include the following text as Implementing Policy 2.2.2 in the Land Use Element:

- e. *Provide the citizens of Loma with a choice of areas of varying densities and housing with a range of costs*

6.5 Add a new Section 9.2.8.2 to the Conservation and Open Space Element to read as follows:

Hillside Conservation Area. That area designated "Hillside Conservation" on the Land Use Element Map is an important conservation area for the City. This area is characterized by natural, scenic hillsides, rough terrain and limited services constituting the highest ridgelines visible from the City proper. Only that development which is consistent with the overall conservation goals for this area is permitted, including residential development at a density not greater than one unit per 10 acres, unless the criteria specified by the Hillside Conservation Land Use Designation are met in which event development at a maximum of up to one unit per 5 acres is permitted. Other consistent uses should be limited to riding, hiking and other trails, and educational and research activities consistent with the conservation of the area. In addition, uses normally associated accessory to such uses, such as corrals, riding stables, groves, and the like may be allowed where the City determines, based upon environmental review, that such uses are consistent with the overall conservation goals for this area.

6.6 Add a new Section 11.1 g to the Conservation and Open Space Element to read as follows:

Hillside Conservation Area. *Preservation and conservation in the areas designated "Hillside Conservation" is a high priority for the City. The City shall undertake a work program as a matter of high priority to develop and adopt any necessary ordinances and/or other programs and policies which may be necessary to implement the Hillside Conservation provisions of this General Plan, provided that any such ordinances, policies, or programs are consistent with the terms of this Plan. Such follow up implementation programs may consist of the following:*

- (a) *An acquisition and/or land exchange program to place some or all of the Hillside Conservation Area in public ownership;*
- (b) *Implementation of a planned residential development ordinance applicable to the area to encourage clustering and to help achieve the other goals specified for this area;*
- (c) *The development of a Hillside Conservation Circulation Plan;*
- (d) *The development of such other ordinance, policies, and programs as the City shall determine necessary to implement the Hillside Conservation designation;*
- (e) *Adoption of a slope density ordinance to specify maximum permitted densities on a sliding scale as determined by slope, provided that in no event shall any lot be less than 2.5 acres in size nor shall the maximum authorized density for any area exceed the densities specific for the Hillside Conservation area; and*

- (f) *Adoption and implementation of a trails and public access plan for the area. Such a plan should be adopted and implemented in consultation with interested organizations and individuals.*

In addition, the City shall undertake as a matter of highest priority to amend any and all provisions of the Municipal Code and the Subdivision Ordinance, to ensure that they are consistent with the Hillside Conservation provisions of the General Plan.

6.7 Revise figures throughout the General Plan to show the correct location of the Hillside Conservation area boundary adopted in 1996.

- 7. Modify text for Special Planning Area “B” to provide for a broader range of uses, including instructional uses for the University.**

Recommendation:

7.1 Modify the Guiding Policy for Special Planning Area “B” to read as follows:

Guiding Policy for Anderson/Van Leuven Area Special Planning Area B

The intent for this area is to develop a mixed use village with residential, office, retail, cultural, medical/health care, educational, and park and recreation uses. Religious assembly uses, such as a church, would also be appropriate within this area.

7.2 Modify Implementing Policy i for Special Planning Area B (Section 2.2.7.2) to read as follows:

Appropriate non-residential development intensity for this Special Planning Area shall be 0.5 FAR for Commercial, Office, and Institutional development, including medical/health care, educational, and religious assembly uses.

- 8. Add a policy calling for temporary noise barriers where needed for construction to meet applicable noise standards.**

Recommendation:

8.1 Modify Implementing policy, “k,” in Section 7.8.1.1, Implementing Policies for Land Use and New Development to read as follows:

- k. Require proposed development adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive uses to implement a construction-related noise mitigation plan that identifies the location of construction equipment storage and maintenance areas, and documents the methods that will be used to minimize impacts on adjacent noise-sensitive land uses, including, where needed, installation of temporary noise barriers.

- 9. Add an implementation measure calling for synchronization of traffic signals along Redlands Boulevard, Barton Road, Anderson Street, and Mountain View Avenue.**

Recommendation:

9.1 Modify Implementing Policy “p” in Section 6.10.1 to read as follows:

- p. Where a series of traffic signals is provided along a route, facilitate the coordination of traffic signals to optimize traffic progression on a given route. Traffic signalization should emphasize facilitating access from neighborhood areas onto the City's primary roadway network, and should work to discourage through traffic from using local streets.
- Require developments impacting traffic along Redlands Blvd., Barton Road, Anderson Street or Mountain View Avenue to provide a fair share contribution for to the synchronization of traffic signals along the impact road(s). If the City has

not yet adopted an implementation mechanism for these improvements, require the project applicant to install the required synchronization, and the City will enter into a reimbursement agreement with the applicant to be reimbursed as future funds are received by the City for that improvement.

10. Clarify how “consistency” with the General Plan is to be determined.

Recommendation:


10.1 Revise the General Plan Consistency Review paragraph in Section 11.1 b to read as follows:

General Plan Consistency Review. New development projects that require discretionary actions by the City will be reviewed for consistency with the provisions of the General Plan, including the General Plan land use and circulation maps and all applicable General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. If it is found that a development project is inconsistent with any applicable provision of the General Plan, the project will be deemed to be inconsistent with the General Plan regardless of whether the project is consistent with other General Plan provisions. The City will not approve any development project found to be inconsistent with the provisions of the General Plan.

Attachments:

- Figure 2.1B Proposed General Plan Land Use
- Figure 2.2 Locations of Special Planning Areas
- Figure 2.3 Conceptual Development Scenario for Special Planning Area - D
- Figure 9.1 Open Space Resources
- Figure 9.1A 1996 Hillside Initiative
- Figure 9.1B Measure V Hillside Land Use Designations
- Figure 9.1C Measure T
- Figure 9.2 Riding and Hiking Trails System Master Plan
- Figure 10.1 Geologic Hazards

I:\General Plan Update2\Amend Package\Proposed GP Revisions May 26, 2009.doc




- Rural Estate (0 to 1 du/ac)
- Very Low Density Residential (0 to 2 du/ac)***
- Low Density Residential (0 to 4 du/ac)
- Medium Density Residential (0 to 9 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (0 to 13 du/ac)
- Very High Density Residential (0 to 20 du/ac)
- Senior Citizen Housing (0 to 25 du/ac)***
- South Hills
- South Hills Preserve
- Expanded Hillside Area
- Hillside Conservation Area (0 to 1 du/10 ac)*
- Low Density Hillside Preservation (0 to 1 du/10 ac)**
- Medium Density Hillside Preservation (0 to 1 du/5 ac)**
- San Timoteo Creek Area
- Commercial
- Business Park
- Office
- Special Planning Area
- Health Care
- Industrial
- City Facilities
- Institutional
- Park
- Public Open Space

Public and Quasi Public

- E Elementary School
- R Riding & Hiking Trails
- C Community Park
- CF Community Facilities

Conditions Specified under Measure V

- * Potential bonus of up to 1 du/5 acres when criteria of Hillside Conservation designation are met.
- ** Potential bonus when specified criteria of Chapter 2A of the General Plan are met.
- *** Future residential land uses not specified on the map.



SOURCE: Parcel Base - City of Loma Linda, Thomas Bros. 2001, USGS 2003


LSA

Figure 2.1B

City of Loma Linda General Plan

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE


April 17, 2009



- Special Planning Area Boundary A through J
- A Loma Linda Academy
- B Anderson Street/Van Leuven Street
- C University Center
- D Redlands Boulevard/California Street
- E Mission Road
- F San Timoteo Creek at Barton Road
- G Senior Center
- H (Reserved)
- I (Reserved)
- J (Reserved)

Jurisdictional and Infrastructure

- Water Ways
- Rail Road
- Proposed Street Alignments



SOURCE: Parcel Base - City of Loma Linda, Thomas Bros. 2001

LSA

Figure 2.2

R:\LLD130\GIS\Reports\GenPlan_2008_Jan\fig2-2_SpecialPlanningAreas.mxd (03/12/09)




FIGURE 2.3

LSA

LAND USE

- Low Density Residential (0 to 4 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (0 to 13 du/ac)
- Senior Citizen Housing (0 to 25 du/ac)
- Retail / Mixed Use
- Parking Structure

JURISDICTIONAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE


- Roadway
- Institutional (School)
- City Sphere of Influence
- City Boundary
- Park
- Trail
- Parks / Open Space

SOURCE: Thomas Bros., 2009, City of Loma Linda


R:\LLD130\GIS\Reports\GenPlan_2008_Jan\fig2-3_SPA_D_LU.mxd (04/08/09)

City of Loma Linda General Plan

**CONCEPTUAL
DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
SPECIAL PLANNING AREA D**




-  City Boundary
-  City Sphere of Influence
-  Targeted Open Space
-  1996 Hillside Initiative Area
-  Approximate Locations of Signature Ridgelines



SOURCE: Basemap AirPhotoUSA 2008

LSA

Figure 9.1




-  City Boundary
-  City Sphere of Influence
-  San Jacinto Fault Zone
-  1996 Hillside Initiative Area


 0 1,000 2,000
 FEET
 SOURCE: fault: USGS, 2003


LSA Figure 9.1A

R:\LLD130\GIS\Reports\GenPlan_2009_Jan\fig9-1A_HillsideInitiative.mxd (04/17/09)




- City Boundary
 - City Sphere of Influence
 - San Jacinto Fault Zone
- Measure V**
- Rural Estate (0 to 1 du/ac)
 - Expanded Hillside Area
 - Hillside Conservation Area (0 to 1 du/10 ac)*
 - Low Density Hillside Preservation (0 to 1 du/10 ac)**
 - Medium Density Hillside Preservation (0 to 1 du/5 ac)**
 - San Timoteo Creek Area

Conditions Specified under Measure V
 * Potential bonus of up to 1 du/5 acres when criteria of Hillside Conservation designation are met.
 ** Potential bonus when specified criteria of Chapter 2A of the General Plan are met.




L S A Figure 9.1B

City of Loma Linda General Plan
**MEASURE V HILLSIDE
 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS**




-  City Boundary
-  City Sphere of Influence
-  San Jacinto Fault Zone
- Measure T**
-  South Hills Preserve




LSA Figure 9.1C

City of Loma Linda General Plan
2008 MEASURE T



- City Boundary
- Sphere of Influence
- Targeted Open Space
- Trail Heads
- Public Trails
- Edison Easement Riding and Hiking Trail
- Green Belt / Flood Control
- Private Trails


Warning
 This document depicts the approximate locations of unmaintained trails, trail heads, and open space areas in the city-owned South Hills Preserve, but is not intended as a formal guide to hikers or other users of the subject properties. The City makes no warranty as to the accuracy of any depiction of trails, geography or other physical features. Nor does the City make any representation as to the safety of any private recreational or other use of the subject properties, or as to the legality or safety of any use of adjoining private properties. Unauthorized entry onto any property, whether or not marked as private property on this map, without the consent of the property owner, may be considered trespassing. By entering upon any City-owned land or trail, hikers and other users assume the risk of injury or damages that may result from hazardous recreational activities (Gov. Code Sec. 831.7), from the use of recreational trails (Gov. Code Sec. 831.4), or from the natural conditions of unimproved property (Gov. Code Sec. 831.2).



SOURCE: Basemap - AirPhotoUSA, 2008; Thomas Bros. 2001

LSA Figure 9.2

City of Loma Linda General Plan
RIDING AND HIKING TRAILS
SYSTEM MASTER PLAN



LSA

Geologic Hazards

- San Jacinto Alquist-Priolo Zone
- Fault, Certain
- Fault, Approximate
- Fault, Concealed
- Loma Linda Fault
- USGS Faults
- Liquefaction Zones
- Area of Steep Slopes and Slope Instability

Fault Lines

- Fault Lines
- USGS Faults

JURISDICTIONAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE

- City Boundary
- City Sphere of Influence
- Railroad
- Water Ways

FIGURE 10.1

City of Loma Linda General Plan
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

SOURCE: Safety Element of the April 1, 1991 General Plan, Rick Engineering Company; California Geological Survey, 2002; USGS 30x60 San Bernardino Geologic Map, 2003; Thomas Bros 2009
*Branch Fault Lines are not all named per the USGS Geologic Maps 2003

R:\LLD130\GIS\Reports\GenPlan_2009_Jan\fig10-1_GeologicHazards.mxd (04/17/09)