

Commenter Comment Summary and Response

<p>Letter 1 - Desert Lakes - Alan Means (7/11)</p>	<p>Concerned GPU land use designations makes their property undevelopable, and would like City to consider to designation to provide better development opportunity. (Located in Sub-Area 13)</p>
<p>Comment 1A</p>	<p>Would like Subarea 13 to be described as: As an environmentally diverse area with limited existing access and infrastructure, this area of the City is envisioned as part of a large future master planned development. Development in this area should occur pursuant to a comprehensive Specific Plan that addresses, among other things, the unique environmental setting, infrastructure needs and access issues that are particular to this area. Any Specific Plan may include, but not be limited to, the following suggested land uses: Low density resorts, rural residential development, suburban development and suburban retail uses. Development should be planned for those areas adjacent to Interstate 10 and in the western portion of the subarea. Any development should be planned to protect and enhance the visual identity and aesthetic beauty of Coachella.</p>
<p>Response 1A</p>	<p>The City will change the Subarea 13 vision language and description to incorporate that 'Any Specific Plan may include, but not be limited to, the following suggested land uses: Low density resorts, rural residential development, suburban development and suburban retail uses. Development should be planned for those areas adjacent to Interstate 10 and in the western portion of the subarea. Any development should be planned to protect and enhance the visual identity and aesthetic beauty of Coachella. '</p>



<p>Letter 2 - McNaughton LLC (7/22)</p>	<p>Would like City of reconsider land use designation in SubArea 13, and provided two potential version for re-defining land use.</p>
<p>Comment 2A</p>	<p>Version 1: SUBAREA 13 – I-10 NORTH</p> <p>Existing Conditions The I-10 North is an environmentally diverse and rich area of the City. It is part of the Mecca Hills that serve as a scenic backdrop to Coachella and is bounded on the south by Interstate 10 and on the west by the San Andreas Fault and Coachella Canal. The area has desert washes and 100 year floodplains and active faults. Caltrans has selected this area for a future interchange that will connect Avenue 50 with I-10 and the North side.</p> <p>Vision As a sensitive area with limited access and a need for infrastructure investment, this area of the City is envisioned for development after portion of other areas within the current City limits are developed. When development does occur, the vision for this area is to have low density resorts, rural residential development and some suburban neighborhoods and suburban retail in the western portion of the subarea.</p>
<p>Response 2A</p>	<p>The City will update the Subarea title and vision for Subarea 13. Additionally, changes will be made to the Existing Conditions and Vision of subarea 13 to reflect these suggestions. The City will delete Policy #2 and edit policy Direction #3 to provide more flexibility with phasing. The final land use designation mix will not be changed. Changing the final designation mix of percentages to higher rates would not support the vision and land use goals for the Resort District in the Planning Area. The Resort District is meant for regional entertainment and attractions, adding high concentrations of General Neighborhood and Neighborhood Center would cause conflict with activities allotted in each of the land uses and the vision for this subarea.</p>



Comment 2B

Version 1: Policy Direction Policy Direction

1. Maintain Resort and Open Space General Plan designations for this subarea.
2. Prior to development, prepare a single Specific Plan for the subarea that establishes a long- term vision, land uses and an implementation program.
3. Minimize grading of the subarea and follow the natural topographic features during the planning and development process.
4. Require that public facilities and services be provided concurrent with the development to ensure commercial development.
5. Require rural and clustered development in steeper and topographically constrained areas.
6. Require new developments be designed for, and provided with, adequate public services and infrastructure to be self-sufficient in the event of a large earthquake.
7. Require the primary boulevards to be designed, constructed and operated as multi-modal boulevards, not wide high-speed streets.
8. Limit all resort development to a density of no more than 4 DU/AC.
9. Final designation mix should be:
 - 20 to 30 percent Open Space
 - Up to 25 percent Agricultural Rancho and Open Space
 - Up to 50 percent Rural Rancho
 - Up to 40 percent General Neighborhood
 - Up to 20 percent Neighborhood Center
 - Up to 60 percent Resort

Response 2B

The City will add policy direction #10: Facilitate roadway connection to Dillon Road. The City will also amend policy direction #2 and #3 to provide more flexibility in phasing.



Comment 2C

Version 2: Existing Conditions

The I-10 North is an environmentally diverse and rich area of the City. It is part of the Mecca Hills that serve as a scenic backdrop to Coachella and is bounded on the south by Interstate 10 and on the west by the San Andreas Fault and Coachella Canal. The area is a very environmentally sensitive and constrained area, with desert washes and 100 year floodplains, active faults and potentially sensitive habitat. Access to the area is very limited.

Vision

As a very sensitive area with limited access and a need for substantial infrastructure investment, this area of the City is envisioned to remain undeveloped during the span of the General Plan. Development in this area should occur after a significant portion of other areas within the current City limits are developed. When development does occur, the vision for this area is to have low density resorts, rural residential development and some suburban neighborhoods and suburban retail in the western portion of the subarea. In the interim, this subarea will be preserved from development and contribute to the visual identity and aesthetic beauty of Coachella

Response 2C

The City has reviewed Version 2, and has opted that edits to Subarea 13 will be coming from alternatives proposed in Version 1.



Comment 2D	<p>Version 2: Policy Direction: 1. Maintain Resort and Open Space General Plan designations for this subarea.</p> <p>2. Prohibit new development to occur until a significant portion of the land within the City limits is developed.</p> <p>3. Prior to development, but after a significant portion of the land in the City limits is developed, prepare a single Specific Plan for the subarea that establishes a long-term vision, land uses and an implementation program.</p> <p>4. Minimize grading of the subarea and follow the natural topographic features during the planning and development process.</p> <p>5. Require that public facilities and services be provided concurrent with the development to ensure a high quality of life for residents.</p> <p>6. Require rural and clustered development in steeper and topographically constrained areas.</p> <p>7. Require new developments be designed for, and provided with, adequate public services and infrastructure to be self-sufficient in the event of a large earthquake.</p> <p>8. Require the primary boulevards to be designed, constructed and operated as multi-modal boulevards, not wide high-speed streets.</p> <p>9. Limit all resort development to a density of no more than 4 DU/AC.</p> <p>10. Final designation mix should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 to 30 percent Open Space • Up to 25 percent Agricultural Rancho and Open Space • Up to 50 percent Rural Rancho • Up to 10 percent General Neighborhood • Up to five percent Neighborhood Center • Up to 60 percent Resort
Response 2D	<p>The City has review Version 2, and has opted that edits to Subarea 13 will be coming from alternatives proposed in Version 1.</p>
Comment 2E	<p>Version 2: Caltrans Interchange: Existing Conditions</p> <p>Nested between La Entrada and I-10 North, this approximately 220 acres of undeveloped land is currently zoned for General Commercial use. This area enjoys a mix of existing conditions as La Entrada and I-10 North.</p> <p>Vision</p> <p>The future construction of an Interchange is paramount for the growth of all the adjacent land, as well the overall development of the north-east part of the City. Caltrans interchanged is envisioned with a diverse commercial use to support the surrounding area.</p> <p>Policy Direction</p> <p>1. Maintain current zoning designations for this subarea.</p>
Response 2E	<p>Version 2 would require allocating an area around the interchange for development. The scale of such a subarea is probably not appropriate for the Draft General Plan. However, this should be addressed in the Specific Plan process for the subarea.</p>



<p>Letter 3 - Carmen M. Manriquez (8/12)</p>	<p>1. Recommends document uses images/illustrations for Coachella as examples, not neighboring cities. 2. Recommends mention of use/implementation of electric car as mode of transportation. Also recommends changes to specific aspects of GPU including Mobility, Air Quality, and Noise Levels.</p>
<p>Comment 3A</p>	<p>1. The document includes images of some of the neighborhood cities within the Coachella Valley and vicinity making the impression that the City of Coachella is promoting these cities (Palm Springs, Rancho Cucamonga). The City of Coachella, after many Planning exercises through the years, has plenty of artwork to illustrate the different concepts discussed on the Draft document.</p>
<p>Response 3A</p>	<p>1. Pictures used in the GPU are not meant to support other cities. Rather, these examples were selected to provide clear direction on design intent sought by the GPU. The City will look into replacing pictures, however, any new pictures will stay within the character of place types desired by the GPU.</p>
<p>Comment 2B</p>	<p>2. City Wide Modal Split: The document mentions that "Coachella Residents have access to several modes of travel such as walking, bicycling and public transit. However, the automobile is the primary means of travel within the City. " There is no mention of other alternative means of transportation for example: electric vehicles (golf carts). Other Cities within the Coachella Valley successfully had incorporate the use of electric vehicles within existing roadways. The Draft General Plan Document reinstates that the Original City Core provides the ideal walking distances between blocks intersections and this would be the perfect integration of such alternative. I must mention that within the original core of the city many of the founders of the City founders still live and these people as time goes by the become less and less mobile and develop disabilities, for these people and many of our seniors walking or driving is not an option anymore!</p>



Reponse 2B	<p>2. Electric vehicles would fall under the automobile mode of transportation. Intertwining golf carts into an existing environment may pose to be problematic from a safety stand point and would not incorporate very well into the Planning Area. Golf cart incorporation may also require additional, and costly, infrastructure changes to accommodate the new mode of transportation on existing roads, where pedestrian and bicycle facilities currently exist and provide efficient mode of transportation. Additionally, to serve the aging population in Coachella, the Draft General Plan addresses mixed use development to support a live/work/shop lifestyle and reduce the need for cars and long transportation distances. Because of the overall infrastructure changes, existing asset of walkability and bikeability in the current built environment, and development under the Draft General Plan that supports walking and biking, golf carts were not chosen as a GPU strategy. However, the GPU does largely follow the recommendations of the CVAG Non-Motorized Plan. Additional language will be added to the Mobility Element to further reinforce the alignment of these plans.</p>
Comment 3C	<p>3. The General Plan Land Use Designation depicts Harrison Street (West Side) from Avenue 52 to Avenue 54 as a Neighborhood Center and Suburban Neighborhood, the designation is a downgrade from the existing General plan designation. The area should be designated as Neighborhood Center from Avenue 52 to Avenue 54. I must note that the intersection of Avenue 53 and Harrison Street is already signalized and therefore is optimum for Commercial Development from Avenue 53 to Avenue 54.</p>
Response 3C	<p>Thank you for the notation to potentially have Avenue 53 and Harrison Street be Commercial Development. However, the Neighborhood Center and Suburban Neighborhood land use designations for these areas are the most optimal, and they promote neighborhood vision of the Draft General Plan and allow for flexibility in land use changes. The land use designations will remain as proposed in the Draft General Plan.</p>
Comment 3D	<p>4. Mobility: Need to incorporate an electric vehicle (golf cart) alternative non polluting component network.</p>
Respos 3D	<p>The City has noted this comment. However, as noted above, the Draft General Plan instead focuses on active transportation.</p>
Comment 3E	<p>5. Goals and Policies: 1.6 Climate-appropriate building types section needs to be expanded to include Climate-appropriate building design and Climate-appropriate building construction to improve indoor air quality, long term reduction of energy for cooling and heating.</p>



Response 3E	The Draft General Plan has multiple policies addressing building efficiency including policy 1.6 and 2.7. Additionally, Policy 11.2 address indoor air quality. No additional language is necessary.
Comment 3F	6. Air Quality: Indoor Air quality can be improved considerably through proper design and construction techniques therefore eliminating many of the health respiratory problems that affect our young population.
Response 3F	The City has noted this comment, thank you. Policy 11.2 address indoor air quality. No additional language is necessary.
Comment 3G	7. Noise Levels: The City of Coachella is making an effort to control the number of Ice cream vendors but asides from that the City needs enforce the existing noise ordinances in place or expand into the general plan by monitoring and enforcing the maximum noise levels generated by the loudspeakers on the Ice cream vehicles, I have measured noise levels between 75 dBA and 80 dBA outside my front door sometimes late at night.
Response 3G	While the Draft General Plan provides policies to ensure noise levels are constrained, enforcement of regulations are outside the scope of the General Plan Update process. Problems with noise level violations should be reported directly to the City. Changes to the Draft General Plan would be irrelevant to enforcement complaints.



<p>Letter 4 - United Engineering Group (6/25)</p>	<p>Want to start entitlement process for proposed Specific Plan (Vista Del Agua) 1. Concerned about the new densities applied to the Vista Del Agua project. 2. They are requesting the northern parcel be changed from Neighborhood Center to General Neighborhood. 3. Proposing a new circulation system for the project</p>
<p>Comment 4A</p>	<p>1. From looking at the General Plan land use for the Vista Del Agua project, it appears the allowed density per the proposed General Plan is approx. 2400 units. Is this number our new unit cap, or is there still a residential cap in place that needs to be addressed?</p>
<p>Response 4A</p>	<p>The Draft General Plan does not identify a specific unit cap for any subarea. Instead, the Draft General Plan would institute a new Master Planning process and identify ranges of densities that would be appropriate for achieving the vision. The exact unit number would be identified during the Master Planning Process.</p>
<p>Comment 4B</p>	<p>2. Will there be density transfers for areas dedicated as parks & school areas?</p>
<p>Response 4B</p>	<p>The Draft General Plan does not create a density transfer process for areas dedicated for parks and schools. Unit allocation is expected to be addressed on a case-by-case basis for each subarea and would need to include the identification and set aside of land intended for public uses such as parks and schools. Density transfers can be specifically addressed as part of a Specific Plan or other Master Planning tool.</p>
<p>Comment 4C</p>	<p>3. In analyzing the proposed Land Use Plan in the General Plan update we have a few minor areas that we would like to discuss with the City and potentially revise in the General Plan. (See First Attachment)</p>
<p>Response 4C</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Comment 4D</p>	<p>4. Similar to the Land Use plan issue above, the Circulation Plan for the project area shows a collector street bisecting the project between Polk St and Tyler St. This street is not, however, located in the same area as the Collector Street in our preliminary plans. (See Second Attachment) a. In addition, Tyler St is shown as a Major Arterial just west of the Vista Del Agua project. As discussed in some of our Preliminary meetings with the City this street alignment had some complications through this area. The Vista Del Agua project team would like to discuss the overall circulation for this area and how we can address/help to solve these issues.</p>



Response 4D	The City has reviewed comments regarding street placement and would like to note that exact alignment of streets is not as important as the performance and overall connectivity of the network. Specific street alignment can be determined during the master planning process.
Comment 4E	5. Abiding by the rules of the new General Plan, would the Vista Del Agua project be considered to have started the Master Plan process?
Response 4E	Yes.
Comment 4F	6. If the Vista Del Agua project develops within the density of the proposed General Plan, will an EIR still be required? a. If so, can the project utilize some of the consultants being used for the General Plan?
Response 4F	It would be too speculative to determine if an EIR is needed for the Vista Del Agua project. However, the EIR could potentially need less extensive detail the more Vista Del Agua conforms to the Draft General Plan and its policies. It is also important to note that the development review process outline in the CAP could also help streamline environmental review.



Letter 5- MSA Consulting Inc. (8/28)	Concerned about future development of Shadow View Specific Plan, and that it is not shown on the GPU, coming from the Shadow View Land and Farming LLC (SVLF).
Comment 5A	Reviewed SVLF Entitlements and that SVSP not being shown on the General Plan Designation Map.
Response 5A	The Draft General Plan does include the SVSP, but envisioned the SVSP undergoing changes to better meet the vision of the General Plan.
Comment 5B	Reviewed Economic Basis for SVLF residential property with recent market demand assessment from the Shadow View Project. The conclusions are 1. Residential development as proposed by the SVSP is appropriate, sustainable and in demand. 2. Commercial land is overbuilt for all types of retail (Neighborhood, Community and Regional Centers) within 3.0 mile, the 5.0 mile and the 8.0 mile trade area of the project. Indeed over 4.87 million square feet of Anchored Retail Center already exists and additional planned projects are underway. In short, converting the SVLF Residential Property to commercial use is simply not feasible in the short or long term.
Response 5B	The City has reviewed this comment and would like to note that the SVSP is not intended to be converted to commercial property. Commercial uses are desired for part of the SVSP area as a long-term goal for the City, even if the market may not exist today. The General Plan is a long-term planning document with a timeframe of more than 20 years. Land use allocation must consider long-term opportunities as well as near-term market demand.
Comment 5C	Requested amendments to the GPU: 1. Page 04-59, Figure 3-23- Designate the approved Shadow View Specific Plan with a Specific Plan crosshatch and remove the underlying land use pattern.
Response 5C	Comment noted. However, the City is not going to change Figure 3-23 as the Draft General Plan anticipates the revision of the SVSP and needs Figure 3-23 to help communicate the desired vision.
Comment 5D	2. Page 04-76 - Revise Policy 1 as follows: Encourage a wide variety of entertainment, commercial and mixed use projects and focus commercial uses in Planning Area 1 of the Shadow View Specific Plan. (instead of " in the area west of Tyler and north of Avenue 48")
Response 5D	Comment noted. However, the language is going to remain unchanged as it appropriately communicates the desired vision for the area.



Comment 5E	3. Page 04-77 - Revise Policy 11 as follows: Encourage a walkable, commercial retail and entertainment destination in Planning Area 1 of Shadow View Specific Plan. Design elements such as those found in the Victoria Gardens project and Downtown Disney are desire. (in stead of "Require an amendment to the Shadow View Specific Plan to establish..."
Response 5E	Comment noted, but no change made to the policy.
Comment 5F	4. Page 04-77 Policy 12 as follows: Designation mixed should be 5 to 30 percent Regional Retail. (Instead of 30-60 percent regional retail.
Response 5F	Comment noted, but no change made to the policy.
Comment 5G	5. Page 05-7, Figure 4-1: Eliminate the east-west "Collector with enhanced bicycle facilities" road segment located north of 48th Avenue and West of Tyler Street to reflect the approved Shadow View Specific Plan.
Response 5G	Comment noted, but no change made to the Draft General Plan.



Letter 6 - MSA Consulting Inc. (8/29)	Supplemental Letter regarding potential commercial development.
Comment 6A	Transmitting an updated market analysis for the Shadow View project. Report has the following conclusions.
Response 6A	Comment noted.
Comment 6B	1. Despite good freeway access, the site is too far removed from current and future population centers to achieve a viable regional commercial center (paragraph 1)
Response 6B	Thank you for your input, the City has noted this comment. The City shall add a policy to consider Urban Residential in exchange for Commercial use.
Comment 6C	2. There is already an oversupply of competing retail centers in the 3,5, and 8 mile trader areas surrounding the site (Paragraph 2)
Response 6C	Thank you for your input, the City has noted this comment. The City would also like to note that this is a long-term plan and existing conditions are expected to change over time.
Comment 6D	3. Even the approximately 100 acres of land in PA1 of the Shadow View Specific Plan is not currently feasible or recommended for commercial/retail/development (paragraph 3)
Response 6D	The City has noted the comment, thank you.
Comment 6E	4. Coachella's non-central location at the far eastern end of the Coachella Valley has resulted in historically weak commercial demand.
Response 6E	The City has noted the comment, thank you.



Letter 7 - Van Buren Investments, INC (6/19)	Various concerns/ comments/ recommendations regarding development of Piece street, North of Airport Boulevard. VBI Inc. have an 80-acre parcel in this area. With the following Considerations
Comment 7A	1. The Initial Conceptual Study Plans previously discussed from time to time with City staff are enclosed in Attachment A.
Response 7A	The City has noted the comment, thank you.
Comment 7B	2. Revised Conceptual Student Plans for FP/SPA are enclosed in Attachment B
Reponse 7B	The City has noted the comment, thank you.
Comment 7C	3. The majority of the property owners in the FP/SPA have been contacted and are supportive of the enclosed revised Conceptual Study Plans
Response 7C	The City has noted the comment, thank you.
Comment 7D	4. It is respectfully submitted that the areas east of Fillmore and West of Pierce Street should be designated as Suburban Neighborhood, not Rural Ranchos, and included in an appropriate separate Sub-Plan Area. This is essential to have the required 'Critical Mass' to attract now or in the near future a successful, national Developer to this area of the City. Also, such a Critical Mass is necessary to be able to fund the water and sewer facilities for SP/SPA
Response 7D	The City has noted the comment. However, the Draft General Plan currently allows for up to 50% of the area to be Suburban Neighborhood, which should adequately address the desire to attract a critical mass for development.
Comment 7E	5. As to Planning Area 8, Possible an 'Overlay Alternative' consistent with the applicable enclosed Conceptual Study Plans can be created to be considered as part of the General Plan Update
Reponse 7E	The City would like to note that Subarea 8 is intended to be a job and industrial center, but up 10% general neighborhood is allowed. However, the City shall also add in a policy to the Draft General Plan for a collaborative planning effort to expand Rancho California Vineyards Specific Plan to achieve a critical mass to facilitate extension of infrastructure to the approved development.
Comment 7G	6. A wastewater reclamation plant located south of Airport Boulevard to reclaim wastewater from La Entrada and the FP/SPA has been suggested as to this alternative might be helpful in attracting a national Developer and provide reclaimed water for these projects and any proposed 'Regional Park' in the area.
Reponse 7G	The City has noted the comment, thank you.



Letter 8 - CA Rural Legal Assistance (8/29)	Responds to Policies in Health and Wellness (HWE) element regarding research that already exists, and recommends additional policies for Health and Wellness Element that are as follows:
Comment 8A	Policy 1.2 (monitoring and evaluation) must state the health and wellness conditions and outcomes that the City plans to track, state whether the Riverside County Department of Public Health has committed to the collaboration described, and indicate the frequency with which the monitoring will be performed and reported to the public if it is to be effective.
Response 8A	Comment noted, but the City will identify these items after the General Plan has been adopted. The City would like to encourage County Public Health Department and H.A.R.C. to track health disparities and indicators that are relevant at that time, and at a smaller geographic area and smaller demographic factors. Also, the City shall monitor trends of environmental determinants of health and health outcomes.
Comment 8B	Policy 1.3 (health and equity) must state health inequities that the City plans to monitor if it is to have meaning. We recommend that this monitoring include not only health outcomes (e.g. diabetes) but also social and environmental determinants of health (e.g. access to parks, safe drinking water, and safe disposal of wastewater).
Response 8B	Comment noted, but the City will identify these items after the General Plan has been adopted.
Comment 8C	Policy 1.7 (EIR Review) should state whether the Riverside County Department of Public Health has committed to the collaboration described.
Response 8C	Comment noted, but the City cannot control whether RCDPH will commit to providing ongoing input.
Comment 8D	Policy 2.2 (affordable housing location) must state concrete ways in which the City will support the development of affordable housing in appropriate locations and should include 500' pollution buffer between affordable housing development and major arterials as envisaged elsewhere in the General Plan or it cannot successfully be implemented.
Response 8D	Comment noted.



Comment 8E	Policy 2.8 (Mobile home parks) must state how the City will provide assistance to mobile home park owners who seek to comply; how it will assist renters to live in decent, affordable mobile home parks; how it will ensure that is enforcing standards that are reasonably related to health and safety and are not excessive; and how it will ensure that mobile home owners are not face with rent increases, retaliation or displacement and place in worse circumstances as a consequence of otherwise well-intended standards. We strongly recommend that the Policy specifically recognize the negative health and wellness ramifications of displacement and consider establishing a commitment to a policy of 'displacement only as a last resort and only where mitigated.' The policy must provide for permitting of mobile home park improvements to be expedite in appropriate circumstances and similarly for fee waivers, and provide other incentives for meeting applicable standards.
Response 8E	The City will add an implementation action states that 'The City shall work towards reducing life safety risks and avoid displacements of residents.'
Comment 8G	Policy 3.5 (smoke-free entertainment) should commit the City to approach the California Gamin Control Commission about possible tobacco-related modifications to the Tribes' Tribal-State Gaming Compacts
Response 8G	The City shall add language to Policy 3.5 to add language regarding tobacco-related modifications to Tribes' Tribal-State Gaming Compacts.
Comment 8H	Policy 4.3 (Community and Safety) must state more specific information about what perceived and actually safety issues will be addressed.
Response 8H	The City has reviewed this comment and would like to refer the commenter to implementation actions #17-#19, which will help guide the City's efforts to improve community safety.
Comment 8I	Policy 7.2 (Targeted employment training) should include a program to ensure that services will be directed to individuals most in need of retraining.
Response 8I	The City will update Policy 7.2 and include "for persons most in need" to address this comment.
Comment 8J	Policy 8.3 (Neighborhood schools) should commit the City to regularly evaluate the distribution of walkable/bikeable schools to ensure an equitable distribution of such schools among all socioeconomic sectors of the community.
Response 8J	The City has reviewed this comment and will not make changes to this policy. However, the City shall update policy 8.6 to include "equitable distribution of school sites among all socioeconomic sectors of the community."
Comment 8K	Policy 8.20 (Child care wellness policies) also must address issues of safety, nutrition, and quality in childcare facilities in order to be effective



Response 8K	The City shall add language to Policy 8.20 to include issues of safety, nutrition, and quality of childcare facilities.
Comment 8L	Policy 9.2 (employer-based health care) should state level of service standards for primary care doctors, specialists, and dentists
Response 8L	Comment noted. However, the employer-based health care policy (Policy 9.1) is intended to encourage the provision of health insurance by employers and a service standard for care providers would not be helpful for implementing this policy.
Comment 8M	Goal 1 (Healthy Community) should state a Policy of increasing the specificity of health-related Policies and Implementation Actions throughout the General Plan, including addition of specific implementation and evaluation measures. Such specificity is necessary in order for health-related Policies to be effective and should include consideration of such measurement tools as level-of-service standards, quantifiable metrics to assess progress towards goals, etc. Inclusion of this Policy in the HWE, accomplished by revisions to the health-related Policies and Implementation Actions in other sections of the General Plan, will make the General Plan internally consistent.
Response 8M	The City shall add a sentence to Policy 1.2 stating that "The City shall work towards developing measurable criteria to evaluate the impact of health and wellness implementation actions."
Comment 8N	Goal 2 (Healthy housing) should include a Policy committing the City to come into compliance with SB 244, and specifically with Gov. Code sec. 65302.10, which requires the City to update its Land Use Element prior to the due date for its Housing Element to (1) identify unincorporated communities within its sphere of influence, (2) analyze each such community's needs/deficiencies with respects to water, wastewater, storm water drainage, and structural fire protection, and (3) analyze, based on available data, benefit assessment districts or other financing alternatives that could make it financially feasible to extend services to each such community. We note that the elements of the general plan must be internally consistent and that the draft Land Use Element does not yet include this analysis, which is directly related to the health and wellness of these communities. Inclusion in the HWS along with updating the Land Use Element and the Housing Element will make the General Plan internally consistent.
Response 8N	Comment noted. The City will add a map and language to the General Plan to identify disadvantaged communities, as intended by SB 244.
Comment 8O	Goal 2 (Healthy housing) should include a Policy on services for the homeless, including but not limited to provisions of safe, sanitary restroom facilities for homeless individuals in key locations in order to be effective.
Response 8O	The City shall add new policy statement that states "Homeless Services: Partner with community organizations for services for homeless including but not limited to provisions of safe, sanitary restroom facilities for homeless individuals in key locations in order to be effective."



Comment 8P	Goal 2 (Health housing) should include a Policy, related to but broader than Policy 2.2, committing the City to recognize affordable housing and low-income minority populations as sensitive uses, sensitive receptors and/or special-needs populations for purposed of the General Plan's Policies and Implementation measures related to buffering from pollution and hazardous materials (e.g. SU Policy 5.3; LU implementation Action 1). Because there is a longstanding history in many communities of locating industrial and polluting uses near low-income communities, and vice versa, it is necessary to be very specific about the intention to impose these protective buffers for the health and wellness of these communities.
Reponse 8P	The City has reviewed this comment and would like to refer commenter to Policy 11.3.
Comment 8Q	Goal 9 (Healthcare and Social Services) should state a Policy on assisting residents to navigate impending health care transitions stemming from implementation of the Affordable Care Act.
Reponse 8Q	The City has reviewed this comment and would like to refer the commenter to implementation action # 31.



<p>Letter 9 - Desert Lakes Master,LLC (8/29)</p>	<p>Owner of land comments on "The Uplands" being reserved for future development. Issues regarding connectivity to the Uplands land. Proposes an update of GPU for 1850 acres of land with the following statements.</p>
<p>Comment 9A</p>	<p>The Uplands area should be designated for "Future Development" subject to normal processing of a specific plan.</p>
<p>Response 9A</p>	<p>Comment noted. The City fully expects this area to undergo future development and the General Plan identifies a range of uses and intensities that would be appropriate for the area. The City will add language to clarify this intent in the document.</p>
<p>Comment 9B</p>	<p>Believe this area can be accessed for immediate development via Vista del Norte where access and utilities currently exist. In that regard, we are in the process of obtaining a letter from RBF confirming the feasibility of the future connection of access and utilities from Vista del Norte Northeasterly and Easterly to the proposed I-10 interchange.</p>
<p>Response 9B</p>	<p>The City will add a grade separation to the Future Roadway Network figure in the Mobility Element.</p>
<p>Comment 9C</p>	<p>Believe that showing the connectivity from Vista del Norte Easterly to the proposed interchange in the General Plan Update will help secure the necessary approvals and funding for the I-10 Interchange</p>
<p>Response 9C</p>	<p>The City will update Future Roadway Network figure in the Mobility Element. Additionally, the road network could be adjusted for topography and physical constraints as long as envisioned connectivity is maintained.</p>
<p>Comment 9D</p>	<p>Request that the 1850 acres be designated in the updated General Plan documents as "Coachella Hills". In this way, we will not be confuse with other projects utilizing the Desert Lakes names.</p>
<p>Response 9D</p>	<p>Comment noted. However, the City is disinclined to rename the subarea at this time.</p>



Letter 10 - Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (8/29)	Has concerns (1) City’s failure to include an analysis of disadvantaged communities located within the City’s Sphere of Influence as well and (2) inadequate implementation measures for the Draft Plan’s stated goals and policies.
--	--

Comment 10A

Refers to CA Gov't Section 65302.10 and requirements to: (1) [A]n identification of each island or fringe community within the city's sphere of influence that is a disadvantaged unincorporated community. In the case of a county, an identification of each legacy community within the boundaries of the county that is a disadvantaged unincorporated community, but not including any area within the sphere of influence of any city. This identification shall include a description of the community and a map designating its location. (2) For each identified community, an analysis of water, wastewater, storm water drainage, and structural fire protection needs or deficiencies. (3) An analysis, based on then existing available data, of benefit assessment districts or other financing alternatives that could make the extension of services to identified communities financially feasible.

Response 10A

The City has noted this requirement and will assess further action to not discount any disadvantaged communities. The Draft General Plan will include a description of disadvantaged communities and the Draft General Plan EIR will also analyze potential impacts on sensitive communities.

Comment 10B

1. The City's land use element does not include any mandated information or required analyses of disadvantaged communities. (Also sites there are several disadvantaged communities within the City's SOI such as Rancho Garcia on Shady Lane near Avenue 54)

Response 10B

The Draft General Plan will include a description of disadvantaged communities and the Draft General Plan EIR will also analyze potential impacts on sensitive communities.

Comment 10C

2. States concern that there are not sufficient implementation measures, and that each policy should have an implementation measures, or state why one is not needed. (Uses example of HWE Goal 7 as there is only one implementation measure to achieve the goal which is not sufficient according to the community member.)

Response 10C

Thank you for your comment, the City has noted this concern. However, it is not appropriate that every policy in a General Plan have individual implementation measures or multiple implementation measures. The implementation program was carefully crafted to develop a realistic pathway to implementing the General Plan.



Comment 10D	3. Concerned that the different neighborhood classifications, and related allocation of housing types within those neighborhood classifications, threatens to segregate community members on the basis of income.
Response 10D	The City has noted this comment. The City would also like to note that the goal and vision of the Draft General Plan is to strengthen and bring communities together and also provide a range of housing options for multiple generations, cultures, and incomes. Additionally, the Master Planning process established in the Draft General Plan creates a process for achieving a finer grain of densities within neighborhoods, which would help alleviate income segregation.
Comment 10E	4. Concerned that the Draft General Plan does not contain adequate policies and implementation measures to protect affordable housing occupants and other sensitive populations from air pollution and other environmental hazards.
Response 10E	The City has noted this comment and will add strengthening language to policy 11.3 of the Sustainability and Natural Environment Element.
Comment 10F	5. Components of the General Plan that include Green House Gas emission reduction strategies should create affordable housing, appropriate transit and employment opportunities in both the more urban and more rural areas of the city and surrounding environment to lead the way in supporting long term sustainability in both the City and the region.
Response 10F	Thank you for the comment and the City agrees. Many, many policies and aspects of the General Plan are intended to reduce GHG emissions, create affordable housing, improve transit and active transportation opportunities, and improve employment opportunities.



Letter 11 - RBF Consulting (8/29)	Concerns regarding Subarea 11, Policy Direction #11, and density suggestions for GPU. Also included a Shadow View Presentation Document titled "Shadow View (Coachella) 8.27" and encourages the following changes be made to the GPU
Comment 11A	1. Subarea 11 - Commercial Entertainment District, Policy Direction #11 in the Draft GPU, which "requires" amendment to the Shadow View SP, should be eliminated; or a minimum revised something to the effect as " The City shall work with the owners of the Shadow View Specific Plan area to incorporate a walkable, commercial retail and entertainment destination within the area designated for commercial use in the Specific Plan. Design elements such as those found in the Victoria Gardens project and Downtown Disney are desired for these commercial areas. The development of high density residential use shall be promoted as a concurrent mixed-use component of these commercial uses. The remainder of the Specific Plan area shall be allowed to be developed in accordance with the approved 2006 Specific Plan, incorporating principles of the General Plan where feasible."
Response 11A	Comment noted. However, the City still feels the requirement is appropriate.
Comment 11B	2. Subarea 11 - Commercial Entertainment District, Policy Direction #12 in the Draft GPU, which provides what the final land use designation mix parameters should be for Subarea 11, should be eliminated; or at minimum should be adjusted to allow higher percentages of Suburban Neighborhood and General Neighborhood land use designation mixes.
Response 11B	Comment noted. However, the City still feels the land use program for Subarea 11 is appropriate.
Comment 11C	3. The General Plan Designation Map (Figure 3-23) in the General Plan should designate the Shadow View Specific Plan similar to the way other specific plans have been designated.
Response 11C	Comment noted. However, the City is not going to change Figure 3-23 as the Draft General Plan anticipates the revision of the SVSP and needs Figure 3-23 to help communicate the desired vision.
Comment 11D	4. An allowed residential density range should be provided under 'Development Intensity' for the Regional Retail District on page 04-38 of the General Plan, which at minimum should be consistent with that allowed in the approved Shadow View Specific Plan commercial areas. Currently it just indicates "n/a". This residential density should also be repeated under Regional Retail District in Table 3-2: General Plan Designations Summary, page 04-55 of the GPU.
Response 11D	The City will consider this edit. The Draft General Plan has not allocated a specific residential density under 'Development Intensity' as residential uses are considered a secondary use for the Regional Retail District. Because of the secondary use, there is not required residential density, and the development under the Draft General Plan can allow for flexibility in market and housing changes.



Comment 11E 5. Both Single Family and Multi-Family residential should be shown as an allowable use under Residential Retail District in Table 3-1: General Plan Designations Compatible Uses, page 04-53 of the GPU. This table currently indicates on "Multi-Family" is an allowable "Secondary Use" in this district.

Response 11E The Regional Retail District in the referenced Planning Area is meant for commercial use and regional entertainment, this area is not meant for a residential hub. Residential uses located close to entertainment and regional retail could have potential land use conflicts, thus limiting multi-family residential to a secondary use, as the main focus for this subarea is retail.



Letter 12 - Desert Valley Builders Association (9/10)	Concerned over costs associated with development impacts and development impacts fees in various elements.
12A	Chapter 5, Goal 6: Sustainable Transportation. Policy 6.3 (Development Contributions to O&M costs) States "Require the new development and redevelopment contribute to the operations and maintenance of new transportation infrastructure."
Comment 12A	Comment 1: This section REQUIRES development contributions, does the City plan on charging new development additional fees on top of the property taxes of higher valued homes and businesses?
Response 12A	Development contributions would be required to fund operations and maintenance of new transportation infrastructure. It is the new infrastructure that ultimately would support new development.
Comment 12B	Comment 2: Home purchased as "new" contribute more in property taxes than older, long term residents.
Response 12B	Thank you for your comment, the City has noted this.
12C	Chapter 6, Goal 7, Policy 7.5 (Formula Retail) states "Consider requiring a conditional use permit for formula retail establishments (large national/multi-national chains). The City Council can assess whether the new establishment will have any serious negative impacts on the local economy or public realm and propose potential conditions of approval."
Comment 12C	Comment 1: This appears to interfere with one's right to pursue a living, financial stability based on unwanted competition. Additionally, there is the potential for said national/multinational chain to consider possible anti-trust issues if require to meet separate level of conditions.
Response 12C	The City has reviewed the comment and would like to note that implementation of this policy can vary be setting different thresholds and criteria for development. Additionally, the use of a CUP for such development types is quite common throughout California and has not seemed to create a barrier to development in other cities.
12D	Chapter 6 Goal 8, Policy 8.8 (Provision of school sites) states "Require the dedication of real property, based on the master plan of applicable school district, for the provision of necessary public education facilities within a half-mile of each neighborhood."
Comment 12D	Comment: This is beyond the scope of the City's Police and Planning Power and School Districts already have the responsibility to charge a mitigation fee or negotiate for real property and improvements. For the City to make this requirement whether on their own or collaboratively with a school district is a violation of established law.
Response 12D	The City has review this comment and will change the policy language from 'require' to 'encourage' the dedication of real property, based on the master plan of applicable school district, for the provision of necessary public education facilities within a half-mile of each neighborhood.



	Chapter 6 Goal 8, Policy 8.17 (Childcare impact fee or inclusionary ordinance) states " Consider establishing an impact fee or inclusionary ordinance to fund the expansion of existing or creation of new child care and pre-k education facilities."
Comment 12E	Comment 1: Prior to the imposition of such a fee the City must produce a 'nexus' study to establish the connection between new construction and the "need", no "want" of child-care facilities (a private business endeavor).
Response 12E	The City has review this comment and supports a 'nexus' study to establish the connection between new construction and the need for child-care facilities. The City will add language to the Draft General Plan.
Comment 12F	Comment 2: Also, past studies do not show a connection between new construction and the "need" for child care. The "need" occurs in bustling (frantic) economy, as people seek to better their monetary situations.
Response 12F	This comment has been noted, thank you.
12G	Chapter 7, Goal 2, Policy 2.1 (Community development-subdivisions) States " When reviewing applications for new subdivisions, require all residents to be oriented along an east-west access, minimizing western sun exposure to maximize energy efficiency."
Comment 12G	Comment 1: Will this apply to previously adopted plans, started or not?
Response 12G	This policy will not apply to vested entitlements, but will be used for future proposed projects in the Planning Area.
Comment 12H	Comment 2: What about those (people) that have a cultural/spiritual requirement for east/west orientation in their living structure?
Response 12H	The City has reviewed this comment and would like to note that the Draft General Plan provides the flexibility to place buildings within 15% of east-west orientation to comply with this policy.
Comment 12I	Comment 3: This appears to limit community design opportunities which is typically a design desired in nearly all General Plans.
Response 12I	This comment has been noted, thank you. The City does not feel that this will substantially limit design opportunities.
Comment 12J	Comment 4: Suggests that a builder be encouraged to build a percentage of structures within a planned development with such an orientation.
Response 12J	This comment has been noted, thank you. The City would also like to add that the east-west orientation is the most energy efficient direction for structures in the Planning Area. The east-west orientation is meant to keep houses cooler and require less energy and resources to cool buildings. This is one policy to meet the City's energy efficiency strategies and support a more sustainable development in Coachella.
Comment 12K	Chapter 7, Goal 2, Policy 2.6 (Energy Performance targets - new construction) states " Require new construction to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 15 percent and incorporate solar photovoltaic."



Response 12K	In response to comment 2,3, and 4, the City would like to note that the City's density has increased by about 280% and would also like to point out residents would get more in return when meeting title 24 standards. In summary, the City supports increased density but expects improved performance from the built environment in return.
Comment 12L	Comment 1: What are the material details of this requirement especially as we ALL must adjust to new Title 24 mandates January 1, 2014?
Response 12L	The Climate Action Plan uses an assumption of reaching the 15% reduction goal from 2008 baseline numbers in order to estimate the GHG reduction benefits of this policy.
Comment 12M	Comment 2: As Title 24 requirements change every couple of years, how is staff going to be able to educate the public on the new requirements when most of the time Materials required for new Title 24 compliance are under-produced or unidentified?
Response 12M	Updates to Title 24 standards can be found at http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/ . New projects or buildings, as well as city staff, can refer to this resource to find out updates and changes to Title 24 standards. Additionally, the City will work on public information items during the implementation process of the Draft General Plan.
Comment 12N	Comment 3: These mandates including solar photovoltaic will price out all lower to middle income home buyers. Additionally, with the recent introduction of PACE Programs into the Coachella Valley - this program opportunity most likely will be unavailable to City of Coachella residents with these proposed changes.
Response 12N	The City will be required to achieve a net-zero energy consumption in new homes by 2020. The 15% reduction will get the City kick-started towards the 2020 goal, and will have a relatively short life-span. Additionally, new construction can incorporate added measures that include thicker walls, with more insulation and well wall frame studs to support energy efficient structures in order to reduce the amount of solar generation needed.
Comment 12O	Comment 4: DVBA believes this to be a substantial economic hurdle dissuading construction investments within the City of Coachella.
Response 12O	Please see above comment. The City has reviewed the growth projections for the Coachella Valley for the next twenty years and there is substantial demand for new housing. The City is confident that these additional performance measures, which are proposed to comply with the goals of AB 32 and SB 375, are in line with those of other communities throughout California.
12P	Chapter 7, Goal 2, Policy 2.7 (Energy performance targets - existing buildings) states " When existing buildings undergo major retrofits, require the building to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 15 percent and encourage solar photovoltaic"
Comment 12P	Comment 1: Please define "Major Retrofit"
Response 12P	A major retrofit would include projects that exceed 50% of the valuation for total replacement value of existing building.



Comment 12Q	Comment 2: What are the material details of this requirement especially as we ALL must adjust to new Title 24 mandates January 1, 2014?
Response 12Q	The Climate Action Plan uses an assumption of reaching the 15% reduction goal from 2008 baseline numbers in order to estimate the GHG reduction benefits of this policy.
Comment 12R	Comment 3: As Title 24 requirements change every couple of years, how is staff going to be able to educate the public on the new requirements when most of the time materials required for new Title 24 compliance are under-produced or unidentified?
Response 12R	Updates to Title 24 standards can be found at http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/ . New projects or buildings, as well as city staff, can refer to this resource to find out updates and changes to Title 24 standards. Additionally, the City will work on public information items during the implementation process of the Draft General Plan.
Comment 12S	Comment 4: These mandates including solar photovoltaic will price out all lower to middle income home buyers.
Response 12S	The City would like to note that builders are already using this technology, and would like to reference the Cesar Chaves Villas project in the City and their use of solar panels. Similarly, the Solara project in San Diego successfully demonstrated that affordable, net zero electricity homes are feasible. Additionally, there is great potential for housing to be more affordable due to reduce energy costs.
Comment 12T	Comment 5: DVBA believes this to be a substantial economic hurdle dissuading construction investment within the City of Coachella.
Response 12T	Please see above comment. The City has reviewed the growth projections for the Coachella Valley for the next twenty years and there is substantial demand for new housing. The City is confident that these additional performance measures, which are proposed
12U	Chapter 7, Goal 3, Policy 3.1 (Conservation Performance Targets) States "Require new construction to exceed the state's Green Building Code for water conservation by an additional 10 percent."
Comment 12U	Comment 1: How does this compare to the standards established through CVAG and CVWD.
Response 12U	The City still needs to adopt a water efficiency landscaping ordinance. This policy is intended to align with the state building code and implement water efficiency standards across all aspects of a site's water use, rather than just address landscaping requirements or building fixtures.
Comment 12V	Comment 2: Same comments and questions reference above regarding Title 24. What are the details of the policy and how will City staff keep people informed on changes to the code, and cost concerns for home buyers.



Response 12V	Water rates in Coachella are comparatively higher than CVWD rates. In order to avoid extremely high costs of water, it is more economical to use water more efficiently and reduce overall consumption. The policy promotes a one-time up front cost that pays off in reduced resource efficiency and water costs.
12W	Chapter 7, Goal 3, Policy 3.5 (Recycled Water) states " Require the use of recycled water for all agriculture, irrigation and industrial uses in order to reserve the City's highest quality potable water for drinking."
Comment 12W	Comment 1: Is this a parallel (sewer/water) system? And what are the infrastructure costs?
Response 12W	The City has reviewed this comment as will include a policy that ' The City will use impact fees to set up tertiary water treatment infrastructure to use recycled water for 'non-potable' uses. The City will also add an implementation strategy item for collecting fees and a recycled water ('purple pipe') system'.
Comment 12X	Comment 2A: If on-site (self-contained within property boundaries) What is the additional cost to provide this system in a moderately sized new home or business?
Response 12X	It depends. If the development is built next to existing recycled water infrastructure, the cost will be less than if it is built further out. An example of this is the added off-site improvements required for the La Entrada development. Additionally, oversized infrastructure would be required in the undeveloped area between current infrastructure & the deve3loperment that is further out so streets do not need to be cut open for new lines or small lines enlarged. It is much less expensive to install at today's construction costs for tomorrow's developments as well. A portion of the new developer's fees would go to reimburse the older developer that put the oversized infrastructure in at an earlier date and the new developer will be paying at a rate much less than current construction costs.
Comment 12X	Comment 2B: What is the long term viability of such a system?
Response 12X	Long term, the system is less costly than filtration and treatment of drinking water. Especially with the pending Chrome 6 requirements that come out this April. Additionally, if we rely solely on drinking water to irrigate, the builders will be out of business as we will have to establish moratoriums on building due to the fact that we don't have water available for the houses & businesses they are building. The Governor of Calif. declared a state of emergency Jan. 17, 2014 with the drought declaration. This makes "Recycled/Reclaimed" water all the more essential to the survival of the building industry in our area!
Comment 12X	Comment 2C: How long before maintenance becomes so costly that the system is connect to the sewer systems?



Response 12X	“Recycled Water is water that is pumped up out of the ground, treated for human consumption (domestic drinking water) discharged to the sewer system, treated at the treatment plant to the tertiary level (disinfected) and the product is “Recycled/Reclaimed” water. It is used to irrigate landscape, is filtered through the ground and pumped back up for domestic use.
Comment 12X	Comment 2D: What are the possibilities of too much grey water and too little yard?
Response 12X	Over watering with any water is highly frowned upon and a violation in many parts of the state. The rules and regulations that govern the use of recycled water do not allow “Run-off”. This means that different types of irrigation such as low angle sprinkler heads and drip systems are required. In most cases, a booster pump is required at the point of connection as the laws governing Recycled Water system require the line pressure to less than the potable system. Typically around 20psi. This State Health Dept. requirement is in place so if a landscaper or plumber tie the two systems together illegally, the higher pressure in the domestic system will keep the recycled water out of the drinking water system. This would only affect the use site as backflow assemblies to the facility protect the public drinking/domestic water system.
12Y	Chapter 7, Goal 3, Policy 3.9 (Water quality detention basis) states "Require water detention basin to be aesthetically pleasing and to serve recreational purposes, such as in the form of Mini Park. Detention basins design for active uses are intended to supplement park and open space and should not be counted towards a developer's minimum park requirements."
Comment 12Y	Comment 1: This section requires detention basins to have a recreation design and use but provides no credit for park land or open space. Landscaping aesthetically similar to the neighborhood has been the norm, however, structural improvements such as trails, sidewalks, exercise and gym equipment, etcetera are "wants" not "needs" for that particular facility. The builder should be credited for those improvements partially offsetting park costs.
Response 12Y	The City would like to note that this policy will be implemented and vary case-by-case. Further, the Quimby Parkland dedication requirements do not apply to gated communities. Additionally, amenities can be used to justify increased density for the 'broad categories' of ranges. The City will generally support increased density if projects provide community benefits and amenities. The City will also add a policy regarding density bonuses associated with added amenities.
12Z	Chapter 7, Goal 3, Policy 3.10 (Retention Basins) States "Establish requirements for water storage of a certain size be stored underground to preserve land. Include storm water retention basins to be underground in future development."
Comment 12Z	Comment 1: What type of storage? Potable, grey water, storm?



Response 12Z	The City has reviewed this comment and will change policy language to 'Encourage storm water retention basins to be underground in future development to promote compact development and efficient use of land and urban character.' The City shall develop criteria for below-grade on-site retention in implementation of the Draft General Plan.
Comment 12Z	Comment 2: What form does this water storage unit consists? Similar to the above ground reservoirs (metal - 1 to 3 mil gal)?
Response 12Z	The City has reviewed this comment and will change policy language to 'Encourage storm water retention basins to be underground in future development to promote compact development and efficient use of land and urban character.' The City shall develop criteria for below-grade on-site retention in implementation of the Draft General Plan.
Comment 12AA	Comment 3: What are the costs of such a system?
Response 12AA	The City has reviewed this comment and will change policy language to 'Encourage storm water retention basins to be underground in future development to promote compact development and efficient use of land and urban character.' The City shall develop criteria for below-grade on-site retention in implementation of the Draft General Plan.
12AB	Chapter 7, Goal 4 (Green Building) States " Require all new substantially renovated City-owned and operated buildings in excess of 5,000 square feet achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the U.S. Green Building Council."
Comment 12AB	Comment 1: Define 'substantially renovated'
Response 12AB	"Substantially renovated" would be considered similarly to a major retrofit and would include projects that exceed 50% of the valuation for total replacement value of existing building.
Comment 12AC	Comment 2: Would the City be applying for certification? This is an expensive process with little or no increase benefits over current California green code construction standards.
Response 12AC	The intent of this policy includes applying for Certification through USGBC. Additionally, this policy selects this standard because there are substantial differences between LEED and CalGreen.
Comment 12AD	Comment 3: Additional costs will be borne by new construction (DIF) for inflated infrastructure costs.
Response 12AD	Thank you, the City has noted this comment, but does not expect a substantial cost to infrastructure being generated by improving the building performance of the City's buildings.
	Chapter 7, Goal 4, Policy 4.5 (Heat island reduction) states " Require heat inland reduction strategies in new developments such as light-colored cool roofs, light-colored paving, permeable paving, right-sized parking requirements, vegetative cover and planting, substantial tree canopy coverage, and south and west side tree planting."
	Comment 1: Some of these suggestions violate other GP Polices.
Comment 12AE	A. Vegetative cover - water use/reduction



Response 12AE	Vegetative covering in this policy would refer to water-efficient plant coverings that will help reduce heat island, and reduce storm water runoff.
Comment 12AF	B. South and west side tree planting (and tree canopy coverage) - water/use reduction and obscures roof-top solar efficiencies
Response 12AF	The City would like to note that water-efficient tree species can both reduce water consumption more than other trees, and provide shade. Additionally, trees can be planted to avoid roof-top solar panels.
Comment 12AG	C. How does the city plan to avoid the use of asphalt paving for streets?
Response 12AG	The policy does not prohibit asphalt paving, but supports the use of trees and canopy coverage to reduce heat absorption. Additionally, porous asphalt is a proven alternative for many asphalt applications.
Comment 12AH	D. Concrete, through light in color both retains heat and deflects heat towards structures.
Response 12AH	Concrete is a better heat island mitigation material than asphalt as the lighter color is more likely to reflect light, and not retain it and re-radiate it as heat.
	Chapter 7, Goal 5, Policy 5.8 (Agricultural Buffers) states " Require new developments, whether they are new urban or new agricultural uses, in which urban and agriculture uses would be adjacent to maintain a protective buffer that ensures land use conflicts do not occur."
Comment 12AI	Comment 1: What are buffers? What is the cost?
Response 12AI	The City shall re-write this policy to state the following: " Require new developments, whether they are new urban or new agricultural uses, in which urban and agriculture uses would be adjacent to maintain a protective buffer, such as landscape set backs, hedgerows, windows, or canopies, that ensures land use conflicts do not occur."
	Chapters 7, Goal 7, Policy 7.2 (Development Impacts) states " When considering development applications, require consideration of onsite detainment of storm water treatment and control measures."
Comment 12AJ	Comment: Treatment is impracticable in our region. Most recent application NPDES MS4 Permit
Response 12AJ	Comment Noted
	Chapter 7, Goal 7, Policy 7.6 (Waterways as amenities) states " When considering development applications and infrastructure improvements, treat waterways as amenities, not hazards, and encourage designs that embrace the waterways."
Comment 12AK	Comment: Please identify the waterways in the City of Coachella. Known waterways are flood channels and irrigation canals, both are hazardous and not amenities.
Response 12AK	In addition to the White Water Channel, dry wash areas exist in subareas 13, 14, and 17. These dry washes will require channelization and can be designed as amenities to residents and visitors.



12AL	Chapter 7, Goal 9, Policy 9.1 (Buffers and new development) states " When considering development applications and infrastructure improvements, treat waterways as amenities, not hazards, and encourage designs that embrace the waterways."
Comment 12AL	Comment: Please explain what required 'buffers' are
Response 12AL	Buffers are also referred to as passive open space and are recommended by biologists to provide a safe distance between open space and other land uses.
12AM	Chapter 7, Goal 9, Policy 9.7 (Landscape Design) states " Encourage new developments to incorporate native vegetation materials into landscape plans and prohibit the use of species known to be invasive according to the California Invasive Plant Inventory."
Comment 12AM	Comment: This appears contradictive to other areas requiring or encouraging planting of trees and the creation of tree canopies in other sections of the Proposed Plan.
Response 12AM	The City does not believe these are contradictive. The primary purpose of this policy is prevent invasive species. Additionally, the use of native plant materials can improve biodiversity. This policy does not exclude non-invasive non-native plants.
12AN	Chapter 7, Goal 10, Policy 10.2 (Open Space Network) states " Require new development to contribute land and/or funding to expand the community's open space network."
Comment 12AN	Comment 1: This will require appropriate "nexus" analysis
Response 12AN	The City agrees, and that this will be included in future D.I.F. Updates.
Comment 12AO	Comment 2: The City and development already adhere to an "Open-Space" plan, Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
Response 12AO	The Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan is meant for the conversation of endangered species, not necessarily open space. This policy will also refer to open space types that include parks, passive open space, riparian areas, drainage areas, and seismically active areas.
12AP	Chapter 7, Goal 10, Policy 10.5 (Grading) states "Require that proposed projects that involved a significant amount of grading shall have an archaeological and paleontological survey conducted before construction."
Comment 12AP	Comment 1: Please define "Significant"
Response 12AP	Significant amount of grading would be reached when a grading permit is required from the City.
Comment 12AQ	Comment 2: Most archeological and paleontological sites/areas/regions have been mapped.
Response 12AQ	The City's areas for sensitivity Archeological and Paleontological resources are known. However, any new project requires site-specific monitoring for these resources in the event of new discoveries of cultural resources due to the historic settlements of the Planning Area.
Comment 12AR	Comment 3: When a location has been labelled as being free from these issues, "Will a builder still need to conduct a survey?"



Response 12AR	This policy serves as a continuation of current City policy regarding protection of these resources. The protection and monitoring of cultural resources is on-going and development requirements, as well as some CEQA requirements could still require a survey. The determination would be made project-by-project.
12AS	Chapter 7, Goal 11, Policy 11.11 (Health Impacts Assessments) States " Develop thresholds of significance for sensitive land uses (schools, senior centers, medical facilities and residence) in proximity to SR86S, SR111 and 110 to require preparation of a health impact assessment (HIA), as part of the CEQA environmental review process, to analyze the significance of the health impact from highway adjacency and incorporate project-specific mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts."
Comment 12AS	Comment 1: Will the City be charging additional fees or on-site/off-site mitigation to all construction in the City, or only to the projects within the sphere of these identified health hazards?
Response 12AS	The City plans to develop local thresholds of significance required for CEQA review. Those projects exceeding the threshold may be required to prepare a Health Impact Assessment at the cost of the developer as a part of the development review process.
12AT	Chapter 7, Goal 13, Policy 13.5 (new development needs) states "Work with new development to provide at least five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents and ensure new development complies with this requirement. School playgrounds and fields shall be counted where access is ensured by a joined use agreement."
Comment 12AT	Comment 1: Based on the last Development Impact Fee Study, the City is far behind the 3 acres to 1,000 residents based of the Quimby Act.
Response 12AT	The City will update the policy to adjust language from 5 acres to 3 acres / 1000 and include language about striving for the city to have an overall park LOS of 5 per 1000 with no neighborhood having less than 3 acres per 1000 residents.
Comment 12AU	Comment 2: This requires a significant financial commitment by the existing residents of the City.
Response 12AU	Comment noted.
Comment 12AV	Comment 3: How does the City plan to financially support its share of the costs?



Response 12AV	According to the Quimby Act: (2) The ordinance includes definite standards for determining the proportion of a subdivision to be dedicated and the amount of any fee to be paid in lieu thereof. The amount of land dedicated or fees paid shall be based upon the residential density, which shall be determined on the basis of the approved or conditionally approved tentative map or parcel map and the average number of persons per household. There shall be a refutable presumption that the average number of persons per household by units in a structure is the same as that disclosed by the most recent available federal census or a census taken pursuant to Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 40200) of Part 2 of Division 3 of Title 4. However, the dedication of land, or the payment of fees, or both, shall not exceed the proportionate amount necessary to provide three acres of park area per 1,000 persons residing within a subdivision subject to this section, unless the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area, as calculated pursuant to this subdivision, exceeds that limit, in which case the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed five acres per 1,000 persons residing within a subdivision subject to this section. http://www.calsj.org/TheQuimbyAct.htm
12AW	Chapter 7, Goal 13, Policy 13.22 (Park fees) states "Collect land dedications or in lie fees from new development for the provision of parks and recreation facilities, in pursuit of a minimum parkland standards of three acres per 1,000 residents, as allowed by the California Quimby Act. Establish policies for identifying neighborhoods that have a preference for the physical provision of park and recreation infrastructure over in lieu fees and administer a fee through which new development can provide parkland in lieu of certain development fees."
Comment 12AW	Comment: This is here to emphasize the previous statements and comments.
Response 12AW	Comment noted.
12AX	Chapter 11, Goal 1, Action 1.7 (Adequate housing) states "Consider preparing a study to explore the benefits and impacts of an inclusionary housing ordinance. The study will: Determine an appropriate percentage of affordable units and potential level of affordability; analyze potential program options including the provision of below market rates on- and off-site as well as land dedication and in-lieu fee options; and examine administrative resources required to administer an inclusionary program."
Comment 12AX	Comment 1: In the long run inclusionary housing displaces the middle class out of the home purchase market. They won't be eligible for sub-market rate homes, and won't be able to afford the median market rate homes as those costs will increase by \$25,000 or more per unit.
Response 12AX	Thank you for your comment. The City would like to note that the Housing Element is being completed separate from the Proposed Project (The Draft General Plan). Questions regarding housing will be directed to the City during the Housing Element Updated.



Comment 12AY	Comment 2: Existing residents will enjoy inclusionary housing as new home supply is reduced in the price range, forcing home buyers to look at existing home stock, and raising the values of the existing home stock.
Response 12AY	Thank you for your comment. The City would like to note that the Housing Element is being completed separate from the Proposed Project (The Draft General Plan). Questions regarding housing will be directed to the City during the Housing Element Updated.



General/informal Comments from meeting on June 19, 2013	
Comment 13 - John Powell, JR (6/14)	"Like many agricultural communities Coachella faces water quality challenges..." Request to modify page 01-1. I don't see any support for this statement in the body of the document, and I believe connecting to agriculture and water quality challenges in the City of Coachella is a false connection. The water quality challenges in this area are not related to agriculture. They are related to the fact that the aquifer is made up of sand and gravel that contain arsenic and chromium from ancient underground rock formations
	Comment noted. The City will clarify this statement as follows: "Like many rural communities that lack adequate infrastructure Coachella faces water quality challenges."
Comment 14 - George R. Phillips, JR Phillips Ranch (12/4)	Request for modification to Subarea 14. We request that our property be redesignated in the General Plan as a new Subarea 18 and be demarcated as a Specific Plan area to be processed in the future (the "Phillips Ranch Specific Plan")
	City is augmenting Subarea 14 to include 400 acres south of La Entrada.
Comment 15 - MSA Consulting, Inc. (1/16)	Proposed for "Residential Overlay" in Subarea 9 within the Shadow View Specific Plan.
	This overlay would not be consistent with the City's vision for the Shadow View Specific Plan Site. No change recommended.
Comment 16 - Samuel C. Alhadeff Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP (1/24)	Requested changes to Subarea 13 regarding policy direction and existing conditions descriptors. Suggest the following language for "Vision" to be substituted for the current draft Vision Statement: "As an environmentally diverse area with limited existing access and infrastructure, this area of the City is envisioned as part of a larger future master planned development. Development in this area should occur pursuant to a comprehensive Specific Plan that addresses, among other things, the unique environmental setting, infrastructure needs and access issues that are particular to this area. Any Specific Plan may include, but not limited to, the following suggested land uses: Low density resorts, rural residential development, suburban development and suburban retail uses. Development should be planned for those areas adjacent to Interstate 10 and in the western portion of the subarea. Any development should be planned to protect and enhance the visual identity and aesthetic beauty of Coachella."
	This letter raises similar issues to 7/11/13 letter from Desert Lakes. Please see comments under Desert Lakes (Alan Means).



<p>Letter 17 - Paul Quill Shadow View, Upland (6/19)</p>	<p>Sub-Area #11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100 Acres of Comm./Ent. (too big of an area for that) - Amend GPU - Percentages of L/U (it is too specific, make it more flexible) - Paragraph 12 – “Targets” - Mixed-Use Types of Development - Increase Densities - Spread Densities
	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 18 - Desert Lakes Manager (6/19)</p>	<p>Disagrees with the vision of "The Uplands"</p>
	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 19 - Jean Martinez (Resident) (6/19)</p>	<p>UCLA Center for Health Policy Institute (Relate to Design for Disease article)</p>
<p>Response 19A</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 19B</p>	<p>Look at Food Eatery Establishments as they give residents the option good food, not just fast food.</p>
<p>Response 19B</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comments.</p>
<p>Comment 19C</p>	<p>Cognizant of health</p>
<p>Response 19C</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comments.</p>
<p>Comment 20 - Mario Zamora, (Planning Commissioner) (6/19)</p>	<p>Goal #6 (Healthy Eatery).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st Time Home Buyer Program (reduce rates) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MH FTHB - Foreclosed Homeowners/ Revisit _____ (3+ years B/K) - SB 812 (SCAG) – Contract with State
<p>Response</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 21 - Steven Hernandez (Councilmember) (6/19)</p>	<p>The Uplands (Conservation Commission)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost Concerns over Conservation - “Open Space” (additional study of types) - Area 15 & 16 & 17 (City Prohibit Annexation Until Urbanization Happens) - Area 5 (Airport Influence Area) <p>-Specificity (Economic Development) Should be considered (Land Use)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future Inv. & Opportunity
<p>Response</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>



<p>Comment 22 - Mayor Eduardo Garcia (6/19)</p>	<p>Be creative with unique terrains</p>
<p>Response 22A</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 22B</p>	<p>La Entrada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural Center/Civic in addition to athletic - Steve H. (Inclusive of Comm.) engage community and take pride in soliciting comments - Stakeholder input from the community - Water supply assess.
<p>Response 22B</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 22C</p>	<p>Existing "Water Well" adjacent to site; CVWD requires water well before they will use "Canal Water"</p>
<p>Response 22C</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.</p>
<p>Comment 22D</p>	<p>Green/Landscape Pallets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment/Retail/ not a truck stop - Similar to "Cook Street" - Diversity of Housing types
<p>Response 22D</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments.</p>
<p>Comment 23 - Jean Martinez (Resident) (7/30)</p>	<p>Period is needed after middle initials on 1st Acknowledgement Page</p>
	<p>Is Noelani Bonlle spelled correctly?</p>
	<p>- Does Joy Acuna Jr have a tilde over the n?</p>
	<p>- Gallilee is spelled "Galilee"</p>
	<p>- 2nd page of Acknowledgements first name is spelled "Jean Martinez"</p>
	<p>- On Consultant Team Page – Matt Raimi, AICP, LEED, AP Principle the word "Principle" should be spelled "Principal"</p>
	<p>- 3rd Page of Contents – on 11-1 the word is "Separate" not "Separate"</p>
	<p>- On pg. 01-1 the title "Setting the State" does not match the title on the Contents Pg. "Setting the Stage"</p>
	<p>-Resident is disappointed in the structure of the last sentence of the 1st paragraph. Suggests working more work on that sentence.</p>
	<p>- on pg. 01-1 the second paragraph is too long, resident suggest adding a period after "security."</p>
	<p>- Second sentence on page 01-1 should read "California (or "it") has passed landmark legislation that commits the state to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, become more energy efficient and strive toward increased (instead of more again) sustainable land use patterns."</p>
	<p>- Third sentence seems to be missing "that" after "challenges"</p>
	<p>- Second paragraph, last sentence – "As this awareness has grown, the role of city planning in affecting public health has cultivated"</p>



	- Third paragraph 4th sentence does not read clearly. In this sentence I suggest using "both" after external market forces as it sets up the two fiscal key health goals which are mentioned as efficiency of infrastructure and land development economics.
	- In the 5th sentence I would not use incomplete twice in the same sentence. Maybe say "unfinished" subdivisions and keep incomplete with infrastructure; just not the same adjective twice.
	- Not completely sure the history is correct.
Response 23A	Thank you for your response, the City has noted these comments and will review spelling call-outs and make changes as necessary.
Comment 24 - Ramiro Alvarez Jr. (8/29)	- More shades in every Sun Line bus stop
Response 24A	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 24B	- A lot more lighting – Bright Lighting
Response 24B	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 24C	- Takes month to replace street lights
Response 24C	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 24D	- City is taking too long to develop
Response 24D	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25 - Cristina Mendez (8/29)	-Mobility Element: City is not complete- No sidewalks near Rancho Las Flores or in borders of the city; Van Buren, parts of Ave. 51, and Ave. 52 amongst others.
Response 25A	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25B	- Goal 4: Could increase bicycle usage by implementing a bicycle adoption program where residents can donate, exchange or purchase bikes. Could possibly include safety classes.
Response 25B	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25C	- Goal 5: Provide more shades closer to restrooms or drinking fountains to aid during extreme heart days.
Response 25C	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25D	- Use the bus shelters as a way to announce community events not just cultural and artistic purposes.
Response 25D	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25E	- Community Health and Wellness - Goal 2- More affordable housing and safer communities in regards to hazards, toxics and pollutants. Would like to see all the different housing typologies with income variations. Provide access to public services. Will the City seek funding opportunities for single parent households and could these services be extended to cities near Coachella? Has the city made an SB 244 analysis?
Response 25E	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.



Comment 25F	- Goal 4: Improve relationships with government and perhaps establish a community resource center for various partnering agencies.
Response 25F	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25G	- Goal 5: Community driven and owned projects, not projects that work well somewhere else.
Response 25G	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25H	- Goal 7: Provide scholarship programs to people who provide service to the community
Response 25H	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25I	- Goal 8: Create incentives for healthier living (both residents and employees). More after school programs for kids. It is essential that we have a gym at minimum cost to residents.
Response 25I	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25J	- Infrastructure and Public Services – Goal 1-4: Joint-Use Facilities
Response 25J	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25K	- Goal 5: Encourage and educate about composting practices
Response 25K	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.
Comment 25L	- Goal 6: City should assist residents in energy efficiency practices to aid residents during summer months when electric bills are at their highest.
Response 25L	Thank you for your response, the City has noted this comment.

