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RESOLUTION NO. 82-122


WHEREAS, a proposed revision of the General Plan of the City of Santa Ana (hereinafter referred to as the "Revised General Plan") has been approved by the Planning Commission after public hearing in the manner required by law, and is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Council; and

WHEREAS, the Revised General Plan includes a draft environmental impact report which has been duly noticed for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, this Council has held a public hearing on the Revised General Plan, including the said draft environmental impact report, after notice in the manner required by law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA ANA AS FOLLOWS:

1. The City Council has evaluated all comments and recommendations written and oral, received from persons who have reviewed the draft environmental impact report, and all responses thereto, including those made at the public hearing. The Clerk of the Council is hereby directed to attach all such written comments and responses and the minutes of the said public hearing to the draft environmental impact report, together with a list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the draft environmental impact report. The said comments, responses, and list are hereby incorporated herein as part of the record and, together with the draft environmental impact report, are declared to constitute the final environmental impact report for the Revised General Plan.

2. The City Council hereby certifies that the final environmental impact report for the Revised General Plan has been completed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the State CEQA Guidelines and local procedures, and that the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the final environmental impact report.
3. The City Council hereby finds, on the basis of the final environmental impact report and other substantial evidence in the record, that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Revised General Plan which mitigate or avoid the following significant environmental effects identified in the final environmental impact report: (1) additional traffic (2) reduced air quality (3) increases in noise levels, and (4) increases in energy consumption, and that such significant environmental effect have thereby been substantially lessened. This finding is supported by the following statement of facts:

(a) Although identified as significant effects of the project in the environmental impact report, such effects are not in fact caused by the adoption of the Revised General Plan, but rather by the expected growth and development of the City of Santa Ana and the surrounding region. Such effects would occur to an equal or greater extent under the previously adopted general plan or in the absence of any general plan.

(b) The Revised General Plan contains "Circulation," "Conservation," "Energy" and "Noise" elements of which the policies and programs are specifically designed to mitigate the said identified significant effects in a rational, coordinated manner so as to achieve minimal adverse effects consistent with reasonable growth and development.

4. The City Council hereby finds, on the basis of the final environmental impact report and other substantial evidence in the record, that specific economic, social and other consideration make infeasible the alternatives to the Revised General Plan identified in the final environmental impact report. This finding is supported by the following statement of facts:

(a) The Revised General Plan represents the best balance of competing goals and objectives: preservation of residential community integrity; maintenance of affordable housing; encouragement of economic development; avoidance of unacceptable levels of congestion and disruption.

(b) Greater restriction of residential development would discourage the new development of housing available to persons of low or moderate income. Increasing
population, with its consequent increased demand for housing, would result in increasing the cost of the existing housing supply. Less restriction of residential development would result in the disruption of established residential communities.

(c) Greater restriction of commercial-industrial development would reduce employment opportunities in the City of Santa Ana; would deny to City government a tax revenue base sufficient to meet the demand for governmental services; and would lead to stagnation and blight conditions in established commercial areas. Less restriction of commercial-industrial development would allow the inter-mixture of incompatible land uses and development which is beyond the capacity of streets and other public improvements to serve.

5. The City Council hereby finds, on the basis of the final environmental impact report and other substantial evidence in the record, that the changes in planned land use for areas of the City of Santa Ana accomplished by the adoption of the Revised General Plan are acceptable. Such changes are necessary for the general welfare of the people of the City of Santa Ana over the long-term, in order to achieve a balance between competing needs, as referenced in Section 4 herein, and in order to channel new development into areas in which it will be both financially feasible and compatible with existing uses.

6. The City Council hereby approves and adopts the Revised General Plan. Said Revised General Plan, together with the Revised Housing Element of the General Plan, adopted by the City Council by its Resolution No. 82-7 on January 18, 1982, shall constitute the General Plan of the City of Santa Ana required by Section 65300 of the Government Code of the State of California and the master plan required by Chapter 27 of the Santa Ana Municipal Code. All elements of the general or master plan or amendments thereto previously adopted or approved by the City Council, excepting only the aforesaid Revised Housing Element of the General Plan, are hereby repealed.

7. The Clerk of the Council is hereby directed to endorse the Revised General Plan to show that it has been adopted by the City Council and to retain the same on file in her office.
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8. The Director of Planning and Development Services is hereby directed to:

(a) Send a copy of the Revised General Plan to the Planning Agency of Orange County.

(b) File a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of Orange County pursuant to Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code and the State CEQA Guidelines.

ADOPTED this 20th day of September, 1982.

[Signature]
Gordon Bricken, Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Janice C. Guy, Clerk of the Council

COUNCILMEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bricken</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourger</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acosta</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrato</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griset</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markel</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuigan</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved as to Form:

Edward J. Cooper by Rex

[Signature]
Edward J. Cooper, City Attorney
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Conservation Element

SUMMARY

The new City of Santa Ana General Plan was developed through an extensive process of public participation involving citizens, elected and appointed City officials and City Staff.

The General Plan has been developed to conform to state law and to meet local planning needs through the year 2000. Periodic updates of the new General Plan are anticipated.

The General Plan builds upon Santa Ana’s historical assets including the City’s heritage as the governmental and financial center of Orange County and the buildings, districts and streetscapes which reflect this heritage.

The General Plan anticipates two major potentials that can shape Santa Ana over the next several decades. The plan anticipates and maximizes the probability of the Countywide rapid transit system to be located in Santa Ana and encourages mixed use development and preservation in corridors and centers relating to this new access and visibility.

The General Plan has three major sections: the Framework Plan, Policy Plan, and Environmental Impact Report.

1. The Framework Plan describes Santa Ana’s overall planning strategy and program. This strategy reorganizes the City’s land use and urban design structure to take maximum advantage of:

   ▪ the economic development advantages offered by Santa Ana’s historic regional location and functions
   ▪ an improved multi-modal transportation system including:
     − Countywide rapid transit access to Santa Ana
     − improved local transit
     − improved auto access to major activity centers
     − a new Amtrak station
     − a downtown multi-modal transportation and bus center
a downtown shuttle system
- new pedestrian connections within and between land use districts and to public transportation facilities.

The Framework Plan provides an overview of the City’s implementation program which includes:

- continuing involvement of the community in developing the detailed implementation plans that will be developed for subareas of the Framework Plan
- efficient processing of development and rehabilitation proposals by means of a Development Review Team
- a carefully coordinated development program to foster and assist private investment through:
  - land assembly
  - coordinated provision of public improvements
  - Specific Plans
  - citizen participation coordination
  - low interest loans and grants
  - project promotion

2. The Policy Plan spells out the:

- goals and objectives which underlie the Framework Plan
- greater detail regarding implementation policies and programs supporting the Framework Plan.

Together, the Framework Plan and Policy Plan envision a new image for Santa Ana consisting of:

- increased economic activity to provide jobs and maintain a solid financial base for city services
- improvement of Santa Ana’s housing stock for a full range of income groups and lifestyles
- the finest multi-modal transportation system in Orange County
- a new physical environment consisting of:
  - preserved and enhanced viable Neighborhoods
  - District Centers combining new shopping facilities with recreational, cultural, education, employment and special housing types
  - improvement of Santa Ana’s major Industrial Districts
  - Mixed Use Corridors with a range of uses similar to the District Centers but with more facilities related to regional transit and auto access.
Exhibit 1  Framework Concept
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Exhibit 2  Regional Context
3. The Environmental Impact Report contains
   - an analysis of the impacts of implementation of the General Plan
   - an evaluation of alternative strategies and
   - mitigation means to insure compatibility of the proposed plans and policies.

PLANNING CONTEXT

HISTORICAL

Santa Ana’s rich history provides a legacy for community planning and revitalization in the 1980’s. Santa Ana was founded in 1869 by William Spurgeon. The original town, laid out by Mr. Spurgeon, consisted of 24 blocks. The town served as a shopping center and post office for surrounding agricultural areas.

In 1878 the Southern Pacific Railroad arrived and the Santa Fe Railroad followed in 1886. This encouraged development of the City. In 1889 the County seat was located in Santa Ana and this further stimulated the development of businesses, stores, financial institutions and hotels serving the metropolitan population. Citrus and walnut farms were still plentiful and buying and selling land became the number one enterprise. The First to 17th Street area was subdivided during the building boom of the 1880’s. Many of the structures in downtown and the surrounding bungalow homes were built in the early 1900’s and 1920’s.

The City is retaining and building upon its important governmental, retailing and employment roles in the County and the rich architectural and streetscapes heritage associated with the City’s history.

REGIONAL

Santa Ana is geographically central to the developable land within Orange County. The City has excellent relationships to freeways, rail services via Amtrak and air transportation at the John Wayne Airport. Because of Santa Ana’s geographic centrality and functional importance to the County, the Orange County Transit District is planning major fixed rail transit corridors in the Main Street and Pacific Electric right-of-ways. These regional transportation improvements, combined with improvements to freeway access points and local streets, provide Santa Ana with abundant development opportunities for the 1980’s.
PLANNING PROCESS

The Planning Process used in creating the Santa Ana General Plan is summarized in Exhibit 3 and related photographs. The process involved:

- a 150-person Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to which all citizens applying were appointed by the City Council
- the Planning Commissioners who served as chairpersons of five CAC subcommittees: Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation, Housing, Economic Development and Environmental Factors
- the City Council who participated in goal setting and policy making workshops
- the public-at-large who participated in a series of Town Forums and Public Hearings
- City Staff who worked with The Arroyo Group (TAG) in conducting the planning process and who evaluated the program as it evolved.

The six key steps in the planning process were:

1. **Data Collection and Analysis.** The data base for the previous General Plan was outdated and up-to-date census data was not available. Emphasis was placed on community definition of problems and opportunities through CAC and Staff Steering Committee workshops and mapping. TAG subcontractors also gathered key data in areas such as market demand, traffic, seismic, etc. This data was summarized and analyzed in a separate Problems and Opportunities Report.

2. **Formulation of Goals and Objectives.** Initial goals and objectives were developed through workshops, with the CAC and City staff. Several cycles of refinement were done by TAG based on input from the Planning Commission, City Council, CAC and staff.

3. **Formulation of Subarea Alternatives.** Santa Ana has a large number of fixed elements such as streets and land uses. Therefore, subarea plans were developed to provide alternative land use patterns in different parts of the City. Each subarea plan was related to an urban design framework previously approved by the CAC, Planning Commission and City staff.

4. **Formulation of Areawide General Plan Alternatives.** Areawide General Plan alternatives focused on different combinations of subarea plans.

5. **Plan Selection Plan.** Selection was done through a series of meetings with the CAC, Planning Commission and City staff.

6. **Plan Refinement.** Plan refinement was accomplished by staff review of a Preliminary Draft, and CAC, Planning Commission and Public-at-Large comments on a Public Hearing Draft.
Exhibit 3 illustrates some of the materials utilized during the planning process.

**POLICY PLAN**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Policy Plan section of the General Plan sets forth the detailed policies of the City relative to the framework Plan described in Section 1.

Each element of the Policy Plan contains goals, objectives, implementation policies and implementation programs.

Each element also contains a Planning Factors section which reflects the major issues identified through the citizen participation process.

The Plan Components section of each element describes the planning and design concepts illustrated in the maps and provides an overview of implementation considerations.

The Conservation element is concerned with the protection, utilization and development of natural and cultural resources. It emphasizes scarce resources and those needing special attention or management, and aims to prevent their exploitation, neglect or destruction.
PLANNING FACTORS

Santa Ana is a built-up, urban community. As a result, readily-apparent resources, such as natural habitat and wildlife, are limited. Certain stretches of Santiago Creek offer undisturbed plant and wildlife environments. Open space lands held for park and recreational uses offer important opportunities for enjoyment of a rare urban resource: open space. Other natural resources for which conservation efforts are appropriate are more difficult to see; they include clean air, water, and land itself.

Man-made resources appropriate for conservation are more plentiful in an urban environment than natural ones. Such resources include relics of our pre-history; examples of our early building and living styles; historic and current contributions to our cultural life; and our use of buildings, space and life forms to stimulate our aesthetic senses.

Both natural and man-made resources are important to the quality of life enjoyed by Santa Ana’s residents.

PLAN COMPONENTS

Major features of the Conservation element include protection of the public health, safety and welfare through effective management of natural resources such as clean air, water and land; preservation of those natural and cultural resources existing today, such as waterways, natural habitats, open spaces, historic buildings and pre-historic remains; and enhancement of the City’s aesthetic and visual amenities through increased use of vegetation and restoration of historic and cultural resources.

Conservation concerns are closely related to open space and recreation objectives. The following element deals with these matters. Conservation objectives also are related to recommendations found in the Scenic Corridors element, which seeks to preserve and enhance natural and man-made resources found in travel corridors throughout the City.
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

GOALS

Goal 1

Protect the public health, safety and welfare through effective management of natural resources.

Goal 2

Preserve, maintain and properly use natural and cultural resources.

Goal 3

Preserve and enhance the aesthetic and environmental quality of the community for the enjoyment of all residents.

OBJECTIVES

1.1 Reduce air pollution emissions to achieve national ambient air quality standards.

1.2 Provide sufficient water of adequate quality for all users.

1.3 Provide safe, land-conserving disposal of solid waste.

1.4 Assure adequate sewer treatment facilities to meet population and economic growth requirements.

2.1 Conserve water resources in commercial, industrial, residential and recreational uses.

2.2 Integrate natural and cultural resource protection measures into land use and development activities.

3.1 Minimize loss of natural aesthetic, historic, archeological and paleontological resources as land is developed.

3.2 Increase planting of trees, bushes, shrubs and flowers on public and private property.

POLICIES

- Support local and regional land use and transportation plans that increase mass transit usage and reduce vehicle trips.
- Enforce emission standards contained in local ordinances.
- Support identification and development of new sources of water.
- Cooperate in the development of a regional solid waste disposal plan and program which is efficient and land-conserving in nature.
- Encourage multiple use of water and other natural resource facilities, such as reservoirs and flood control channels.
- Encourage water conservation through design and facilities features of new developments through the use of water quality wetlands, biofiltration swales, watershed-scale retrofits, etc. where such measures are likely to be effective and technically and economically feasible.
- Use provisions of the open space plan as means to achieve applicable conservation objectives.
- Encourage private sector participation in natural and cultural resource protection activities.
- Maximize the City’s aesthetic and visual appeal by increasing vegetation throughout the community and by enhancing architectural, historic and other visual resources.
- Preserve vegetation along watercourse channels.
- Establish development guidelines for areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.
- Provide for appropriate permanent measures to reduce storm water pollutant loads in storm water from the development site.
- Minimize changes in hydrology and pollutant loading; require incorporation of control, including structural and non-structural and Best Management Practices to mitigate the projected increases in pollutant loads and flows.
- Ensure that post-development runoff rates and velocities from a site have no significant adverse impact on downstream erosion and stream habitat.

**Programs**

- Implement the Mixed Use Corridor and District Center components of the Land Use element and their transit features.
- Assign development approval priorities to proposals which minimize vehicular trips and other pollution sources.
- Incorporate particulate and other emission standards into the building permit process and zoning ordinance.
- Cooperate with Metropolitan Water District efforts to develop additional water sources.
- Condition development approvals upon adequate sewer treatment capacity.
- Develop and/or support regional solid waste disposal programs with high safety and land conservation standards.
- Develop local water recycling programs and cooperate with regional recycling efforts.
- Incorporate water conservation standards into the zoning ordinance and building permit process.
- Implement on a priority basis provisions of the open space section which encourage multiple use of natural resources such as waterways for both health and safety and recreational/aesthetic junctions.
- Inventory existing historic, archeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and districts.
- Require preservation of natural and cultural resources as a condition of building permit approvals.
- Develop incentives in the zoning code to encourage protection and enhancement of natural, cultural and historic resources.
- Develop a citywide landscaping plan and improvement program.
- Require site plans to incorporate existing or add new plant materials that are related to Santa Ana’s history, climate and cultures.
- Use drought resistant and durable landscaping materials.
- Participate in greenbelt and channel improvement plans for the Santa Ana River and Santiago Creek which aim to preserve natural vegetation.
- Maintain compliance with regional watershed and storm water management principles.