



VICINITY MAP



3D VIEW



Source:
2014 Aerial Image: Esri, Digital Globe, USGS

AERIAL VIEW

LEGEND



Sub-Area



Analysis Area



SITE PHOTO KEY MAP



1 From near the northeastern corner of the northern parcel of Sub-Area 1, facing southwest at coastal sage scrub vegetation.




2 Google street view of the slope on the eastern end of Sub-Area 1, along Champagne Boulevard.



3 From near the top of the hill in the central portion of Sub-Area 1, facing southeast (toward Champagne Blvd) at coastal sage scrub vegetation and some riparian vegetation within the drainage area.



4 From Champagne Boulevard, facing northwest at the slopes in the southern end of Sub-Area 1.



SITE PHOTO KEY MAP



1 Facing northwest at an area of non-native grasslands and coastal sage scrub on/around the hill, from the northern end of the eastern property line – northern parcel of Sub-Area 8.




2 Facing southwest at an area of coastal sage scrub surrounding an oak, from near the northern portion of the eastern property line – southern parcel of Sub-Area 8.



3 Facing north at an area of non-native grasslands and oaks, from near the southern property line of the southern parcel of Sub-Area 8.



4 Facing west from near the southeastern corner of the southern parcel of Sub-Area 8; the oaks on the left are mostly in Sub-Area 6 to the south.



SITE PHOTO KEY MAP



1 From the northern portion of Sub-Area 6 near the eastern property line, facing west at an area of oak woodlands.




2 From the central portion of Sub-Area 6 facing west and an area of oak woodlands and coastal sage scrub near a drainage.



3 From the central portion of the property (where coastal sage scrub starts to transition to a combination of coastal sage scrub and non-native grasslands), facing south.



4 From the southern portion of the Sub-Area 6 property, facing north.



SITE PHOTO KEY MAP



1 View along the front (eastern) façade of the mini storage complex on Sub-Area 7, facing south.



2 Facing east at the Sub-Area 7 driveway in the northern portion of the property, leading to Champagne Boulevard.




3 Facing west at the entry gate for the mini-storage complex in the northern portion of Sub-Area 7.




4 Facing south at the interior of the mini-storage complex within Sub-Area 7.



GENERAL PLAN - CURRENT LAND USE DESIGNATIONS



GENERAL PLAN - PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS - REFERRAL MAP



LEGEND

- Sub-Area
- Analysis Area


LEGEND

- | | |
|--|---|
| Village Residential (VR-30), 30 du/ac | Rural Lands (RL-80), 1 du/80 ac |
| Village Residential (VR-24), 24 du/ac | Specific Plan Area (residential densities in italics) |
| Village Residential (VR-20), 20 du/ac | Office Professional |
| Village Residential (VR-15), 15 du/ac | Neighborhood Commercial |
| Village Residential (VR-10.9), 10.9 du/ac | General Commercial |
| Village Residential (VR-7.3), 7.3 du/ac | Rural Commercial |
| Village Residential (VR-4.3), 4.3 du/ac | Limited Impact Industrial |
| Village Residential (VR-2.9), 2.9 du/ac | Medium Impact Industrial |
| Village Residential (VR-2), 2 du/ac | High Impact Industrial |
| Semi-Rural Residential (SR-0.5), 1 du/0.5,1,2 ac | Village Core Mixed Use |
| Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1), 1 du/1,2,4 ac | Public/Semi-Public Facilities |
| Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2), 1 du/2,4,8 ac | Public/Semi-Public Lands - Solid Waste Facility |
| Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4), 1 du/4,8,16 ac | Public Agency Lands |
| Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10), 1 du/10,20 ac | Tribal Lands |
| Rural Lands (RL-20), 1 du/20 ac | Open Space (Recreation) |
| Rural Lands (RL-40), 1 du/40 ac | Open Space (Conservation) |


The Referral Map alternative is the highest density/intensity to be considered. To view the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map and Environmentally Superior Map alternatives, see pages 20 & 21.



ZONING - EXISTING ZONING USE REGULATION



ZONING - PROPOSED ZONING USE REGULATION - REFERRAL MAP



LEGEND
 Sub-Area
 Analysis Area

The Referral Map alternative is the highest density/intensity to be considered. To view the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map and Environmentally Superior Map alternatives, see pages 20 & 21.

LEGEND

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Agriculture | Open Space |
| Commercial and Office | Extractive Use |
| Industrial | Transportation and Utility |
| Multi-Family Residential | Limited Control |
| Residential Mobile Home | Specific Plan |
| Rural Residential | Holding Area |
| Residential - Single | General Rural |
| Residential - Urban | City of San Diego/No Zone |
| Residential - Variable | Indian Reservation |
| Fallbrook Revitalization Area | |



SURROUNDING AREA ANALYSIS - LAND USE



Source:
2015 LANDUSE_CURRENT: SanGIS

LEGEND

RESIDENTIAL

- Spaced Rural Residential
- Single Family Detached
- Single Family Attached
- Mobile Homes
- Multiple Family
- Mixed Use

COMMERCIAL AND OFFICE

- Shopping Centers
- Commercial and Office

INDUSTRIAL

- Heavy Industry
- Light Industry
- Extractive Industry

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND UTILITIES

- Transportation, Communications, Utilities
- Education
- Institutions
- Military

PARKS AND RECREATION

- Recreation
- Open Space Parks

AGRICULTURE

- Intensive Agriculture
- Extensive Agriculture

UNDEVELOPED


- Undeveloped; Undevelopable Natural Area
- Water
- Road Rights of Way
- Railroad Rights of Way

LEGEND


- Sub-Area
- Analysis Area



TOPOGRAPHIC VIEW




3D VIEW



LEGEND


- Sub-Area
- Analysis Area




ILLUSTRATIVE SECTION ELEVATION LOOKING NORTH




STEEP SLOPES



3D VIEW




PLAN VIEW



3D VIEW # 2


VERY HIGH FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY ZONE



3D VIEW





PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

LEGEND

-  Sub-Area
-  Analysis Area




100-YR Floodway 100-YR Floodplain 500-YR Floodplain



3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

Wetland Area Wetland Buffer

The outlined area of wetlands is just an estimate, and wetland delineations by a qualified biologist would be required at the development review stage.


Note: In this aerial map, the estimated wetlands are only shown within the Analysis Area boundaries. For additional information on any estimated wetlands within the map view, but outside the Analysis Area, please email pds.advanceplanning@sdcountry.ca.gov.



3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW



3D VIEW # 2

LEGEND




Sub-Area




Analysis Area





DAM INUNDATION ZONES



WILLIAMSON ACT CONTRACTS




LEGEND

-  Sub-Area
-  Analysis Area

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2




VEGETATION

Coastal Sage Scrub	Riparian Woodland	Marsh	Urban, Disturbed Habitat, Agriculture, Eucalyptus Woodland
Chaparral	Riparian Forest	Desert Scrub	Not Mapped (data gaps)
Grassland	Other Woodlands	Dry Wash Woodland	
Riparian Scrub	Vernal Pool, Meadow and Seep	Water (Including 11200, 13200)	



UPPER TIER VEGETATION


These areas contain upper tier vegetation communities, per the GIS vegetation layer. Upper tier vegetation communities found in the PSR areas include oak woodlands, coastal sage scrub, riparian forest types, riparian scrub types, and other wetland vegetation types like marshes. While these areas are not necessarily undevelopable in all situations, the criteria for allowing development and the permitting process for development in these areas are very restrictive.




LEGEND

- Sub-Area
- Analysis Area

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2




DRAFT NCMSCP PAMA **DRAFT NCMSCP PRESERVE LANDS**

Draft NCMSCP PAMA – For an explanation of MSCP and PAMA, see p. 42. While PAMA areas are not undevelopable, higher habitat preservation ratios are typically required, particularly in areas that serve as potential wildlife corridors.



PRIME AGRICULTURAL SOILS **STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANT SOILS**



LEGEND




Sub-Area




Analysis Area

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW



3D VIEW # 2





COMPOSITE CONSTRAINTS

- Wetland Area
- Wetland Buffer
- Flood Hazard Constraint
- Slope Constraint

	Approximate Acreage Within the Analysis Area	Approximate % of the Analysis Area
Constraint Area	7 ac	15 %
Potential Development Area	37 ac	85 %

See p. 42 for an explanation of the potential development area and limitations of this graphic analysis.

Potential Development Area




LEGEND

- Sub-Area
- Analysis Area

3D VIEW



PLAN VIEW




3D VIEW # 2

3D VIEW




DENSITY POTENTIAL FOR COMMON OWNERSHIPS



EXISTING DENSITY POTENTIAL

LEGEND

EXISTING		PROPOSED
0	Yellow	3
0	Pink	1
1	Orange	1
0	Blue	3



PROPOSED DENSITY POTENTIAL

LEGEND

Red outline	Sub-Area
Black outline	Analysis Area




EXISTING

The current General Plan designation of Specific Plan Area (SPA) was a mapping error during the General Plan Update process, as the Specific Plan expired in 2007.


RURAL				SEMI-RURAL					VILLAGE							
RL 80	RL 40	RL 20		SR 10	SR 4	SR 2	SR 1	SR .5	VR 2	VR 2.9	VR 4.3	VR 7.3	VR 10.9	VR 15	VR 24	VR 30
RURAL				SEMI-RURAL					VILLAGE							

PROPOSED

In addition to SR-10, Rural Commercial is proposed for a portion of Sub-Area 8 and a portion of Sub-Area 6, as shown on page 6.



EXISTING GENERAL PLAN



PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN



LEGEND



Sub-Area



Analysis Area

Project Overview

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: PRELIMINARY STAFF REC MAP (see p. 20; same as Referral Map for this area)

Analysis Area/PSR Description

Proposed Land Use designation:

- Referral Map: SR-10 on Sub-Areas 1 and 7; SR-10 and Rural Commercial on Sub-Areas 6 and 8 (proposed Rural Commercial covers the southern 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6 and the southeastern 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8)
- Preliminary Staff Recommendation: Same as Referral Map
- Environmentally Superior Map: All SR-10 on Sub-Areas 1, 6, 7, and 8

Property Owners:

Flores, Champagne Blvd LTD Partnership, Dunahoo, Groenenberg

Size:

Eastern Champagne Gardens (Sub-Areas 1, 6, 7, and 8) – 44.4 acres; 8 parcels

Location/Description:

Western Champagne Gardens is located on the west side of Champagne Boulevard, between Lawrence Welk Lane and Gopher Canyon Road, just east of the I-15; inside the County Water Authority boundary

Estimated Potential Dwelling Unit Increase (based on Referral Map): 7

Fire Service Travel Time: Current estimates show that the entire Western Champagne Gardens Area is within the 0-5 minute travel time range

Prevalence of Constraints: ● – high; ◐ – partial; ○ – none

- ◐ Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)
- ◐ Floodplain
- ◐ Wetlands
- Sensitive Habitat
- Agricultural Lands
- Fire Hazard Severity Zones

Project Context

Project Background

- The Champagne Gardens Specific Plan was approved in 1999 for a number of visitor serving commercial uses, but the Specific Plan expired in 2007.
- Associated with the 2011 adoption of the County’s comprehensive update of the General Plan, a mapping error occurred for these properties within the area of the former Specific Plan, in that the Specific Plan Area General Plan designation, Specific Plan Area zoning, and Village Regional Category were carried forward from the former General Plan even though the Specific Plan had expired.
 - Sub-Area 7 is the one exception, with a current General Plan designation of Rural Lands 20 (RL-20).

Parcels

- Western Champagne Gardens contains 8 parcels over 4 Sub-Areas, totaling 44.4 acres.
 - Sub-Area 1 consists of three parcels totaling 9.7 acres.
 - Sub-Area 6 consists of one 13.8 acre parcel.
 - Sub-Area 7 consists of two parcels totaling 1.6 acres.
 - Sub-Area 8 consists of two parcels totaling 19.3 acres.

General Plan

- The existing designations are Specific Plan Area (SPA) for Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 and RL-20 for Sub-Area 7.
- The proposed designations are SR-10 on Sub-Areas 1 and 7; and a combination of SR-10 and Rural Commercial on Sub-Areas 6 and 8 (proposed Rural Commercial covers 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6 and 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8).

Location/Access

- This portion of Champagne Gardens is on the west side of Champagne Boulevard, just east of I-15 and just south of Gopher Canyon Road.
- The properties are accessed via Champagne Boulevard, a County-maintained Mobility Element road.

Public Utilities and Services

- Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are in the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) for potential water service, but they are not within RMWD’s sewer service area.
- Sub-Area 7 is in the Vallecitos Water District (VWD) for potential water service, but is not within VWD’s sewer service area.
- Fire protection service is provided by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District.

Uses



- Sub-Area 7 is developed with a permitted mini-storage facility. The rest of the Sub-Areas are undeveloped.

Environmental Characteristics

- The majority of the Analysis Area contains coastal sage scrub vegetation, in addition to a few pockets of oak woodlands and non-native grasslands. Most of the acreage proposed for Rural Commercial in parts of Sub-Areas 6 and 8 consists of non-native grasslands.
- Sub-Area 1 is mostly in steep slopes, with a very steep, rocky hillside along the Champagne Boulevard frontage. The northern portion of Sub-Area 6 is also hilly with steep slopes.
- Though there are no wetlands currently mapped in GIS, some areas along the Champagne Boulevard would likely qualify as wetlands as evidenced by riparian vegetation present. There are also a couple of narrow west to east drainages originating from the I-15 corridor that could qualify as wetlands.

Comparison of Land Use Maps



(Sub-Areas outlined in blue)

Existing General Plan		Proposed General Plan – Referral Map (“Proposed Project” Map)	
			
Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 1 unit		Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 8 units	
ZONING	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	
Zoning Use Regulation	S88 (Specific Plan Area); S90 (Holding Area)	Sub-Areas 1 & 7 – RR (Rural Residential) / Sub-Areas 6 & 8 – RR and C42 (Rural Residential and Visitor Serving Commercial)	
Zoning Minimum Lot Size	(currently no minimum lot size)	4 acres in SR-10 area; 2 acres in Rural Commercial area	
COMMUNITY INPUT			
At their 2/6/18 meeting, the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group voted to recommend the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map (Alternative Map – see the next page).			

Comparison of Land Use Maps

(Sub-Areas outlined in blue)

Existing General Plan	Proposed General Plan – Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map (Alternative Map)
------------------------------	---



Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 1 unit

Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 8 units


ZONING	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning
Zoning Use Regulation	S88 (Specific Plan Area); S90 (Holding Area)	Sub-Areas 1 & 7 – RR (Rural Residential) / Sub-Areas 6 & 8 – RR and C42 (Rural Residential and Visitor Serving Commercial)
Zoning Minimum Lot Size	(currently no minimum lot size)	4 acres in SR-10 area; 2 acres in Rural Commercial area

COMMUNITY INPUT

At their 2/6/18 meeting, the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group voted to recommend the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map (Alternative Map).

Comparison of Land Use Maps

(Sub-Areas outlined in blue)



Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 1 units		Potential Dwelling Unit Estimate Sub Areas 1, 6, 7, & 8 – 7 units	
ZONING	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	
Zoning Use Regulation	S88 (Specific Plan area); S90	Sub-Area 1, 6, 7, and 8 – RR (Rural Residential)	
Zoning Minimum Lot Size	(currently no minimum lot size)	4 acres	
COMMUNITY INPUT			
At their 2/6/18 meeting, the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group voted to recommend the Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map (Alternative Map).			

Guiding Principle Review

Guiding Principle	
1. Support a reasonable share of projected regional population growth.	See Policies LU-9.9 and H-1.3
2. Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development.	See Policy LU-1.1
3. Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities when planning new housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.	See Policies LU-2.3 and LU-2.4
4. Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance.	See Policy LU-6.2
5. Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.	See Policy LU-1.9, LU-6.11, and S-1.1
6. Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns and, when appropriate, plan for development which supports public transportation.	See Policy COS-14.1
7. Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.	See Policy COS-14.1
8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.	See Policy LU-7.1
9. Minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with new development.	See Policy LU-1.1
10. Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.	See Policy LU-2.3 and LU-2.4

General Plan Conformance - Review of General Plan Policies applicable to General Plan Amendments/Rezoning without an associated development project

Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations. Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community Development Model (CDM) and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.	Regional Categories Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Areas 1, 6, 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Village Regional Category (carried forward in the General Plan Update mapping error, see p. 18) to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. • Sub-Area 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Rural Lands Regional Category to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	LU-1.1 Additional Notes
	Extent of existing infrastructure and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads/transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Adjacent to a County-maintained Mobility Element road (Champagne Boulevard) ➢ Approximately ¼ mile to the closest I-15 on-ramp, via Champagne Boulevard and Gopher Canyon Road ➢ Approximately 5.5 miles to the nearest NCTD bus stop at Gopher Canyon Road and East Vista Way <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bus Route 306 provides service from Mission Road in Fallbrook to the Vista Transit Center • Water Service & Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Rainbow Municipal Water District (Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Though these properties do not have current service, there is a current water line extended to at least the edge of each property, providing a connection point for expanding water infrastructure and starting service. ➢ Vallecitos Water District (Sub-Area 7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sub-Area 7 does not currently have water service or a water line on, or adjacent to the property. • Sewer Service & Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ None of the Sub-Areas are in a sewer service area. • Fire protection service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Deer Springs Fire Protection District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The closest fire station is Deer Springs Fire Station 1 at 8709 Circle R Drive, approximately ½ mile away. ➢ For more information on fire protection service and fire hazard issues, see LU-6.11, S-1.1, and S-6.4. 	
	Comparison to existing land uses and existing designations in the vicinity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing land uses within a ½ mile: residential, open space, agriculture, golf course, and commercial • Land use designations within ½ mile: SR-2, SR-4, RL-20, Public/Semi-Public Facilities, Rural Commercial, Open Space/Recreation, and Specific Plan Area (Welk Resort) 	
	Proximity to the village, other commercial areas, and major job centers	Approximately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.6 miles to the Hidden Meadows West Village (geographic center) that has 236 jobs and contains commercial uses at Welk Resort • 6.4 miles to the City of Vista (geographic center) that has 33,290 jobs (closest incorporated City) • 11.3 miles to the City of Carlsbad (geographic center) which has the most jobs of North County cities with 67,713 jobs • 9.1 miles to the Pala Reservation Casino that has 1,854 jobs • ¼ mile to the nearest commercial areas, within the Welk Resort on the south and the Pointed Roof Delicatessen on Old Castle Road to the north 	
LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development. Prohibit	Proposing Village designation(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A – No Village designations are proposed. 	LU-1.2 Additional Notes

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	<p>leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. <i>[See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</i></p>	<p>Project review of development design</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	
<p>LU-1.3</p>	<p>Development Patterns. Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.</p>	<p>Land use designations within a 1 mile radius of Analysis Area/PSR</p>	<p>Approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 acre in the RL-40 designation • 1,328 acres in the RL-20 designation • 545 acres in the SR-4 designation • 511 acres in the SR-10 designation • 7 acres in the Rural Commercial designation • 132 acres in the Open Space/Recreation designation • 163 acres in the SR-2 designation • 5 acres in VR-20 designation • 408 acres in the Public/Semi-Public Facilities designation (I-15 corridor) • 925 acres in the Specific Plan Area (SPA) designation 	<p>LU-1.3 Additional Notes</p>
		<p>Evident mapping patterns in the vicinity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are two relatively small Village areas (with associated Village boundaries) located in the vicinity. One is in the area of the Welk Resort (SPA), adjacent to the east and another in the area of the Hidden Meadows Specific Plan, approximately 2 miles away. • Most of the areas surrounding these Villages are in Semi-Rural densities, with specific designations/densities applied with consideration of existing parcelization, level of environmental constraints, and availability of/proximity to infrastructure and services. • Other than the SPA designation adjacent to this area on the east (and the mapping error SPA designation of the eastern portion of Champagne Gardens to the east across Champagne Boulevard), the only other designation adjacent to these Sub-Areas is an area of SR-4 adjacent to the northeast of Sub- Areas 1 & 8, that is approximately 750 acres. 	

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several areas along the I-15 corridor between Escondido and Riverside County are in RL-20 or SR-10 designations where there are extensive steep slopes, to reflect realistic development expectations. 	
		Regional Categories Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Areas 1, 6, 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Village Regional Category (carried forward in the General Plan Update mapping error, see p. 18) to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Sub-Area 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Rural Lands Regional Category to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	
		Greenbelts on/near the edges of communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens is not within a ‘greenbelt’ per the General Plan definition because Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are not located within a very low density area (Rural Lands). Though Sub-Area 7 is a relatively small (1.6-acre) property with a current Rural Lands 20 designation, it is developed with a mini-storage facility, with the development footprint covering the majority of the property. 	
LU-1.4	Village Expansion. Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area 	Proposing Village Regional Category land use designation(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – No Village designations are proposed. 	LU-1.4 Additional Notes
		Contiguous Village expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
		Satisfaction of the four criteria listed in the policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
LU-1.5	Relationship of County Land Use Designations with Adjoining Jurisdictions. Prohibit the use of	Proximity to other jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 3.5 miles from the City of Vista boundary Approximately 13 miles from the County of Riverside Approximately 8 miles from the San Pasqual Reservation 	LU-1.5 Additional Notes

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	<p>established or planned land use patterns in nearby or adjacent jurisdictions as the primary precedent or justification for adjusting land use designations of unincorporated County lands. Coordinate with adjacent cities to ensure that land use designations are consistent with existing and planned infrastructure capacities and capabilities.</p>	<p>Land use patterns in nearby or adjacent jurisdictions used as primary precedent or justification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use patterns in nearby jurisdictions are not primary justifications in density considerations for the site. 	
<p>LU-1.9</p>	<p>Achievement of Planned Densities. Recognizing that the General Plan was created with the concept that subdivisions will be able to achieve densities shown on the Land Use Map, planned densities are intended to be achieved through the subdivision process except in cases where regulations or site specific characteristics render such densities infeasible.</p>	<p>Overall acreage area of Analysis Area/PSR(s)</p> <p>Overall additional density potential</p> <p>Portions of the Analysis Area/PSR that would have additional density potential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens is 44.4 acres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 1 is 9.7 acres. Sub-Area 6 is 13.8 acres. Sub-Area 7 is 1.6 acres. Sub-Area 8 is 19.3 acres. <p>For each of the Sub-Areas except Sub-Area 7, the SPA designation was mistakenly carried forward in the General Plan Update, with a density on the Land Use Map of 0, so there is currently no density potential for these Sub-Areas. Sub-Area 7 has a current designation of RL-20 and one dwelling unit is technically possible, even though the property is fully developed with a mini-storage facility. The numbers below represent the estimated density potential, based on the designations proposed in each map alternative.</p> <p><u>Referral Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 7 additional potential dwelling units. <p><u>Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 7 additional potential dwelling units. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 6 additional potential dwelling units. <p>For each of the Sub-Areas except Sub-Area 7, the SPA designation was mistakenly carried forward in the General Plan Update, with a density on the Land Use Map of 0, so there is currently no density potential for these Sub-Areas. Sub-Area 7 has a current designation of RL-20 and one dwelling unit is technically possible, although the property is fully developed with a mini-storage facility. The numbers below represent the estimated density potential, based on the designations proposed in each map alternative.</p> <p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 1 (SR-10 proposed): 3 potential dwelling units Sub-Area 6 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 7 (SR-10 proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 8 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 3 potential dwelling units <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map (SR-10 proposed for all Sub-Areas)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 1 (SR-10 proposed): 3 potential dwelling units 	<p>LU-1.9 Additional Notes</p>

Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 6 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 7 (SR-10 proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 8 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 2 potential dwelling units <p><i>Note: Under the Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map, the Rural Commercial General Plan designation and C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) zoning use regulation are proposed over the southeastern 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and the southern 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. As such, additional development potential would be possible in each Sub-Area except Sub-Area 7.</i></p>	
	<p>Conservation Subdivision design requirement – not currently applicable or maintained/removed with the proposed designation change See p. 42 for an explanation of the Conservation Subdivision Program.</p>	<p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Maps, the Conservation Subdivision requirement would apply to the areas proposed for an SR-10 designation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An SR-10 designation requires 75% resource avoidance. The Conservation Subdivision requirement would not apply to the areas proposed for a Rural Commercial designation. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Environmentally Superior Map, the Conservation Subdivision requirement would apply to all Sub-Areas, which are proposed for an SR-10 designation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An SR-10 designation requires 75% resource avoidance. 	
	<p>Steep slopes (≥25%) within the areas of additional density potential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 4.5 acres of steep slope within Sub-Area 1 Approximately 3 acres of steep slope within Sub-Area 8 Approximately 3 acres of steep slope within Sub-Area 6 	
	<p>Allowed slope encroachment per the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) See p. 42 for an explanation of RPO steep slope implications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% encroachment range (encroachment percentage based on 75% or less of the area of the properties being in steep slopes). 	
	<p>FEMA or County mapped floodplains and floodways within the areas with additional density potential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no FEMA floodplains/floodways within the Analysis Area. A County-mapped floodplain covers approximately 1.4 acres of Sub-Area 7 and ½ acre in the southeastern portion of Sub-Area 6. 	
	<p>Wetlands within the areas of additional density potential See p. 42 for an explanation of RPO wetland implications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though there are no wetlands currently mapped in GIS, some areas along the Champagne Boulevard frontage would likely qualify as wetlands, as evidenced by riparian vegetation present. There are also a couple of narrow west to east drainages originating from the I-15 corridor that could qualify as wetlands. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The majority of the areas of potential wetlands along the Champagne Boulevard frontage are within the Champagne Boulevard right-of-way and not within the subject properties. 	

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		Upper tier habitats/vegetation communities within the areas with additional density potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 29 acres of mapped coastal sage scrub within Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Current conditions show the southern portion of Sub-Area 6 is a transition area of coastal sage scrub and non-native grasslands, with the majority of the area proposed for Rural Commercial consisting of non-native grasslands. Approximately 2 acres of coast live oak woodland within Sub-Area 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There are also additional areas of oaks within Sub-Area 8 (not currently shown in the vegetation map). 	
		North County MSCP - Draft Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) overall in the Analysis Area and acreage within the areas of additional density potential. See p. 42 for an explanation of MSCP and PAMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are within the draft PAMA (42.8 acres). 	
		Adjacent open space preserves or large blocks of undeveloped native habitat (if in draft PAMA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no adjacent open space preserves, but there are extensive areas of undeveloped native habitat on the east side of Champagne Boulevard (also in draft PAMA), with culverts under the road to allow movement of small animals. Guidance in the MSCP planning documents details the need to maintain a habitat corridor along the I-15, to allow the continued movement of California gnatcatchers through their preferred habitat of coastal sage scrub. 	
		Maximum dead end road length (DERL) based on the proposed minimum lot size	<p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map are identical for this Analysis Area. These maps include a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for an SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning, and a 2-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for a Rural Commercial General Plan designation/C42 zoning. Both the 2 and 4-acre minimum lot size areas would have a corresponding maximum DERL of 1,320 feet. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environmentally Superior map includes a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for all of the Sub-Areas, which the SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning throughout. <p><i>Discretion of the Fire Marshal is possible in applying DERLs, for consideration of the applicable density.</i></p>	
		Number of parcels within the Analysis Area/PSR with additional density potential that have existing access via dead end roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only Sub-Area 7 has current access to fire protection standards, and it's the only Sub-Area that is developed. 	
		Existing public road access for areas with additional density potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Sub-Areas have frontage on Champagne Boulevard, which is a County-maintained Mobility Element Road. 	
		Existing private road access with paved widths of at least 24 feet (fire access standard) for areas with additional density potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no existing private roads within the Analysis Area. 	

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		Existing environmental constraints that could limit the potential for widening substandard roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The areas of potential wetlands along the Champagne Gardens frontage could pose challenges to developing road access from Champagne Boulevard, depending on the extent of the wetlands delineated during a biological survey. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See this link for Section 86.604(a)5 of the County’s Resource Protection Ordinance, which discusses the criteria for potential access roads over wetlands - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/docs/res_prot_ord.pdf Areas of coastal sage scrub and oak woodlands could limit locations of internal roads. 	
		Unbuilt Mobility Element roads (“paper roads”) that would likely encumber portions of the Analysis Area/PSR with an Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate (IOD) public road right-of-way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – There are no unbuilt Mobility Element roads within Western Champagne Gardens. 	
LU-2.3	Development Densities and Lot Sizes. Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.	Overall additional density potential	<p>For each of the Sub-Areas except Sub-Area 7, the SPA designation was mistakenly carried forward in the General Plan Update, with a density on the Land Use Map of 0, so there is currently no density potential. Sub-Area 7 has a current designation of RL-20 and one dwelling unit is technically possible, although the property is fully developed with a mini-storage facility. The numbers below represent the estimated density potential, based on the designations proposed in each map alternative.</p> <p><u>Referral Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 7 additional potential dwelling units. <p><u>Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 7 additional potential dwelling units. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would result in 6 additional potential dwelling units. 	LU-2.3 Additional Notes
Portions of the Analysis Area that would have additional density potential	<p>For each of the Sub-Areas except Sub-Area 7, the SPA designation was mistakenly carried forward in the General Plan Update, with a density on the Land Use Map of 0, so there is currently no density potential for these Sub-Areas. Sub-Area 7 has a current designation of RL-20 and one dwelling unit is technically possible, although the property is fully developed with a mini-storage facility. The numbers below represent the estimated density potential, based on the designations proposed in each map alternative.</p> <p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 1 (SR-10 proposed): 3 potential dwelling units Sub-Area 6 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 7 (SR-10 proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 8 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 3 potential dwelling units <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map (SR-10 proposed for all Sub-Areas)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 1 (SR-10 proposed): 3 potential dwelling units Sub-Area 6 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 7 (SR-10 proposed): 1 potential dwelling unit Sub-Area 8 (SR-10/Rural Commercial proposed): 2 potential dwelling units 			

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
			<p><i>Note: Under the Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map, the Rural Commercial General Plan designation and C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) zoning use regulation are proposed over the southeastern 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and the southern 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. As such</i></p>	
		<p>Prevalent land use designations surrounding the Analysis Area/PSR (1-mile radius and beyond)</p>	<p>Approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 acre in the RL-40 designation • 1,328 acres in the RL-20 designation • 545 acres in the SR-4 designation • 511 acres in the SR-10 designation • 7 acres in the Rural Commercial designation • 132 acres in the Open Space/Recreation designation • 163 acres in the SR-2 designation • 5 acres in VR-20 designation • 408 acres in the Public/Semi-Public Facilities designation (I-15 corridor) • 925 acres in the Specific Plan Area (SPA) designation 	
		<p>Changes in zoning minimum lot size</p>	<p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map are identical for this Analysis Area. These maps include a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for the SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning, and a 2-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for a Rural Commercial General Plan designation/C42 zoning. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environmentally Superior map includes a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for all of the Sub-Areas, with the SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning throughout. 	
		<p>Range of lot sizes and most common (mode) lot size in the area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcel sizes range from ¼ acre lots to 50 acre lots within a 1 mile radius <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Larger lots are common in the immediate vicinity, while 2-4 acre lots are more common in Valley Center, to the east of the Welk Resort, over the ridge. 	
		<p>Community Plan policies (applicable to the proposal) that specifically reference the application of densities and minimum lot sizes</p>	<p><u>Bonsall Community Plan (covers all Sub-Areas of Western Champagne Gardens)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LU-5.2.1: <i>“Require lot sizes, except through planned development, lot area averaging or specific plan projects, to be no smaller than;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50 percent of the density indicated on the Land Use Map, without clustering or lot averaging, for Semi Rural 4 and higher densities, or ▪ Four acres for Semi Rural 10 and lower densities.” • Policy LU-5.2.2: <i>“Allow further reductions in minimum lot sizes indicated in Policy LU-5.2.1, through Planned Development, Lot Area Averaging, or Specific Plan projects only when setbacks, building scale, and design are appropriate to retain the equestrian and agricultural community character in the area.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed zoning minimum lot sizes are consistent with Community Plan Policy LU-5.2.1. 	
<p>LU-2.4</p>	<p>Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that</p>	<p>Community issues/objectives noted in the community plan that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal LU-1.1: <i>“A unique balance of Bonsall’s rural agriculture, estate lots, ridgelines, equestrian uses, and open space</i> 	<p>LU-2.4 Additional Notes</p>

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	<p>the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or land use designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a community plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.</p>	<p>are particularly relevant to the proposal</p>	<p><i>land uses within the community, including open space and low density buffers that separate the community from adjacent cities and unincorporated community and new development that conserves natural resources and topography.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Approximately 85% of the total area of the Western Champagne Gardens Analysis Area would be in a low density SR-10 designation in the Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map alternatives, and 100% of the area would be SR-10 in the Environmentally Superior Map. ➤ The small areas of Rural Commercial (3.5 acres in Sub-Area 6 and 2.5 acres in Sub-Area 8) proposed in the Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation would not be out of character for this area of Champagne Boulevard, which is separated from the rest of Bonsall by the I-15 freeway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are three existing commercial areas along Champagne Boulevard in this area, and another one ¼ mile away on Old Castle Road. ○ The existing residential densities in this area surrounding Champagne Boulevard (outside the Champagne Garden Sub-Areas with the Specific Plan mapping error) are higher than on the west side of I-15. 	
		<p>Community plan policies that are relevant to the proposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LU-1.1.2: <i>“Maintain the existing rural lifestyle by continuing the existing pattern of residential, equestrian, and agricultural uses within the Bonsall CPA.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed SR-10 designated lands would support these types of uses. ➤ As discussed above in the discussion of Goal LU-1.1, the two small areas proposed for Rural Commercial in the Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map would not be out of character with the pattern of this area of Champagne Boulevard, which exhibits the characteristics of a Semi-Rural Mobility Element road corridor with small-scale commercial uses supporting the Village densities within the adjacent Welk Resort. • Policies 5.2.1 and 5.2.2: See the review of Policy LU-2.3 in this report for the Policy text and discussion of these Community Plan policies. • A number of other policies in the Bonsall Community Plan would be applicable to this area during the review of development plans, which are not included in this ‘stand-alone’ GPA/Rezone project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A ‘B’ special area designator exists on these properties and would remain under each of the alternative map proposals, requiring Site Plan review for development, for consistency with the Bonsall Design Guidelines and the I-15 Corridor Scenic Preservation Guidelines. Part of that Site Plan review process would include review by the Bonsall and I-15 Corridor Design Review Boards. 	
		<p>Unique issues and/or community-specific planning rationales noted in the General Plan Update/PSR Board reports that are particularly relevant to the proposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A ‘community-specific planning rationale’ for Bonsall, referenced in the Board Letters of May 19, 2004, and April 13, 2011 noted: <i>“Because agriculture is a key factor in Bonsall’s rural community character, a Semi-Rural designation (1 du/10 acres) is proposed for agricultural lands.”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Though there is no existing agriculture within the Sub-Areas, prime agricultural soils cover approximately half of the area. ➤ In addition to preserving areas suitable for agriculture, SR-10 is consistent with residential densities in other areas of Bonsall, along the I-15. 	
<p>LU-2.5</p>	<p>Greenbelts to Define Communities. Identify and maintain greenbelts between</p>	<p>Greenbelts on/near the edges of communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Champagne Gardens is not within a ‘greenbelt’ per the General Plan definition because Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are not located within a very low density area (Rural Lands). Though Sub-Area 7 is a relatively small (1.6-acre) property with a current Rural Lands 20 designation, it is developed with a mini- 	<p>LU-2.5 Additional Notes</p>

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities. See p. 42 for a General Plan definition of greenbelts.	Regional Category change	storage facility and with the development footprint covering the majority of the property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Areas 1, 6, 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Village Regional Category (carried forward in the General Plan Update mapping error, see p. 18) to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. • Sub-Area 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Rural Lands Regional Category to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	
LU-6.2	Reducing Development Pressures. Assign lowest-density or lowest-intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources.	Conservation Subdivision design requirement – not currently applicable or maintained/removed with the proposed designation change See p. 42 for an explanation of the Conservation Subdivision Program Habitat/vegetation types that are found in the areas of additional density potential Resource Conservation Areas Community Plan policies that reference one or more of the vegetation communities found in the Analysis Area/PSR North County MSCP – Draft Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) overall in the Analysis Area and acreage within the areas of additional density. See p. 42 for an explanation of MSCP and PAMA.	<u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Maps, the Conservation Subdivision requirement would apply to the areas proposed for an SR-10 designation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An SR-10 designation requires 75% resource avoidance. • The Conservation Subdivision requirement would not apply to the areas proposed for a Rural Commercial designation. <u>Environmentally Superior Map</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Environmentally Superior Map, the Conservation Subdivision requirement would apply to all Sub-Areas, which are proposed for an SR-10 designation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An SR-10 designation requires 75% resource avoidance. • Approximately 1 acre of southern mixed chaparral within Sub-Area 1 • Approximately 29 acres of mapped coastal sage scrub within Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 • Approximately 9 acres of non-native grassland within Sub-Areas 6 and 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Current conditions show the southern portion of Sub-Area 6 is a transition area of coastal sage scrub and non-native grasslands, with the majority of the area proposed for Rural Commercial consisting of non-native grasslands. • Approximately 2 acres of coast live oak woodland within Sub-Area 6 • There are also additional areas of oaks within Sub-Area 8 (not currently shown in the vegetation map). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Champagne Gardens is not within a Resource Conservation Area of the Bonsall Community Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy COS-1.3.1: <i>Encourage the protection of all sensitive lands and habitat as identified by federal, State, and County guidelines such as oak and willow riparian, coastal, and Diegan sage scrub, native grasslands and wetlands.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See the review of Policy LU-1.9 in this report for a discussion of the location of these noted habitats in relation to development potential associated with the proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are within draft PAMA. Sub-Area 7 is not. • At the time of finalizing the map options for Western Champagne Gardens in late 2015, the draft PAMA delineation only covered Sub-Area 1 and the northern 15 acres of Sub-Area 8. 	LU-6.2 Additional Notes

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		Areas that could serve as potential wildlife corridors, due to connections between substantial undeveloped native vegetation onsite and undeveloped native vegetation offsite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no adjacent open space preserves, but there are extensive areas of undeveloped native habitat on the east side of Champagne Boulevard (also in draft PAMA), with culverts under the road to allow movement of small animals. Guidance in the MSCP planning documents details the need to maintain a habitat corridor along the I-15, to allow the continued movement of California gnatcatchers through their preferred habitat of coastal sage scrub. 	
		Species covered in the Draft NCMSCP that have the potential to occur in the Analysis Area/PSR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following animal species covered in the draft NCMSCP have the potential to occur in Western Champagne Gardens: arroyo toad, burrowing owl, San Diego coast horned lizard, Harbison's dun skipper, California gnatcatcher, golden eagle, least Bell's vireo, pallid bat, southwestern willow flycatcher, southwestern pond turtle, Stephen's kangaroo rat, Townsend's big-eared bat, tricolored blackbird, and western spadefoot toad. 	
		US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat Area designations for federally endangered species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These Sub-Areas are approximately 4.9 miles from a Critical Habitat area (San Luis Rey River) for the federally endangered arroyo toad, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher. 	
LU-6.11	Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.	Very High and High Fire Hazard Severity Zones present within Analysis Area/PSR	Based on available data, Western Champagne Gardens contains the following approximate acreages of these FHSZ categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very High – 44.4 acres See Policy S-1.1 for information on existing fire protection infrastructure and services. 	LU-6.11 Additional Notes
	Proposed density consistency with emergency response travel times	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current estimates show each of the Sub-Areas are in the 0-5 minute travel time range, which would meet the General Plan standard for the proposed designations in each of the alternative maps (see the review of Policy S-6.4 for additional information). 		
	Other hazards present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no fault rupture hazard zones or dam inundation zones within Western Champagne Gardens. There are no FEMA floodplains/floodways within the Analysis Area. A County-mapped floodplain covers approximately 1.4 acres of Sub-Area 7 and ½ acre in the southeastern portion of Sub-Area 6. 		
LU-7.1	Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.	SR-2 density threshold (maximum density determined to support continued agricultural operations) See p. 42 for an explanation of the SR-2 threshold for supporting continued agricultural operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens does not contain existing agricultural operations and there is no indication of agricultural operations in the last 20 years, based on review of aerial imagery. 	LU-7.1 Additional Notes
	Agricultural operations present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 		
LU-8.1	Density Relationship to Groundwater Sustainability. Require land use densities in	County Water Authority (CWA) Boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the Sub-Areas in Western Champagne Gardens are within the County Water Authority boundary (Rainbow Municipal Water District and Vallecitos Water District). This policy is not applicable to areas that are within the County Water Authority boundary. 	LU-8.1 Additional Notes

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	groundwater dependent areas to be consistent with the long-term sustainability of groundwater supplies, except in the Borrego Valley.	Groundwater-dependent (per the Groundwater Ordinance criteria)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A - Western Champagne Gardens is not groundwater dependent. 	
		Groundwater Ordinance minimum lot size (if groundwater-dependent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
		Proposed land use designation consistency with Groundwater Ordinance minimum lot size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
LU-9.2	Density Relationship to Environmental Setting. Assign Village land use designations in a manner consistent with community character, and environmental constraints. In general, areas that contain more steep slopes or other environmental constraints should receive lower density designations. <i>[See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</i>	Village land use designations proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – No Village land use designation is proposed. 	LU-9.2 Additional Notes
		Potential community character issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
		Consistency with the level of environmental constraint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
LU-9.5	Village Uses. Encourage development of distinct areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types.	Village land use designations proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – No Village land use designation is proposed. 	LU-9.5 Additional Notes
		Potential uses associated with Village proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
		Nearby uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
LU-9.6	Town Center Uses. Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Villages or Rural Villages at transportation nodes. Exceptions to this pattern may be allowed for established industrial districts and secondary commercial districts or	Commercial, office, civic, and higher density (Village) proposals	<p>The proposed zoning use regulations for the Sub-Areas include the following:</p> <p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR (Rural Residential) is proposed for Sub-Areas 1 and 7 and most of Sub-Areas 8 and 6. C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) is proposed for 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR is proposed for all Sub-Areas in this map. 	LU-9.6 Additional Notes
		Town Center or Rural Village in a transportation node	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens is adjacent to the Welk Resort Specific Plan Area, which is within a Village boundary and includes commercial directly across the road from Sub-Area 6 and ¼ mile from Sub-Area 8. 	

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	corridors. See p. 43 for a General Plan definition of transportation node.	Established industrial district, a secondary commercial district, or corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area of Champagne Boulevard could be considered a secondary commercial corridor with a mix of residential and commercial uses, as there are existing commercial uses in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Within Sub-Area 7 ➤ Within the Welk Resort across the road on the eastern side of Champagne Boulevard ➤ The Deer Park Winery across the road on the eastern side of Champagne Boulevard ➤ The Pointed Roof Deli near the intersection of Old Castle Road and Champagne Boulevard, approximately ¼ mile away 	
LU-9.9	Residential Development Pattern. Plan and support an efficient residential development pattern that enhances established neighborhoods or creates new neighborhoods in identified growth areas. (Goal LU-9 refers to distinct villages and community cores)	Distinct Village/Community core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A – Western Champagne Gardens is proposed to change from the Village and Rural Lands Regional Categories to the Semi-Rural Regional Category, as part of correcting the mapping error to reflect the expired Specific Plan. 	LU-9.9 Additional Notes
		Village densities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Champagne Gardens does not propose Village designations. 	
		Land uses surrounding the Analysis Area /PSR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	
		Identified growth area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	
LU-10.3	Village Boundaries. Use Semi-Rural and Rural Land Use designations to define the boundaries of Villages and Rural Land Use designations to serve as buffers between communities.	Regional Category changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Areas 1, 6, 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Village Regional Category (carried forward in the General Plan Update mapping error see p. 18), to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. • Sub-Area 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Rural Lands Regional Category to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	LU-10.3 Additional Notes
		Proximity to the Village Boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sub-Areas are currently located within a Village boundary, which is associated with the Specific Plan Area designation and zoning that were mistakenly carried forward in the General Plan Update. • Under either of the alternative maps, the Sub-Areas would be outside of the Village boundary and would be part of the first outer layer of Semi-Rural Regional Categories and designations. 	
		Proximity to the CPA boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Sub-Areas of Western Champagne Gardens are adjacent to the Valley Center CPA, and are within the Bonsall CPA. • The Semi-Rural Regional Category is appropriate in this area, as it will be across the road from the Village boundary around the Welk Resort Specific Plan area. 	
		Greenbelts on/near the edges of communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Champagne Gardens is not within a ‘greenbelt’ per the General Plan definition because Sub-Areas 1, 6, and 8 are not located within a very low density area (Rural Lands). Though Sub-Area 7 is a relatively small (1.6-acre) property with a current Rural Lands 20 designation, it is developed with a mini-storage facility and with the development footprint covering the majority of the property. 	

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
LU-10.4	Commercial and Industrial Development. Limit the establishment of commercial and industrial uses in Semi-Rural and Rural areas that are outside of Villages (including Rural Villages) to minimize vehicle trips and environmental impacts.	Commercial or industrial land use designations outside of Villages	<p>The proposed zoning use regulations for the Sub-Areas include the following:</p> <p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR (Rural Residential) is proposed for Sub-Areas 1 and 7 and most of Sub-Areas 8 and 6. C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) is proposed for 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR is proposed for all Sub-Areas in this map. 	LU-10.3 Additional Notes
		Distance between the proposed commercial or industrial designation and the Village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Analysis Area is across the road from the Welk Resort Specific Plan area, which is within the Village Boundary and within a Village Regional Category. See the review of Policies LU-9.6 and LU-10.3 for additional information related to the small areas of commercial proposed in the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Maps. 	
LU-11.1	Location and Connectivity. Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.	Commercial, office, or industrial land use designations outside of Villages	<p>The proposed zoning use regulations for the Sub-Areas include the following:</p> <p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR (Rural Residential) is proposed for Sub-Areas 1 and 7 and most of Sub-Areas 8 and 6. C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) is proposed for 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR is proposed for all Sub-Areas in this map. 	LU-11.1 Additional Notes
		Accessibility from surrounding areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Analysis Area is across the road from the Welk Resort Specific Plan area, which is within the Village Boundary and within a Village Regional Category. See the review of Policies LU-9.6 and LU-10.3 for additional information related to the small areas of commercial proposed in the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Maps. 	
LU-11.10	Integrity of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses. Protect designated Medium and High Impact Industrial areas from encroachment of incompatible land uses, such as residences, schools, or other uses that are sensitive to industrial impacts. The intent of this policy is to retain the ability to utilize industrially designated locations by reducing future development conflicts.	Within a ¼ mile of existing designated medium or high-impact industrial areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – Western Champagne Gardens is not within a ¼ mile of existing designated Medium or High Impact Industrial areas. 	LU-11.10 Additional Notes
		Clustering and/or buffering opportunities if within ¼ mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
COS-10.2	Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands. Discourage development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or	On or adjacent to areas classified as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2) or as having mineral resources that may be significant (MRZ-3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entirety of Western Champagne Gardens is designated as MRZ-3. 	COS-10.2 Additional Notes

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), as well as potential mineral lands identified by other government agencies. The potential for the extraction of substantial mineral resources from lands classified by the State of California as areas that contain mineral resources (MRZ-3) shall be considered by the County in making land use decisions.	Threshold of SR-10 or lower density (maximum density determined to not preclude mining operations per State Mining & Geology Board)	<u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SR-10 General Plan designation is proposed for Sub-Areas 1 and 7 and most of Sub-Areas 8 and 6. The Rural Commercial General Plan designation is proposed for 2.5 acres of Sub-Area 8 and 3.5 acres of Sub-Area 6. 	
		If higher density than SR-10 & contains these mineral resource designations – existing uses that would preclude mining	<u>Environmentally Superior Map</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SR-10 is proposed for all Sub-Areas in this map. The existing residential, commercial, and lodging uses in the adjacent Welk Resort, along with the existing residential uses to the north and east, would preclude a mining operation in this area. 	
COS-12.1	Hillside and Ridgeline Development Density. Protect undeveloped ridgelines and steep hillsides by maintaining semi-rural or rural designations on these areas.	Semi-Rural or Rural Lands designations on areas of undeveloped ridgelines and steep hillsides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steep hillsides are found in Sub-Areas 1 and smaller areas of steep slope occur in Sub-Areas 6 and 8. The areas proposed for Rural Commercial in Sub-Areas 6 and 8 would be located outside of steep slopes, along the southern border of each of these Sub-Areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The areas proposed for Rural Commercial would be in the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	COS-12.1 Additional Notes
COS-14.1	Land Use Development Form. Require that development be located and designed to reduce vehicular trips (and associated air pollution) by utilizing compact regional and community-level development patterns while maintaining community character.	Regional Category changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Areas 1, 6, 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Village Regional Category (carried forward in the General Plan Update mapping error, see p. 18) to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Sub-Area 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under each of the map alternatives, the proposal would require a change in the Regional Category, from the Rural Lands Regional Category to the Semi-Rural Regional Category. 	COS-14.1 Additional Notes
		Alternative transportation networks available in the vicinity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 5.5 miles to the nearest NCTD bus stop at Gopher Canyon Road and East Vista Way <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Route 306 provides service from Mission Road in Fallbrook to the Vista Transit Center. Approximately ¼ mile to the nearest park-and-ride facility near the intersection of Champagne Boulevard and Gopher Canyon Road. Class II bike lanes are available along Champagne Boulevard. 	
		Proximity to the village, other commercial areas, and major job centers	Approximately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0.6 miles to the Hidden Meadows West Village (geographic center) that has 236 jobs and contains commercial uses at Welk Resort 6.4 miles to the City of Vista (geographic center) that has 33,290 jobs (closest incorporated City) 11.3 miles to the City of Carlsbad (geographic center) which has the most jobs of North County cities with 67,713 jobs 9.1 miles to the Pala Reservation Casino that has 1,854 jobs ¼ mile to the nearest commercial areas, within the Welk Resort on the south and the Pointed Roof Delicatessen on Old Castle Road to the north 	

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		Land use mapping pattern consistent with community character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For information on mapping patterns and community character, see the reviews of Policies LU-2.3 and LU-2.4. 	
H-1.3	Housing near Public Services. Maximize housing in areas served by transportation networks, within close proximity to job centers, and where public services and infrastructure are available.	Extensive transportation networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens is adjacent to a County-maintained Mobility Element Road (Champagne Boulevard) and ¼ mile from an I-15 interchange; however, bus service and pedestrian infrastructure is limited in this area. See review of Policies LU-1.1 and COS-14.1 for additional information. 	H-1.3 Additional Notes
		Proximity to job centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See review of Policies LU-1.1 and COS-14.1. 	
		Extensive public services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common public services <i>not</i> present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no sewer service available on this western side of Champagne Boulevard. ➤ There are currently no existing sidewalks or trails in this area of Champagne Boulevard. ➤ There is no bus service along Champagne Boulevard, and the closest bus stop is approximately 5.5 miles away. 	
S-1.1	Minimize Exposure to Hazards. Minimize the population exposed to hazards by assigning land use designations and density allowances that reflect site-specific constraints and hazards.	Hazards present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Champagne Gardens is within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. See Policy LU-6.11 for additional information. There are no fault rupture hazard zones or dam inundation zones within Western Champagne Gardens. Approximately 2 acres in the southern portion are within a County-designated floodplain. See Policies S-9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 10.1 for additional information. 	S-1.1 Additional Notes
		Extent of existing road infrastructure that is built to fire access standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Sub-Areas have frontage on Champagne Boulevard, which is a County-maintained Mobility Element Road. Only Sub-Area 7 has current access to fire protection standards, and it's the only Sub-Area that is developed. 	
		Maximum allowed Dead End Road Length (DERL), based on the proposed zoning minimum lot size	<p><u>Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Referral Map and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Map are identical for this Analysis Area. These maps include a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning, and a 2-acre zoning minimum lot size for the areas proposed for a Rural Commercial General Plan designation/C42 zoning. Both the 2 and 4-acre minimum lot size areas would have a corresponding maximum DERL of 1,320 feet. <p><u>Environmentally Superior Map</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environmentally Superior map includes a 4-acre zoning minimum lot size for all of the Sub-Areas, with the SR-10 General Plan designation/RR zoning throughout. <p><i>Discretion of the Fire Marshal is possible in applying DERLs, for consideration of the applicable density.</i></p>	
		Portions of the Analysis Area/PSR that would require extensive access improvements in order to meet fire access standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the exception of Sub-Area 7 (developed with fire access), extensive access improvements would be required throughout the other Sub-Areas to meet fire access standards, so that new structures would be within 150' of a 24' paved road. 	

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
		Existing site constraints that could limit the feasibility of fire clearing to the proposed density or could limit access improvements where necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The areas of potential wetlands along the Champagne Gardens frontage could pose challenges to developing road access from Champagne Boulevard in addition to limiting the locations of structures/fire clearing, depending on the extent of the wetlands delineated during a biological survey. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See this link for Section 86.604(a)5 of the County’s Resource Protection Ordinance, which discusses the criteria for potential access roads over wetlands - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/docs/res_prot_ord.pdf Areas of coastal sage scrub and oak woodlands could also limit locations of internal roads and structures/fire clearing. For additional information on feasibility, see the review of Policy LU-1.9. 	
S-6.4	Fire Protection Services for Development. Require that development demonstrate that fire services can be provided that meets the minimum travel times identified in Table S-1 (Travel Time Standards).	Estimated fire response travel time consistency with the proposed designation in accordance with Table S-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to current GIS estimates, each of the Sub-Areas are within the 0-5 minute estimated fire response travel time, which would meet the General Plan standard (per Table S-1) for both of the General Plan designations proposed in the alternative maps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ These Sub-Areas are within the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and the closest fire station is Deer Springs Fire Station 1 at 8709 Circle R Drive, approximately ½ mile away. 	S-6.4 Additional Notes
S-9.2	Development in Floodplains. Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.	Floodplains present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no FEMA floodplains/floodways within the Analysis Area. A County-mapped floodplain approximately 1.4 acres of Sub-Area 7 and ½ acre in the southeastern portion of Sub-Area 6. 	S-6.4 Additional Notes
		Density feasibility with avoidance of floodplain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Area 7 is developed with a mini-storage facility. The ½ acre area within a County floodplain in Sub-Area 6 could be avoided in developing a use allowed in the proposed C42 (Visitor Serving Commercial) area, covering the southern 3.5 acres in the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation maps. See the review of Policy LU-1.9 for additional information on feasibility. 	
S-9.4	Development in Villages within the Floodplain Fringe. Allow new uses and development within the	Village designation proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – No Village land use designation is proposed. 	S-9.4 Additional Notes

Policy		Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
	floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.	Mapped floodplains within an area proposed for a Village designation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
S-9.5	Development in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands within the Floodplain Fringe. Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.	Semi-Rural or Rural land use designations in the floodplain fringe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no FEMA floodplains/floodways within the Analysis Area. A County-mapped floodplain approximately 1.4 acres of Sub-Area 7 and ½ acre in the southeastern portion of Sub-Area 6. Semi-Rural designations are proposed in each alternative map. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rural Commercial designation proposed for two small areas in the Referral and Preliminary Staff Recommendation Maps is compatible with multiple Regional Categories and would be proposed for the Semi-Rural Regional Category in this project. 	S-9.5 Additional Notes
		Community Plan explicit references	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bonsall Community Plan does not include policy language to allow additional floodplain development beyond the allowances in this policy. 	
		Parcels located entirely within a floodplain that would have additional density potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Sub-Area 7, only approximately 0.2 acres is located outside the County floodplain; however, the property is developed with a mini-storage facility. 	
S-9.6	Development in Dam Inundation Areas. Prohibit development in dam inundation areas that may interfere with the County’s emergency response and evacuation plans.	Dam Inundation Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – There are no dam inundation zones within Western Champagne Gardens. 	S-9.6 Additional Notes
		Density feasibility with avoidance of dam inundation area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	

	Policy	Policy Review Criteria	Description	Notes
S-10.1	<p>Land Uses within Floodways. Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<p>Floodways</p> <hr/> <p>Density feasibility with avoidance of the floodway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A – There are no FEMA or County-mapped floodways within Western Champagne Gardens. <hr/> • N/A 	<p><i>S-10.1 Additional Notes</i></p>

Glossary of County Planning Terms and Regulations Referenced

The following list provides definitions of terms used in the policy analysis, in addition to brief explanations of the how certain regulations referenced can impact development potential.

Conservation Subdivision – The intent of the Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP) is to encourage residential subdivision design that improves the preservation of sensitive environmental resources and community character. Design and preservation requirements have been added to the Subdivision Ordinance to encourage conservation oriented design, while additional flexibility in lot size and lot design is possible when processing a Conservation Subdivision. This program is mandatory when subdividing property with General Plan land use designations of Semi-Rural 10, Rural Lands 20, Rural Lands 40, and Rural Lands 80, with a minimum percentage of avoided resources of 75% to 90%, depending on the designation.

Greenbelt (General Plan definition) – A largely undeveloped area surrounding more urbanized areas, consisting of either agricultural lands, open space, conservation areas, passive parks, or very low density rural residential lands.

Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) Model – The LARA model is used to assess the relative of agricultural resources in San Diego County. The LARA model takes into account certain factors in determining the importance of an agricultural resource. The required factors are water, climate, and soil quality. The complementary factors are surrounding land uses, land use consistency, and topography. More specific documentation of the LARA model can be found the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources at <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ProjectPlanning/docs/AG-Guidelines.pdf>

Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) – The MSCP is a regional conservation planning program that develops and implements conservation plans intended to ensure the long-term survival of plant and animal species and protect native vegetation communities found throughout San Diego County. The County is currently in the planning process for the MSCP North County Plan.

MSCP Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) Designation – A PAMA is an area with high biological value in which conservation will be encouraged. This will be done by providing mitigation ratios that favor developing outside of the PAMA and mitigating inside of the PAMA. These areas may also be targets for acquisition by various entities from willing sellers when funding is available. Most of the PSRs are in the area that will be covered by the North County MSCP (NCMSCP), which is currently in the planning phase. As noted in the policy reviews, PAMA designations are considered draft at this point, in the areas that will be covered by the draft NCMSCP. If the NCMSCP is adopted with the current draft PAMA delineations, the preservation of effective wildlife corridors in these areas will be sought during the development review stage.

Potential Development Area (referenced in graphics) – The potential development area on p. 15 shows the area available after factoring out steep slopes, floodplains, estimated wetlands, and estimated wetland buffers. These are not the only constraints that impact potential development areas and there are limited circumstances under which these areas can be developed (small RPO slope encroachment percentage noted below, an access road can cross in certain restrictive circumstances, etc.). This graphic is included to help inform the process of looking at available acreages in relation to density potential associated with the proposal, while recognizing there are limitations to this graphic exercise.

Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) – The RPO includes provisions to protect wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and prehistoric and historic sites. The policy reviews in this document specifically addresses the implications of anticipated requirements associated with wetlands, floodplains, and steep slopes, utilizing available information. Site specific studies at the development review stage will be used to determine RPO requirements for other sensitive biological habitats and prehistoric and historic sites. At this stand-alone GPA/Rezone stage, FEMA and County floodplain/floodway maps are available, a GIS slope model is available to estimate acreage of steep slopes ($\geq 25\%$), and estimates of the extent of wetland areas are available. The RPO limits development footprint encroachment into steep slopes to a small percentage, based on the percentage of the lot in steep slopes (almost all of the PSR areas will fall somewhere in the range of 10-16% encroachment allowed). Development in wetlands and associated buffers (typically 50’-200’ buffers) would be limited to road crossings under certain limited circumstances (restrictive). Uses permitted in floodways are limited to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses.

Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) Threshold for Policy LU-7.1 Review –

Based on research found in County documents, including the Agricultural Resources section of the General Plan EIR and the County’s CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources, an SR-2 density (1 unit per 2 acres, slope-dependent) could be considered a threshold for a lower-density land use designation that supports continued agricultural operations.

An SR-2 threshold is based on research on available analysis of lot sizes in relation to successful agricultural operations in the county. The County Agricultural Commissioner provided input on this issue in a 1997 letter to the Department of Planning and Land Use that affirmed the commercial viability of small farms and specifically, two-acre parcels for agricultural use in June 1997. The high cost of land and difficulties farmers face in starting operations on large parcels led to the establishment of San Diego County’s unique small-farm economy. The Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources contains language that supports an SR-2 threshold and states lands compatible with agricultural uses include ‘rural residential lands,’ which is defined in these Guidelines as parcel sizes of two acres or greater.

Analysis included in the General Plan Update Final EIR provides additional justification for the use of an SR-2 threshold for supporting the continuation of agricultural operations. In the *Agricultural Resources – Conversion of Agricultural Resources to Non-Agricultural Land Uses* section, the analysis assumes that areas allowing one dwelling unit per acre (SR-1) would not support continued agricultural operations. This assumption considers the typical zoning minimum lot sizes and overall residential density associated with SR-1, with many homes in close proximity to each other.

Transportation Node (General Plan definition) – As referenced in Policy LU-9.6, a transportation node is intended to be the intersection of two high volume Mobility Element roadways, along with a transit stop.