

January 9, 2012 Workshop
Property Specific Requests

Land Use Map Adopted: August 2011

Land Use Designations

- Village Residential (VR-30)
- Village Residential (VR-24)
- Village Residential (VR-20)
- Village Residential (VR-15)
- Village Residential (VR-10.9)
- Village Residential (VR-7.3)
- Village Residential (VR-4.3)
- Village Residential (VR-2.9)
- Village Residential (VR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-5)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4)
- Semi-Rural Residential (SR-10)
- Rural Lands (RL-20)
- Rural Lands (RL-40)
- Rural Lands (RL-80)
- Specific Plan Area (residential densities in italics)
- Office Professional
- Neighborhood Commercial
- General Commercial
- Rural Commercial
- Limited Impact Industrial
- Medium Impact Industrial
- High Impact Industrial
- Village Core Mixed Use
- Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility)
- Public Agency Lands
- Tribal Lands
- Open Space (Recreation)
- Open Space (Conservation)
- Forest Conservation Initiative Overlay
- Community Planning Area Boundary

Property Specific Request


- Property Owner
- Others

Level of Change

- MAJOR
- MODERATE
- MINOR

Additional information is available at the County's Department of Planning and Land Use Project Processing Center or <http://www.sdcourty.ca.gov/581/updates/updates.html>.

Map Prepared By:



Coordinates: NAD83 Feet

THIS MAP/DATA IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Note: This product may contain information reproduced with permission granted by RAND McNALLY & COMPANY™ to SANDAG. This map is copyrighted by RAND McNALLY & COMPANY™. It is unlawful to copy or reproduce all or any part thereof, whether for personal use or resale, without the prior, written permission of RAND McNALLY & COMPANY™.

Copyright SANDAG 2009. All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: http://www.sandag.org/legal_notice.htm

This is a draft map and should be destroyed upon submission of subsequent versions.

Source: County of San Diego, SANDAG
File reference: S:\land_use\gplupdate_maps\lcm\map\2011109workshop.mxd, K:\gpl2020\20110512_changes\map_output

Printed: December 22, 2011



ACRES

40

0.5 0.25 0 Miles

Printed: December 22, 2011

ACRES




B018

General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Property Specific Request	SR4
Requested by: Mark Wollam	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ¹	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	Yes
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Changes to GPU Principles Needed	No
Level of Change (March 2011)	Moderate


Note:
1- Based on staff's experience

Property Description	
Property Owner: Wollam Wendall Family Trust	
Size: 21.7 acres 2 parcels	
Location/Description: Intersection of Calle Joya and Aquaduct Road; Inside County Water Authority boundary	
Prevalence of Constraints (See following page): ● - high; ◐ - partially; ○ - none	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Steep slope (greater than 25%) ○ Floodplain ○ Wetlands ○ Habitat Value ◐ Agricultural Lands ◐ Fire Hazard Severity Zones 	

Land Use	
<i>General Plan</i>	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	1 du/4,8,20 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Referral	SR10
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20
<i>Zoning</i>	
Former — A70, 8-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011 — Same as existing	



Aerial




Adopted Aug 2011


Discussion

The property owner is requesting a SR4 designation consistent with the former General Plan; however, the Zoning for this property requires an 8-acre minimum lot size due to the entire parcel being constrained by steep slopes. Also, the northern portion of the site is currently under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, a SR4 designation would still not yield further subdivision potential because it is slope dependant. As such, when accounting for slope constraints, these two parcels totaling 21.67 acres would not have been able to subdivide further under the former General Plan; however, a larger area should also be considered to ensure a consistent mapping approach is followed.


B018 (cont.)



Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)



Agricultural Lands



Fire Hazard Severity Zones

BO18 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 4	Semi-Rural 10	Moderate

Rationale for Moderate Category Classification

The request for a SR4 density (one dwelling unit per four acres) was not directed by the Board to be evaluated as part of the General Plan Update. The highest density for the site considered as part of the General Plan Update was one dwelling unit per 10 acres. Therefore, additional environmental documentation would be necessary in order to comply with State law.

Guiding Principles/General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

Although the request is no longer considered a spot zone (the area south of the property was designated as SR4) the adjacent area of SR4 reflects existing parcelization and an approved TPM. Therefore, if this change is directed an additional 1,089 acres is recommended to also be changed for consistency with this mapping approach (see Figure 1 below).

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None





Figure 1: Property Specific Request — Refinements Necessary for Change - - - -


B020

General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Property Specific Request:	SR2
Requested by: Gerald Church	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ¹	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	Yes
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Change to GPU Principles Needed	Yes
Level of Change (March 2011)	Major ²

Note:
 1- Based on staff's experience
 2- Staff possible land use alternative April 2011:
 Moderate (attached)



Aerial



Adopted Aug 2011


Property Description	
Property Owner: Sleeping Indian Properties	
Size: 59.2 acres 6 parcels	
Location/Description: Non-contiguous parcels west of Interstate 15, one parcel is adjacent to Old Highway 395; Inside County Water Authority boundary	
Prevalence of Constraints (See following page): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● - high; ◐ - partially; ○ - none ○ Steep slope (greater than 25%) ○ Floodplain ○ Wetlands ◐ Habitat Value ◐ Agricultural Lands ◐ Fire Hazard Severity Zones 	

Land Use	
<i>General Plan</i>	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	Intensive Ag. 1 du/2,4,8 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Referral	SR10
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20
<i>Zoning</i>	
Former — A70, 2-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011 — Same as existing	


Discussion

Four of the subject parcels are adjacent to parcels similar in size to the requested density of two acres; however, the request would result in an island of Semi Rural 2 density. To avoid this island, a much larger area would need to be designated SR2. A SR2 designation on the eastern fringes of the community planning area would not be supported by the Community Development Model since this area is composed of SR4 and SR10 designations. (See also B029 and B033)


B020 (cont.)



Habitat Evaluation Model



Agricultural Lands



Fire Hazard Severity Zones

BO20 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 2*	Semi-Rural 10	Major

*Note – On April 13, 2011, staff recommended a compromise for a SR4 designation for this property, which would result in a Moderate level of change. This compromise was NOT adopted (see also BO29 and BO33)

Rationale for Major Category Classification

- The site contains high quality agricultural lands and is distant from any community center, services, or major infrastructure.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies support the preservation of agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.
- Any designation more dense than SR4 would conflict with the future commercial agricultural viability of those lands. This concept was endorsed early in the General Plan Update and numerous properties were designated with SR4 or SR10 based on it.
- The General Plan does not include similar or more intense densities in the vicinity and the vast majority of lots in the area are at least four acres or greater.
- The General Plan Community Development Model does not support increased development away from community centers.

General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

- To ensure the SR2 designation is consistently assigned, approximately 3.3 square miles in the eastern portion of Bonsall located from West Lilac Rd to Gopher Canyon Rd would require a change in designation from SR4 and SR10 to SR2 (see Figure 1). This area includes two other requests that were part of a compromise proposed by staff on April 13, 2011.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize compact communities.
- Revisions may also be necessary to Guiding Principles and policies that relate to reducing densities in areas with sensitive natural resources and certain constraints.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize the importance of agriculture to the County in areas where it is no longer feasible.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to reflect that some communities that have historically been agriculture in character may transition to large lot estate or suburban communities because of the decreasing viability of agriculture.
- In areas where the presence of agricultural lands strongly influenced the General Plan designation, the designation should be reconsidered. This would likely mainly occur in agricultural north county communities such as Bonsall, Fallbrook, Twin Oaks, Valley Center, and Pala/Pauma.

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None – This issue relates to agricultural lands which may be considered for densities of SR2 or greater. No lands in the Forest Conservation Initiative area occur in established agricultural communities where SR2 or greater densities might be applied.

Relevant General Plan Principles, Goals, and Policies

A sampling is included below:

Principle 2. Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development.

Goal LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element. A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.

Policy LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations. Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community

Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.

Policy LU-1.3 Development Patterns. Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.

Goal COS-14 Sustainable Land Development. Land use development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment.

Policy 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.

Principle 8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.

Policy 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.

Policy LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that 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.

Goal LU-7 Agricultural Conservation. A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.

Policy LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.






Figure 1: Property Specific Request — Refinements Necessary for Change - - - -

BO20, BO29, BO33 – Gerald Church, Mark Wollam, Steve Nakai

Property Specific Request	PC / Staff Recommendation	Possible Alternative Designation(s)	Level of Change for Alternative
Semi-Rural 2	Semi-Rural 10	Semi-Rural 4	Moderate
			
PC / Staff Recommendation		Possible Alternative Land Use Change	

Discussion:

- These sites were not raised as residential referrals during previous Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Hearings prior to October 20, 2011; however, they were raised in testimony and correspondence during the Board of Supervisors hearings in the Fall of 2010.
- This potential alternative designation would give the SR4 designation not only to the three subject properties but also to the surrounding area north of Moosa Canyon Creek. Since the most intense designation evaluated in the EIR was SR10, the potential land use change would still require recirculation of the EIR.


BO22

General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10/RL40
Property Specific Request	SR4/RL40
Requested by: Mark Thompson/Marlene Wendall	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ^{1,2}	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	No
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Change to GPU Principles Needed	No
Level of Change (March 2011)	Moderate


Note:
 1 – Based on staff’s experience
 2 – TRS Consultants letter dated March, 1, 2011

Property Description	
Property Owner: EWM Investments LLC	
Size: 216 acres 10 parcels	
Location/Description: Intersection of Camino Del Rey and Rancho Amigos Rd; Inside County Water Authority boundary	
Prevalence of Constraints (See following page): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● – high; ◐ – partially; ○ - none ◐ Steep slope (greater than 25%) ◐ Floodplain ◐ Wetlands ● Habitat Value ◐ Agricultural Lands ◐ Fire Hazard Severity Zones 	

Land Use	
<i>General Plan</i>	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	1 du/4,8,20 ac 1 du/2, 4 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10/RL40
Referral	SR10/RL40
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20/RL40
<i>Zoning</i>	
Former — A70, 8-acre minimum lot size RR, 2-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011 — Same as existing	



Aerial




Adopted Aug 2011


Discussion

The site is entirely constrained by steep slopes, wetlands, floodplain, or sensitive biological habitat. In addition, much of this area is within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. This request is the site of the Brisa Del Mar Tentative Map (TM), which is currently processing 20 lots and is not pipelined. This project would not be consistent with the proposed SR10/RL40 densities, which would allow approximately 14 lots. To the northwest of this property, some lots have already been subdivided into four acres; however, the request was outside the range of alternatives evaluated by the EIR. After approval of the General Plan Update a Plan Amendment Authorization to amend the General Plan was submitted by the applicant and approved by the Director.


B022 (cont.)




Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)




Floodplain




Wetlands



Habitat Evaluation Model



Agricultural Lands



Fire Hazard Severity Zones

BO22 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 4 / Rural Lands 40	Semi-Rural 10 / Rural Lands 40	Moderate

Rationale for Moderate Category Classification

The request for a SR4 density (one dwelling unit per four acres) was not directed by the Board to be evaluated as part of the General Plan Update. The highest density for the site considered as part of the General Plan Update was one dwelling unit per 10 acres with RL40 over the drainage feature. Therefore, additional environmental documentation would be necessary in order to comply with State law.

Guiding Principles/General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

- Although the request is no longer considered a spot zone (the area east of the property was designated as SR4), the adjacent area of SR4 reflects existing parcelization and an approved TPM. Therefore, if this change is directed an additional 988 acres is recommended to also be changed for consistency with this mapping approach (see Figure 1).
- Because some existing parcelization occurs in the area similar to the request, the extent of changes needed to the General Plan could be controlled through revisions to the General Plan that place greater emphasis on existing parcelization.

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None




Figure 1: Property Specific Request — Refinements Necessary for Change - - - - -

BO29

General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Property Specific Request	SR2
Requested by: Mark Wollam	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ^{1,2}	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	Yes
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Change to GPU Principles Needed	Yes
Level of Change (March 2011)	Major ³

Note:
 1 – Based on staff’s experience
 2 – TRS Consultants letter dated March, 1, 2011
 3 – Incorrectly classified as Moderate in March 16th report.

Property Description

Property Owner:
 Tuckahoe Rancho II


Size:
 14.6 acres
 1 parcel

Location/Description:
 Accessed via Rancho Amigos Road,
 approximately ¼ mile west of Aqueduct Road;
 Inside County Water Authority boundary


- Prevalence of Constraints (See following page):**
- – high; ◐ – partially; ○ - none
 - Steep slope (greater than 25%)
 - Floodplain
 - Wetlands
 - Habitat Value
 - Agricultural Lands
 - ◐ Fire Hazard Severity Zones

Land Use

General Plan	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	1 du/2,4,8 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Referral	SR10
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20
Zoning	
Former — A70, 4-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011— Same as existing	



Aerial




Adopted Aug 2011


Discussion

Parcel is surrounded by lots of 2.5 to 10 acres that are proposed for a land use designation of SR10. A SR2 designation on the eastern fringes of the community planning area would not be supported by the Community Development Model since this area is composed of SR4 and SR10 designations. (See also BO20 and BO33)

B029 (cont.)



Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)



Fire Hazard Severity Zones

BO29 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 2	Semi-Rural 10	Major**

*Note – On April 13, 2011, staff recommended a compromise for a SR4 designation for this property, which would result in a Moderate level of change. This compromise was NOT adopted (see also BO20 and BO33)

**Note - Incorrectly classified as a Moderate in March 16, 2011 staff report.

Rationale for Major Category Classification

- The site contains high quality agricultural lands and is distant from any community center, services, or major infrastructure.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies support the preservation of agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.
- Any designation more dense than SR4 would conflict with the future commercial agricultural viability of those lands. This concept was endorsed early in the General Plan Update and numerous properties were designated with SR4 or SR10 based on it.
- The General Plan does not include similar or more intense densities in the vicinity and the vast majority of lots in the area are at least four acres or greater.
- The General Plan Community Development Model does not support increased development away from community centers.

General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

- To ensure the SR2 designation is consistently assigned, approximately 3.3 square miles in the eastern portion of Bonsall located from West Lilac Rd to Gopher Canyon Rd would require a change in designation from SR4 and SR10 to SR2 (see Figure 1). This area includes two other requests that were part of a compromise proposed by staff on April 13, 2011.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize compact communities.
- Revisions may also be necessary to Guiding Principles and policies that relate to reducing densities in areas with sensitive natural resources and certain constraints.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize the importance of agriculture to the County in areas where it is no longer feasible.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to reflect that some communities that have historically been agriculture in character may transition to large lot estate or suburban communities because of the decreasing viability of agriculture.
- In areas where the presence of agricultural lands strongly influenced the General Plan designation, the designation should be reconsidered. This would likely mainly occur in agricultural North County communities such as Bonsall, Fallbrook, Twin Oaks, Valley Center, and Pala/Pauma.

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None – This issue relates to agricultural lands which may be considered for densities of SR2 or greater. No lands in the Forest Conservation Initiative area occur in established agricultural communities where SR2 or greater densities might be applied.

Relevant General Plan Principles, Goals, and Policies

A sampling is included below:

Principle 2. Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development.

Goal LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element. A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.

Policy LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations. Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community

Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.

Policy LU-1.3 Development Patterns. Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.

Goal COS-14 Sustainable Land Development. Land use development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment.

Policy 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.

Principle 8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.

Policy 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.

Policy LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that 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.

Goal LU-7 Agricultural Conservation. A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.

Policy LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.






Figure 1: Property Specific Request — Refinements Necessary for Change - - -

BO20, BO29, BO33 – Gerald Church, Mark Wollam, Steve Nakai

Property Specific Request	PC / Staff Recommendation	Possible Alternative Designation(s)	Level of Change for Alternative
Semi-Rural 2	Semi-Rural 10	Semi-Rural 4	Moderate
			
PC / Staff Recommendation		Possible Alternative Land Use Change	

Discussion:

- These sites were not raised as residential referrals during previous Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Hearings prior to October 20, 2011; however, they were raised in testimony and correspondence during the Board of Supervisors hearings in the Fall of 2010.
- This potential alternative designation would give the SR4 designation not only to the three subject properties but also to the surrounding area north of Moosa Canyon Creek. Since the most intense designation evaluated in the EIR was SR10, the potential land use change would still require recirculation of the EIR.


B032

General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Property Specific Request	SR4
Requested by: Robert Drowns	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ¹	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	Yes
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Change to GPU Principles Needed	No
Level of Change (March 2011)	Moderate

Note:
 1 – Based on staff's experience



Aerial



Adopted Aug 2011


Discussion

The area to the south and west of the subject property is parcelized into two to four-acre lots; however, larger parcels similar in size to the subject parcel are located to the north and east. The property owner's request would cause a spot designation unless the designation for surrounding parcels is also changed. This would allow additional subdivision for some of these parcels. The SR4 density is more intensive than the range of alternatives evaluated in the General Plan Update DEIR. [See also, B018, B022, B029, B030]


Property Description	
Property Owner:	Drowns Family Trust
Size:	18.9 acres 1 parcel
Location/Description:	Accessed via Via Ararat Drive and Mt. Ararat Way, approximately 2/3 miles south of West Lilac Road; Inside County Water Authority boundary
Prevalence of Constraints (See following page):	
	● – high; ◐ – partially; ○ - none
◐	Steep slope (greater than 25%)
○	Floodplain
○	Wetlands
○	Habitat Value
◐	Agricultural Lands
◐	Fire Hazard Severity Zones

Land Use	
General Plan	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	1 du/2,4,8 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Referral	SR10
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20
Zoning	
Former — A70, 2-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011— Same as existing	


B032 (cont.)



Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)



Fire Hazard Severity Zones



Agricultural Lands

BO32 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 4	Semi-Rural 10	Moderate

Rationale for Moderate Category Classification

The request for SR4 (a density of one dwelling unit per four acres) was not directed by the Board to be evaluated as part of the General Plan Update. The highest density for the site considered as part of the General Plan Update was one dwelling unit per 10 acres. Therefore, additional environmental documentation would be necessary in order to comply with State law.

Guiding Principles/General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

To ensure the SR4 designation is consistently assigned, an additional 1050-acre area around the property would require a change in designation from SR10 to SR4 (see Figure 1).

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None




Figure 1: Property Specific Request ——— Additional Remapping Necessary for Change - - - -

7727 Mt. Ararat Way
Bonsall, CA 92003
September 20, 2011

Mr. Devon Muto
Chief, Advanced Planning Directorate
Department of Planning and Land Use
County of San Diego
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123

RE: Property-Specific Requests for November 9, 2011 Workshop
Bonsall B032, Property Owner: Robert Drowns, Parcel 127-290-20

Dear Mr. Muto,

I am objecting to the SR10 Land Use downgrade of my property from SR2, but I am willing to compromise on a SR4. Prior to the 2020 General Plan my land was designated as SR2 and my 18.88 acre parcel could have been split into about eight (8) parcels, but with the SR10 downgrade designation I cannot split my property.

My wife and I have not subdivided since I bought this property in 1974. We built our home and my sons and I planted our avocado grove in 1978 and we have lived here for the past 33 years. With the recent increase in the cost of water, and with the forecasted further increase in the cost of water it appears that avocado growing may be uneconomical; therefore, it is very probable that we will have to sell our home and land. With our 18.88 acres of land at SR10, we will not be able to split and will lose our investment in our property because of your downsizing.

We are one (1) mile west of Interstate 15 (a designated traffic corridor). Directly north and north-west of our property is a subdivision, West Lilac Tentative Map (TM5276) with twenty eight (28) homes on 92.8 acres, for an average parcel size of 3.3 acres. Directly adjacent to us on the west is 20 acres which has been subdivided twice that resulted in eight parcels of 2.5 acres each (PM 10605 and PM 19605). Just to the west and adjacent to the above is another 20 acres (PM 18199 and PM10864) which now has 7 homes on an average of less than 3 acres each. And immediately to the west of that is 40 acres which was split into 8 parcels, 6 of which average 2.65 acres each.

1. Why can you say that my property must be limited to 18.88 acres when there are 49 adjacent parcels at 2 to 3 acres each west and north of me?
2. Why can you say that my property is listed as a "Spot Designation" since I have all these 49 parcels of 2 to 3 acre properties adjacent to me?
3. Why is an "EIR Recirculation Needed" if my land has been designated as SR2 for over 35 years?

I respectfully request that we compromise on a downgrade of my property from SR2 to SR4.

Respectfully yours,



Robert E. Drowns

BO33


General Plan (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Property Specific Request	SR2
Requested by: Steve Nakai	
Community Recommendation	SR10
Opposition Expected ¹	Yes
Spot Designation/Zone	Yes
Impact to FCI Timeline	None
Change to GPU Principles Needed	Yes
Level of Change (March 2011)	Major ²

Note:


- 1- Based on staff's experience
- 2- Possible land use alternative April 2011: Moderate (attached)

Property Description	
<u>Property Owner:</u> Emiko Nakai	
<u>Size:</u> 20.91 acres 1 parcels	
<u>Location/Description:</u> Adjacent to the West of Interstate 15 via Aquaduct Road Inside County Water Authority boundary	
<u>Prevalence of Constraints (See following page):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● – high; ◐ – partially; ○ - none ◐ Steep slope (greater than 25%) ○ Floodplain ○ Wetlands ◐ Habitat Value ◐ Agricultural Lands ◐ Fire Hazard Severity Zones 	

Land Use	
General Plan	
Scenario	Designation
Former GP	1 du/ 2, 4, 8 ac
GP (Adopted Aug 2011)	SR10
Referral	SR10
Hybrid	
Draft Land Use	
Environmentally Superior	RL20
Zoning	
Former — A70, 2-acre minimum lot size	
Adopted Aug 2011— A70, 4-acre minimum lot size	



Aerial




Adopted Aug 2011


Discussion

This property is in Bonsall on the west side of Interstate 15, in an agricultural area. The property owner's request would result in a spot designation would likely require additional parcels to be designated at Semi-Rural 2. A SR2 designation on the eastern fringes of the community planning area would not be supported by the Community Development Model since this area is composed of SR4 and SR10 designations.


B033 (cont.)




Steep Slope (Greater than 25%)



Habitat Evaluation Model



Prime Agricultural Land



Agricultural Lands



Fire Hazard Severity Zones

BO33 SUPPLEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF AMENDING GENERAL PLAN

Property Specific Request	August 3 Adopted Designation	Level of Change Category
Semi-Rural 2*	Semi-Rural 10	Major

*Note – On April 13, 2011, staff recommended a compromise for a SR4 designation for this property, which would result in a Moderate level of change. This compromise was NOT adopted (see also BO20 and BO29)

Rationale for Major Category Classification

- The site contains high quality agricultural lands and is distant from any community center, services, or major infrastructure.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies support the preservation of agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.
- Any designation more dense than SR4 would conflict with the future commercial agricultural viability of those lands. This concept was endorsed early in the General Plan Update and numerous properties were designated with SR4 or SR10 based on it.
- The General Plan does not include similar or more intense densities in the vicinity and the vast majority of lots in the area are at least four acres or greater.
- The General Plan Community Development Model does not support increased development away from community centers.

General Plan Changes Necessary to Support the Request

- To ensure the SR2 designation is consistently assigned, approximately 3.3 square miles in the eastern portion of Bonsall located from West Lilac Rd to Gopher Canyon Rd would require a change in designation from SR4 and SR10 to SR2 (see Figure 1). This area includes two other requests that were part of a compromise proposed by staff on April 13, 2011.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize compact communities.
- Revisions may also be necessary to Guiding Principles and policies that relate to reducing densities in areas with sensitive natural resources and certain constraints.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to deemphasize the importance of agriculture to the County in areas where it is no longer feasible.
- The General Plan Guiding Principles and policies would require revisions to reflect that some communities that have historically been agriculture in character may transition to large lot estate or suburban communities because of the decreasing viability of agriculture.
- In areas where the presence of agricultural lands strongly influenced the General Plan designation, the designation should be reconsidered. This would likely mainly occur in agricultural north county communities such as Bonsall, Fallbrook, Twin Oaks, Valley Center, and Pala/Pauma.

Impact to Forest Conservation Initiative Remapping Timeline

None – This issue relates to agricultural lands which may be considered for densities of SR2 or greater. No lands in the Forest Conservation Initiative area occur in established agricultural communities where SR2 or greater densities might be applied.

Relevant General Plan Principles, Goals, and Policies

A sampling is included below:

Principle 2. Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development.

Goal LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element. A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.

Policy LU-1.1 Assigning Land Use Designations. Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community

Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.

Policy LU-1.3 Development Patterns. Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.

Goal COS-14 Sustainable Land Development. Land use development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment.

Policy 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.

Principle 8. Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.

Policy 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.

Policy LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that 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.

Goal LU-7 Agricultural Conservation. A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.

Policy LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.






Figure 1: Property Specific Request — Refinements Necessary for Change - - - -

BO20, BO29, BO33 – Gerald Church, Mark Wollam, Steve Nakai

Property Specific Request	PC / Staff Recommendation	Possible Alternative Designation(s)	Level of Change for Alternative
Semi-Rural 2	Semi-Rural 10	Semi-Rural 4	Moderate
			
PC / Staff Recommendation		Possible Alternative Land Use Change	

Discussion:

- These sites were not raised as residential referrals during previous Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Hearings prior to October 20, 2011; however, they were raised in testimony and correspondence during the Board of Supervisors hearings in the Fall of 2010.
- This potential alternative designation would give the SR4 designation not only to the three subject properties but also to the surrounding area north of Moosa Canyon Creek. Since the most intense designation evaluated in the EIR was SR10, the potential land use change would still require recirculation of the EIR.