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1.4 LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS

1.4.1 Compatible Land Uses

The following land uses are considered conditionally compatible with the biological objectives of the MSCP and thus will be allowed within the City’s MHPA:

- Passive recreation
- Utility lines and roads in compliance with policies in 1.4.2 below
- Limited water facilities and other essential public facilities
- Limited low density residential uses
- Brush Management (Zone 2)
- Limited agriculture

Under the proposed revised environmental land use regulations described in Section 1.6, development on private property in the MHPA will not exceed 25 percent of the parcel, with 75 percent remaining as open space. When combined with the 100 percent preservation in negotiated areas on private lands, the approximately 94 percent preservation on publicly owned lands in the MHPA, and strategic acquisitions, the overall 90 percent preservation goal within the City’s MHPA can be met.

Some disturbed lands within the MHPA may be targeted for enhancement and restoration in order to more fully contribute to the functioning of the MHPA. Existing development within the MHPA such as single-family residences on A-1-10 lots are considered conditionally compatible. Expansion of existing permitted uses within the MHPA would need to be in compliance with applicable land use regulations and should provide measures to minimize impacts on the MHPA including lighting, noise, or uncontrolled access. Expansion of uses should be generally restricted to the existing approved development areas. Other existing uses within the MHPA which are not listed above may be managed for compatibility as noted above in Section 1.2 or phased out in the long term.

1.4.2 General Planning Policies and Design Guidelines

The following general planning policies and design guidelines should be applied in the review and approval of development projects within or adjacent to the MHPA. More specific policies and guidelines which are unique to individual MHPA areas are identified under Sections 1.2.2 - 1.2.5, and management policies and directives are in Section 1.5.
Roads and Utilities - Construction and Maintenance Policies:

1. All proposed utility lines (e.g., sewer, water, etc.) should be designed to avoid or minimize intrusion into the MHPA. These facilities should be routed through developed or developing areas rather than the MHPA, where possible. If no other routing is feasible, then the lines should follow previously existing roads, easements, rights-of-way and disturbed areas, minimizing habitat fragmentation.

2. All new development for utilities and facilities within or crossing the MHPA shall be planned, designed, located and constructed to minimize environmental impacts. All such activities must avoid disturbing the habitat of MSCP covered species, and wetlands. If avoidance is infeasible, mitigation will be required.

3. Temporary construction areas and roads, staging areas, or permanent access roads must not disturb existing habitat unless determined to be unavoidable. All such activities must occur on existing agricultural lands or in other disturbed areas rather than in habitat. If temporary habitat disturbance is unavoidable, then restoration of, and/or mitigation for, the disturbed area after project completion will be required.

4. Construction and maintenance activities in wildlife corridors must avoid significant disruption of corridor usage. Environmental documents and mitigation monitoring and reporting programs covering such development must clearly specify how this will be achieved, and construction plans must contain all the pertinent information and be readily available to crews in the field. Training of construction crews and field workers must be conducted to ensure that all conditions are met. A responsible party must be specified.

5. Roads in the MHPA will be limited to those identified in Community Plan Circulation Elements, collector streets essential for area circulation, and necessary maintenance/emergency access roads. Local streets should not cross the MHPA except where needed to access isolated development areas.

6. Development of roads in canyon bottoms should be avoided whenever feasible. If an alternative location outside the MHPA is not feasible, then the road must be designed to cross the shortest length possible of the MHPA in order to minimize impacts and fragmentation of sensitive species and habitat. If roads cross the MHPA, they should provide for fully-functional wildlife movement capability. Bridges are the preferred method of providing for movement, although culverts in selected locations may be acceptable. Fencing, grading and plant cover should be provided where needed to protect and shield animals, and guide them away from roads to appropriate crossings.
7. Where possible, roads within the MHPA should be narrowed from existing design standards to minimize habitat fragmentation and disruption of wildlife movement and breeding areas. Roads must be located in lower quality habitat or disturbed areas to the extent possible.

8. For the most part, existing roads and utility lines are considered a compatible use within the MHPA and therefore will be maintained. Exceptions may occur where underutilized or duplicative road systems are determined not to be necessary as identified in the Framework Management Section 1.5.

Fencing, Lighting, and Signage

1. Fencing or other barriers will be used where it is determined to be the best method to achieve conservation goals and adjacent to land uses incompatible with the MHPA. For example, use chain link or cattle wire to direct wildlife to appropriate corridor crossings, natural rocks/boulders or split rail fencing to direct public access to appropriate locations, and chain link to provide added protection of certain sensitive species or habitats (e.g., vernal pools).

2. Lighting shall be designed to avoid intrusion into the MHPA and effects on wildlife. Lighting in areas of wildlife crossings should be of low-sodium or similar lighting. Signage will be limited to access and litter control and educational purposes.

Materials Storage

Prohibit storage of materials (e.g., hazardous or toxic, chemicals, equipment, etc.) within the MHPA and ensure appropriate storage per applicable regulations in any areas that may impact the MHPA, especially due to potential leakage.

Mining, Extraction, and Processing Facilities

1. Mining operations include mineral extraction, processing and other related mining activities (e.g., asphaltic processing). Currently permitted mining operations that have approved restoration plans may continue operating in the MHPA. New or expanded mining operations on lands conserved as part of the MHPA are incompatible with MSCP preserve goals for covered species and their habitats unless otherwise agreed to by the wildlife agencies at the time the parcel is conserved. New operations are permitted in the MHPA if: 1) impacts have been assessed and conditions incorporated to mitigate biological impacts and restore mined areas; 2) adverse impacts to covered species in the MHPA have been mitigated consistent with the Subarea Plan; and 3) requirements of other City land
use policies and regulations (e.g., Adjacency Guidelines, Conditional Use Permit) have been satisfied. Existing and any newly permitted operations adjacent to or within the MHPA shall meet noise, air quality and water quality regulation requirements, as identified in the conditions of any existing or new permit, in order to adequately protect adjacent preserved areas and covered species. Such facilities shall also be appropriately restored upon cessation of mining activities.

2. All mining and other related activities must be consistent with the objectives, guidelines, and recommendations in the MSCP plan, the City of San Diego's Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance, all relevant long-range plans, as well as with the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975.

3. Any sand removal activities should be monitored for noise impacts to surrounding sensitive habitats, and all new sediment removal or mining operations proposed in proximity to the MHPA, or changes in existing operations, must include noise reduction methods that take into consideration the breeding and nesting seasons of sensitive bird species.

4. All existing and future mined lands adjacent to or within the MHPA shall be reclaimed pursuant to SMARA. Ponds are considered compatible uses where they provide native wildlife and wetland habitats and do not conflict with conservation goals of the MSCP and Subarea Plan.

5. Any permitted mining activity including reclamation of sand must consider changes and impacts to water quality, water table level, fluvial hydrology, flooding, and wetlands and habitats upstream and downstream, and provide adequate mitigation.

**Flood Control**

1. Flood control should generally be limited to existing agreements with resource agencies unless demonstrated to be needed based on a cost benefit analysis and pursuant to a restoration plan. Floodplains within the MHPA, and upstream from the MHPA if feasible, should remain in a natural condition and configuration in order to allow for the ecological, geological, hydrological, and other natural processes to remain or be restored.

2. No berming, channelization, or man-made constraints or barriers to creek, tributary, or river flows should be allowed in any floodplain within the MHPA unless reviewed by all appropriate agencies, and adequately mitigated. Review must include impacts to upstream and downstream habitats, flood flow volumes, velocities and configurations, water availability, and changes to the water table level.
3. No riprap, concrete, or other unnatural material shall be used to stabilize river, creek, tributary, and channel banks within the MHPA. River, stream, and channel banks shall be natural, and stabilized where necessary with willows and other appropriate native plantings. Rock gabions may be used where necessary to dissipate flows and should incorporate design features to ensure wildlife movement.

1.4.3 Land Use Adjacency Guidelines

Land uses planned or existing adjacent to the MHPA include single and multiple family residential, active recreation, commercial, industrial, agricultural, landfills, and extractive uses. Land uses adjacent to the MHPA will be managed to ensure minimal impacts to the MHPA. Consideration will be given to good planning principles in relation to adjacent land uses as described below. The following are adjacency guidelines that will be addressed, on a project-by-project basis, during either the planning (new development) or management (new and existing development) stages to minimize impacts and maintain the function of the MHPA. Implementation of these guidelines is addressed further in Section 1.5, Framework Management Plan. Many of these issues will be identified and addressed through the CEQA Process.

Drainage

1. All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the preserve must not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials and other elements that might degrade or harm the natural environment or ecosystem processes within the MHPA. This can be accomplished using a variety of methods including natural detention basins, grass swales or mechanical trapping devices. These systems should be maintained approximately once a year, or as often as needed, to ensure proper functioning. Maintenance should include dredging out sediments if needed, removing exotic plant materials, and adding chemical-neutralizing compounds (e.g., clay compounds) when necessary and appropriate.

Toxics

2. Land uses, such as recreation and agriculture, that use chemicals or generate by-products such as manure, that are potentially toxic or impactive to wildlife, sensitive species, habitat, or water quality need to incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. Such measures should include drainage/detention basins, swales, or holding areas with non-invasive grasses or wetland-type native vegetation to filter out the toxic materials. Regular maintenance should be provided. Where applicable, this requirement should be incorporated into leases on publicly owned property as leases come up for renewal.
ORDINANCE NUMBER 0-17698 (NEW SERIES)
ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 7, 1991

AN ORDINANCE SETTING ASIDE AND
DEDICATING VARIOUS PORTIONS OF LOS
PENASQUITOS CANYON PRESERVE AND LOPEZ
CANYON IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO,
CALIFORNIA, FOR A PUBLIC PARK

BE IT ORDAINED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, as
follows:

Section 1. That portions of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve and
Lopez Canyon, which are more particularly described in Attachments A, B
and C hereto which are by this reference incorporated herein, are hereby
set aside and dedicated in perpetuity for park and recreational
purposes.

Section 2. That the City Council of The City of San Diego
hereby specifically reserves the right to establish underground public
service easements through and across the dedicated property so long as
the construction and maintenance of the subject easements do not
substantially negatively impact the availability of the property for use
for park and recreational purposes.

Section 3. That the City Clerk of said City be and he is hereby
authorized and directed to file for record in the office of the San
Diego County Recorder a certified copy of this ordinance.

Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force on
the thirtieth day from and after its passage.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney
By Harold O. Valderhaug
Deputy City Attorney
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