

APPENDIX

Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA)
Boundary Line Correction



NATURAL RESOURCE MAPPING/ MHPA BOUNDARY LINE CORRECTION

As part of the Golden Hill community plan update process, the areas designated by the community plan as open space and areas within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) were reviewed for their applicability to conservation of Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL). It was determined that some areas had been mapped to include what appeared to be a significant extent of existing development (i.e., houses, streets) while other areas containing sensitive biological resources were not included. Therefore, a comprehensive, systematic approach was developed in order to evaluate areas of existing developed land that should be removed as well as areas where biological resources should be added. The following GIS layers were reviewed:

- Existing MHPA and Community Plan Open Space boundaries
- 1992 aerial mapping
- Public Ownership
- City Dedicated and Designated Open Space Lands
- SANGIS Conserved Lands database
- Topographical data
- SANGIS Vegetation layers – 1997 and 2012
- 2012 aerial mapping

City staff reviewed the first two layers to determine where, if any, potential errors existed. Subsequent GIS layers were added to refine the boundary lines. A comprehensive MHPA boundary line correction for the communities of Golden Hill, Uptown, and North Park was considered

in coordination with the State and Federal Wildlife Agencies and is consistent with the goals of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) to conserve biological resources and allow for existing and future development in appropriate areas. The net gain in acreage to the MHPA for the three community plan areas would be 23.7 acres.

The evaluation process considered the following factors:

1. The proposed area to be corrected out was legally permitted pre-adoption of the MSCP (1997); or
2. If there appears to be a GIS mapping error, a correction may be considered if it would not result in either:
3. Removal of habitat, including wetlands;
4. Impacts to biological buffer areas (e.g., wetland buffer, wildlife corridor).
5. Removing the area from the MHPA would not avert the applicant from having to otherwise comply with the City's MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

The MHPA correction removed: 1) existing development (i.e., structures and streets), and; 2) the 35-foot brush management zone 1 area as required in accordance with the City's Land Development Code, Section 142.0412. Generally, the MHPA boundary was corrected by shifting the boundary to the rear portion of many private parcels thereby resulting in the removal of existing single-family homes and yards within brush management zone 1 while adding sensitive habitat/resources in other locations. In a few cases, sensitive habitat/resources located within designated community plan open space on private land was added to the MHPA in order to expand the local wildlife corridor and increase the viability and connectivity of sensitive habitat within the existing MHPA. Regardless of the MHPA boundary line correction, these addition areas

are regulated through ESL regulations for sensitive biological resources and steep slopes.

The MPHA boundary line correction would not add or increase any regulations associated with City projects such as sewer line repairs within the canyons. These projects would continue to be conducted in accordance with the Canyon Sewer Cleaning Program (LDR No. 6020), Council Policies 400-13 and 400-14 and Community Plan policies related to this program.

As shown in Table B-1, the MPHA correction for Golden Hill after all additions and deletions includes a net increase of 1.0 acres of coastal sage scrub, 2.4 acres in chaparral, and 1.3 acres of disturbed land. The total change in MPHA results in the addition of 1.7 acres. As shown in Figure B-1 and Table B-1, a majority of the corrections removed developed land while adding sensitive habitats which would include coastal sage scrub and chaparral.

Preservation of sensitive habitat is consistent with the goals of the MSCP, the Conservation Element for the three Community Plans, and the City’s ESL regulations. Correcting the MPHA boundary would not relieve projects from having to otherwise comply with the City’s MPHA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

TABLE B-1: RESULT OF THE MPHA BOUNDARY LINE CORRECTION WITHIN GOLDEN HILL

VEGETATION COMMUNITY/LAND COVER TYPE	MPHA ADDITION	MPHA DELETION*	CHANGE IN MPHA
Coastal sage scrub	1.3	0.3	1.0
Chaparral	2.5	0.1	2.4
Disturbed Land	1.3	0.0	1.3
Developed	0.0	3.0	-3.0
Total	5.1	3.4	1.7