

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
Existing #88	Conservation - Tree Preservation Conservation - Trees	Policy 7. Preserve oaks, sycamores, eucalyptus, olive trees, pines and other individual specimen trees which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The way this is written, it could apply to all trees of any kind and any size. The Design Guidelines have detailed guidance for preservation of oaks and sycamores based on size, in addition to grading proximity considerations, and other factors. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate. LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Combine tree category items - Conservation policy 7 takes care of it. It is in too small (should be 10" or more). 24" box also needs a size - minimum 2". - Make numbers consistent with DG - DG not applicable to all areas that GAP/CPU addresses. - Are words public/private required? - Would this apply to homeowners? <u>Public Comment:</u> - Does this policy cover all trees, or should phrase be revised? Motion: Recommend combining items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising. Proposed revision: Preserve healthy large native and specimen trees as a way to retain community character, wildlife habitat, and for soil preservation. Native trees of particular concern are Coast Live Oaks, California Sycamores, Coulter Pines, Willows, and Cottonwoods. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees. But if unavoidable during construction, such trees must be replaced with at least an equal number of native or compatible specimen trees on the project property. A large tree has a trunk diameter of at least eight (8) inches measured four (4) feet above the ground and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24 inch box or larger with a diameter of at least four (4) inches two (2) feet above the box. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #91	Conservation - Tree Preservation Conservation - Trees	Policy 10. It is strongly encouraged that trees be planted wherever possible to stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices Encourage best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to protect watersheds, reduce GHG emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> note: See Item 88 Motion: Recommend combining items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising. Proposed revision: Preserve healthy large native and specimen trees as a way to retain community character, wildlife habitat, and for soil preservation. Native trees of particular concern are Coast Live Oaks, California Sycamores, Coulter Pines, Willows, and Cottonwoods. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees. But if unavoidable during construction, such trees must be replaced with at least an equal number of native or compatible specimen trees on the project property. A large tree has a trunk diameter of at least eight (8) inches measured four (4) feet above the ground and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24 inch box or larger with a diameter of at least four (4) inches two (2) feet above the box. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #163	Conservation - Tree Preservation Conservation - Trees	Policy LU-3.4.5 Preserve landmark trees of all species as significant features of Valley Center's natural heritage. A "landmark tree" is defined as visually significant (diameter greater than 12"), historically significant, exemplary of its species, or more than 100 years old.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not going to be feasible to preserve every tree type that is 12" in diameter and there are no guidelines for determining what constitutes a "historically significant tree" or "exemplary of its species." Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate. LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment. LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.] LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.] LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #88 (CP Conservation Policy 7) Preserve oaks, sycamores, eucalyptus, olive trees, pines and other individual specimen trees which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat. Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> note: See Item 88 Motion: Recommend combining items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising. Proposed revision: Preserve healthy large native and specimen trees as a way to retain community character, wildlife habitat, and for soil preservation. Native trees of particular concern are Coast Live Oaks, California Sycamores, Coulter Pines, Willows, and Cottonwoods. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees. But if unavoidable during construction, such trees must be replaced with at least an equal number of native or compatible specimen trees on the project property. A large tree has a trunk diameter of at least eight (8) inches measured four (4) feet above the ground and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24 inch box or larger with a diameter of at least four (4) inches two (2) feet above the box. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting	
2012 Proposals #167	Conservation - Tree Preservation Conservation - Trees	Policy LU3-4.9 Require any large trees that are destroyed during construction to be replaced by at least an equal number of native or native compatible specimen sized trees shall be replanted on the property. Large trees are those measuring 6" in diameter when measured 4 feet from the ground. Specimen sized tree are those contained in boxes which are 24" in width or larger.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not going to be defensible to require replacement of every 6" diameter tree with a 24" box. The Design Guidelines focus on oaks and sycamores, which will be much more feasible to include. The current Design Guidelines provide additional guidance on size considerations and could be referred to for a potential policy if there is concern about applying something like this in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands areas, which are mostly not subject to the Design Guidelines.	LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> note: See Item 88 Motion: Recommend combining Items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising. Proposed revision: Preserve healthy large native and specimen trees as a way to retain community character, wildlife habitat, and for soil preservation. Native trees of particular concern are Coast Live Oaks, California Sycamores, Coulter Pines, Willows, and Cottonwoods. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees. But if unavoidable during construction, such trees must be replaced with at least an equal number of native or compatible specimen trees on the project property. A large tree has a trunk diameter of at least eight (8) inches measured four (4) feet above the ground and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24 inch box or larger with a diameter of at least four (4) inches two (2) feet above the box. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0	
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]			
				LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.			
2012 Proposals #413	Conservation - Tree Preservation Conservation - Trees	Policy COS 2.2.1 Require public and private development to protect heritage trees and large native trees such as oaks, sycamores, pines and other individual specimen trees, which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The way this is written, it could apply to all trees of any kind and any size. The current Design Guidelines include good criteria for preservation of oaks and sycamores.	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #88 (CP Conservation Policy 7) Preserve oaks, sycamores, eucalyptus, olive trees, pines and other individual specimen trees which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> note: See Item 88 Motion: Recommend combining Items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising. Proposed revision: Preserve healthy large native and specimen trees as a way to retain community character, wildlife habitat, and for soil preservation. Native trees of particular concern are Coast Live Oaks, California Sycamores, Coulter Pines, Willows, and Cottonwoods. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees. But if unavoidable during construction, such trees must be replaced with at least an equal number of native or compatible specimen trees on the project property. A large tree has a trunk diameter of at least eight (8) inches measured four (4) feet above the ground and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24 inch box or larger with a diameter of at least four (4) inches two (2) feet above the box. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0	
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA				
2012 Proposals #165	Conservation - Native Landscaping	Policy LU-3.4.7 Encourage new development to retain as much of the natural landscape and vegetation as possible, and to revegetate with native, native-compatible and drought tolerant species that will thrive in the particular sub-area's microclimate.		COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Adopt staff revision	
				COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping Require efficient irrigation systems and in new development encourage the use of native plant species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping.			
				LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.			
					Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Though it is similar to the referenced GP and CP policies, it provides a unique component with the revegetation recommendation. A revision is necessary due to subarea reference.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Adopt staff revision
				Proposed revision: Encourage new development to retain as much of the natural landscape and native vegetation as possible, and to revegetate with native, native-compatible, and/or drought tolerant species that will thrive in the particular location.			
				Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA			
				LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]			
		LU-6.7 Open Space Network Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors, preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.	Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance				
		LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.					
		LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.					

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
Existing #82	Conservation - Scenic Resources	Policy 1. Subdivisions should be designed to preserve scenic viewsheds. Radio and T.V. antennas that obscure scenic ridgelines are discouraged.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> Please see GP Policy COS-12.2. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky. LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts; for Mobility Element roads identified in Table M-4, an LOS D or better may not be achieved.	Residential Subdivision Design County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics & Visual Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Agree with motion, similar items approved <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove item Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #421	Conservation - Scenic Resources	Policy COS 3.2.2 Prohibit water storage tanks on ridgelines, and encourage screening from public view.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered more effectively in the existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policy. Also, see the Item 3 in Section 4 of the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources. As detailed there, ridgeline development would be considered a significant CEQA impact when viewable from a public road, a trail, a scenic vista, or a recreational area. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes. COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors, such as scenic highways and regional trails. COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) Prohibit ridgeline development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties. County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Covered under existing policies <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove item Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #422	Conservation - Scenic Resources	Policy COS 3.2.3 Restrict radio, cellular, and television antennas and other man-made structures on ridgelines, and require facilities be disguised to blend with the natural surroundings, whenever possible, in order to protect view sheds and aesthetic qualities.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered more effectively in the existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policy. Also, see the Item 3 in Section 4 of the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources. As detailed there, ridgeline development would be considered a significant CEQA impact when viewable from a public road, a trail, a scenic vista, or a recreational area. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes. COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors, such as scenic highways and regional trails. COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties. County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Include item Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #171	Conservation - Resource Conservation Areas	Goal LU-3.5: Preserve resources that are identified on the Community Resources Map. (insert map)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) and associated text can be updated with the Community Plan Update. It will be optimal to maintain the RCA reference (instead of "Community Resources Map") for consistency in reviewing projects. Proposed revision (should be reviewed in comparison to the existing policy referenced): Community Plan consistency findings for projects within Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) shall provide details on how the project conserves the resource(s) identified for conservation in the RCA description within the Community Plan Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	Existing Goals and Policies matrix #86 (CP Conservation Policy 5) Projects within or within the vicinity of a Resource Conservation Area should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on the resources the RCA was created to protect. Community Plan Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Adequate review of RCAs conducted and more specific areas <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Include staff recommendation and revision Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #80	Conservation - Light Pollution	Goal Provide for a "dark sky" which would retain the rural setting and not detract from astronomical research at Palomar Mountain.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This may have been in the CP since before the more restrictive "Zone A" requirements of the County's Light Pollution Code. Most of Valley Center is within Zone A. Though this is sufficient as a goal, underlying policies are recommended for removal, so there should be discussion on whether this should be a separate goal with a group of policies. Stakeholders may find that it's not needed, as existing Light Pollution Code requirements are restrictive in Zone A. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-13 Dark Skies Preserved dark skies that contribute to rural character and are necessary for the local observatories.	County Light Pollution Code	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Include item Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #417	Conservation - Light Pollution	Policy COS 3.1.1 Prohibit street lighting, except in the villages as necessary for safety. Discourage area lighting, unless necessary for safety.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> There may be instances where street lighting is needed outside the Villages for safety reasons. The County's Light Pollution Code contains strict requirements for lamp types and shielding within Zone A (15 mile buffer from Palomar Observatory), which covers most of Valley Center. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards. COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna Minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the impact of development on the dark skies surrounding Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories to maintain dark skies which are vital to these two world-class observatories by restricting exterior light sources within the impact areas of the observatories.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #100 (CP Conservation Policy 19) Support implementation and enforcement of the County's ordinance on lighting standards including lamp types and shielding for both public and private sector projects.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Useful to retain and reword <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove Item Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #81	Conservation - Cultural Resources	Goal Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the GP goals referenced, and there are unique goal proposals addressing this issue in the 2012 Proposals matrix, which can serve as lead for related policies. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.	COS-7 Protection and Preservation of Archaeological Resources Protection and preservation of the County's important archaeological resources for their cultural importance to local communities, as well as their research and educational potential. COS-8 Protection and Conservation of the Historical Built Environments Protection, conservation, use, and enjoyment of the County's important historic resources.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove Items 81 and 492 Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #492	Conservation - Cultural Resources	Policy COS 11.1.1 Encourage public and private Developers, to the maximum extent possible, to incorporate historic and cultural presentations in the design and construction of Projects that impact cultural and historic resources, along with pathway and trail facilities implementing the Community Trails Master Plan.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Though the wording is clear, the assumed intent is covered by the referenced Existing Community Plan policy (Conservation Policy 23 proposed for inclusion with a minor revision) and General Plan policies. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-7.1 Archaeological Protection Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources. COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #104 (CP Conservation Policy 23) Require owners of significant historic and/or architectural sites to dedicate open space easements to preserve significant examples of California history and archaeology in the course of discretionary permit processing in order to register for Landmark Zoning with the County Historic Site Board. County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove Items 81 and 492 Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #157	Historic Preservation - Policy	Policy LU-3-3. 12 Encourage preservation of historic sites and structures.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered under the existing CP and GP policies referenced. Section 86.602 of the Resource Protection Ordinance includes a definition of "Significant Prehistoric or Historic Sites." Section 4.2 of the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources details actions that would constitute a significant impact to a significant prehistoric or historic site and section 5 of the Guidelines provides standard mitigation and design considerations. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.	Existing Goals & Policies #81 (CP Conservation-General Goal) Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources. County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources Resource Protection Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - References Existing GP 81 which we recommended to be removed - Covered under Cos-8.1 <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove Item Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #22	Conservation Subdivision	Policy 8. Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewerred, and providing that: a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency. AND: b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The recommended inclusion would include the CPG-approved (5/8/17) revision (see below) associated with the PSRs GPA, which is now on hold due to the Climate Action Plan litigation. In addition to the CPG recommendation of approval, staff has recommended approval, and the Planning Commission recommended approval, prior to the project being put on hold. This one serves a different purpose than Residential Policy 7 (current row 21), as it calls for minimum lot sizes for clustering. GP Policy LU-6.3 and Conservation Subdivision guidelines specifically call for seeing CPs for applicable policies. A few CPs have these and it's within their purview. Here is the revision recommended for approval by the CPG and Planning Commission: "...0.5 acre in SR-1 and SR-2, 1 acre in SR-4..." As explained during the 2015-2017 outreach on this proposed policy revision: Outside of Champagne Blvd (former Champagne Gardens specific plan properties included in PSRs GPA) this policy revision would currently only potentially affect one other parcel in the CPA, as the revision only applies to properties designated SR-2 or SR-4 and also within the VCMWD sewer service area. The policy revision does not affect allowed density in any way, just the configuration of lots within a subdivision. The additional clustering allowance would facilitate better preservation of sensitive resources. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> The list in item a of the policy provides examples of environmental resources present on a project site to justify the clustered minimum lot sizes shown. It doesn't provide new requirements in dealing with rock outcroppings.	LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Not clear on clustering - Something that prevents people from providing 40 acres and cluster with 40 units? Still have to keep to 1/2 acre/1 acre? Want as much open space as possible. <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #263	Conservation Subdivision	Policy LU-2. Require a clear and significant conservation objective for clustering, such as preservation of important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcropping, or archaeological and cultural resources which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions. Section 81.401r provides criteria for the areas to be avoided through the process and notes open space easements and/or other conservation easements are required for the areas to be avoided. It notes the easements shall be dedicated to the County or other conservation agency approved by the Director. With regard to open space, the section calls for the largest blocks of unfragmented and interconnected open space to be conserved, maximizing surface to perimeter ratios to avoid "silvers or fingers" of open space, and located in areas to provide the maximum amount of connectivity with offsite open space. In addition to protecting sensitive habitat areas, drainages, and cultural resources, agricultural resources can also be protected through the Conservation Subdivision process. In addition to the Subdivision Ordinance section, here is a link to a page with additional information on the Conservation Subdivision process - https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/centerforpolicyandplanning/conservation/subdivision.html (or search, County of San Diego Conservation Subdivision Program) Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of 263 and 268 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Hans Britsch Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #267	Conservation Subdivision	Policy LU-5. Prohibit uniform lots lined up in teeth-like rows. Minimum lot sizes are established for each sub-area of Valley Center. However, the community encourages diversity, for example: a mingled mix of lot sizes and shapes that follow natural land forms, varied setbacks, individually determined structure orientations that take advantage of particular views, climatic concerns and the like.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is one of a few different policies that call for diversity in subdivision design. See also Items 282 and 283 of this matrix. Potential rewrite (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided." Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles. LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character. County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program) Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Did we keep item #6? Similar to other items <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend Remove Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #268	Conservation Subdivision	Policy LU-6 Conservation areas should be laid out so that open space set-asides on adjacent properties join together to form interconnected open space network throughout the planning area.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions. Section 81.401.r.i and ii note the following for Conservation Subdivisions: -The largest blocks of unfragmented and interconnected open space shall be conserved. -Open Space shall be located in areas with the maximum amount of connectivity with off-site open space. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-6.7 Open Space Network Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #107 (CP Open Space Policy 2) Integrate open space dedications in private developments with surrounding uses to maximize a functional open space/recreation and wildlife management system.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of 263 and 268 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Hans Britsch Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #108	Conservation - Open Space	Policy 3. Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: NA Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision. Proposed revision: Strive for a functional open space system with passive recreational opportunities where feasible.	COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System A regionally managed, inter-connected preserve system that embodies the regional biological diversity of San Diego County. COS-23.2 Regional Coordination Coordinate the planning, acquisition, protection, development, and management of open space among governmental agencies and private organizations to maximize opportunities to link regional open space lands.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - 110 talks about preserving existing public access points. How do we consider future public access points? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision for item 108 and accept staff revision with removal of word "existing" on item 110. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #110	Conservation - Open Space	Policy 5. Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: NA Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff finds a revision can be proposed to maintain the intent of the policy. Proposed revision: Design new residential development to preserve existing public access points to surrounding open space.	LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques: perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.] LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.] LU-6.7 Open Space Network Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities. COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System Identify and develop a coordinated biological preserve system that includes Pre-Approved Mitigation Areas, Biological Resource Core Areas, wildlife corridors, and linkages to allow wildlife to travel throughout their habitat ranges.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - 110 talks about preserving existing public access points. How do we consider future public access points? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision for item 108 and accept staff revision with removal of word "existing" on item 110. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #153	Conservation - Open Space	Policy LU-3.3.8 Encourage site plans that provide open spaces that are visible from Valley Center roads, accessible to homes and link to open spaces on adjacent properties.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> As worded, the policy is unclear and could be interpreted as encouraging something other than the intent, such as inconsistent recreational uses within open space dedicated for protection of biological resources. Proposed revision: In addition to providing open spaces to preserve sensitive resources, encourage the use of open space for recreational and aesthetic purposes, accessible to homes and adjacent properties. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff is proposing to clarify that the revision is referring to passive recreation within preserves. Proposed revision: In addition to providing open spaces to preserve sensitive resources, encourage the use of open space for passive recreational and aesthetic purposes, accessible to homes and adjacent properties.	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #287 (CP Open Space Policy 5) Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Adopt staff revision with addition of "and public roads." Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			County Guidelines for Determining Significance (particularly Guidelines for Biological Resources and Aesthetics/Visual Resources)			
Existing #119	Parks and Recreation	Policy 6. Acquire and develop outstanding scenic areas, cultural, biological and historical resources. The establishment of park locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> It is assumed the intent is to develop parks in these areas; however, it is assumed the intent wasn't to develop active parks in areas of outstanding biological resources. Stakeholders should determine whether the text of GP Policy COS-21.3 is sufficient to cover the intent, so that this policy is not needed. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision. Proposed revision: Acquire outstanding scenic areas; cultural, biological and historic resources. The establishment of preserve locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	COS-21.2 Location of Parks Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers where feasible, so that they may function as the "heart" of a community.	County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Park Design Manual	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff recommendation of 119 and 122 with revision to 122: "complement the Valley Center Trails Master Plan". Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			COS-21.3 Park Design Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.			
Existing #122	Parks and Recreation	Policy 9. Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision. Proposed revision: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center trails system.	COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.	Community Trails Master Plan	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff recommendation of 119 and 122 with revision to 122: "complement the Valley Center Trails Master Plan". Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #459	Parks and Recreation	Policy COS 9.1.2 Prohibit public or private recreational off-road and all-terrain vehicle use areas.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The Noise Ordinance provides direction on noise standards for recreational off-road vehicles for private and public property. The CTMP policy CIS 1.3 prohibits motorized vehicles on "non-motorized trails." The Noise Ordinance limits the operation of off-road vehicles on private property at certain sound levels based on the time of day. When in compliance with Noise Ordinance requirements, APCD requirements, easement restrictions, and trail restrictions, the County can't further regulate off-road vehicle use on private property unless it involves commercial use. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #127 (CP Noise-Temporary and/or Nuisance Noise Policy 4) Encourage the use of buffering devices on off-road vehicles and provide strict enforcement of noise regulations for off-road vehicles.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Concern with 479 in light of soccer field <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove items 459, 460 and 462. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Noise Ordinance - Noise from Off-Road Recreational Vehicles Community Trails Master Plan			
2012 Proposals #460	Parks and Recreation	Policy COS 9.1.3 Encourage voluntary dedication of non-motorized multi-use pathways and trails throughout Valley Center, and implementation of the Community Trails Master Plan, especially connecting segments that have been previously dedicated.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) policy CP 3.9 encourages the voluntary dedication of trail easements through incentives and implementation strategy CIS 3.2 provides indemnity to persons granting trail easements and landowners adjacent to trails, as does the Trail Defense and Indemnification Ordinance. Combining these ordinances and policies with the existing CP policy that promotes interconnecting trails already speaks to the intent of this policy. Together they encourage voluntary dedication of non-motorized trails/pathways without legal implications. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity Require development in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and countywide networks.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #79 (CP Conservation - General Goal 5) Encourage and promote a system of interconnecting trails and paths for horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Concern with 479 in light of soccer field <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove items 459, 460 and 462. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Trail Defense and Indemnification Ordinance CTMP CP 3.9 CTMP CIS 3.2 ATP 11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity			

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #462	Parks and Recreation	Policy COS 9.1.5 Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails Master Plan.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is identical to the existing policy, which the County is recommending for inclusion. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #122) which was recommended for inclusion. A slight wording change is proposed for that referenced existing policy. See Item 122 in the Existing Matrix.	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Concern with 479 in light of soccer field <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove items 459, 460 and 462. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #463	Parks and Recreation	Policy COS 9.1.6 Require new residential developments in the Villages to include pocket parks	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Parkland dedication and/or payment of in-lieu fees is determined based on the requirements of the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. Not all development within Villages will require park land dedication. Board Policy I-44 details the public participation for local public park design, and we can't limit that process by requiring pocket parks every time. Changing the language to "encourage" from "require" would better reflect what was written as a similar policy for the Ramona CP (Policy LU 2.3.8). The proposed revision addresses this proposal and the proposal in row 470 of this matrix. Proposed revision: Encourage new residential developments in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend removal. Pocket parks should be considered on a case by case basis, based on project characteristics and public input received during individual project review processes. Pocket parks won't always be appropriate in Village developments.	COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services Provide parks and recreation facilities that create opportunities for a broad range of recreational experiences to serve user interests. COS-21.2 Location of Parks Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers where feasible, so that they may function as the "heart" of a community. COS-21.3 Park Design Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #290 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal) Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA. Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Board Policy I-44 Procedure for Designing New County-owned Local Parks	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -More small parks in Village is more useful -Revise to include greenbelts -Greenbelts are different issue from parks <u>Public Comment:</u> - Communities would historically be developed with pocket parks, but weren't used often Proposed revision: Encourage new residential developments in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #464	Parks and Recreation	Goal COS 9.2 A stable, predictable set of funding sources for the acquisition and management of our parks and recreational facilities.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> General Plan Goal COS-24 is similar to the proposed goal. However, this goal statement provides a framework for further refinement with following policies. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: This seems to be a goal proposed in consideration of the funding situation of the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District (VCPRD) at the time of the preparation of these 2012 drafts. In consideration of comments received and the current process to consider a proposed transfer of assets and operations to the County Department of Parks and Recreation, a revision is proposed. Proposed revision: Fund the acquisition and management of County parks and recreation facilities to the extent possible.	COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding Adequate funding for acquisition, development, maintenance, management, and operation of parks, recreation facilities, and preserves.	NA (though there are related policies, they don't provide an appropriate comparison to a high level goal)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision Proposed revision: Fund the acquisition and management of County parks and recreation facilities to the extent possible. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #477	Parks and Recreation	Policy COS 9.5.1 Encourage the VC P&R District, VC/Pauma School District, VCMWD, and VC Library to create multiple-use facilities that include recreation features. Joint use agreements should include a fair distribution of operational costs, as well as periodic review and potential adjustment of such costs.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Although the policy as written is duplicative and vague, the County understands the intent and offer the proposed revision below. Proposed revision: Encourage the Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District, the Valley Center Municipal Water District and the Valley Center Library to establish Joint Powers Agreements with local parks and recreation providers to create multiple-use facilities that include recreation features. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Post-public review update: After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #116) and the recommendation on this similar proposed policy has been changed to recommend removal.	LU-18.2 CoLocation of Civic Uses Encourage the co-location of civic uses such as County library facilities, community centers, parks, and schools. To encourage access by all segments of the population, civic uses should be accessible by transit whenever possible. COS-21.2 Location of Parks Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers where feasible, so that they may function as the "heart" of a community.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #116 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 3) Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities will be coordinated with local school facilities whenever possible by establishing Joint Powers Agreements to promote joint development, operation and maintenance.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Contingent on item 116 acceptance <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove item Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #479	Parks and Recreation	Goal COS 9.6 Identified opportunities for commercial recreational development	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> To provide clarity, staff is recommending: Proposed revision: Identify opportunities for commercial recreational development and maintain the zoning to allow such uses by right or with discretionary permits. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The reference to removal was in error. This goal is proposed for inclusion with the proposed revision: Identify opportunities for commercial recreational development and maintain the zoning to allow such uses by right or with discretionary permits.	NA	Zoning Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision Proposed revision: Identify opportunities for commercial recreational development and maintain the zoning to allow such uses by right or with discretionary permits. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #143	Land Use - Parks	Policy LU-3-1.5 Require new development to provide sufficient, central and accessible open spaces, parks, recreational outlets, amenities and services to serve their residents.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This concept is covered by the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (http://www.sdparks.org/content/sdparks/en/AboutUs/PPlans/pldo.html) and the related General Plan policies listed. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development Require the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services needed by new development prior to that development, either directly or through fees. Where appropriate, the construction of infrastructure and facilities may be phased to coincide with project phasing.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #113 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal) Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
				COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding Adequate funding for acquisition, development, maintenance, management, and operation of parks, recreation facilities, and preserves.		
				COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions Require development to provide fair-share contributions toward parks and recreation facilities and trails consistent with local, state, and federal law.		
Existing #98	Mobility - Trails (also bring in Item 240 from Land Use Semi-Rural Development)	Policy 17. During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the CTMP or the RTP. Proposed revision: Ensure the continued implementation of the planned Valley Center trails network within the CTMP, by requiring trail easement dedication on project sites that contain a planned trail alignment from the CTMP. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.	Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -staff revision relies too heavily on CTMP and adds limitations -Is the proposed revision is already in other areas? <u>Public Comment:</u> -plans for trailhead? Motion: Recommend inclusion Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
				M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.		
				COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions Require development to provide fair-share contributions toward parks and recreation facilities and trails consistent with local, state, and federal law.		
2012 Proposals #240	Mobility - Trails (also bring in Item 240 from Land Use Semi-Rural Development)	Policy 6. Incorporate non-motorized cross-country trails into the site design.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan. The County does not have the authority to require that developers obtain off-site trail easements. The language lacks clarity and seems to require cross country trails for any project in the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Section 81.402u of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.	Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Linking to 15 year old plan with plan's intent not to limit what might come up. How can we allow changes to plan to allow new connecting trails/paths when development occurs when existing plan is out of date? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of items 240 and 331 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
				COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.		
2012 Proposals #331	Mobility - Trails (also bring in Item 240 from Land Use Semi-Rural Development)	Policy 2.6.1.1 A policy be developed to add new connecting trails and paths to the CTMP as development occurs.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> As the text indicates, this is not exactly a policy proposal. This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy. As stakeholders can see, a revision is proposed to that existing policy as follows, "Ensure the continued implementation of the planned Valley Center trails network within the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), by requiring trail easement dedication on project sites that contain a planned trail alignment from the CTMP. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #98 (CP Conservation-Policy 17) During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Linking to 15 year old plan with plan's intent not to limit what might come up. How can we allow changes to plan to allow new connecting trails/paths when development occurs when existing plan is out of date? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of items 240 and 331 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
				M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.		
2012 Proposals #332	Mobility - Trails (also bring in Item 240 from Land Use Semi-Rural Development)	Policy 2.6.1.2 Development projects are required to plan, dedicate and construct internal trails that integrate with the community's trails master plan to increase overall trail connectivity.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan and there is no need for a policy requiring this, as it is already required. Adding new trails outside of CTMP alignments is of course not feasible in small developments. Section 81.402u of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #98 (CP Conservation-Policy 17) During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - revise 332 <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of items 332 and 333 Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
				M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.		

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #333	Mobility - Trails (also bring in Item 240 from Land Use Semi-Rural Development)	Policy 2.6.1.3 Non-motorized local travel is promoted	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	M-4-1 Walkable Village Roads Encourage multi-modal roads in Villages and compact residential areas with pedestrian-oriented development patterns that enhance pedestrian safety and walkability, along with other non-motorized modes of travel, such as designing narrower but slower speed roads that increase pedestrian safety. COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility-Policy 13) Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - revise 332 <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal of items 332 and 333 Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
Existing #44	Agriculture	Policy 2. Encourage the formation of Agricultural Preserves in areas with active agricultural operations and in locations that will be optimal for future agricultural production.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This should be updated to reflect the current emphasis on the PACE Program. Proposed Revision: Support the continued promotion of the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program and outreach to eligible property owners. Encourage property owner participation in this program, in order to preserve agriculture in Valley Center. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.	COS-6.4 Conservation Easements Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and programs that preserve agricultural lands.	Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Action on item 392? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff recommendation Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #45	Agriculture	Policy 3. Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The language is vague and leaves it open for interpretation, re: adverse impact on existing ag uses. Please see GP Policy COS-6.2 and the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources for discussion of significant agricultural impacts and mitigation. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.	COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following: ■ Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations ■ Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses ■ Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and design development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development ■ Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture ■ Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations ■ Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove item Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #245	Agriculture	Policy 1. Goals and Policies are needed to achieve the stated goal of retaining and protecting agriculture in Valley Center. The failure to protect agriculture and food production is a significant problem with this General Plan. What should these be in VC????	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> (there is no policy proposal) GP Policy COS-6.2 is one of the longest, most detailed policies in the General Plan, discussing measures to protect agricultural operations. Stakeholders should review that policy, which applies to Valley Center and all other unincorporated communities. Per the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources, direct impacts to agricultural resources occur when the site contains significant agricultural resources as determined by the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) model and the project would convert agricultural resources that meet the soil quality criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The guidelines also go into detail on what would constitute indirect and cumulative impacts. Mitigating direct impacts typically requires onsite preservation via conservation easements or limited building zone (LBZ) easements, or purchase of an offsite agricultural conservation easement (County PACE program). In addition, agricultural resources are one of the resources that can be preserved through the Conservation Subdivision program. See the referenced documents for additional information on all the County regulations and programs to preserve agriculture. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following: ■ Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations ■ Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses ■ Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and design development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development ■ Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture ■ Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations ■ Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process	Existing Goals & Policies #45 (Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3) Prohibit residential development that would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses. County Subdivision Ordinance (specifically the Conservation Subdivision program) County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove item Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #259	Agriculture	Policy 7. Encourage the establishment of "green" small family owned farms and vineyards.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This policy is unclear as currently worded. Are stakeholders looking to encourage sustainable farming practices, low GHG emission agriculture, organic farms? Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Change to goal? <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend inclusion and change from policy to a goal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	GPU Subcommittee 1/20/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #393	Agriculture	<p>Policy COS 1.2.2 Allow residential development only where shown in subareas on the CP Land Use Map which would NOT have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses. Support the "Right to Farm Ordinance" and require any residential project that adversely affects existing adjoining agricultural uses to mitigate the identified impact.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff recommends removal of the existing policy referenced. The County cannot prohibit residential development in areas zoned for it when they have addressed impacts to significant agricultural resources in accordance with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources. GP Policy COS-6.2 is one of the longest, most detailed policies in the General Plan, discussing measures to protect agricultural operations. Stakeholders should review that policy, which of course applies to Valley Center and all other unincorporated communities. Per the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources, direct impacts to agricultural resources occur when the site contains significant agricultural resources as determined by the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) model and the project would convert agricultural resources that meet the soil quality criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The guidelines also go into detail on what would constitute indirect and cumulative impacts. Mitigating direct impacts typically requires onsite preservation via conservation easements or limited building zone (LIZ) easements, or purchase of an offsite agricultural conservation easement (County PACE program). In addition, agricultural resources are at-risk resources that can be preserved through the Conservation Subdivision program. See the referenced documents for additional information on all the County regulations and programs to preserve agriculture. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>	<p>COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and design development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process </p>	<p>Existing Goals & Policies matrix #45 (GP Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3) Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Recommend remove items 393 and 401. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>
2012 Proposals #396	Agriculture	<p>Policy COS 1.2.5 Encourage public/private partnerships to provide recreation, open space, and multi-use non-motorized trails in the agriculture/development interface to implement or enlarge the Community Open Space Plan and/or the Community Trails Master Plan. Incorporate provisions to reduce or eliminate potential liability or other frustration of the agricultural operation, while protecting recreational users from injuries, such as from pesticide spraying.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The second half of the proposed policy is unclear in its desired outcome or methodology to achieve. Staff recommends the revision below. Proposed revision: Encourage public/private partnerships to provide recreation, open space, and multi-use non-motorized trails in the agriculture/development interface. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>	NA	<p>Community Open Space Plan Community Trails Master Plan</p>	<p>Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Accept staff revision Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>
2012 Proposals #401	Agriculture	<p>Policy COS 1.2.10 Encourage and aggressively educate the community about the "Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Program"</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This could be revised into one policy generally covering educating the community on programs providing incentives for agriculture; however, as discussed above, the County is already actively promoting many incentive programs. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA</p>	NA	NA	<p>Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Recommend remove items 393 and 401. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>
2012 Proposals #254	Agri-business	<p>Policy 2. Support enterprises that support our rural economy like horse breeding, boarding and training facilities, wedding chapels and other special event venues, antiques shops, farm stands and unique enterprises like the Lavender Fields and Mathilde's Mouse where consistent with the Noise Element.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> See Item 247 for information on agricultural tourism use type allowances in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (zones that cover almost all of the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas). The types of uses listed can all be allowed in these zones, subject to limitations, with the exceptions of wedding facilities and antique shops. Wedding facilities would require a Major Use Permit in these zones and antique shops are classified like other retail uses (mostly limited to commercial zones). The County is recommending the same revision here as in row 248 of this matrix. It would not be appropriate for a community plan policy to call out special preference for an individual business establishment. Proposed revision: Within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas, support horse stables and agriculture-related commercial activities that can be allowed in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (subject to limitations) when in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements. Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p>	NA	NA	<p>Subcommittee Comment: -duplicates item Public Comment: Motion: Recommend removal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>
2012 Proposals #125	Noise	<p>Policy 2. Permit residential development in areas with projected exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) exceeding 60 decibels near main roads only when traffic noise impacts can be mitigated.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The GP allows decision-makers to approve residential projects where the CNEL is above 60 decibels (and not fully mitigated to below 60) under extraordinary circumstances. This goes a step beyond that, to call for not permitting residential development under these circumstances. Therefore, we don't find it to be repetitive, but within the purview of issues CP policies can address. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA</p>	<p>LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations Support the development and implementation of design guidelines, Village-specific regulations for roads, parking, and noise, and other planning and regulatory mechanisms that recognize the unique operations and character of Villages, Town Centers, and transportation nodes. Ensure that new development be compatible with the overall scale and character of established neighborhoods.</p> <p>N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses Require an acoustical study to identify appropriate noise level where development may directly result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to noise levels equal to or greater than 60 CNEL and require mitigation for sensitive uses in compliance with the noise standards listed in Table N-2.</p> <p>N-2.2 Balconies and Patios Assure that in developments where the exterior noise level on patios or balconies for multi-family residences or mixed-use developments exceed 65 CNEL, a solid noise barrier is incorporated into the building design of the balconies and patios while still maintaining the openness of the patio or balcony.</p> <p>LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or area detrimental to human health and safety.</p> <p>LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations Support the development and implementation of design guidelines, Village-specific regulations for roads, parking, and noise, and other planning and regulatory mechanisms that recognize the unique operations and character of Villages, Town Centers, and transportation nodes. Ensure that new development be compatible with the overall scale and character of established neighborhoods.</p>	<p>County Noise Ordinance</p>	<p>Subcommittee Comment: -60 DB is loud and mitigation are sound barriers (block walls) -S and N Village have high density, no way to get around it and walls allowed next to busy road -Distinguish between Villages and areas outside Public Comment: -At Park Circle, without sound walls houses would be set back from the road further reducing density (unless stacking townhomes) Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision "Permit residential development in the North and South Villages with projected exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) exceeding 60 decibels near main roads only when traffic noise impacts can be mitigated." Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations - Revisited Items
1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee Meeting
Existing (on consent item) #26	Land Use - Commercial	Policy 1. Prohibit strip commercial development by containing commercial uses in the Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road area and the Mirar de Valle Road and Valley Center Road area. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The "prohibit" language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comments:</u> 26 and 30 are redundant - include on without need to retain both <u>Public Comments:</u> Motion: Leave items 26 and 30 on consent Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing (on consent item) #30	Land Use - Commercial	Policy 5. Future commercial development shall be planned so that strip commercial development will be avoided. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The "prohibit" language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comments:</u> 26 and 30 are redundant - include on without need to retain both <u>Public Comments:</u> Motion: Leave items 26 and 30 on consent Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals (on consent item) #520	Safety - Fire Evacuation	Policy S4.2.b.1 – Secondary Access: Require secondary access for all developments without exception. (S-3.5) (Require development to include multiple access/egress routes)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County Consolidated Fire Code provides the project discretion to the Fire Marshal/fire code official for determining access. Per Section 503.12, "The fire code official is authorized to require more than one fire apparatus access road based on the potential for impairment of a single road by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions or other factors that could limit access. When additional fire apparatus access roads are necessary as mitigation for exceedance of the maximum allowable dead-end road length, the additional fire apparatus access road must be remote from the primary fire apparatus access road." This policy proposal references General Plan Policy S-3.5, which requires secondary access "when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently." The following revision is proposed in order to avoid inconsistency with discretion allowed for in the Fire Code. Proposed revision: Evaluate the adequacy of access routes to and from fire hazard areas relative to the degree of development or use (e.g., road width, road type, length of dead-end roads, etc.). Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	GP: S-3.5 Access Roads	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility Policy 12) Section 503.12 County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Wildland Fire and Fire Protection	<u>Subcommittee Comments:</u> -Doesn't hurt to include in CP <u>Public Comments:</u> Note from County staff: Earlier versions of the consent calendar incorrectly noted "Recommend Inclusion" when it should have noted "Recommend Inclusion with Revision" with the following proposed revision: Proposed revision: Evaluate the adequacy of access routes to and from fire hazard areas relative to the degree of development or use (e.g., road width, road type, length of dead-end roads, etc.). Motion: Keep with staff revisions proposed Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #407	Conservation - Habitat Preservation	Policy COS 2.1.4 Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned or maintained by the County or the VC Parks & Recreation District).	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by existing Community Plan policies and the proposed text doesn't specify whether the preference is for the County or one of these listed types of entities to own and manage open space. Most open space in Valley Center is owned and managed by the County. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4) Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	<u>Subcommittee Comments:</u> <u>Public Comments:</u> Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision and the following language: "Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented well established land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties (unless owned or maintained by the County) Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #434	Conservation - Water Quality	Policy COS 4.2.2 Require _____ to present educational programs and opportunities for owners of large animal keeping facilities on proper manure storage/disposal, to prevent watercourse contamination.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This could be discussed in another section of the updated Community Plan on various training programs sought in the community. Section 67.807 of the County's Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance outlines requirements for manure and pet waste management to prevent runoff to stormwater conveyance systems or receiving waters. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices Encourage best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to protect watersheds, reduce GHG emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power.	County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -other requirements that require monitoring water that comes off their property <u>Public Comment:</u> Original note by Subcommittee: Table for future consideration under a different section (related to training) Motion: Recommend removal Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0