

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
236	Land Use - Community Character	<p>Policy On larger properties create interconnected smaller neighborhoods separated by open space; avoid a sprawl of houses or independent enclaves.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The language is too vague to effectively implement and the policy reads as internally inconsistent.</p> <p>Additional rationale: The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, pathways/trails, and open space networks. Section 81.401q of the County's Subdivision Ordinance requires that roads/easements to parcels on a subdivision boundary shall not terminate in a cul-de-sac when it is feasible for the road/easement to serve as a through street.</p>	<p>GP: LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity</p> <p>County Subdivision Ordinance</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Avoid closing off neighborhoods - goal: conserve natural beauty - something needs to be there to support rural character statement - adequately covered under other items</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation for removal</p> <p>Maker Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 1</p>
24	Land Use - Community Character	<p>Policy Avoid discontinuous development density that would increase the cost of extending infrastructure (roads, utilities) and would defeat the intention of the community development model.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> "Discontinuous development density" is too vague. The assumed intent is covered by General Plan policies LU-1.4 and LU-12.1. Refer to the Existing Matrix for additional information on this item.</p>	<p>GP: LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: Avoid discontinuous development density that would increase the cost of extending infrastructure (roads, utilities) and would defeat the intention of the community development model.</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Add emphasis to CDM</p> <p>Public Comments: - recommend to remove the item</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Lisa Adams Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 10 Noes: 3</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
17	Land Use - Community Character	<p>Policy Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas. 	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p> <p>These issues are covered by other policies now, so it would be repetitive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All grading disturbs the natural terrain -Owners cannot be required to retain agriculture unless it's part of conditioned mitigation for an on-site agricultural conservation easement, or for purchase of off-site PACE credits/easements. GP Policy COS-6.2 details policy requirements to minimize impacts to agriculture. - Retaining all natural vegetation in all VC projects is not feasible when seeking to get close to allowed GP densities. 	<p>GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</p> <p>Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments: -item in conflict with permitted development - agree with staff</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: LaVonne Norwood Second: Lisa Adams</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0 Abstain: Kathleen McCabe</p>
230	Land Use - Community Character	<p>Policy Require developers of all subdivisions to prepare site inventory maps that pinpoint locations of environmental, scenic and historic features on their properties, and to build around them.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> • Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations. • During the CEQA review of subdivisions, projects are reviewed against the standards found in the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance. The language in the proposed policy is vague and applicants aren't going to always know what constitutes significant resources until technical studies are done. Refer to the 2012 matrix for additional information on this item.</p>	<p>County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/procguid.html (particularly Guidelines for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Aesthetics and Visual Resources)</p>		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
209	Land Use - Villages	<p>Policy Village development is encouraged to be two stories and no more than three stories including special features such as bell and clock towers, and steeples.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> Most Village properties are currently subject to the G Height designator, allowing up to 35 feet and 2 stories. This proposed policy language limits flexibility in development types in the Villages, where slightly higher density may be advantageous. Staff recommends removal and continuing discussion as a part of the Plan Concepts and Design Guidelines processes.</p> <p>Additional rationale: A process is available through a discretionary Administrative Permit or Major Use Permit to allow an additional story. These would go to the CPG for review and require staff making findings of community character compatibility and harmony with the scale and bulk of dwellings on adjacent properties in the same zone (see Zoning Ordinance sections 4610 - 4622). Prohibiting a third story under these special circumstances would limit creative solutions to achieving density within Villages, where the exterior may match the scale and bulk of most two-story structures. Such projects within Villages would also have to comply with the Design Guidelines on application of this policy.</p>	Zoning Ordinance Section 4600-4631	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: Proposed revision: "Village development is encouraged to be two-stories and no more than three stories including special features such as bell and clock towers, and steeples." Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: -Like what's encouraged here, but agree with difficulty - Can this be a goal? - G-designator can be changed. Keeping heights to 2 stories/no more than 3 helps staff consider before making change to G-designator. -2-stories of livable space?</p> <p>Public Comments: Motion: Support the CPU Subcommittee's recommendation for inclusion with revision, which is the current text shown.</p> <p>Maker: LaVonne Norwood Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 1</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
259	Land Use - Semi-Rural and Rural Lands	<p>Policy Encourage the establishment of “green” small family owned farms and vineyards.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> "Green" is too vague in this reference.</p>	NA	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion and change from policy to a goal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkeller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Remove "green" and "small" - Family owned vineyards should be encouraged - Next policy in org doc covers this. - Goal of VC is to be agricultural/rural</p> <p>Public Comments: -</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
26	Land Use - Commercial	<p>Policy 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.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 33 and 247 in this section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. "Uses" becomes more problematic when considering existing commercial zoning outside the Villages and when considering certain commercial uses that can be allowed in residential and agricultural zones. An option would be to connect it to the establishment of commercial zones on sites where there wasn't already a commercial zone.</p> <p>Potential revision from staff: The establishment of new commercial zoning (C30, C31, C32, C34, C35, C36, C37, C38, C40, C42, C44, and C46) on sites where there is not an existing commercial zone, shall be limited to within the Village boundaries. 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.</p>	<p>GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers</p>	<p>Motion: Leave items 26 and 30 on consent Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Intent to keep commercial zoning collected in Villages -Subzoning change for properties that don't have opportunity for their own zoning change</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept the staff recommended revision (shown in the staff recommendation column).</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0 Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>
33	Land Use - Commercial	<p>Policy Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages. 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 GP Update in August 2011.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 26 and 247 in this section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. "Uses" becomes more problematic when considering existing commercial zoning outside the Villages and when considering certain commercial uses that can be allowed in residential and agricultural zones. An option would be to connect it to the establishment of commercial zones on sites where wasn't already a commercial zone.</p> <p>The staff revision proposed in Item 26 would cover this policy also.</p>	<p>GP: LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - This is now covered under Item 26 with the revision to 26 accepted.</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Remove item</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
247/253/254	Land Use - Commercial	<p>Policy 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.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 26 and 33 in this Land Use-Commercial section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. If the proposed staff revision (or similar wording change) for Items 26 and 33 is accepted, that would address the inconsistency issue and there won't be a need to change the wording of this policy.</p>	NA	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: Public Comments: Motion: Retain item. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
255	Land Use - Commercial	<p>Policy Discourage general commercial and industrial enterprises which are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development such as conventional convenience stores and gas stations.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy is vague and existing zoning on several properties in Valley Center allows these types of uses (by right or with discretionary permits). Additional rationale: Sections 1200-1800 of the Zoning Ordinance provide definitions of use types. These use types are referred to in Sections for each zone, to note which are allowed, which require special discretionary permits, and which are not allowed.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)</p>	<p>Motion: Retain 255 and change "prohibit" to "discourage" Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: -Revise wording Public Comments: Motion: Include with revision. Proposed revision: Discourage general commercial and industrial enterprises that are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 1</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
31	Land Use - Commercial	<p>Policy Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.</p>	<p>GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - How to clarify for staff interpretation? Public Comments: Motion: Table for additional County staff input. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kathleen McCabe Vote: Ayes: 10 Noes: 3 Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>
567	Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water	<p>Goal New staff goal proposal to address policies in the Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water section: Ongoing improvements in the provision of imported water and wastewater services address health, safety, sustainability, and emergency preparedness.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 72, 75, and 185 in a "Land Use – Wastewater and Imported Water" section.</p>	<p>NA</p>		<p>CPG Comments: Public Comments: Motion: Accept staff recommendation Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Kathleen McCabe Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes:0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
62	Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water	<p>Goal Adopt an active program of coordination between the allowable growth of population and the infrastructure serving it, to ensure compliance, that the public welfare and safety are prioritized.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is addressed in General Plan Goal LU-12 and development projects already address this through required service availability forms (and associated project conditions) for water, sewer, fire protection, and schools, as applicable. Projects are also conditioned to address transportation impacts through project conditions for transportation infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development</p>	<p>Motion: Keep item 62 with the following change: Adopt an active program of coordination between the allowable growth of population and the infrastructure serving it, to ensure compliance, that the public welfare and safety are prioritized. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: Public Comments: Motion: Accept staff recommendation Maker: Julia Feliciano Second: LaVonne Norwood Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>
68	Land Use - Schools	<p>Goal Ensure the provision of adequate services and facilities to meet the educational needs of all the residents of the CPA.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by General Plan Goal LU-17 and there were no underlying policies recommended by the Subcommittee or the public</p>	<p>GP: LU-17 Adequate Education</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: Public Comments: Motion: Accept staff recommendation. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
568	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p>Goal New staff goal proposal to address policies in Mobility - Access and Connectivity section:</p> <p>Create land use patterns and mobility networks that provide improved connectivity and safety.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 50, 54, 189, 308, 315/323/522 (one revision covers 315/323/522), and 307 in a “Mobility – Access and Connectivity” section.</p>	NA		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
189	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p>Policy Reviews of development projects within Villages shall include analyzing opportunities for connecting to off-site roads. Dead end roads and cul-de-sacs should be avoided in the Villages.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Revision</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations. This is a staff recommended revision.</p>	GP: M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads	Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 1</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
308	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p>Policy Recommend developers provide un-gated interconnections between roads rather than creating more unconnected networks of roads.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Item 189 and in the Subdivision Ordinance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is covered in Item 189 above and in the Subdivision Ordinance. Refer to the 2012 matrix for additional information on this item. Additional rationale - County Subdivision Ordinance reference: "A subdivision shall be designed so that a street or road easement providing access to a parcel located on a subdivision boundary, shall not terminate in a cul-de-sac when it is feasible for the street or road easement to serve as a through street connecting the subdivision to a street or road easement in an existing or proposed, adjacent subdivision. If there is no street or road easement on the adjacent property, the street or road easement shall be designed to allow a connection to an adjacent property, in case the adjacent property is developed in the future." 	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12)</p> <p>GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</p> <p>County Subdivision Ordinance</p>	<p>Motion: Change language from "Developers be required to provide" to "Recommend developers provide"</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 2</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Potentially impede public safety - Emergency personnel have access - Add detail to policy - People in VC want their private roads gated</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: LaVonne Norwood Second: Delores Chaves Harmes</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>
307	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p>Policy Each future subdivision needs to be assessed for its potential to provide linkages for long-term circulation improvement, while still allowing for a road design in keeping with a "rural neighborhood" character.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Item 189 and in the Subdivision Ordinance.</p> <p>Additional rationale: County Subdivision Ordinance reference: "A subdivision shall be designed so that a street or road easement providing access to a parcel located on a subdivision boundary, shall not terminate in a cul-de-sac when it is feasible for the street or road easement to serve as a through street connecting the subdivision to a street or road easement in an existing or proposed, adjacent subdivision. If there is no street or road easement on the adjacent property, the street or road easement shall be designed to allow a connection to an adjacent property, in case the adjacent property is developed in the future."</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12)</p> <p>GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</p> <p>County Subdivision Ordinance</p>	<p>Motion: Include item #307.</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: LaVonne Norwood Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
364	Mobility - Road Planning and Design	<p>Policy Design should be selected to minimize grading impacts yet to maintain safety and capacity.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already the practice of the Department of Public Works. It is much more expensive (including mitigation requirements) to propose more grading than is needed.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy B)</p> <p>GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</p> <p>County Public Road Standards</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: "Design should be selected to minimize..."</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Retain policy item 364.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>
18	Mobility - Road Planning and Design	<p>Policy Require new residential developments outside of the North and South Villages to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid "urbanizing" improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center's Community Right of Way Development Standards.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards, which are in effect now.</p>	<p>GP: LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</p> <p>Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: " require new residential developments outside of the North and South Villages to construct roads..."</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
304	Mobility - Road Planning and Design	<p>Policy Add new alternative roads that reduce traffic on existing roads and increase connectivity versus adding lanes to existing roads.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p> <p>Determination of the best way to address safety or capacity issues is made on a site-specific basis. Either approach may be advantageous depending on the context. In addition, adding new roads may require acquisition of additional rights-of-way that would delay construction and increase the cost of the improvements.</p>	<p>GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network County Public Road Standards County Capital Improvement Program 5-Year Plan</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend Inclusion Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Should it be a policy or a goal? Include "when feasible"? - Keep as policy as stated - Keep staff recommendation - if they consider adding new roads may lead to eminent domain. They should add more lanes. -Will be same whether widening or adding new roads. Add roads on Mobility Element map.</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Retain item 304 as proposed.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 9 Noes: 5</p>
569	Mobility - Active Transportation and Transit	<p>Goal New staff goal proposal to address policies in Mobility - Active Transportation and Transit section: Improved transportation options and active transportation facilities in Valley Center.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 327, 335, 328, and 346 in a "Mobility – Active Transportation and Transit" section.</p>	NA		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
570	Mobility - Scenic Routes	<p>Goal New staff goal proposal to address policies in the Mobility - Scenic Routes section:</p> <p>The planning and engineering of road development and improvement projects considers accentuating Valley Center's valued scenic resources.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 55 and 425 in a "Mobility – Scenic Routes" section.</p>	NA		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
13	Conservation and Open Space - Natural Landscapes Conservation	<p>Policy Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undeveloped steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. In addition, there are other policies carried forward that address the issues, including Items 165, 406, 14, 86, 171, 160, 161, 429, 427, 85, 55, 425, 15, 422, 153, and 148.</p>	<p>GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</p> <p>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory) Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend inclusion Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: -Substitute "floodplain" with "riparian habitat"</p> <p>Public Comments: - Confuses floodwater control with floodplain - item is unclear (see item 112)</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: James Garritson Second: Lisa Adams</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 11 Noes: 3</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
159	Conservation and Open Space - Natural Landscapes Conservation	<p>Policy Preserve Valley Center’s naturally functioning eco-system, its natural beauty and landscape features (open spaces, canyons, ravines, creek beds and wetlands, ridgelines and hillsides, rock outcroppings and ledges, natural topographical contours, unique scenic views, meadows, oak and sycamore trees), and its natural plant and animal habitats.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. In addition, there are other policies carried forward that address the issues, including Items 165, 406, 14, 86, 171, 160, 161, 429, 427, 85, 55, 425, 15, 422, 153 and 148..</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2)</p> <p>GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</p> <p>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection</p>	<p>Motion: Recommend retain</p> <p>Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - How does this deal with protected trees? - By changing to goal, policy won't need additional clarity - Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Public Comments: - Covered under separate policies and is subjective - recommend removal</p> <p>Motion: Change to goal with existing text.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
427	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p>Policy Prohibit development within delineated wetlands, with the exception of road crossings, when meeting the requirements of the Resource Protection Ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations. This is a staff recommended revision.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #93 (CP Conservation Policy 12)</p> <p>GP COS-5.1 Impact to Floodplains S-9.2 Development in Floodplains S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas S-9.4 Development in Villages S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</p> <p>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kathleen McCabe</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
431	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p>Policy Minimize road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat. Only allow these, with mitigation, when alternatives have been considered and determined infeasible.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff recommendation for removal – This is completely covered by Item 85 above, which is recommended for inclusion by the Subcommittee and staff.</p>	<p>GP: S-9.2 Development in Floodplains S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</p> <p>Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee’s public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: James Garritson Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
428	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p>Policy Support as a high priority the development of open space corridors, community non-motorized multi-use trails, and parkland along watercourses.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations. • This presents an inconsistency issue with other policies included. 	<p>CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #84 (CP Conservation Policy 4) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #119 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 6)</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - County has this already as goal/policy - What are the inconsistencies? - Is public use clear enough?</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Include the policy with word "passive" in front of word "parkland."</p> <p>Maker: Julia Faliciano Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1</p>
430	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p>Policy Prohibit the construction of concrete lined flood control channels except where necessary because of existing improvements which block flood flow.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is covered in the Resource Protection Ordinance as follows: Concrete or rip-rap lined flood control channels are only allowed where findings are made that completion of the channel is necessary to protect existing buildings (at the time of RPO enactment - 1989) from a current flooding problem. 	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use - Industrial Policy 4)</p> <p>GP: S-9.2 Development in Floodplains S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</p> <p>Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Lisa Adams Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>