

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
Existing #25	Land Use - Commercial	Goal Commercial uses are concentrated within the boundaries of two compact scale, "rural villages" that are consistent in scale and design with a low density rural residential and agricultural community.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> - Compact scale and low density are conflicting descriptions - There are existing commercial uses outside the Villages. Through public review and Subcommittee meetings, it can be determined whether stakeholders want a goal of removing those. 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.	LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Item 25: remove "low density" but retain. - LU-11.1 covers item 25 - LU-11.1 not specific to scale - Remove low density based on conflicting description of compact scale and low density based on staff recommendation/rationale. <u>Public Comment:</u> - Is there a road next to project? purpose of secondary access. Motion: Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32. Maker: Pam Wiedenkel Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Note: Revisit white items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
Existing #28	Land Use - Commercial	Policy 3. Ensure that all commercial areas are served by Mobility Element roads or local roads which meet the standards of the County of San Diego. Whenever possible, require new commercial development to provide secondary road access as opposed to access from major through roads.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This can be especially relevant for development of the North Village. The policy expands on GP Policy M-2.2, connecting it to commercial uses. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> This policy discourages driveways to businesses being right on a Mobility Element road like Valley Center Road. Each development would need to evaluate the safest way to access the site, which may not be the same way in every instance.	LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible. M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designation Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Mobility Element Designated Roads	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Item 25: remove "low density" but retain. - LU-11.1 covers item 25 - LU-11.1 not specific to scale - Remove low density based on conflicting description of compact scale and low density based on staff recommendation/rationale. <u>Public Comment:</u> - Is there a road next to project? purpose of secondary access. Motion: Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32. Maker: Pam Wiedenkel Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Note: Revisit white items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
Existing #32	Land Use - Commercial	Policy 7. Commercial/civic uses shall be periodically reviewed to ensure that the standards for noise, light, traffic, odors and all other conditions of approval are continuing to be met.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Once condition satisfaction is completed, the County has to rely on people contacting Code Compliance for issues with commercial uses not complying with ongoing requirements or violating noise, lighting, etc. regulations. Code Compliance doesn't have enough staff to actively search for violations and this is the case with most jurisdictions. 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.	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Item 25: remove "low density" but retain. - LU-11.1 covers item 25 - LU-11.1 not specific to scale - Remove low density based on conflicting description of compact scale and low density based on staff recommendation/rationale. <u>Public Comment:</u> - Is there a road next to project? purpose of secondary access. Motion: Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32. Maker: Pam Wiedenkel Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Note: Revisit white items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
2012 Proposals #255	Commercial Uses	Policy 3. Prohibit general commercial and industrial enterprises which are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development such as conventional convenience stores and gas stations.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> Policy proposals in this section dealing with commercial outside the Villages are contradicting, so it's not clear on the intent. For example, this policy proposal speaks of not wanting general commercial uses, then the next one refers to wanting something like Harvest Farms, which has several types of general commercial uses. General language and/or contradicting policies lead to inconsistent implementation. Please review Sections 1200-1800 of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides 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. If a policy provides a list of Zoning Ordinance use types that should not be allowed outside Villages, that will provide sufficient direction on which zones should not be used outside Villages. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing or revising the policy.	NA	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy #) Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. 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.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - In general limit development? - Encourage development of businesses that support rural scale/character of VC - change "incompatible" to "compatible" - Discourage development of places incompatible with neighboring policies - change word "prohibit" to "discourage" - Redundancy with item 33 (on consent with proposed revision, additional language doesn't move forward with recommendation) - 255 addresses industrial and addresses areas outside of Villages - What type of industrial policies compatible with agricultural development? <u>Public Comment:</u> - Policy is vague with a lot of interpretation left. Needs more definition. Motion: Retain 255 and change "prohibit" to "discourage" Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkel Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
Existing #35	Land Use - Industrial	Goal Well planned and contained industrial uses which are clean, non-polluting, and compatible with the rural low density residential character of the community.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community. LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development Limit the establishment of commercial and industrial uses in Semi-Rural and Rural areas that are outside of Villages (including Rural Villages) to minimize vehicle trips and environmental impacts.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped" Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #36	Land Use - Industrial	Goal The retention of established industrial uses outside of the FEMA floodway.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped" Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #37	Land Use - Industrial	Policy 1. Require all industrial development to adhere to the Valley Center Design Guidelines on file with the Clerk of the Board.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.	Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped" Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #39	Land Use - Industrial	Policy 3. Require new industrial development to adhere to floodplain preservation criteria outlined in Design Guidelines for Valley Center. Hazards of flood inundation and stream bank erosion shall be minimized while protecting the scenic and aesthetic values of the floodplain. As per Design Guidelines for Valley Center, the environmentally sensitive floodplain areas or any mapped plan shall be protected as open space.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy. 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.	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction. S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas 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. S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe Encourage development of district areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types. S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.	Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped" Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
Existing #40	Land Use - Industrial	Policy 4. Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This issue is covered in the Design Guidelines, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and to a certain extent, in the GP policies listed. 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.	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood-proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction. S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas 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. S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe Encourage development of district areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types. S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.	Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped" Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #272	Specific Plans	Goal LU-6.1: Detailed Specific Plans govern development of large properties, unique properties and multiple-parceled Village properties.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> One of the main advantages of specific plans is that they allow for flexibility in applying regulations over a development. By developing a clear set of policies in this update, we can help to ensure specific plans and other application types achieve consistency with the vision for the community. Those policy proposals from the 2012 specific plan section that are recommended for inclusion below could be included under a different goal applicable to the issue addressed in the policy proposal. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - What is the purpose to keep this? <u>Public Comment:</u> - Can group have legal authority to remove entitlements? May not stand up if goes in front of Planning Group, given certain circumstances. Motion: Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #273	Specific Plans	Policy 1. Encourage Specific Plans for the development of large properties, unique properties and multiple-parceled Village properties.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not clear enough for a policy, with regard to what constitutes a large property and what constitutes a unique property, as referenced. Staff will already recommend the specific plan process for project proposals that would benefit from the flexibility allowed in that process. The costs associated with the process would limit the feasibility of using it for smaller projects. This recommendation is also in consideration of limiting the number of policies that will have little to no impact. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - What is the purpose to keep this? <u>Public Comment:</u> - Can group have legal authority to remove entitlements? May not stand up if goes in front of Planning Group, given certain circumstances. Motion: Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #274	Specific Plans	Policy 2. Amendments to Specific Plans adhere to the character and underlying density of the original Specific Plan.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The community plan cannot prohibit a property owner or applicant from requesting an amendment that varies from existing entitlements. If changes are requested, applicants must undergo all required analyses, notifications, and hearings for a Specific Plan Amendment and/or General Plan Amendment, and those proposals would be evaluated for compatibility with existing environmental resources and planned development patterns. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - What is the purpose to keep this? <u>Public Comment:</u> - Can group have legal authority to remove entitlements? May not stand up if goes in front of Planning Group, given certain circumstances. Motion: Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #276	Specific Plans	Policy 3. Specific Plans "expire" after a period of time. Existing designated Specific Plan Areas shall expire and be removed from the Land Use Map if the related Specific Plan and other required discretionary approvals are not obtained within two years of BOS approval of the General Plan Update, and substantial progress made on implementation of the Specific Plan within one year after Specific Plan approval. Lands within the SP Area shall then be assigned (automatically revert to) the General Plan Land Use designation applicable to the majority of its surrounding parcels, unless and until the owner obtains a GPA assigning different designation(s).	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is now outdated, since two years from the GP Update adoption has passed. Re: the rest of the language, "substantial progress" is unclear and open to different interpretations. The CPC can include expiration recommendations on a project basis when bringing forward recommendations on individual specific plan projects. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	Land Use Element p. 17 (description of the Specific Plan Area GP land use designation)	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Item #276 revision: The designation Specific Plan Areas (SPA) may be recommended for termination by the VCCPG if timely and substantial progress toward completion is not made within four (4) years of designation. If granted termination, the SPA lands would revert to their previous Land Use Designation under the General Plan. <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain with revision: The designation Specific Plan Areas (SPA) may be recommended for termination by the VCCPG if timely and substantial progress toward completion is not made within four (4) years of designation. If granted termination, the SPA lands would revert to their previous Land Use Designation under the General Plan. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Hans Britsch Vote: Ayes: 3 Noes: 3 The motion failed and no substitute motion was made. The Subcommittee moved forward without a recommendation on the item.
Existing #53	Mobility	Policy 6. Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This type of issue is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right of Way Development Standards. In addition, "significant visual benefit" is open for interpretation. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.	Valley Center Design Guidelines Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #55	Mobility	Policy 8. Woods Valley Road from Valley Center Road, east to Paradise Mountain Road and, Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Highway 76 are significant aesthetic resources. Future improvements should maintain as much of their original character as possible without compromising safety.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #56	Mobility	Policy 9. Require that the road system function at a service level no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This conflicts with GP M-2.1, calling for D or better, but providing allowance for accepting failing LOS pursuant to criteria in the policy. It also conflicts with GP Table M-4, which calls out road segments (including in VC) that have been accepted at failing LOS by the GP, in accordance with criteria for accepting failing LOS. 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.	M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #59	Mobility	Policy 12. Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Section 81.402 of the County Subdivision Ordinance has detailed guidance on when public road dedication is required and when private roads can be allowed (GP designations are a factor). Staff wants to make sure policies are not inconsistent with that or vague with text like "clear circulation need" and "benefits the overall community" as people could make the argument that the Subdivision Ordinance should be updated with separate standards for VC (for consistency with the CP). 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.	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations. M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Residential Subdivision Design Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.	County Subdivision Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
Existing #60	Mobility	Policy 13. Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This will need to have more clarity/specificity on what is being suggested so that it can be an impactful policy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards, Active Transportation Plan and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.	County Public Road Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #61	Mobility	Policy 14. To mitigate cumulative traffic impacts, endorse a Bridge and Thoroughfare Traffic Mitigation Program for the establishment of a fee to be collected at the building permit stage.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The Transportation Impact Fee serves this purpose (a fee collected at the building permit stage). Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff is adding the following to the rationale: In addition, the implementation of SB743 (switch to Vehicle Miles Traveled [VMT] for CEQA analysis) will change how traffic impacts are determined.	M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and equestrian.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #48	Mobility - Access	Policy 1. Where appropriate, minimize private driveway and private road access on to Mobility Element roads.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is repetitive of GP Policy M-2.2. In addition, the County Public Road Standards (Section 6.1) note the minimum separation between non-Mobility Element roads and driveways entering a Mobility Element road. 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.	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	County Public Road Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #48- why retain when it appears redundant? - #48: It is a problem that needs to be addressed, not translating from policy to reality - M-2.2 includes similar wording <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove #48, #282 and #283. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #282	Mobility - Access	Policy 2.1.2.1 The uncontrolled access from private driveways and private roads onto Mobility Element roads is minimized.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Existing Community Plan policy (recommended for inclusion to remain) and the General Plan policy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #90 Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized. County Public Road Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #48- why retain when it appears redundant? - #48: It is a problem that needs to be addressed, not translating from policy to reality - M-2.2 includes similar wording <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove #48, #282 and #283. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #283	Mobility - Access	Policy 2.1.2.2 The direct access points onto Mobility Element roads are minimized in commercial areas to promote unimpeded traffic flow. This shall be achieved by requiring that new commercial development provide indirect access through the use of new road access points.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in existing Community Plan and General Plan policies. Additionally, the County Public Road Standards (Section 6.1) require that Non-Mobility roads (includes driveways) entering into a Mobility Element road shall have their centerlines separated by at least 300 feet. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #90 Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized. County Public Road Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #48- why retain when it appears redundant? - #48: It is a problem that needs to be addressed, not translating from policy to reality - M-2.2 includes similar wording <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Remove #48, #282 and #283. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #284	Mobility - Access	Policy 2.1.2.3 The access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined and during the planning process, the new subdivision roads will be connected to critical roads to improve access and connectivity. Where a circulation need is identified that will benefit the overall community, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Section 81.402 of the County Subdivision Ordinance has guidance on when public road dedication is required and when private roads can be allowed based on General Plan land use designations. The needs for roads and the timing of their construction are determined on a project by project basis. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #99 Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points. County Public Road Standards County Subdivision Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #284 - Other documents in County have established criteria to make recommendations; not comfortable as CPG member <u>Public Comment:</u> - Agree with comment that established in other documents and not comfortable with #284 proposed Motion: Remove item #284 and item #314. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #314	Mobility - Access	Policy 2.3.1.1 Additional routes are provided to reduce congestion, spread traffic, and allow alternate evacuation routes in case of fire or other emergency.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The County is not clear on how a policy consistency determination would be made for this. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #284 - Other documents in County have established criteria to make recommendations; not comfortable as CPG member <u>Public Comment:</u> - Agree with comment that established in other documents and not comfortable with #284 proposed Motion: Remove item #284 and item #314. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #296	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.1.4.1 The road system must be flexible, combining a sufficient network of public and private roads with a smaller number of Mobility Element Roads to achieve connectivity that permits alternative circulation choices for residents.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate. M-1 Balanced Road Network A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Remove items #296, #297 and #299 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #297	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.1.4.2 The system should serve Valley Center residents well, but not act as a conduit for growth.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal. 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.	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate. M-1 Balanced Road Network A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Remove items #296, #297 and #299 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #299	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.1.4.4 The system should provide easy access throughout the community, while preserving our open spaces.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal. This would have no impact as a policy, as there would not be a way to determine policy consistency. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate. M-1 Balanced Road Network A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A Motion: Remove items #296, #297 and #299 Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #307	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.2.1 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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This item is being compared to the referenced policy in the Existing Community Plan, which is proposed for removal. A road design in keeping with a "rural neighborhood" character is addressed in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards, as it seems the community values the right of way design components outside of the travel lanes, detailed in that document. It is not clear on how one would establish consistency with a rural design for the travel lanes. More clarity would be needed there. In terms of connectivity, there needs to be a "nexus" in terms of how the subdivision application is connected to this and associated impacts/mitigation to off-site circulation. The County recommends providing this excerpt from the County Subdivision Ordinance to understand existing requirements. It reads, "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 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." 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.	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points.	Subcommittee Comment: - staff comments point out #59 has a related item (recommend removal) - item #59 - has this been voted on? - Likes staff's recommendations for removal of both items - Fire has keys (safety isn't an issue) - Can this be put off until end of the meetings to take later? - Word "require" on #308 is potential concern Public Comment: Motion: Include item #307. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
			M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.	County Subdivision Ordinance		
2012 Proposals #308	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.2.2 Developers be required to provide un-gated interconnections between roads rather than creating more unconnected networks of roads.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> See the reference to existing regulations (covering this issue) of the County Subdivision Ordinance in the row for item 307 above. 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.	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points.	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: - item 308: "ungated interconnections" difficult to define. Using word "required" is questionable. Motion: Change language from "Developers be required to provide" to "Recommend developers provide" Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 2
			M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.	County Subdivision Ordinance		
2012 Proposals #310	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.2.3.2 Improved local connectivity could reduce the amount of traffic serving these dispersed facilities by offering alternative routes.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is a repeat of item 305 above (we are including the repeat in this matrix because it was repeated in the 2012 draft Mobility 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.	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	Subcommittee Comment: N/A Public Comment: N/A Motion: Remove items #310, #311, #312. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			M-1 Balanced Road Network	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points.		
2012 Proposals #311	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.2.3.3 Many existing roads cannot be widened or improved because of terrain limitations and residential properties preventing expansion of right-of-way.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is a repeat of item 305 above (we are including the repeat in this matrix because it was repeated in the 2012 draft Mobility 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.	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.		Subcommittee Comment: N/A Public Comment: N/A Motion: Remove items #310, #311, #312. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			M-1 Balanced Road Network A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	NA		
2012 Proposals #312	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	Policy 2.2.3.4 The County needs a better way to convert private roads to public roads to allow connectivity and improve safety and .	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy. 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.	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.	NA	Subcommittee Comment: N/A Public Comment: N/A Motion: Remove items #310, #311, #312. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			NA	NA		

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #288	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	Policy 2.1.3.2 Casino and through traffic should move safely through our town with minimum impact on local circulation.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Traffic counts along with future traffic from planned developments are used in developing traffic improvements and mitigation measures in traffic studies for development projects. The traffic counts do not differentiate between casino traffic and other traffic. Proposed revision: Consider the impacts of casino traffic and other through traffic when developing traffic improvement plans. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: Slightly revised wording is proposed to reflect the shift in CEQA analysis from Level of Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Proposed revision: Consider the extent of casino traffic and other through traffic when developing traffic improvement plans.	M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a falling level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service (E/F)). When development is proposed on roads where a falling level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network. M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend inclusion with the staff proposed revision, plus add, "with the goal of safety and minimal impact on local circulation." Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Jeana Boulos Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #289	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	Policy 2.1.3.3 The majority of roads on the Mobility Element map should remain 2 lanes.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The Mobility Element map is a component of the Community Plan update and is determined by existing and proposed traffic capacity. Please see related General Plan policies. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>Recommend Removal (revised rationale)</i> Post-public review update: In consideration of inter-departmental input, we have the following proposed revision to the rationale: The Mobility Element Network for Valley Center will be evaluated for potential updates as part of the Community Plan Update process. Proposed updates to the Mobility Element Network are determined through analysis of existing and proposed traffic, in relation to applicable standards. Please see the related General Plan policies.	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate. M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #289 - revise the goal to say "the majority of roads to remain 2 lanes with changes subject to analysis of existing and proposed traffic and safety requirements." (not carried forward in the motion) - Analysis of traffic circulations and road size has a process. Recommend removal. - Important to include redundancy. <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation for items #289 and #302. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Jeana Boulos Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #302	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	Policy 2.1.5.1 Our villages need a circulation network with enough roads and connectivity without using Major/Prime Arterial roads. For example, use one-way roads instead of 4-6 lanes roads to carry capacity in walkable villages.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is partially covered by the referenced Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies. A revision is proposed to address the last part. Proposed revision: Consider the use of one way internal circulation roads within Villages to improve traffic capacity. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate. M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - #289 - revise the goal to say "the majority of roads to remain 2 lanes with changes subject to analysis of existing and proposed traffic and safety requirements." (not carried forward in the motion) - Analysis of traffic circulations and road size has a process. Recommend removal. - Important to include redundancy. <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Retain staff recommendation for items #289 and #302. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Jeana Boulos Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #293	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	Policy 2.1.3.7 Our road network must safely and efficiently accommodate realistic projected population growth.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan Goal and in the referenced General Plan policies. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas Provide a public road network that accommodates travel between and within community planning areas rather than accommodating overflow traffic from State Highways and freeways that are unable to meet regional travel demands. M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies. M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a falling level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service (E/F)). When development is proposed on roads where a falling level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 Adopt an active program of coordination between the allowable growth of population and the infrastructure serving it to ensure at all times, that the public welfare and safety are guaranteed.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A Motion: Recommend removal. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

12/10/2020 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 12/9/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #303	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	Policy 2.1.5.2 Roads need to be designed based on realistic land use needs versus buildout capacity.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan Goal and in the referenced General Plan policies.	M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas Provide a public road network that accommodates travel between and within community planning areas rather than accommodating overflow traffic from State Highways and freeways that are unable to meet regional travel demands.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 Adopt an active program of coordination between the allowable growth of population and the infrastructure serving it to ensure at all times, that the public welfare and safety are guaranteed.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A Motion: Recommend retain staff recommendation. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies.		
				M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service "E"). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.		
2012 Proposals #318	Mobility - Evacuation	Policy 2.3.2.2 All areas of VC are able to evacuate during emergencies.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> There would be no way to determine policy consistency with this proposal. Evacuation is addressed in the CVPPs and in Fire Protection Plans (FPPs) for projects. Access requirements in the Consolidated Fire Code were developed in consideration of evacuations, in addition to access for fire protection equipment.	S-3.5 Access Roads Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A Motion: Recommend retain staff recommendation. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA			
2012 Proposals #324	Safety - Staging Areas	Policy 2.3.4.3 Development of staging areas at several locations to accommodate emergency vehicles.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> There would be no way to determine policy consistency with this proposal. This issue is addressed more clearly in Item 397 of this matrix, which is proposed for inclusion with a minor revision.	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A Motion: Recommend retain staff recommendation. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	S-3.5 Access Roads Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.		
Existing #18	Mobility - Road Design	Policy 5. Require new residential development 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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not consistent with the Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards, which allow different treatments in different areas.	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.	Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> - hydrology may require gutters and curbs, also push for community to have sidewalks Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: " require new residential developments outside of the North and South Villages to construct roads..." Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> The Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development standards do allow curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in the Villages and the Industrial area. See Table 1 on p. 13, Table 2 on p. 14, and Table 3 on p. 15. In addition, section 3.2.1 states, "As shown in the tables in Section 3.1, there are several options for the design of the travel way edge: a natural swale, no curb, asphalt curbs, rolled concrete and concrete curbs and gutters." It goes on to state concrete curbs and gutters are allowed only in the Industrial Zone 1 and in Zone 2 (both Villages). There is nothing in the policy about landscaping in the right of way.	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.		
2012 Proposals #364	Mobility - Road Design	Policy 2.12.1.6 Design is selected to minimize grading impacts yet to maintain safety and capacity.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies referenced.	M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 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: • 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.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: "Design should be selected to minimize..." Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
			Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.		