

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

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 10/22/2020 Meeting
#31	Design Guidelines	Policy 6. Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Design Guidelines The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-9.6 Town Center Uses Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Villages or Rural Villages at transportation nodes. Exceptions to this pattern may be allowed for established industrial districts and secondary commercial districts or corridors.  LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	Subcommittee Comment: Include in consideration for Design Guidelines and retain in Community Plan.  Public Comment:  Motion: Include in consideration for Design Guidelines and retain in Community Plan.  Maker: Pam Wiedenkelter Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#169	Design Guidelines	Policy LU-3.4.11 Encourage green development and green building practices.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal This is repetitive of the General Plan. GP Policy COS-15.1 calls for new buildings to be designed in accordance with "green building" programs.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	COS-15.1 Design and Construction of New Buildings Require that new buildings be designed and constructed in accordance with "green building" programs that incorporate techniques and materials that maximize energy efficiency, incorporate the use of sustainable resources and recycled materials, and reduce emissions of GHGs and toxic air contaminants.	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Remove from Community Plan. COS-15.1 adequately covers this Policy. Covered under other regulations, as well. Green development undefined - would have to add more specificity (LEED ND.)  Public Comment: Already covered under existing State regulations.  Motion: Remove from the Community Plan.  Maker: Pam Wiedenkelter Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#213	Design Guidelines - Architecture	Policy 1. Prohibit "big box" stores (How best? Through floor area ratios?)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Design Guidelines During the update of the Design Guidelines, stakeholders can recommend components to ensure compatible designing with the Villages and outside the Villages properties zoned for commercial. The architectural, parking, and building placement guidelines covered in the Design Guidelines can address unfavorable design components typically associated with big box stores. Floor area ratios are not the appropriate mechanism for addressing this issue, as the allowed floor area would be determined based on the size of the property.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, sited, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.  Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Language not specific enough to enforce. Suggest wording in Item #214 (also considered for DG). Consider for Design Guidelines.  Public Comment:  Motion: Consider for Design Guidelines.  Maker: Pam Wiedenkelter Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#182	Design Guidelines - Parking	Policy 6. Encourage a design that incorporates both on-street parking and parking to the rear-of-building in small, conveniently located and shared parking lots that are abundantly landscaped and mostly out-of-view.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal General Plan policy LU-11.3 states the preference for Villages and Village Design Guidelines throughout the County including compact, walkable configurations, parking in the rear or side, and retail street-fronting uses. In terms of Valley Center, the Design Guidelines will be updated as part of the process and this policy's intent would be considered as part of those updated Design Guidelines.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Remove - Covered under DRB during design review process.  Public Comment: Remove - Covered under DRB during design review process.  Motion: Recommend Removal  Maker: Pam Wiedenkelter Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#129	Land Use - Regional Categories	Goal Maintain the boundaries of Village, Semi-Rural and Rural land use designations.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal The General Plan has strict policies (LU-1.2, LU-1.4) on GPAs proposing changes from Semi-Rural or Rural to a Village Regional Category and land use designation. This policy would remove the flexibility to allow stakeholders and decision-makers to consider changed circumstances (infrastructure/service extents, market conditions, public facilities, parks/open space, etc.) in the evaluation of land use proposals.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.  LU-12 Leapfrog Development Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village centers located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries.  LU-14 Village Expansion Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: • Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding. • Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network. • Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents. • The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area.  LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	Land Use Goal 1: Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.	Subcommittee Comment: Recommend removal.  Public Comment:  Motion: Recommend removal.  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkelter Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#1	Land Use - Community Character	Goal 1. Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  No Change to Recommendation The text in referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Villages - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category	LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.  LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.  LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.  Public Comment:  Motion: Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

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 10/22/2020 Meeting
#2	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Goal</b> 1.A. Village: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <b>Recommend Removal</b> The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <b>No Change to Recommendation</b> The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category</p>	<p><b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.</p> <p><b>LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores</b> Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.</p> <p><b>LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands</b> Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.</p>	NA	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>
#3	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Goal</b> 1.B. Semi-Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the semi-rural areas.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <b>Recommend Removal</b> The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <b>No Change to Recommendation</b> The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category</p>	<p><b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.</p> <p><b>LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores</b> Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.</p> <p><b>LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands</b> Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.</p>	NA	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>
#4	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Goal</b> 1.C. Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the rural lands area outside the semi-rural area.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <b>Recommend Removal</b> The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <b>No Change to Recommendation</b> The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category</p>	<p><b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.</p> <p><b>LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores</b> Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.</p> <p><b>LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands</b> Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.</p>	NA	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>
#10	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Goal</b> Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <b>Recommend Removal</b> The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. There are other existing policies, 2012 proposals, and other regulations that address these types of resources and this type of broad stroke policy without clear definitions would lead to inconsistencies with other regulations and inconsistent interpretations.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <b>No Change to Recommendation</b> The County accidentally excluded this policy from the matrix, but it was numbered correctly in the Community Plan pdf with matrix item numbers. The County is also clear on Fred's reference with the note of p. 11, A-1 from the Community Plan. That being said, the comment doesn't seem to fit the existing policy as it doesn't refer to public access within open space easements. Most large open space preserves allow trails and public access; however, there are many open space easement areas that do not have trails nor allow public access in order to allow for the necessary resource protection required.</p>	<p><b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.</p> <p><b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b></p>	NA	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>
#18	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Policy</b> 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.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <b>Recommend Removal</b> This is not consistent with the Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards, which allow different treatments in different areas.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <b>No Change to Recommendation</b> 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 3 on p. 13, Table 7 on p. 14, and Table 9 on p. 15. In addition, section 3.2 states, "As shown in the table in Section 3.1, there are several options for the design of the travel way edge: a natural finish, 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 3 and in Zone 4 (both Villages).  There is nothing in the policy about landscaping in the right of way.</p>	<p><b>LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility</b> 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 preservative 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.</p> <p><b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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.</p>	Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

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 10/22/2020 Meeting
#144	Land Use - Community Character	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.1.6 Require any on-site amenities and services to be compatible with sub-area character and reflect activities that typically take place in the area.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> On-site amenities and services will be reviewed on a project by project basis.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #10 (CP Land Use-General Goal)</b> Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.  <b>Existing Goals and Policies matrix #11 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1)</b> Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley CPA.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146 <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#145	Land Use - Community Character	<b>Goal</b> LU-3.2: New development respects and furthers the community's rural heritage and quality of life. The skin of the earth is not disturbed any more than is absolutely necessary.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. For maximum effectiveness, they should be consolidated in 1-2 policies.  The second sentence of this proposed policy seems to be in line with encouraging clustering (flexibility in lot sizes without affecting allowed density), which doesn't match the intent of other 2012 proposals.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #10 (CP Land Use-General Goal)</b> Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.  <b>Existing Goals and Policies matrix #11 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1)</b> Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley CPA.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146 <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#146	Land Use - Community Character	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.3.1. Support development in Semi-Rural areas of single family homes at slope-dependent densities providing that development is consistent with surrounding built neighborhoods and respectful of natural resources and features that characterize these areas, their mesas, valleys and gentle slopes.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. For maximum effectiveness, they should be consolidated in 1-2 policies.  The County would not anticipate this policy to have much impact because the direction is unclear (e.g. "consistent with" and "respectful of natural resources and features" will have different meanings depending on the reader).  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.  <b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.  <b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal)</b> A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.  <b>Existing Goals and Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1)</b> Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed 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.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal. Text covered under staff recommendation of item #148.  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 144, 145, 146 <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#147	Land Use - Community Character	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.3.2 Support development in Rural designations of single family homes and permitted agri-businesses when conservation site planning respects the scale, irregularity and diversity that characterizes rural development.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. This one refers to preferring irregularity and diversity as important for development within the Rural Lands designated properties. Please reference existing policy (Land Use-Community Character Policy 2), though that policy is not specific to any Regional Category or group of land use designations.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2)</b> Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Requires that site design is consistent with the rural character of the community.  <b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal)</b> Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkaeller <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#132	Land Use - Village Boundary	<b>Policy</b> LU-1.3 Prohibit expansion of the Village Boundary and/or sewer services until properties within the established Village boundary are built out. (Commercial area provided in this plan already exceeds Valley Center's build-out needs by 100%; and Village residential units provided in this plan reflect a 1000% increase over existing conditions. The community will be ill-served by expanding Village boundaries until growth is achieved where it is already planned.)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> The policy will be open to interpretation because there is no definition of "built out" and the text in parentheses is outdated now. Please see General Plan policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.4 related to Village expansion and LU-14.4 related to sewer service expansion to determine if additional area-specific circumstances should be addressed for Valley Center.  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.	<b>LU-1.3 Leapfrog Development</b> Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries.  <b>LU-1.4 Village Expansion</b> Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: ● Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding. ● Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network. ● Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents. ● The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area.  <b>LU-14.4 Sewer Facilities</b> Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond other Village boundaries or extend Urban Limit Lines, whichever is more restrictive, except: ● When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare; ● When within existing sewer district boundaries; ● When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or ● Where specifically allowed in the community plan.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend revision - change language from "built out" to "developed." Recommend removal.  <u>Public Comment:</u> Object to language in policies.  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal for item #132 and 133. <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

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 10/22/2020 Meeting
#133	Land Use - Village Boundary	<b>Policy</b> LU-1.4 Prohibit the establishment of new Village areas in the CPA except in the context of a comprehensive General Plan Update	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This addresses the same issue as 2012 proposed policy LU-1.3, but is inconsistent with that. Stakeholders should consider the feedback within that row and the GP policies referenced.  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.	<b>LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development</b> Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries.  <b>LU-1.4 Village Expansion</b> Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding.</li> <li>Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network.</li> <li>Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents.</li> <li>The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area.</li> </ul>	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend revision - change language from "built out" to "developed." Recommend removal.  <u>Public Comment:</u> Object to language in policies.  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal for item #132 and 133. <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#222	Land Use - Village Densities	<b>Policy</b> 2. Neighborhoods closest to the Village core include a mix of the denser housing. Density decreases as it approaches the boundary of Semi-Rural properties along Misty Oak.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>LU-1.3 Development Patterns</b> Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.  <b>LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes</b> Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.  <b>LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character</b> Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Remove item  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#176	Land Use - Village Development	<b>Goal</b> LU-4.1 Two compact and master-planned "town centers" provide local shopping and services, central gathering places for public community activities, and expanded options for housing.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Master plans for both villages would be difficult at this point so staff is recommending the following revision:  Proposed revision: Two compact "town centers" provide local shopping and services, central gathering places for public community activities, and expanded options for housing.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores</b> Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.  <b>LU-9.5 Village Uses</b> 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.  <b>LU-9.6 Town Center Uses</b> Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Villages or Rural Villages at transportation nodes. Exceptions to this pattern may be allowed for established industrial districts and secondary commercial districts or corridors.  <b>LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design</b> Plan and guide the development of Town Center and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Whenever possible, locate public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend inclusion with revision, as revised by staff.  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Adopt the proposed revised language <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#140	Land Use - Village Residential Uses	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.1.2 Encourage achievement of allotted density in Village areas.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The GP policy referenced in this row is similar but calls for achieving at least 80% of the permitted density on sites designated at 15 to 30 units per acre. This policy proposal would cover all Village areas.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>H-1.2 Development Intensity Relative to Permitted Density</b> Encourage a development intensity of at least 80 percent of the maximum permitted gross density for sites designated at 15 to 30 dwelling units per acre in development projects.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend removal - reluctant to encourage development to full density allotted. Covered under H-1.2.  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
#209	Zoning Development Designators - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 9. Limit village development to two-stories except for special features that the community desires, such as bell and clock towers, and church steeples	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> While most of the properties in the Villages have a "C" height designator (allowing a maximum of 35' and two stories), a process is available through a discretionary Administrative Permit or Major Use Permit to allow an additional story. These would go to the CIG 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. Finally, phrases like "special features that the community desires" could lead to confusion and differing opinions on application of this policy.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	NA	Zoning Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Recommend inclusion to retain two-story limit. Remove words "community desires". Revise language so the proposed is two stories with a maximum of three.  <u>Recommend inclusion with revision:</u>  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."  <u>Public Comment:</u> Suggest a cap of three stories to accommodate density. Agree with Subcommittee comments. Address each project on its own merit with individual developer/project.  <b>Motion:</b> 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." <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0

**Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations**  
11/12/2020 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 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #234	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	<b>Goal</b> 6-2 Retain the character that distinguishes the sub-area. Site designs are consistent with the image, scale and diversity of the surrounding semi-rural neighborhood.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal This is mostly covered in the existing goals referenced. To suggest consistency with image and scale, but then wanting diversity could make this wording confusing.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	<b>LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character</b> Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	<b>Existing Goals and Policies matrix #10</b> Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> * Recommend retain with revision. * The following policies may be repeating this goal. * Exclude villages? * Only the word #239 as policies * Keep policy #236  Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages.  <b>Public Comment:</b> * May be amenable to achieve. Consider design and cost with General Plan density requirements. * Consider each area uniquely and work with developers - premature to place limitations.  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238.  Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
			Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal The County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which calls for clustered development, is required in SR 30, RL-20/40/80 and is optional in others. See Section 8.404 of the County's Subdivision Ordinance for the requirements of Conservation Subdivisions.  The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, pathway/trails, and open space networks. Road/vacations to parcels on a subdivision boundary shall not terminate in a dead-end when it is feasible for the road/segment to serve as a through street.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-3 Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods</b> A land use plan that accommodates a range of building and neighborhood types suitable for a variety of lifestyles, ages, affordability levels, and design options.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #11</b> Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley Center CPA.	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> See item #234. * Do Villages need to be specifically considered as this is covering Land Use - Semi-Rural?  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238.  Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
2012 Proposals #236	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	<b>Policy</b> 2. On larger properties create interconnected smaller neighborhoods separated by open space; avoid a sprawl of houses or independent enclaves.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal The County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which calls for clustered development, is required in SR 30, RL-20/40/80 and is optional in others. See Section 8.404 of the County's Subdivision Ordinance for the requirements of Conservation Subdivisions.  The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, pathway/trails, and open space networks. Road/vacations to parcels on a subdivision boundary shall not terminate in a dead-end when it is feasible for the road/segment to serve as a through street.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity</b> 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.	<b>County Subdivision Ordinance</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> See item #234. * Do Villages need to be specifically considered as this is covering Land Use - Semi-Rural?  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238.  Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
2012 Proposals #238	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	<b>Policy</b> 4. Prohibit monotonous site designs: this means checkerboard layouts, uniform lot sizes, repetitious architecture, uniform building materials, and pretentious branding that cites the natural features the project has just destroyed.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal This issue is covered in the policy proposal in item 235 of this matrix and the issue is covered in a more generalized style in GP Policy LU-3.2. The County doesn't regulate the types of marketing materials referenced.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.  <b>LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	NA	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> See item #234. Issue with the word "require" in item #234 goal. * Currently have #236 and #239 on consent. * Without the word "require", give too much flexibility to developers.  Reference item #236 (on consent): Evaluate the pattern of diverse home site designs and home styles that characterize neighborhoods of custom homes.  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238.  Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
Existing #6	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	<b>Policy</b> 2. Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Inclusion with Revision Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course). Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation This policy does not refer to other related proposals to consider in the 2023 matrix. Projects are required to be consistent with the Community Plan and that requirement will carry forward to the Community Plan Update.	<b>LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.  <b>LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	<b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> * Covered by item #148. Recommend retain #148 and #152. * Agree with staff revision.  <b>Public Comment:</b> * Subdivision lots have to be the same size, careful of what constraints are put on  Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkelter  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #152	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.7 Prohibit repetitive cookie-cutter development that destroys local character.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Inclusion with Revision Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course). "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with same-model elevations should be avoided."  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	<b>LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.  <b>LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2)</b> Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b>  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation with revision.  <b>Proposed revision:</b> Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkelter  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #154	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.3.9 Require a diversity and mix of lot sizes and housing types, architecture, landscaping and lot sizes to attract people of diverse lifestyles, occupations, interests, and ages.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Inclusion with Revision The different component on this one is the reference to landscaping, but that should be covered in the Design Guidelines for areas subject to design review, or in the Community Right of Way Development Standards covering the parkway portion of the public road right of way.  Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	<b>LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.  <b>LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2)</b> Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b>  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation with revision.  <b>Proposed revision:</b> Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkelter  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #155	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.3.10 Produce variety within the range of design options that are compatible with the character of the sub-area (see the chapter on Community Characters: Valley Center's Sub-Areas.)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies This policy is not specific to Village areas or other commercial/industrial areas, so it is not recommended to be included in the Design Guidelines update.  Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	<b>LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types</b> Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.  <b>LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects</b> Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2)</b> Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b>  <b>Public Comment:</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation with revision.  <b>Proposed revision:</b> Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkelter  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #24	Land Use - Residential	<b>Policy</b> 9. Prohibit residential development which would prematurely subdivide land and require expansion of public utilities and services to such developments.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  Recommend Removal There is no explanation of what would constitute prematurely subdividing land. Public utility/infrastructure expansion policies are already covered in a separate section and in the GP.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.	<b>LU-4 Village Expansion</b> Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: * Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding * Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network * Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents * The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area	NA	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> * 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 mode. * Avoiding cost doesn't make sense.  <b>Public Comment:</b> * This proposed language might prevent some potential projects to be developed. Add language to allow for flexibility. * Limitations might not need to be put in place if developers understand Valley Center's characteristics.  <b>Motion:</b> 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 mode.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1

**Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations**  
11/12/2020 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 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #149	Land Use - Subdivisions	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.4. Require site inventory maps to precede site planning in order to determine areas that should be conserved and areas that can be disturbed for development.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This proposed policy would be difficult to implement in only Valley Center and "areas to be conserved" would not hold regulatory weight.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	<b>PDS Form #090 - Minimum Plot Plan Information</b>  <b>Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Recommend inclusion with revision  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Take staff recommendation to remove item #149.  <b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #174	Land Use - Subdivisions	<b>Policy</b> LU-4.1.2 Designs for major subdivisions will follow the County's manual for achieving context-sensitive project designs: "Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions"	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines were intended to serve as a resource tool so mandating the Guidelines as policy regulations in Valley Center would be inconsistent with their intention.  Proposed revision: Designs for major subdivisions should follow guidance in the County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines in order to achieve community character compatibility.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	NA	<b>Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Accept staff proposed revision  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Accept staff revision.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #240	Land Use - Subdivisions	<b>Policy</b> 6. Incorporate non-motorized cross-country trails into the site design.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan. The County does not have the authority to require that developers obtain off-site trail easements. The language lacks clarity and seems to require cross country trails for any project in the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Section 81.402b of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails</b> Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for rail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.  <b>COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks</b> Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.	<b>Goals &amp; Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9)</b> CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Master Plan developed as baseline level of service of trails needed * We need to find opportunities to connect to existing trails, even if there isn't a CTMP alignment through the site. * Perhaps consider with the other trails proposals.  <u>Public Comment:</u> * Situate with the County not taking on maintenance of all trails. Maintenance can be particularly problematic with regular equestrian use.  <b>Motion:</b> Table for now, take up with other trail items.  <b>Maker:</b> <b>Second:</b>  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: Noes:
Existing #19	Land Use - Buffering	<b>Policy</b> 6. Buffer residential areas from incompatible activities which create heavy traffic, noise, odors, dust, and unsightly views through the use of landscaping and preservation of open space.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This is very similar to GP Policies LU-11.9, 10, and 11, but it's possible it could be retained with the specifics on using landscaping and open space. Stakeholders should review the referenced GP policies to see if they are sufficient to cover the issue.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> It seems the comment submitted does not note a disagreement with including this current policy in the update, but calls for additional policy language for screening of noise walls. GP Policy N-1.3 discourages noise walls and calls for berms, landscaping, or other screening when noise walls can't be avoided.	<b>LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions</b> Locate transitions of medium-intensity land uses or provide buffers between lower intensity uses, such as low-density residential districts and higher intensity development, such as commercial or industrial uses. Buffering may be accomplished through increased setbacks or other techniques such as grade differentials, walls, and/or landscaping but must be consistent with community design standards.  <b>LU-11.10 Integrity of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses</b> Protect designated medium and high impact industrial areas from encroachment of incompatible land uses, such as residences, schools, or other uses that are sensitive to industrial impacts. The intent of this policy is to retain the ability to utilize industrially designated locations by reducing future development conflicts.  <b>LU-11.11 Industrial Compatibility with Adjoining Uses</b> Require industrial land uses with outdoor activities or storage to provide a buffer from adjacent incompatible land uses (refer to Policy LU-11.9 for examples of buffering).  <b>M-2.4 Roadway Noise Buffers</b> Incorporate buffers or other noise reduction measures consistent with standards established in the Noise Element into the siting and design of roads located next to sensitive noise-receptors to minimize adverse impacts from traffic noise. Consider reduction measures such as alternative road design, reduced speeds, alternative paving, and setbacks or buffers, prior to berms and walls.  <b>N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies</b> Require the following strategies as higher priorities than construction of conventional noise barriers where noise abatement is necessary: * Avoid placement of noise sensitive uses within noise areas * Increase setbacks between noise generators and noise sensitive uses * Orient buildings such that the noise sensitive portions of a project are shielded from noise sources * Use sound-attenuating architectural design and building features * Employ technologies when appropriate that reduce noise generation (i.e. alternative pavement materials on roadways)	<b>Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Add text at end of existing sentence. Prioritize landscape/open space buffer. "Discourage, except as a last resort, sound walls" * Open space/landscape buffer not enough if next to major street. Recommend taking staff recommendation * Buffer walls should be last resort in VC.  <b>Item #126 (consent item) : Design subdivisions to retain natural and landscaped sound barriers in preference to earth berms or walls, where they are needed.</b>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend Removal  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #184	Land Use - Affordable Housing	<b>Policy</b> 8. Integrate affordable housing units with market priced dwellings; prohibit their concentration in one area of any neighborhood.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> The integration of affordable housing into development projects is part of the countywide Housing Affordability strategy.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>H-3.3 Density Bonus as a Means to Develop Affordable Housing</b> Provide a local density bonus program to encourage the development of housing affordable to lower income households and special needs housing.  <b>H-3.4 Housing for Moderate-Income Families in Villages</b> Facilitate the production of housing for moderate income families within Villages by permitting developments that offer affordable housing to incorporate other compatible housing types within areas zoned for single-family residential development.	<b>Zoning Ordinance - Density Bonus Program (starting at Section 6350)</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Covered elsewhere, agree with staff recommendation to remove (H-3.3 & H-3.4) * Allows affordable housing units to be clustered, suggest not to concentrate but have them commingle * Would be more difficult to plan for public transit * Wouldn't break up connected housing (apt. condo) * Addressed in ZO  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenheiler <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

**Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations**  
11/12/2020 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 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #231	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 2. Retain natural vegetation, rock outcroppings, and natural drainage.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommended Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.	Existing Goals and Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 1) Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed 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.	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas  Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot size, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. (See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.)	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	
				LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. (See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.)	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) 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.	
				LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance	
				LU-6.7 Open Space Network Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors, preserve scenic vistas and areas, and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.		
				LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.		
2012 Proposals #232	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 3. Require grading for building pads and roads to follow the natural contours of the land. Prohibit flat building pads on slopes greater than 25%. Require stepped foundations to accommodate the natural terrain.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommended Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated. In particular, the 2012 proposed policy in row 24 of this matrix is focused on the same issue.  The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into steep slopes (>25%) based on the percentage of the property containing steep slopes.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) 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.	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas  Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance	
2012 Proposals #233	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 4. Require developers to locate buildings construction activities and construction staging areas in such a way that special features are protected from damage during construction, and	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no description of what is meant by "special features."  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas  Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #92	Grading	Policy 11. Grading associated with discretionary permits shall not change natural land contours and shall be minimized to reduce erosion and siltation and damage to downstream properties.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> Though all grading includes some change to natural land contours, this text is otherwise almost the same as GP Policy LU 6.9.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	Grading Ordinance BMP Design Manual Watershed Protection Ordinance	Subcommittee Comment:  Public Comment: Motion: Recommend removal.  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following: • Creative site planning • Integration of natural features into the project • Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape • Minimal disturbance of topography		
2012 Proposals #185	Land Use - Recycled Water	Policy 9. Encourage use of treated water for irrigation of Village landscaping, parks and golf courses.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This gets more specific than the GP policy, to include preferred uses of recycled water.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-4.5 Recycled Water Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.		Subcommittee Comment: Street landscaping considered?  Public Comment: Water district policy for Villages to use recycled water. Problem is Village doesn't have recycled water capabilities currently. Motion: Include as staff recommended. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #137	Land Use - reference other sections	Policy LU-1.8 Consult chapters below on Conservation Subdivisions and Community Character, the County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions, and Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that asks the reader to review other policies and regulations that are already applicable to Valley Center.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-1.8 Density Allocation on Project Sites Permit changes in density within a project site with parcels that have more than one land use designation to provide flexibility in project design when approved by Major Use Permit or Specific Plan. The policy does not allow a project to receive more units than is established by the Land Use Maps nor to supersede Housing Element requirements related to achieving the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation. (See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.)	Conservation Subdivision County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivision Valley Center Design Guidelines	Subcommittee Comment:  Public Comment: Motion: Recommend Removal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller 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 #25	Land Use - Commercial	<b>Goal</b> 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.	<b>LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkel <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0  Note: Revisit while items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
Existing #28	Land Use - Commercial	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity</b> Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.  <b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designation Roads</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkel <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0  Note: Revisit while items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
Existing #32	Land Use - Commercial	<b>Policy</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Modify by removing "low density" for item 25, retain item 28 and remove item 32.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkel <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0  Note: Revisit while items considered. Add item 26 and 30.
2012 Proposals #255	Commercial Uses	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy #)</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Retain 255 and change "prohibit" to "discourage"  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkel  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Goal</b> 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	<b>LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character</b> Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.  <b>LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped"  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #36	Land Use - Industrial	<b>Goal</b> 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	<b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped"  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #37	Land Use - Industrial	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character</b> Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.	<b>Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped"  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #39	Land Use - Industrial	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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.  <b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> 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.  <b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> 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.  <b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> 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.	<b>Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped"  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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.  <b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> 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.  <b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> 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.  <b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> 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.	<b>Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items 35, 36, 37, 39 and 40. Item 36 "FEMA" will change to "County mapped"  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #272	Specific Plans	<b>Goal</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #273	Specific Plans	<b>Policy</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #274	Specific Plans	<b>Policy</b> 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.  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation and remove items #272, #273, #274.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> 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.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Hans Britsch  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing  #55	Mobility	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing  #56	Mobility	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing  #59	Mobility	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.  <b>M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Residential Subdivision Design</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #61	Mobility	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation on items #53, #55, #56, #59, #60, #61  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
Existing #48	Mobility - Access	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Remove #48, #282 and #283.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #282	Mobility - Access	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Remove #48, #282 and #283.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #283	Mobility - Access	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Remove #48, #282 and #283.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #99</b> 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.  <b>County Public Road Standards</b> <b>County Subdivision Ordinance</b>	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> - #284 - Other documents in County have established criteria to make recommendations; not comfortable as CPG member  <b>Public Comment:</b> - Agree with comment that established in other documents and not comfortable with #284 proposed  <b>Motion:</b> Remove item #284 and item #314.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #314	Mobility - Access	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</b> 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	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> - #284 - Other documents in County have established criteria to make recommendations; not comfortable as CPG member  <b>Public Comment:</b> - Agree with comment that established in other documents and not comfortable with #284 proposed  <b>Motion:</b> Remove item #284 and item #314.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #296	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #47</b> 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.	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Public Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #296, #297 and #299  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #297	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #47</b> 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.	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Public Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #296, #297 and #299  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #299	Mobility - Connectivity Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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	<b>LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #47</b> 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.	<b>Subcommittee Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Public Comment:</b> - N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #296, #297 and #299  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.  <b>M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #59</b> 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.  <b>County Subdivision Ordinance</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - 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  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Include item #307.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
			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.	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.  <b>M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #59</b> 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.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u> - item 308: "ungated interconnections" difficult to define. Using word "required" is questionable.  <b>Motion:</b> Change language from "Developers be required to provide" to "Recommend developers provide"  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 2
2012 Proposals #310	Mobility - Connectivity  Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-1.1 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-1.1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #47</b> 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.  <b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #59</b> 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.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #310, #311, #312.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			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.	<b>M-1.1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.  <b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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.	<b>NA</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #310, #311, #312.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #311	Mobility - Connectivity  Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-1.1 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-1.1 Balanced Road Network</b> A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.	<b>NA</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #310, #311, #312.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			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.	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #310, #311, #312.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #312	Mobility - Connectivity  Mobility - Villages	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> N/A  <u>Public Comment:</u> N/A  <b>Motion:</b> Remove items #310, #311, #312.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> 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 #288	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	<b>Policy 2.1.3.2</b> 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.	<b>M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria</b> 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.  <b>M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character</b> 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.]	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #49</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with the staff proposed revision, plus add, "with the goal of safety and minimal impact on local circulation."  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Jeana Boulos  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #289	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	<b>Policy 2.1.3.3</b> 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.	<b>LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation for items #289 and #302.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Jeana Boulos  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #302	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	<b>Policy 2.1.5.1</b> 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	<b>LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character</b> 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.  <b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #54</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Retain staff recommendation for items #289 and #302.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Jeana Boulos  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #293	Mobility - Capacity Mobility - Road Capacity	<b>Policy 2.1.3.7</b> 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	<b>M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas</b> 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.  <b>M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network</b> 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.  <b>M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #62</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison  <b>Vote:</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #62</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain staff recommendation.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network</b> 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.		
				<b>M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria</b> 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.		
2012 Proposals #318	Mobility - Evacuation	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>S-3.5 Access Roads</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain staff recommendation.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA			
2012 Proposals #324	Safety - Staging Areas	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads</b> Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #54</b> 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  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain staff recommendation.  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0
			Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>S-3.5 Access Roads</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility</b> 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.	<b>Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u> - hydrology may require gutters and curbs, also push for community to have sidewalks  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with revision: " require new residential developments outside of the North and South Villages to construct roads..."  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> 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.	<b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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	<b>Policy</b> 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.	<b>M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design</b> 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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #17</b> 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>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with revision: "Design should be selected to minimize..."  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 1
			Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design</b> 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.		



# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #425	Mobility - Right-of-Way Special Features	<b>Policy</b> COS 3.2.6 To the maximum extent possible, require roads which connect with pathway/trail staging areas to include design and construction of scenic vista viewpoints to take best advantage of scenic vistas shown on the Community Assets Map.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Revision or Removal</i> Stakeholders should recommend one or two areas where development of a turnout for a scenic vista viewpoint, interpretive signage, etc. is desired.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> NA	NA	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -include anything near Rancho Lilac (future publicly accessible park)? Also Cole Grade Road overlook that looks over Fauna Valley -delete last five words: "shown on the Community Assets Map"  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Include with addendum of: " e.g. Via Piedra at Lilac Road, Valley Center Road at Banbury, West Lilac at Roadrunner Ridge"  "To the maximum extent possible, require roads which connect with pathway/trail staging areas to include design and construction of scenic vista viewpoints to take best advantage of scenic vistas." with addendum  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #334	Mobility - Bike Lanes	<b>Policy</b> 2.6.1.4 Bike lanes are added along existing roads as shown on the San Diego County Regional Bike Trails Map.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> The Mobility Element Network calls for bike lanes on several more roads than the three segments in Valley Center that are shown on the Regional Bike Trails Map. The method for requiring right of way dedication for- and road construction for bike lanes is when development occurs along Mobility Element alignments that call for bike lanes. This is a current requirement per the General Plan and the County Public Road Standards, so there's no need for a policy. There are several more roads (beyond those listed above) on the Valley Center Mobility Element Network, that call for bike lanes.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>M-11.3 Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element</b> Maximize the provision of bicycle facilities on County Mobility Element roads in Semi Rural and Rural Lands to provide a safe and continuous bicycle network in rural areas that can be used for recreation or transportation purposes, while retaining rural character.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility Policy 13)</b> Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.  <b>Valley Center Mobility Element Network (part of the General Plan)</b> <b>County Public Road Standards</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Remove item 334.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #351	Mobility - Parking	<b>Policy</b> 2.9.2.1 Adequate off-street parking should be provided at school bus stops.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> School bus stops are often in residential neighborhoods so we're not clear on how off-street parking lots would be established in those areas.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	<b>County Public Road Standards</b> <b>Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards</b> <b>Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - GP inadequate to address congestion around schools, community center and school bus stops -Schools and bus stops will always have congestion -Locate bus stops where parking spots are available  <u>Public Comment:</u> - Difficult to find off-street parking in existing neighborhood, maybe on-street parking to be considered. For new neighborhood, who will determine what's adequate?  <b>Motion:</b> Accept staff recommendation on items 351 and 353.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #353	Mobility - Parking	<b>Policy</b> 2.9.2.3 Paved on-street parking is available where large public gatherings may occur, such as the schools and community center.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	<b>M-10.1 Parking Capacity</b> Require new development to: ■ Provide sufficient parking capacity for motor vehicles consistent with the project's location, use, and intensity ■ Provide parking facilities for motorcycles and bicycles ■ Provide staging areas for regional and community trails  <b>M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity</b> Require the design and placement of on-site automobile, motorcycle, and bicycle parking in Villages and Rural Villages that encourages pedestrian activity by providing a clear separation between vehicle and pedestrian areas and prohibit parking areas from restricting pedestrian circulation patterns.  <b>M-10.3 Maximize On-Street Parking</b> Encourage the use of on-street parking in commercial and/or high-density residential town center areas to calm traffic and improve pedestrian interaction. Traffic operations and pedestrian safety must not be compromised.	<b>County Public Road Standards</b> <b>Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - GP inadequate to address congestion around schools, community center and school bus stops -Schools and bus stops will always have congestion -Locate bus stops where parking spots are available  <u>Public Comment:</u> - Difficult to find off-street parking in existing neighborhood, maybe on-street parking to be considered. For new neighborhood, who will determine what's adequate?  <b>Motion:</b> Accept staff recommendation on items 351 and 353.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #243	Mobility - Transit	<b>Policy</b> 9. Provide safety turn-outs for school buses in subdivisions of 10 units or more.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> It is unclear from this language what special circumstance in Valley Center would require this. This could be recommended for consideration in future updates to the Public Road Standards and/or the Subdivision Ordinance; however, it will be difficult to justify the nexus for subdivisions of 10-20 lots.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	Road Design	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Remove as County recommends  <b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
Existing #62	Infrastructure	<b>Goal</b> 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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This a common practice among agencies serving Valley Center and covered in the General Plan Goal referenced.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development</b> Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> 62 is referenced as existing policy in at least 4 other items to be discussed. Differs from LU-12 (references welfare/public safety) and 63 covered under LU-12. - Can't guarantee safety - Change guarantee to prioritize - "The infrastructure serving it, to ensure compliance, that the public welfare and safety are prioritized"  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> 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.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
Existing #63	Infrastructure	<b>Goal</b> Provide a means for establishing the expansion or construction of roads, the construction of adequate school facilities, and the approved staffing of police and fire agencies before Valley Center's residential population overburdens existing facilities.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> There are processes in place for service availability forms, addressing deficiencies in fire protection services via development mitigation, Sheriff operations adjusting to population changes, right-of-way dedication and share of road construction through development conditions, among other processes.  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.	<b>LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development</b> Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.  <b>LU-17 Adequate Education</b> Quality schools that enhance our communities and mitigate for their impacts.  <b>S-12 Adequate Law Enforcement Facilities</b> Timely development of law enforcement facilities in located that serve the unincorporated areas of the County.	County Subdivision Ordinance County Public Road Standards	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Removal of item 63.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #141	Land Use - Infrastructure Availability	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.1.3 Ensure that new development is coordinated the following resources: road capacity, water availability, potential wastewater treatment facilities to include landscape and agricultural land available for dispersal of treated water, school classrooms, park land, and air quality.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> These issues are already considered on a project by project basis.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> NA	<b>LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development</b> Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #62 (CP Mobility Policy 14)</b> 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.  <b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #69 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Education Policy 1)</b> Coordinate school facility planning with residential development to ensure that school facilities will be available to accommodate the increase in enrollment without overcrowding.  <b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #73 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Water Service Policy 2)</b> The delivery of imported water service to the CPA shall be coordinated and the infrastructure adequately sized so that service can be provided to all land within the Valley Center Municipal Water District Territory in a cost effective manner.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal as recommended by County.  <b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
2012 Proposals #187	Infrastructure - Villages	<b>Goal</b> LU-4.2: Village infrastructure and amenities serve business patrons and residents of Village neighborhoods as well as the citizens of greater Valley Center.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This is very similar to the goal referenced from the existing CP, in providing a very high level intention for infrastructure. Stakeholders should determine which one best covers the desired wording.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> NA	NA	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services Goal)</b> 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> Item 62 covers same issues. - Like language in 187 more than 62 - Reference to 62 in 187 not appropriate, make motion to include  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
Existing #72	Infrastructure - Water Safety - Water Supply	<b>Policy</b> 1. Adopt and support the Board of Supervisors' water supply and conservation policies which include:  a. Support of cost effective storage facilities such as emergency storage facilities located near demand areas or away from earthquake faults. b. Support water reclamation policy where reclamation and reuse facilities can provide significant sources of "new" irrigation water to help offset imported demands of local water supplies for non-potable purposes. c. Support necessary changes in the water allocation priority formula that will provide agriculture with assurances that those who participate in conservation and/or water reclamation programs will be entitled to an adequate water supply during water shortages.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Staff couldn't find this in the Board of Supervisors policies. CP Policy COS-19.2 already covers item b and wastewater is currently reclaimed by the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) for irrigation. With regard to item c, commercial agriculture customers are afforded a water price reduction (in comparison to residential and commercial/industrial customers) through the SD County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Transitional Special Agricultural Water Rate (TSAWR) Program. The agricultural customers receive this price differential because they provide the SDCWA the water management benefit of having accepted a lower level of supply reliability in times of water shortage or disaster related emergency which might limit supplies to the SDCWA service area. The loss of this price differential would be economically devastating to commercial agriculture in Valley Center. A minor revision is proposed for item a, as noted below.  Proposed revision: Support the continued development of emergency storage facilities located near demand areas and away from earthquake faults.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply Coordinate water infrastructure planning with land use planning to maintain an acceptable availability of a high quality sustainable water supply. Ensure that new development includes both indoor and outdoor water conservation measures to reduce demand.  COS-4.5 Recycled Water Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.  COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development Require the use of recycled water in development wherever feasible. Restrict the use of recycled water when it increases salt loading in reservoirs.	NA	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> Revision not clear if proposing only item a retained - item c is desirable, but policy is out of County hands (SDCWA, etc.) - First point framing doesn't make sense if only one item is retained  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Adopt staff revision.  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #500	Infrastructure - Water Safety - Water Supply	<b>Goal</b> S4.1.a – Adequate water supplies exist in an emergency.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan policy.  Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to ensure the long-term viability of San Diego County's water quality and supply.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #71 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal [not numbered])</b> Ensure that enough water is available from both local and outside sources to adequately supply all users in the community plan area.	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -71 and LU-13 are general supply statements. How should goal be rewritten to ensure water available after an earthquake? Does it come from somewhere else in emergency demand? -VMWD has plans to increase storage supplies. Is the CP an appropriate place to direct VMWD for construction of adequate emergency supplies?  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #449	Conservation - Imported Water	<b>Goal</b> COS 7.1 Decreased need for imported water.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Landscape Ordinance and the Climate Action Plan.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to ensure the long-term viability of the County's water quality and supply.  COS-4 Water Management A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to achieve the long-term viability of the County's water quality and supply.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #71 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal)</b> Ensure that enough water is available from both local and outside sources to adequately supply all users in the community plan area.  Climate Action Plan Landscape Ordinance	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -Which CAP covers this problem?  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<b>Existing #68</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>Goal</b> Ensure the provision of adequate services and facilities to meet the educational needs of all the residents of the CPA.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Though the County doesn't handle planning and permitting for public schools, there is some agency coordination and this is ok as a goal.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.</p>	<b>LU-17 Adequate Education</b> Quality schools that enhance our communities and mitigate for their impacts.	<b>NA</b>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<b>2012 Proposals #250</b>	<b>Wildland Fire Protection</b>	<b>Policy</b> 6. Minimize development in hazardous wildfire areas and other immitigable hazardous area.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The GP policy referenced calls for assigning land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high, and high fire threat areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas. Therefore, this is covered in the GP, as the General Plan designations serve to guide the extent of development allowed.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>	<b>LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards</b> Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high fire threat areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.	<b>NA</b>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - Current GP policies haven't precluded inclusion of projects in very high fire hazard severity areas. Including item might help lower risk. - Redundancy in CP might not serve a purpose.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> - County Fire Code has definite descriptions, with this wording being vague. All VC in high fire hazard severity area, could be interpreted broadly.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Include item 250</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<b>Existing #93</b>	<b>Safety - Flood Hazards</b>	<b>Policy</b> 12. Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy doesn't define "flood prone area" so it's not clear on where structures and development would be prohibited. The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Zoning Ordinance have specific requirements for development within floodplains and floodways. In addition, the GP has restrictive policies that cover this type of issue. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per GP Policy S-10.1 and the RPO.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.</p>	<p><b>COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains</b> Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.</p> <p><b>S-9.1 Floodplain Maps</b> Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.</p> <p><b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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 floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.</p> <p><b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding. Dam</p> <p><b>S-9.4 Development in Villages</b> Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.</p> <p><b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.</p> <p><b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<b>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance</b>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Remove items 93 and 95.</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Pam Wledenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<b>Existing</b>  <b>#95</b>	<b>Safety - Flood Hazards</b>	<b>Policy 14.</b> Prohibit discretionary permits that exacerbate problems in a currently identified downstream flooding area.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This already covered in the existing regulations. See Section 811.104 of the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i> All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.</p>	<p><b>COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains</b> Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.</p> <p><b>S-9.1 Floodplain Maps</b> Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.</p> <p><b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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 floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.</p> <p><b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding.</p> <p><b>S-9.4 Development in Villages</b> Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.</p> <p><b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.</p> <p><b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<b>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</b> <b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b> <b>Watershed Protection Ordinance</b>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Remove items 93 and 95.</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Pam Wledenkeller <b>Vote:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Ayes:</b> 5 <b>Noes:</b> 0</p>
<b>2012 Proposals</b>  <b>#436</b>	<b>Safety - Flood Hazards</b>	<b>Policy COS 4.3.1</b> Prohibit development that would increase the existing flooding problem in the central valley.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><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).</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.</p>	<p><b>COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains</b> Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.</p> <p><b>S-9.1 Floodplain Maps</b> Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.</p> <p><b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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 floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.</p> <p><b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding.</p> <p><b>S-9.4 Development in Villages</b> Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.</p> <p><b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.</p> <p><b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #54 (CP Conservation Policy 16)</b> During the discretionary permit process, and in addition to the application of the "F" designator, no development or destruction of watershed shall be allowed which would increase the present flooding problem in the valley.	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - covered by CP 16 (item 54)</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Ayes:</b> 5 <b>Noes:</b> 0</p>

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<b>Existing #77</b>	Conservation	<b>Goal</b> Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> Preserving all native vegetation is not feasible; however, there are several similar/related 2012 proposals to consider within that matrix.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment</b> Sustainable ecosystems with long-term viability to maintain natural processes, sensitive lands, and sensitive as well as common species, coupled with sustainable growth and development.	<b>NA</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> - add in front "prioritize" or "minimize"  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion and change to "Minimize the disturbance of native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA"  <b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
<b>Existing #78</b>	Conservation	<b>Goal</b> Minimize soil erosion incidental to development in order to preserve valley Center's unique soil characteristics.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Though the Grading Ordinance and Watershed Protection Ordinance contain requirements to address this issue, it could be retained as a high level goal. Reviewers may consider more focus and/or a goal from the 2012 draft to cover the issue.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources</b> Protection and maintenance of local reservoirs, watersheds, aquifer-recharge areas, and natural drainage systems to maintain high-quality water resources.	<b>Grading Ordinance Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Ordinance</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
<b>2012 Proposals #162</b>	Conservation	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.4 Incorporate conservation into all new development. New building should showcase Valley Center's natural splendors not obliterate them!	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <i>Recommend Removal</i> Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	<b>LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability</b> Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.  <b>LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design</b> Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]  <b>LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design</b> Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]  <b>LU-6.7 Open Space Network</b> Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.  <b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.  <b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal)</b> A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.  <b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal.  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting	
2012 Proposals #404	Conservation - Habitat Preservation	<p><b>Policy</b> COS 2.1.1 Require projects in each of the subareas shown on the Land Use Map within or in the vicinity of the assets shown on the Community Assets Map to be sited to maximize preservation and enhancement of natural habitat, and designed to eliminate or minimize adverse impacts on them.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:   <i>Recommend Removal</i>                      The Resource Conservation Areas (as opposed to "Community Assets Map") serve this purpose and provide consistency across community plans. With that, this is covered in the existing CP policy.                       Post-Public Review Staff Response:   <i>No Change to Recommendation</i>                      Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>	<p><b>COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement</b> Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies #86 (CP Conservation Policy 5)</b> Projects within or within the vicinity of a Resource Conservation Area should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on the resources the RCA was created to protect.</p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>   <u>Public Comment:</u>   <b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal of 404   <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Vote:</b>                      Ayes: 5                      Noes: 0</p>	
				<p><b>COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design</b> Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.</p>			<p><b>Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources</b></p>
				<p><b>LU-6.3 Conservation Oriented Project Design</b> Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p>			
2012 Proposals #407	Conservation - Habitat Preservation	<p><b>Policy</b> COS 2.1.4 Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned or maintained by the County or the VC Parks &amp; Recreation District).</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:   <i>Recommend Removal</i>                      This is covered by existing Community Plan policies and the proposed text doesn't specify whether the preference is for the County or one of these listed types of entities to own and manage open space. Most open space in Valley Center is owned and managed by the County.                       Post-Public Review Staff Response:                       NA</p>	NA	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4)</b> Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.</p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>                      • Covered in general terms by item #109, but policy is more detailed. Should we include how we support this activity?                      • Can support land conservancies/trusts, not sure of value of policy in CP.                      • Keep, but modify wording after Valley Center-oriented to include "well established"   <u>Public Comment:</u>   <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with revision and the following language: "Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented well established land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity. Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned or maintained by the County or the VC Parks &amp; Recreation District)."   <b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b>                      Ayes: 5                      Noes: 0                       This item was revisited by the Subcommittee on 1/20/21.   <b>1/20 Motion and Vote:</b>   <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with revision and the following language: "Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented well established land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity. Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties (unless owned or maintained by the County)   <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b>                      Ayes: 6                      Noes: 0</p>	
				<p><b>LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability</b> Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.</p>			
Existing #14	Land Use - Habitat Preservation	<p><b>Policy</b> 2. Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:   <i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>                      This is similar to Residential Policy 1 of the Existing Community Plan, 2012 proposals, and GP Policies LU-6.1 and LU-6.6.                       Post-Public Review Staff Response:   <i>No Change to Recommendation</i>                      Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>	<p><b>COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement</b> Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</b>   <b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>   <u>Public Comment:</u>   <b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion with modifying to change the word "require" to "encourage."   <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b>                      Ayes: 5                      Noes: 0</p>	
				<p><b>LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design</b> Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p>			
				<p><b>LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design</b> Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p>			
				<p><b>LU-6.7 Open Space Network</b> Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.</p>			
				<p><b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.</p>			
<p><b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p>							

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<b>Existing #13</b>	<b>No Category Noted (potentially Land Use - Habitat Preservation)</b>	<p><b>Policy</b> 1. 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>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. There are other existing policies, 2012 proposals, and other regulations that address these types of resources and this type of broad stroke policy without clear definitions would lead to inconsistencies with other regulations and inconsistent interpretations.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> The County accidentally excluded this policy from the matrix, but it was numbered correctly in the Community Plan pdf with matrix item numbers. The County is also clear on Fred's reference with the note of p. 11, A-1 from the Community Plan. That being said, the comment doesn't seem to fit the existing policy as it doesn't refer to public access within open space easements. Most large open space preserves allow trails and public access; however, there are many open space easement areas that do not have trails nor allow public access in order to allow for the necessary resource protection required.</p>	<p><b>COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement</b> Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.</p> <p><b>LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability</b> Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.</p> <p><b>LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design</b> Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p> <p><b>LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design</b> Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p> <p><b>LU-6.7 Open Space Network</b> Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.</p> <p><b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.</p> <p><b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	<p><b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory) Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance</b></p>	<p>Subcommittee Comment: - should stay and say "require" without a change - Encourage allow for developer interpretation - Not certain what additional clarity staff needs to make viable policy -Existing LU policies didn't address environmental characteristics unique to VC. Recommend removing reference to "unique scenic views".</p> <p>Public Comment: - Language is vague and can be used to excuse other things. Projects have extensive rules.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<b>2012 Proposals #159</b>	<b>Habitat Preservation - Policy</b>	<p><b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.1 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>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA</p>	<p><b>COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement</b> Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.</p> <p><b>LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability</b> Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.</p> <p><b>LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design</b> Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p> <p><b>LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design</b> Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p> <p><b>LU-6.7 Open Space Network</b> Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.</p> <p><b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.</p> <p><b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1)</b> Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed 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><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2)</b> Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.</p> <p><b>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance</b></p>	<p>Subcommittee Comment: -Helpful to have condensed text other than GP text separate policies.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend retain</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>



# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<b>2012 Proposals #164</b>	<b>Habitat Mitigation Policy</b>	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.6 Require mitigation for Valley Center projects to occur in Valley Center: on site or in established VC mitigation areas.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This type of policy has been addressed by County Counsel and revised language has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for other community plans. Determining the appropriate biological mitigation must be based on biological considerations such as species distribution, ecological boundaries, and quality of mitigation site. Having a mitigation policy based on community planning boundaries would not be defensible.</p> <p>Proposed revision: When considering the appropriate mitigation for impacts to biological resources within the Valley Center Community Plan Area (VCCPA), consider local community options first. The acceptance of biological mitigation options outside the VCCPA is strongly discouraged when appropriate mitigation is available within the VCCPA.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA</p>	NA	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> - VC doesn't have mitigation land for every type of impacts. Might be impossible to meet requirement.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Include item with staff revision</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<b>2012 Proposals #160</b>	<b>Conservation - Riparian Areas  Conservation Wetlands and Riparian Habitat</b>	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.2 Prohibit the artificial channeling of any creek, the flattening of any hilltops, and the filling of any canyons, ravines or valleys.	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Parts of this policy are addressed in other policy reviews, including the review of existing Land Use-Industrial Policy 4 (repetitive of RPO requirements; RPO is very strict, allowing concrete or rip rap channels only when necessary to protect buildings existing before RPO [1989]) and Land Use-Residential Policy 3 (addresses ridgelines; recommended for inclusion/retention). The clarity of referring to ridgelines is needed as hilltop tends to be more of a subjective term.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Preserve Valley Center's canyon ecosystems by encouraging onsite preservation of wetland and upland native habitats in undeveloped canyons, as opposed to fill impacts and off-site mitigation.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with the proposed revision.</p>	<p><b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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 floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.</p> <p><b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding.</p> <p><b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.</p> <p><b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use-Industrial Policy 4)</b> Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.</p> <p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 3)</b> Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a watershed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.</p> <p><b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend to include staff recommendation on 160</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/6/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 1/6/2021 Meeting
<p><b>2012 Proposals</b> <b>#161</b></p>	<p>Conservation - Riparian Areas</p> <p>Conservation Wetlands and Riparian Habitat</p>	<p><b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.3 Maintain green belts along streams and flood prone areas.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance have specific requirements for development within floodplains and floodways. In addition, the General Plan has restrictive policies that cover this type of issue. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per GP Policy S-10.1 and the RPO. Therefore, the proposed revision clarifies terminology references.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along ephemeral streams and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Post-public review update: Slightly revised wording is proposed to ensure that this language covers all creeks in Valley Center.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along creeks and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.</p>	<p><b>COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains</b> Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.</p> <p><b>S-9.1 Floodplain Maps</b> Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.</p> <p><b>S-9.2 Development in Floodplains</b> 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 floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.</p> <p><b>S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas</b> Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding.</p> <p><b>S-9.4 Development in Villages</b> Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.</p> <p><b>S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe</b> Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.</p> <p><b>S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</b> Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #93 (CP Conservation Policy 12)</b> Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.</p> <p><b>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</b> <b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b> <b>Zoning Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend to include staff recommendation on 161</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<p><b>2012 Proposals</b> <b>#434</b></p>	<p>Conservation - Water Quality</p>	<p><b>Policy</b> COS 4.2.2 Require ____ to present educational programs and opportunities for owners of large animal keeping facilities on proper manure storage/disposal, to prevent watercourse contamination.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This could be discussed in another section of the updated Community Plan on various training programs sought in the community. Section 67.807 of the County's Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance outlines requirements for manure and pet waste management to prevent runoff to stormwater conveyance systems or receiving waters.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p>NA</p>	<p><b>COS-6.5 Best Management Practices</b> Encourage best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to protect watersheds, reduce GHG emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power.</p>	<p><b>County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -other requirements that require monitoring water that comes off their property</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> <b>Maker:</b> <b>Second:</b> <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: Noes:</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Table for future consideration under a different section (related to training)</p> <p><b>This item was related by the Subcommittee on 1/20/21.</b></p> <p><b>11/20 Motion and Vote:</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal <b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>
<p><b>2012 Proposals</b> <b>#424</b></p>	<p>Conservation - Steep Slopes</p>	<p><b>Policy</b> COS 3.2.5 Prohibit development on slopes in excess of ???% [Ask Bob].</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This appears to be an unfinished idea from the 2012 proposals.</p> <p>The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into steep slopes (&gt;25%) based on the percentage of the property containing steep slopes. Most properties fall under the category of 75% or less of the property containing steep slopes, and a corresponding maximum encroachment into steep slopes of 10%.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p>NA</p>	<p><b>LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design</b> Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]</p> <p><b>LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design</b> Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.</p> <p><b>LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</b> Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	<p><b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 1)</b> Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed 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><b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>
<p><b>2012 Proposals</b> <b>#409</b></p>	<p>Conservation - MSCP</p>	<p><b>Policy</b> COS 2.1.6 Implement the goals and policies of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan for any listed threatened or endangered species as it pertains to Valley Center.</p>	<p>Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The North County MSCP is still a draft plan and measures contained within it could change prior to adoption. Stakeholders can review current drafts to see if there are specific draft measures they would like to propose as Community Plan policies.</p> <p>Post-Public Review Staff Response:</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p><b>Draft North County MSCP</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> -MSCP still a draft plan, but policy seems redundant when it does get adopted</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend removal</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 1</p>

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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



# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

# Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations

## 1/20/2021 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

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

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

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