

# 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 Wiedenkeller <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 Wledenkeller <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 Resource Protection Ordinance 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
Existing #77	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.	NA	<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
Existing #78	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
2012 Proposals #162	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>                       Motion: Recommend removal of 404                       Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller                      Second: Kevin Smith                      Vote:                      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>		
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 Comments:</u>                       Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision and the following language: "Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented well established land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned or maintained by the County or the VC Parks &amp; Recreation District)."                       Note: Added to revisit list by staff after the 1/6 meeting                      o Problematic: "... and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned and managed by the County or the VC Parks and Recreation District)."                      o End of it should be: "... mitigation banks, open space easements and other properties (unless owned by the County)."                       Maker: Lisa Adams                      Second: Pam Wiedenkiller                      Vote:                      Ayes: 5                      Noes: 0</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>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</b> (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory) <b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b></p>	<p><u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>                       Motion: Recommend inclusion with modifying to change the word "require" to "encourage."                       Maker: Kevin Smith                      Second: Pam Wiedenkiller                      Vote:                      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 #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
2012 Proposals #164	Habitat Mitigation Policy	<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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <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.  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.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  NA	NA	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u> - VC doesn't have mitigation land for every type of impacts. Might be impossible to meet requirement.  <b>Motion:</b> Include item with staff revision  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #160	Conservation - Riparian Areas  Conservation Wetlands and Riparian Habitat	<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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale:  <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.  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.  Post-Public Review Staff Response:  <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with the proposed revision.	<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.  <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.  <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.  <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.	<b>Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use-Industrial Policy 4)</b> Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.  <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.  <b>Resource Protection Ordinance</b>	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u>  <u>Public Comment:</u>  <b>Motion:</b> Recommend to include staff recommendation on 160  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller <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 #161	Conservation - Riparian Areas  Conservation Wetlands and Riparian Habitat	<b>Policy</b> LU-3.4.3 Maintain green belts along streams and flood prone areas.	<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 Resource Protection Ordinance 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>
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.	<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: 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>	<b>County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance</b>	<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:  Note: Table for future consideration under a different section (related to training)</p>
2012 Proposals #424	Conservation - Steep Slopes	<b>Policy</b> COS 3.2.5 Prohibit development on slopes in excess of ???% [Ask Bob].	<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: 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>
2012 Proposals #409	Conservation - MSCP	<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>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: NA</p>	NA	<b>Draft North County MSCP</b>	<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>