

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

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
17	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Policy</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads that follow topography and minimize grading;</li> <li>• Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography;</li> <li>• Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain;</li> <li>• Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets;</li> <li>• Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p> <p>These issues are covered by other policies now, so it would be repetitive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-All grading disturbs the natural terrain</li> <li>-Owners cannot be required to retain agriculture unless it's part of conditioned mitigation for an on-site agricultural conservation easement, or for purchase of off-site PACE credits/easements. GP Policy COS-6.2 details policy requirements to minimize impacts to agriculture.</li> <li>- Retaining all natural vegetation in all VC projects is not feasible when seeking to get close to allowed GP densities.</li> </ul>	<p>GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography</p> <p>Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments: -item in conflict with permitted development - agree with staff</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: LaVonne Norwood Second: Lisa Adams</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0 Abstain: Kathleen McCabe</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
230	Land Use - Community Character	<p><b>Policy</b> Require developers of all subdivisions to prepare site inventory maps that pinpoint locations of environmental, scenic and historic features on their properties, and to build around them.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</li> <li>• During the CEQA review of subdivisions, projects are reviewed against the standards found in the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance. The language in the proposed policy is vague and applicants aren't going to always know what constitutes significant resources until technical studies are done. Refer to the 2012 matrix for additional information on this item.</li> </ul>	<p>County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance  <a href="https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/procguid.html">https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/procguid.html</a>  (particularly Guidelines for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Aesthetics and Visual Resources)</p>		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>

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

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
259	Land Use - Semi-Rural and Rural Lands	<p><b>Policy</b> Encourage the establishment of "green" small family owned farms and vineyards.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> "Green" is too vague in this reference.</p>	NA	<p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion and change from policy to a goal   <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith  <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller  <b>Vote:</b>  Ayes: 6  Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments:  - Remove "green" and "small"  - Family owned vineyards should be encouraged  - Next policy in org doc covers this.  - Goal of VC is to be agricultural/rural</p> <p>Public Comments:  -</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith  Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote:  Ayes: 14  Noes: 0</p>
26	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Prohibit strip commercial development by containing commercial uses in the Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road area and the Mirar de Valle Road and Valley Center Road area. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 33 and 247 in this section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. "Uses" becomes more problematic when considering existing commercial zoning outside the Villages and when considering certain commercial uses that can be allowed in residential and agricultural zones. An option would be to connect it to the establishment of commercial zones on sites where there wasn't already a commercial zone.</p> <p>Potential revision from staff:  The establishment of new commercial zoning (C30, C31, C32, C34, C35, C36, C37, C38, C40, C42, C44, and C46) on sites where there is not an existing commercial zone, shall be limited to within the Village boundaries. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011 and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.</p>	<p>GP:  LU-9.6 Town Center Uses  LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity  LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Leave items 26 and 30 on consent   <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkeller  <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams  <b>Vote:</b>  Ayes: 6  Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments:  - Intent to keep commercial zoning collected in Villages  -Subzoning change for properties that don't have opportunity for their own zoning change</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept the staff recommended revision (shown in the staff recommendation column).</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith  Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote:  Ayes: 13  Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
33	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the GP Update in August 2011.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 26 and 247 in this section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. "Uses" becomes more problematic when considering existing commercial zoning outside the Villages and when considering certain commercial uses that can be allowed in residential and agricultural zones. An option would be to connect it to the establishment of commercial zones on sites where wasn't already a commercial zone.</p> <p>The staff revision proposed in Item 26 would cover this policy also.</p>	<p>GP: LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - This is now covered under Item 26 with the revision to 26 accepted.</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Remove item</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
247/253/254	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas, support horse stables and agriculture-related commercial activities that can be allowed in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (subject to limitations) when in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements.</p>	<p>Staff input: This item should be considered by the CPG in comparison with Items 26 and 33 in this Land Use-Commercial section. There is an apparent policy inconsistency issue. If the proposed staff revision (or similar wording change) for Items 26 and 33 is accepted, that would address the inconsistency issue and there won't be a need to change the wording of this policy.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Retain item.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
255	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Discourage general commercial and industrial enterprises which are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development such as conventional convenience stores and gas stations.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy is vague and existing zoning on several properties in Valley Center allows these types of uses (by right or with discretionary permits).  Additional rationale: Sections 1200-1800 of the Zoning Ordinance provide definitions of use types. These use types are referred to in Sections for each zone, to note which are allowed, which require special discretionary permits, and which are not allowed.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Retain 255 and change "prohibit" to "discourage"  <b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller  <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: -Revise wording  Public Comments:  Motion: Include with revision.  Proposed revision: Discourage general commercial and industrial enterprises that are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development.  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison  Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 1</p>
31	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.</p>	<p>GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character  Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - How to clarify for staff interpretation?  Public Comments:  Motion: Table for additional County staff input.  Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kathleen McCabe  Vote: Ayes: 10 Noes: 3 Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
567	Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water	<p><b>Goal</b> New staff goal proposal to address policies in the Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water section:</p> <p>Ongoing improvements in the provision of imported water and wastewater services address health, safety, sustainability, and emergency preparedness.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 72, 75, and 185 in a “Land Use – Wastewater and Imported Water” section.</p>	NA		<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Kathleen McCabe</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes:0</p>
62	Land Use - Wastewater and Imported Water	<p><b>Goal</b> Adopt an active program of coordination between the allowable growth of population and the infrastructure serving it, to ensure compliance, that the public welfare and safety are prioritized.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is addressed in General Plan Goal LU-12 and development projects already address this through required service availability forms (and associated project conditions) for water, sewer, fire protection, and schools, as applicable. Projects are also conditioned to address transportation impacts through project conditions for transportation infrastructure improvements.</p>	GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development	<p><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.</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 4 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Julia Feliciano Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 2</p>



Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
68	Land Use - Schools	<p><b>Goal</b> Ensure the provision of adequate services and facilities to meet the educational needs of all the residents of the CPA.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by General Plan Goal LU-17 and there were no underlying policies recommended by the Subcommittee or the public</p>	<p>GP: LU-17 Adequate Education</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend inclusion  <b>Maker:</b> Pam Wiedenkiller <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 5 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments:  Public Comments:  Motion: Accept staff recommendation.  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams  Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
568	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p><b>Goal</b> New staff goal proposal to address policies in Mobility - Access and Connectivity section:  Create land use patterns and mobility networks that provide improved connectivity and safety.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with policy Items 50, 54, 189, 308, 315/323/522 (one revision covers 315/323/522), and 307 in a "Mobility – Access and Connectivity" section.</p>	<p>NA</p>		<p>CPG Comments:  Public Comments:  Motion: Accept staff recommendation  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson  Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
189	Mobility - Access and Connectivity	<p><b>Policy</b> Reviews of development projects within Villages shall include analyzing opportunities for connecting to off-site roads. Dead end roads and cul-de-sacs should be avoided in the Villages.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Revision</i> Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations. This is a staff recommended revision.</p>	<p>GP: M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:  Public Comments:  Motion: Accept staff recommendation  Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison  Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 1</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
428	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p><b>Policy</b> Support as a high priority the development of open space corridors, community non-motorized multi-use trails, and parkland along watercourses.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</li> <li>• This presents an inconsistency issue with other policies included.</li> </ul>	<p>CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #84 (CP Conservation Policy 4) Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #119 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 6)</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - County has this already as goal/policy - What are the inconsistencies? - Is public use clear enough?</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Include the policy with word "passive" in front of word "parkland."</p> <p>Maker: Julia Faliciano Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1</p>



Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
430	Conservation and Open Space - Wetlands and Riparian Habitat Conservation	<p><b>Policy</b> Prohibit the construction of concrete lined flood control channels except where necessary because of existing improvements which block flood flow.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is covered in the Resource Protection Ordinance as follows: Concrete or rip-rap lined flood control channels are only allowed where findings are made that completion of the channel is necessary to protect existing buildings (at the time of RPO enactment - 1989) from a current flooding problem.</li> </ul>	<p>CP: Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use - Industrial Policy 4)</p> <p>GP: S-9.2 Development in Floodplains S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways</p> <p>Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>Staff accidentally left this off the order by category document used for Subcommittee deliberations.</p>	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation.</p> <p>Maker: Lisa Adams Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 14 Noes: 0</p>
31	Land Use - Commercial	<p><b>Policy</b> Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.</p>	<p>GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character</p> <p>Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - How to clarify for staff interpretation?</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Remove item</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 11 Noes: 0 Abstain: Dori Rattray, Susan Fajardo</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
573	Conservation and Open Space -Active Recreation Parks	<p><b>Goal</b> New staff goal proposal to address policies in Conservation and Open Space - Active Recreation Parks section: Collaboration between agencies and private entities is leveraged to address community park and recreation priorities.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i></p> <p>This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with Items 118, 116, 70, 192, 120 and 463 in a "Conservation and Open Space - Active Recreation Parks" section.</p>	NA	This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with Items 118, 116, 70, 192, 120 and 463 in a "Conservation and Open Space - Active Recreation Parks" section.	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0</p>
192	Conservation and Open Space - Active Recreation Parks	<p><b>Policy</b> In developing and evaluating plans for public parkland dedication and development of other public spaces, the development of a "village green" for the North Village should be considered a priority. The community desires this type of park amenity to help facilitate public gatherings.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i></p> <p>During CPG meeting(s), staff will point out that this was a Subcommittee consent item noting a staff recommendation of "recommend inclusion with revision." Therefore, it was carried forward in the process without further Subcommittee deliberations. The revision text (shown here now) was missing from the matrix version used during the Subcommittee consent calendar process.</p> <p>The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process. Therefore, it was carried forward in the process without further Subcommittee deliberations. The revision text shown now was missing from the matrix version used during the Subcommittee consent calendar process.</p>	GP: LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design	The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process. Therefore, it was carried forward in the process without further Subcommittee deliberations. The revision text shown now was missing from the matrix version used during the Subcommittee consent calendar process.	<p>CPG Comments: - Village green is vague</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff revision</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 13 Noes: 0</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
463	Conservation and Open Space - Active Recreation Parks	<p><b>Policy</b> Encourage new residential development in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #290 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal)</p> <p>GP: COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design</p> <p>Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Board Policy I-44 Procedure for Designing New County-owned Local Parks</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Include with original staff revision.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Encourage new residential developments in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks.</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - It says encourage, doesn't have to do - can be on case-by-case basis. -Larger complexes would do better for larger parks - Subcommittee revised "require" to "encourage"</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Include item and revise.</p> <p>Proposed Revision: Encourage new residential development in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks well as larger park spaces</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 10 Noes: 3</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
407	Conservation and Open Space - Protected Open Space	<p><b>Policy</b> 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).</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>The County often manages open space.</p>	<p>CP: Existing Goals &amp; Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4)</p>	<p><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)</p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Second:</b> Lisa Adams <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: - Intent: Target more properties in absence of County control. Doesn't seem to be appropriate place for it. - Run into same problem with finance/maintenance with VC Parks and Recreation - There are mitigation banks in VC. There should be a back-up if County can't go into mitigation bank property.</p> <p>Public Comments: Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: James Garritson Second: Lisa Adams</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 10 Noes: 3</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
566	Conservation and Open Space - Trails and Pathways	<p><b>Policy</b> In order to expedite the implementation of public trails for Valley Center shown in the County's Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), the development of new private trail systems should be avoided. Trail plans in new housing developments shall prioritize public access and connectivity to the CTMP.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>Since this item was pulled for deliberations during the March 8 CPG meeting, the staff project team has coordinated with DPR staff and stakeholders to develop a proposed revision.</p> <p>Proposed revision: New housing developments should prioritize public trail systems over private trail systems. Avoid private trail systems that would cut off access and connectivity to the County's public trail system.</p>	NA	The Subcommittee recommended inclusion of this item as part of the consent calendar during the Subcommittee's public meeting review process.	<p>CPG Comments: -"Should" doesn't require public trail systems over private trail systems - We're not trying to avoid private trails, but include them with public trail system</p> <p>Public Comments: - County DPR doesn't have funds to maintain private trails - who will pay? When you say private trails have access to public trails, only those with private trails would have access.</p> <p>Motion: Accept with revision</p> <p>Proposed Revision: New housing developments should prioritize public trail systems.</p> <p>Maker: Lisa Adams Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 1</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
88/91/ 163/1 67/41 3	Conservation - Trees	<p><b>Policy</b> 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. If removal is 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 inches, measured four feet above the ground, and a specimen tree is one contained in a 24-inch box or larger with a diameter of at four inches, measured two feet above the box.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>It would be difficult to have objective implementation of this policy and there are existing protections for native tree habitats like oak woodlands and riparian woodlands. In addition, detailed guidelines on tree preservation are included in the current Design Guidelines and it is anticipated this type of guidance would be carried forward in the Design Guidelines Update.</p>	<p>GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Valley Center Design Guidelines</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Recommend combining items 88, 91, 163, 167 and 413, and revising.  <i>The Subcommittee's proposed revision is the text shown for this item in the organization document and in column C of this screen share matrix.</i></p> <p><b>Maker:</b> Steve Hutchison <b>Second:</b> Kevin Smith <b>Vote:</b> Ayes: 6 Noes: 0</p>	<p>CPG Comments: -Why would this be difficult to implement? - Are Engelmann Oaks included in text?</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Recommend retain text with revision.</p> <p>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, cottonwoods, and Engelmann oaks. However, specimen trees of other species are to be considered as well. Discretionary projects should avoid removal of such trees.</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: LaVonne Norwood</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 11 Noes: 2</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
572	Conservation and Open Space – Historic Resources	<p><b>Goal</b> New staff goal proposal to address policies in Conservation and Open Space - Historic Resources</p> <p>Conserve Valley Center's valued historic resources.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i></p> <p>This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with Items 102, 104, and 494 in a "Conservation and Open Space – Historic Resources" section.</p>	NA	This proposed goal was added to fill in a goal gap during the process of organizing items that were carried forward from the Subcommittee process. This proposed goal would go with Items 102, 104, and 494 in a "Conservation and Open Space – Historic Resources" section.	<p>CPG Comments:</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Accept staff recommendation</p> <p>Maker: Kevin Smith Second: James Garritson</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 12 Noes: 0 Abstain: Dori Rattray</p>

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	CPU Subcommittee Meeting Deliberations	CPG Meeting Deliberations
250	Safety – Fire Protection	<p><b>Policy</b> Minimize development in hazardous wildfire areas and other immitigable hazardous area.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>This is covered in General Plan Policy LU-6.11.</p> <p>Additional rationale: 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>GP: LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards</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>	<p>CPG Comments: - County approved development in extremely high fire hazard severity areas (discretionary); emphasize discouraging development in those areas - What is the definition of hazardous wilfire areas?</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Motion: Retain item 250 with revision</p> <p>Proposed revision</p> <p>Minimize development in hazardous wildfire areas and other unmitigable hazardous areas.</p> <p>Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith</p> <p>Vote: Ayes: 9 Noes: 4</p>