

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#129	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Goal	Maintain the boundaries of Village, Semi-Rural and Rural land use designations.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #1 (CP Land Use Goal 1) GP: Goal LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development Policy LU-1.4 Village Expansion Goal LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character General Plan Regional Categories	Land Use Goal 1: Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The General Plan has strict policies (LU-1.2, LU-1.4) on GPAs proposing changes from Semi-Rural or Rural to a Village Regional Category and land use designation. This policy would remove the flexibility to allow stakeholders and decision-makers to consider changed circumstances (infrastructure/service extents, market conditions, public facilities, parks/open space, etc.) in the evaluation of land use proposals.	Land Use - Regional Categories	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#130	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.1 Contain new Industrial, General Commercial, Office Professional, Mixed Use and Village Residential uses inside the central valley Village boundary.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #2 (CP Land Use Goal 1A) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #7 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use-Commercial Policy 8)	Land Use Goal 1A: Village: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations Land Use-General Goal: Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages where dense residential uses, as well as commercial and industrial uses, are contained. Land Use-Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This goes beyond the existing Community Plan policies listed by adding additional land uses.	Land Use - Village Boundary	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#131	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.2 Contain urban services and amenities, such as sewer services, concrete curbs and gutters, sidewalks, on-street parking, and street lights inside the Village Boundary.	⌘	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The VCMWD existing sewer service area extends beyond the Village boundaries through the Lower Moosa Canyon and Woods Valley Ranch Service Areas. The other components listed are generally consistent with the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards and those standards should remain there.	Design Guidelines & Community Right of Way Development Standards	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#132	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.3 Prohibit expansion of the Village Boundary and/or sewer services until properties within the established Village boundary are built out. (Commercial area provided in this plan already exceeds Valley Center's build-out needs by 100%; and Village residential units provided in this plan reflect a 1000% increase over existing conditions. The community will be ill-served by expanding Village boundaries until growth is achieved where it is already planned.)	GP: LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-14.4 Sewer Facilities	NA	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> The policy will be open to interpretation because there is no definition of "built out" and the text in parentheses is outdated now. Please see General Plan policies LU-1.2 and LU-1.4 related to Village expansion and LU-14.4 related to sewer service expansion to determine if additional area-specific circumstances should be addressed for Valley Center.	Land Use - Village Boundary	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing or revising the policy.
#133	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.4 Prohibit the establishment of new Village areas in the CPA except in the context of a comprehensive General Plan Update	GP: LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development LU-1.4 Village Expansion	NA	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This addresses the same issue as 2012 proposed policy LU-1.3, but is inconsistent with that. Stakeholders should consider the feedback within that row and the GP policies referenced.	Land Use - Villages Boundary	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing or revising the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#134	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.5 Maintain the minimum lot size of two acres in Semi-Rural designations except for: Conservation Subdivisions and other projects developed under a Specific Plan, and pre-existing smaller parcels including those that are Village adjacent and designated Semi-Rural-1.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix item #22 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 8) GP: Guiding Principal 2 (would pose inconsistency with this Guiding Principle) LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design	Land Use-Residential Policy 8: Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewerred, and providing that: a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency. AND: b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> -There are existing minimum lot sizes of less than two acres within the Semi-Rural areas of Valley Center. -This policy would not allow the use of SR-0.5 or SR-1 in Valley Center, as these are not consistent with a two acre minimum lot size. -This type of policy is not consistent with GP Guiding Principle 2 to "promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development". - Clustering of development through conservation subdivisions doesn't change the allowed GP density. - See the review of Land Use-Residential Policy 8 of the Existing CP (item 22 in the matrix). The CPG has also recommended approval of a revision to further facilitate clustering in the small area of Semi-Rural that is within the sewer service area (western portion of Valley Center, near I-15).	Land Use - Lot Sizes	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#135	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.6 Lot sizes achieved through Conservation Subdivision planning vary by land use designation and by sub-area. (See the section below in this chapter on Conservation Subdivisions.)	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #22 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 8)	Land Use-Residential Policy 8: Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewerred, and providing that: a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency. AND: b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Though it is similar to Land Use-Residential Policy 8 of the Existing CP, this proposed policy refers to lot sizes by subarea (not by land use designation). This is not written as a policy, but as a general statement.	Land Use - Lot Sizes	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#136	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.7 Maintain the Rural designation as buffers around the periphery of the VC CPA.	GP: LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands LU-10.3 Village Boundaries	NA	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This is covered in the referenced GP Policy LU-10.3.	Land Use - Regional Categories	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#137	Land Use - Land Use Designations	Policy	LU-1.8 Consult chapters below on Conservation Subdivisions and Community Character, the County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions, and Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Conservation Subdivision County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivision Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that asks the reader to review other policies and regulations that are already applicable to Valley Center.	Land Use - reference other sections		
#138	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Goal	LU-3.1: New development is consistent with land use designations and zoning, existing and planned infrastructure, and available resources.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal) GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development	Public Facilities and Services-General Goal: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need to have a policy requiring consistency with the General Plan and zoning.	Land Use - Infrastructure Availability		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#139	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.1.1 Concentrate new Industrial, General Commercial, Office Professional, Mixed Use and compact residential development in Village areas where uses and densities have been intensified in accord with existing and planned infrastructure, services and amenities;	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #2 (CP Community Character Goal 1A) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #7 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use-Commercial Policy 8)	Community Character Goal 1A: Village: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations Land Use-General Goal: Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages where dense residential uses, as well as commercial and industrial uses, are contained. Land Use-Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This policy doesn't have the issues of policies covering the same issue, as it directs to "concentrate." This seems to be wording that could be supported by the community, as the CPG has, in recent years, demonstrated the desire for exceptions to limiting commercial to Villages only.	Land Use - Village Boundary		
#140	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.1.2 Encourage achievement of allotted density in Village areas.	GP: H-1.2 Development Intensity Relative to Permitted Density	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The GP policy referenced in this row is similar but calls for achieving at least 80% of the permitted density on sites designated at 15 to 30 units per acre. This policy proposal would cover all Village areas.	Land Use - Village Residential Uses		
#141	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	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.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Mobility Policy 14) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #69 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Education Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #73 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Water Service Policy 2) GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development	Mobility Policy 14: 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. Public Facilities and Services-Education Policy 1: Coordinate school facility planning with residential development to ensure that school facilities will be available to accommodate the increase in enrollment without overcrowding. Public Facilities and Services-Water Service Policy 2: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> These issues are already considered on a project by project basis.	Land Use - Infrastructure Availability		
#142	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU3-1.4 Ensure that new development covers costs of expanding public infrastructure, utilities and services, including wastewater treatment facilities.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #69 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Education Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #73 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Water Service Policy 2) GP: LU-12.1 Concurrence of Infrastructure and Services with Development	Public Facilities and Services-General Goal: 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. Public Facilities and Services-Education Policy 1: Coordinate school facility planning with residential development to ensure that school facilities will be available to accommodate the increase in enrollment without overcrowding. Public Facilities and Services-Water Service Policy 2: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is similar to policies of the existing Community Plan and General Plan Policy LU-12.1.	Land Use - Infrastructure Availability	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#143	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3-1.5 Require new development to provide sufficient, central and accessible open spaces, parks, recreational outlets, amenities and services to serve their residents.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #113 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal) GP: LU-12.1 Concurrence of Infrastructure and Services with Development COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Parks and Recreation Goal: Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This concept is covered by the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (http://www.sdparks.org/content/sdparks/en/AboutUs/Plans/pldo.html) and the related General Plan policies listed.	Land Use - Parks	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#144	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.1.6 Require any on-site amenities and services to be compatible with sub-area character and reflect activities that typically take place in the area.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #10 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #11 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-General Goal: Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design. Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley CPA.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> On-site amenities and services will be reviewed on a project by project basis.	Land Use - Community Character		
#145	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Goal	LU-3.2: New development respects and furthers the community's rural heritage and quality of life. The skin of the earth is not disturbed any more than is absolutely necessary.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #10 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #11 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-General Goal: Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design. Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley CPA.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. For maximum effectiveness, they should be consolidated in 1-2 policies. The second sentence of this proposed policy seems to be in line with encouraging clustering (flexibility in lot sizes without affecting allowed density), which doesn't match the intent of other 2012 proposals.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#146	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.1. Support development in Semi-Rural areas of single family homes at slope-dependent densities providing that development is consistent with surrounding built neighborhoods and respectful of natural resources and features that characterize these areas, their mesas, valleys and gentle slopes.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-General Goal: A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character. Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops, and unique scenic views in order reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. For maximum effectiveness, they should be consolidated in 1-2 policies. The County would not anticipate this policy to have much impact because the direction is unclear (e.g. "consistent with" and "respectful of natural resources and features" will have different meanings depending on the reader).	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#147	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.2 Support development in Rural designations of single family homes and permitted agri-businesses when conservation site planning respects the scale, irregularity and diversity that characterizes rural development.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	CP Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require that site design is consistent with the rural character of the community. CP Land Use-General Goal: Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> There are several references to maintaining rural character in the Existing CP and 2012 proposals. This one refers to preferring irregularity and diversity as important for development within the Rural Lands designated properties. Please reference existing policy (Land Use-Community Character Policy 2), though that policy is not specific to any Regional Category or group of land use designations.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#148	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.3. Require contextually sensitive rural planning and design in all land use designations. This means that new development should treat as assets: the rural character of the community, the natural slope and features of the land such as rock outcroppings, boulders, mature indigenous trees and thickets of natural vegetation.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and situating that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This is very similar to the existing CP policy (Land Use-Residential #4), but doesn't have some of the issues of the current policy as referenced in the Existing Community Plan matrix. This would not have to be moved to Design Guidelines consideration because it is not specific to Villages and/or other commercial and industrial areas. Proposed revision: Require contextually sensitive rural planning and design in all land use designations. Projects should treat the following components as assets and demonstrate how they are incorporated into the project design: natural topography, rock outcroppings, mature indigenous trees and native vegetation.	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#149	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.4. Require site inventory maps to precede site planning in order to determine areas that should be conserved and areas that can be disturbed for development.	GP: LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design PDS Form #090 - Minimum Plot Plan Information Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This proposed policy would be difficult to implement in only Valley Center and "areas to be conserved" would not hold regulatory weight.	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#150	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.5. Require site plans to be harmonious in scope, scale, bulk, style and coverage with surrounding properties, so that new building pads and structures blend inconspicuously into the landscape.	Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this policy refers to site plans, the County recommends it be considered as part of the Design Guidelines update. Design Guidelines apply to the Site Plan permit application type. The County assumes that this wasn't intended to apply outside the Villages, as other policy proposals refer to a preference for not matching the style of surrounding properties.	Design Guidelines		
#151	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.6. Require grading and shaping of building pads to follow the landscape's natural contours; prevent unnatural geometric shapes and the artificial elevation of building pads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roads that follow topography and minimize grading;• Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography;• Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain;• Structure design and situating that allows preservation of the site's natural assets;• Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Though it is similar to GP Policy LU-6.9, it provides unique components. Recommended revision: Require grading and shaping of building pads to follow the landscape's natural contours and prevent unnatural geometric landform shapes resulting from grading. The artificial elevation of building pads is prohibited unless necessary for safety considerations.	Land Use - Grading		
#152	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.7 Prohibit repetitive cookie-cutter development that destroys local character.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) GP: LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with same-model elevations should be avoided."	Land Use - Varied Design		
#153	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.8 Encourage site plans that provide open spaces that are visible from Valley Center roads, accessible to homes and link to open spaces on adjacent properties.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #287 (CP Open Space Policy 5) County Guidelines for Determining Significance (particularly Guidelines for Biological Resources and Aesthetics/Visual Resources)	Open Space Policy 5: Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> As worded, the policy is unclear and could be interpreted as encouraging something other than the intent, such as inconsistent recreational uses within open space dedicated for protection of biological resources. Proposed revision: In addition to providing open spaces to preserve sensitive resources, encourage the use of open space for recreational and aesthetic purposes, accessible to homes and adjacent properties.	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff is proposing to clarify that the revision is referring to passive recreation within preserves. Proposed revision: In addition to providing open spaces to preserve sensitive resources, encourage the use of open space for passive recreational and aesthetic purposes, accessible to homes and adjacent properties.
#154	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.9 Require a diversity and mix of lot sizes and housing types, architecture, landscaping and lot sizes to attract people of diverse lifestyles, occupations, interests, and ages.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) GP: LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The different component on this one is the reference to landscaping, but that should be covered in the Design Guidelines for areas subject to design review, or in the Community Right of Way Development Standards covering the parkway portion of the public road right of way. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#155	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.3.10 Produce variety within the range of design options that are compatible with the character of the sub-area (see the chapter on Community Characters: Valley Center's Sub-Areas.)	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) GP: LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This policy is not specific to Village areas or other commercial/industrial areas, so it is not recommended to be included in the Design Guidelines update. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design		
#156	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3-3.11 Discourage the destruction of agriculture. Support the Right to Farm Ordinance and require mitigation for any residential project that destroys agriculture or adversely affects adjacent and near-by agricultural uses.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #45 (CP Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3) GP: COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources	Land Use - Agricultural Policy 3: Prohibit residential development that would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> GP Policy COS-6.2 covers this issue in detail and addresses the intent of the VC proposed policy without posing a potential inconsistency related to mitigation requirements with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources.	Agriculture		
#157	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3-3. 12 Encourage preservation of historic sites and structures.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #81 (CP Conservation-General Goal) GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources Resource Protection Ordinance	Conservation-General Goal: Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered under the existing CP and GP policies referenced. Section 86.602 of the Resource Protection Ordinance includes a definition of "Significant Prehistoric or Historic Sites." Section 4.2 of the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources details actions that would constitute a significant impact to a significant prehistoric or historic site and section 5 of the Guidelines provides standard mitigation and design considerations.	Historic Preservation - Policy	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#158	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Goal	LU-3.4: New development preserves the beauty and function of the native environment.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character	Land Use-General Goal: A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Habitat Preservation - Goal		
#159	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	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.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) 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 Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance	Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements. Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Habitat Preservation - Policy		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#160	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	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.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use-Industrial Policy 4) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 3) 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 Resource Protection Ordinance	Land Use-Industrial Policy 4: Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited. Land Use-Residential Policy 3: Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	<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.	Conservation - Riparian Areas	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with the proposed revision.
#161	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.3 Maintain green belts along streams and flood prone areas.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #93 (CP Conservation Policy 12) GP: COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains S-9.1 Floodplain Maps 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 Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance	Conservation Policy 12: Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	<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. Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along ephemeral streams and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.	Conservation - Riparian Areas		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> Slightly revised wording is proposed to ensure that this language covers all creeks in Valley Center. Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along creeks and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.
#162	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.4 Incorporate conservation into all new development. New building should showcase Valley Center’s natural splendors not obliterate them!	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal) GP: 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 Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance	Land Use-General Goal: A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center’s natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center’s rural character.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Conservation		
#163	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.5 Preserve landmark trees of all species as significant features of Valley Center’s natural heritage. A “landmark tree” is defined as visually significant (diameter greater than 12”), historically significant, exemplary of its species, or more than 100 years old.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #88 (CP Conservation Policy 7) 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-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Conservation Policy 7: Preserve oaks, sycamores, eucalyptus, olive trees, pines and other individual specimen trees which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not going to be feasible to preserve every tree type that is 12" in diameter and there are no guidelines for determining what constitutes a "historically significant tree" or "exemplary of its species."	Conservation - Tree Preservation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#164	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.6 Require mitigation for Valley Center projects to occur in Valley Center: on site or in established VC mitigation areas.		NA	<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.	Habitat Mitigation - Policy		
#165	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.7 Encourage new development to retain as much of the natural landscape and vegetation as possible, and to re-vegetate with native, native-compatible and drought tolerant species that will thrive in the particular sub-area's microclimate.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) GP: COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping 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 Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance	Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements. Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Though it is similar to the referenced GP and CP policies, it provides a unique component with the revegetation recommendation. A revision is necessary due to subarea reference. Proposed revision: Encourage new development to retain as much of the natural landscape and native vegetation as possible, and to revegetate with native, native-compatible, and/or drought tolerant species that will thrive in the particular location.	Conservation - Native Landscaping		
#166	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU3-4.8 Encourage retention and/or relocation of mature trees. When relocating within a project is not possible, encourage relocation to other areas of Valley Center, including, but not limited to, parks, schools, and other public sites.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) 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-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Topography Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Though it has some similarities, the proposed policy provides unique wording and references to relocation recommendations.	Conservation - Tree Preservation		
#167	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU3-4.9 Require any large trees that are destroyed during construction to be replaced by at least an equal number of native or native compatible specimen sized trees shall be replanted on the property. Large trees are those measuring 6" in diameter when measured 4 feet from the ground. Specimen sized tree are those contained in boxes which are 24" in width or larger.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not going to be defensible to require replacement of every 6" diameter tree with a 24" box. The Design Guidelines focus on oaks and sycamores, which will be much more feasible to include. The current Design Guidelines provide additional guidance on size considerations and could be referred to for a potential policy if there is concern about applying something like this in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands areas, which are mostly not subject to the Design Guidelines.	Conservation - Tree Preservation	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#168	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.10 Safeguard air and groundwater quality with adequate greening.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not clear enough to have any impact. There is no guidance on thresholds of "adequate greening."	Conservation - Air and Water Quality		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#169	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.11 Encourage green development and green building practices.	GP: COS-15.1 Design and Construction of New Buildings	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is repetitive of the General Plan. GP Policy COS-15.1 calls for new buildings to be designed in accordance with "green building" programs.	Design Guidelines	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#170	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.12 Consult the chapters on Conservation Subdivisions and Conservation and Open Space, and the County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not necessary to have a policy that calls for reviewing other policies and regulations that are already applicable to Valley Center.	Reference Regulations		
#171	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Goal	LU-3.5: Preserve resources that are identified on the Community Resources Map. (insert map)	CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #86 (CP Conservation Policy 5) Community Plan Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs)	Conservation Policy 5: 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.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) and associated text can be updated with the Community Plan Update. It will be optimal to maintain the RCA reference (instead of "Community Resources Map") for consistency in reviewing projects. Proposed revision (should be reviewed in comparison to the existing policy referenced): Community Plan consistency findings for projects within Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) shall provide details on how the project conserves the resource(s) identified for conservation in the RCA description within the Community Plan	Conservation - Resource Conservation Areas	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#172	Land Use - Community Characters: Sub-Areas of the Valley Center Planning Area	Goal	LU-4.1 New development emulates and strengthens the distinctive characters of Valley Center's sub-areas	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use-General Goal)	Land Use-General Goal: Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is duplicative and covered under both existing and proposed Community Plan goals and policies with additional clarity.	Land Use - Community Character		
#173	Land Use - Community Characters: Sub-Areas of the Valley Center Planning Area	Policy	LU-4.1.1 Site, architectural and landscape designs for new development will emulate development patterns that are described for each sub-area of Valley Center (see Chapters specific to Village, Semi-Rural and Rural Sub-Areas).	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4)	Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roads that follow topography and minimize grading;• Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography;• Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain;• Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets;• Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is duplicative and covered under both existing and proposed Community Plan goals and policies with additional clarity.	Land Use - Community Character		
#174	Land Use - Community Characters: Sub-Areas of the Valley Center Planning Area	Policy	LU-4.1.2 Designs for major subdivisions will follow the County's manual for achieving context-sensitive project designs: "Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions "	Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines were intended to serve as a resource tool so mandating the Guidelines as policy regulations in Valley Center would be inconsistent with their intention. Proposed revision: Designs for major subdivisions should follow guidance in the County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines in order to achieve community character compatibility.	Land Use - Subdivisions		
#175	Land Use - Community Characters: Sub-Areas of the Valley Center Planning Area	Policy	LU-4.2 Site plans will adhere to context sensitive street edge treatments which are detailed in Valley Center's J-36 Right-of-Way Development Standards.	Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that asks the reader to review other policies, regulations, etc. These Standards already apply to the public road right-of-way areas in Valley Center.	Mobility - Right-of-Way Development Standards		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#176	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Goal	LU-4.1 Two compact and master-planned "town centers" provide local shopping and services, central gathering places for public community activities, and expanded options for housing.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #2 (CP Community Character Goal 1A) GP: LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-9.5 Village Uses LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design	Community Character Goal 1A: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Master plans for both villages would be difficult at this point so staff is recommending the following revision: Proposed revision: Two compact "town centers" provide local shopping and services, central gathering places for public community activities, and expanded options for housing.	Land Use - Village Development		
#177	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	1. Require integrated master-planning of separately owned parcels so that commercial areas and residential neighborhoods are contiguous and work together as a whole town center.	GP: LU-9.10 Internal Village Connectivity	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> For separate properties under separate ownership, there is no way to require similar timing of development and financial contributions to the development planning process. Design Guidelines, the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards, and Community Plan policies to ensure all developments are adhering to important standards.	Land Use - Village Development		
#178	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	2. Support expansion of the Woods Valley Ranch wastewater treatment facility to serve the South Village, and the establishment of a new wastewater treatment facility to serve the North Village.	GP: LU-14.1 Wastewater Facility Plans	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is outdated as the Woods Valley Ranch wastewater treatment facility has been expanded to serve the North and South Village.	Infrastructure - Sewer		
#179	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	3. Require Village commercial areas to be pedestrian- oriented AND accessible by automobile.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal) GP: LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	Mobility Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> With more specificity on pedestrian-oriented aspects desired, this would belong in the Design Guidelines, which will be updated as part of the process. The Design Guidelines apply to all Village properties. See the existing goal referenced, as this proposed policy reads more like a goal. The issue with including it as a goal is that underlying policies developed would be items that belong in the Design Guidelines.	Mobility - Villages		
#180	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	4. Encourage a "main street" design for the commercial core: small retail shops, restaurants and local retail and service businesses, with side streets for professional, medical and civic offices, and small businesses and service organizations.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #25 (CP Land Use-Commercial Goal) GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity Design Guidelines	Land Use-Commercial Goal: Commercial uses are concentrated within the boundaries of two compact scale, "rural villages" that are consistent in scale and design with a low density rural residential and agricultural community.	<i>Design Guidelines</i> This proposed policy seems to be addressing a couple issues. Village design components would belong in the Design Guidelines, which will be updated as part of the process. The Design Guidelines apply to all Village properties. The second part about which types of commercial uses go where could be addressed in the subarea identification and analysis process, where stakeholders may desire, for example, a C30 (Office Professional) zone for certain side street properties and a C36 (General Commercial) zone for certain Valley Center Road properties.	Land Use - Village Commercial		
#181	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	5. Prohibit a hodgepodge of unrelated shopping areas and residential subdivisions.	GP: LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> By itself, this policy would be difficult to apply in a project's review process. Other policies on community character will be included with more clarity on how the intent of this policy would be applied.	Land Use - Village Uses		
#182	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	6. Encourage a design that incorporates both on-street parking and parking to the rear-of-building in small, conveniently located and shared parking lots that are abundantly landscaped and mostly out-of-view.	GP: LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> General Plan policy LU-11.3 states the preference for Villages and Village Design Guidelines throughout the County including compact, walkable configurations, parking in the rear or side, and retail street-fronting uses. In terms of Valley Center, the Design Guidelines will be updated as part of the process and this policy's intent would be considered as part of those updated Design Guidelines.	Design Guidelines - Parking		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#183	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	7. Underground all utilities.	Subdivision Ordinance Centerline Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Subdivisions, commercial projects, and multi-family residential projects are already required per the County's Subdivision and Centerline Ordinances to underground utilities.	Land Use - Infrastructure		
#184	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	8. Integrate affordable housing units with market priced dwellings; prohibit their concentration in one area of any neighborhood.	GP: H-3.3 Density Bonus as a Means to Develop Affordable Housing H-3.4 Housing for Moderate-Income Families in Villages Zoning Ordinance - Density Bonus Program (starting at Section 6350)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The integration of affordable housing into development projects is part of the countywide Housing Affordability strategy.	Land Use - Affordable Housing	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#185	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	9. Encourage use of treated water for irrigation of Village landscaping, parks and golf courses.	GP: COS-4.5 Recycled Water	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This gets more specific than the GP policy, to include preferred uses of recycled water.	Land Use - Recycled Water		
#186	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	10. Consult the chapter on Village Character for additional design parameters	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that directs readers to review another section of the CP.	Land Use - Villages		
#187	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Goal	LU-4.2: Village infrastructure and amenities serve business patrons and residents of Village neighborhoods as well as the citizens of greater Valley Center.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services Goal)	Public Facilities and Services Goal: 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.	<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.	Infrastructure - Villages		
#188	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	1. Require Village transportation infrastructure that meets needs of all users: pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and equestrians.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal) GP: M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads	Mobility Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommended Removal</i> This language is similar to the Mobility goal from the Existing CP, referenced here and another goal in this matrix (see mobility section).	Mobility - Villages		
#189	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	2. Require an interconnected network of multi-modal Village roads that facilitate mobility; avoid dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs.	GP: M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is very similar to the GP policy referenced, but this adds the reference to dead end streets and cul-de-sacs. Proposed revision: 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.	Mobility - Villages		
#190	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	3. Require wide, shaded sidewalks for walking, browsing and community gathering.	Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards provide detail on where sidewalks or decomposed granite (DG) pathways are allowed and desired. Removal eliminates redundant standards.	Mobility - Villages		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#191	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	4.Require non-motorized cross-country trails to link residential neighborhoods to commercial areas.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) GP: M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan County Subdivision Ordinance	Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan. The County does not have the authority to require that developers obtain off-site trail easements. See section 9.1 of the CTMP and Section 81.402u of the Subdivision Ordinance for information on how trail easement dedication is secured on private property through the subdivision review process and in the review of other discretionary permit types. Considering these existing requirements and referenced GP policies, removal is recommended.	Mobility - Villages	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#192	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	5. Require a central “village green” that is large enough to accommodate large public gatherings.	GP: LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> General Plan policy LU-9.7 addresses using villages and town centers as focal points for infrastructure and public facilities like parks. The siting and sizing of park facilities depends on a variety of factors determined in the entitlement process and guided by the County's Parks Master Plan and Park Land Dedication Ordinance, which complement, but are separate from, the community plan.	Public Spaces - Villages		
#193	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	6. Require greenways that link to village residential neighborhoods.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) GP: COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks	Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Opportunity areas for trails within the Villages can be made for future updates of the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) through this Community Plan Update process, but this is separate from community plan goals and policies. The CTMP is the mechanism to implement trail connections through natural areas (reference to "greenways") of multiple ownerships, to commercial areas and public spaces.	Public Spaces - Villages		
#194	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	7. Require inviting, shaded public greens and open spaces.	NA	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> With additional clarity, this can be provided as a recommendation during the process to update the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Public Spaces - Village Parks		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> The Design Guidelines are not voluntary and this can be considered during the update of the Design Guidelines.
#195	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	8. Require a large public green adjacent to central public areas for community celebrations, art shows and performances that can be easily be expanded by closing public streets to motorized traffic.	GP: LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already addressed in item 194 above, which is proposed for inclusion with revision.	Public Spaces - Villages		
#196	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	9. Strengthen the friendly, family-oriented ambience of Valley Center’s small town character with contemporary amenities and conveniences.	GP: LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Priority List for Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Policy intent is unclear. Specifics on desired park amenities can be considered for inclusion in updates to Valley Center’s Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Priority List. Design related amenities for private properties within Villages can be addressed in the update to the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Public Spaces - Villages	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#197	Land Use - Village Development and Character	Policy	11. Consult the chapter on Mobility and Valley Center’s J-36 Right of Way Development Standards.	Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that directs readers to review other applicable regulations or other Community Plan sections.	Mobility - Community Right-of-Way Development Standards		
#198	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Goal	5.3.1 New commercial and residential development emulates authentic development patterns, scale, features and architectural styles of a traditional California Farm Village.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#199	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	1. Advise property owners and developers to work with planners, designers and architects who are familiar with authentic historical architectures of the West, and know how to combine the design elements that create them.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#200	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	2. Encourage building design that emulates authentic historical forms, architectural genres and detailing.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#201	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	3. Use authentic Adobe, Monterey, Spanish Colonial, Mission, and Mission Revival styles of architecture that are typically combined in small towns of Valley Center's vintage, each Village node will appear as though it has evolved over time.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#202	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	3. Prohibit hybrid architectures.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#203	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	3. Old buildings should, if possible, be renovated, added-to and re-used instead of torn down.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#204	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	4. New buildings should emulate historic architectures in terms of scale, form, styles, massing, roof pitch and shape, window size, shape and spacing, and exterior materials.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#205	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	5. Buildings should vary from one another, be irregular in design and be uniquely located on the land.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#206	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	6. Properties should use fences, hedges, and other traditional devices to define a property's relationship to the street.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Landscaping		
#207	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	7. Enforce design guidelines for site planning, architecture, landscaping, street edge treatments, and other design elements which are historically authentic in commercial and residential areas	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> While something like this would apply to the Design Guidelines, there is no need for a policy or Design Guidelines standard that calls for following existing applicable regulations.	Design Guidelines - Reference		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#208	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	8. Adhere to VC Design Guidelines in all areas.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> The Design Guidelines only apply to areas that have a "B" special area zoning designator, including Village properties, and other properties outside the Villages that are zoned for commercial, industrial, or multi-family residential.	Design Guidelines - Reference		
#209	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	9. Limit village development to two-stories except for special features that the community desires, such as bell and clock towers, and church steeples	Zoning Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> While most of the properties in the Villages have a "G" height designator (allowing a maximum of 35' and two stories), a process is available through a discretionary Administrative Permit or Major Use Permit to allow an additional story. These would go to the 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. Finally, phrases like "special features that the community desires" could lead to confusion and differing opinions on application of this policy.	Zoning Development Designators - Villages		
#210	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	10. Reconfigure and reclaim strip commercial development along VC Road in the South Node (see Figure ____).	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines. The update of the Design Guidelines can reinforce requirements to avoid design components typical of strip commercial development; however, the Design Guidelines would apply to permitting new development and exterior alterations.	Design Guidelines - Site Planning		
#211	Land Use - Village Character: A California Farm Village	Policy	11. Buffer Village Residential areas from incompatible activities that create heavy traffic, noise, odors, dust, and unsightly views through the use of landscaping and preserved open space.	GP: LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> This applies to a design component within Villages and therefore, would typically be included in the Design Guidelines. The referenced GP policy is very similar, but also notes buffering treatments must be consistent with community design standards (Design Guidelines).	Design Guidelines - Site Planning		
#212	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Goal	LU-5.3.2 Vibrant, compact, pedestrian-oriented commercial areas that replicate the human scale, style and character of a California Farm Village.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> This is a proposed goal that is further addressed by the proposed policies below, which would belong in the Design Guidelines.	Design Guidelines - Site Planning		
#213	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	1. Prohibit "big box" stores (How best? Through floor area ratios?)	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> During the update of the Design Guidelines, stakeholders can recommend components to ensure compatible designing with the Villages and outside the Villages properties zoned for commercial. The architectural, parking, and building placement guidelines covered in the Design Guidelines can address unfavorable design components typically associated with big box stores. Floor area ratios are not the appropriate mechanism for addressing this issue, as the allowed floor area would be determined based on the size of the property.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#214	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	2. Larger retail buildings should be scaled to residential proportions. Buildings larger than 2500 SF should be designed as groupings of attached structures, and arranged in varied, clustered masses or a refurbished agricultural building, such as a barn or packing house.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Site Planning		
#215	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	3. Chain stores must adapt corporate branding to be consistent with Valley Center's "Farm Village" identity. This applies to architectural treatments and signage that serve as brand identities, such as McDonald's "golden arches" Community character – keep VC's small town look and feel.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Architecture		
#216	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	4. Structures as a group should create a strong building edge 15-30 feet from the street	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Site Planning		
#217	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	5. Larger structures, such as grocery, drug, hardware, and feed stores that require abundant parking should be sited on the periphery of pedestrian-centered areas. Parking lots will not be the focal points of our town centers. But, they will be ample and convenient for villagers and other residents to easily carry large purchases to their cars, and are also available for overflow parking that occurs with special events.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design and site layout (parking areas) within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update. Bulk and scale of retail buildings can also be addressed in the Design Guidelines.	Design Guidelines - Parking		
#218	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	6. Parking areas should be shared, consolidated and connected, and located behind or to the side of buildings in order to screen parking and reduce traffic congestion	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design and site layout (parking areas) within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines - Parking		
#219	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Policy	7. Village vegetation should be compatible with the qualities of treated wastewater which will be a source of all Village irrigation.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update. Village landscaping is covered in the Design Guidelines.	Design Guidelines - Landscaping		
#220	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Goal	LU5-38.1 Village residential neighborhoods provide a mingled diversity of housing products to meet needs of people of different ages, life stages and incomes.	GP: Goal H-1 Housing Development and Variety Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This is almost a duplicate of the General Plan Housing Element goal referenced; however, as a goal it serves to guide any underlying policies that remain for the updated Community Plan.	Housing - Diversity of Types		
#221	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	1. Mingle diverse lot sizes and shapes, and home types and sizes through Village residential neighborhoods	GP: LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes H-1.6 Land for All Housing Types Provided in Villages H-1.7 Mix of Residential Development Types in Villages	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by the existing General Plan policies referenced, which apply to Valley Center.	Housing - Diversity of Types	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#222	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	2. Neighborhoods closest to the Village core include a mix of the denser housing. Density decreases as it approaches the boundary of Semi-Rural properties along Misty Oak.	GP: LU-1.3 Development Patterns LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced.	Land Use - Village Densities		
#223	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	3. Provide functional and recreational amenities to serve neighborhood residents in addition to Park Lands Dedication Ordinance funds.	GP: COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Policy is unclear. Community input is sought on desired amenities and other components through separate processes when developing parks plans.	Parks & Recreation		
#224	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	4. Maximum primary building area (1500 SF plus 25% of the lot area?) (Lot-Dwelling size relationships)	Zoning Ordinance - Zoning Development Designators	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> This appears to be a pre-final idea in the 2012 drafts, based on the question mark included. The maximum building area is limited by Zoning Development Designators, including setback, height, floor area ratio (where applicable), and coverage (where applicable). The Design Guidelines address scale, bulk, facades, articulation, etc.	Design Guidelines - Building Area		
#225	Land Use - Village Residential	Goal	Goal: LUS-3 B.2 Village residential neighborhoods mix architectural styles, materials and landscape treatments to replicate a traditional town center where homes have been built at different times and by different owners.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines		
#226	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	1. Require the use of authentic architectural genres and details from a selection of architectures that have been used historically in rural California: Adobe; Monterey: Spanish Colonial; Mission; Mission Revival; Greek Revival; Craftsman: Ranch; Farmhouse.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines		
#227	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	2. Avoid "hybrid" architectures or the use of a multiplicity of architectural styles and materials in the same structure.	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines		
#228	Land Use - Village Residential	Policy	3. Provide and incorporate common areas within clusters of Village homes	Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation for the Design Guidelines update.	Design Guidelines		
#229	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Goal	LU-6.1 Retain the community's natural landscape.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #76 (CP Conservation-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #77 (CP Conservation- Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #81 (CP Conservation-Goal) GP: LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment COS-7 Protection and Preservation of Archaeological Resources	Conservation-General Goal: Preserve Valley Center's unique, natural and cultural resources while supporting its traditional semi-rural lifestyle Conservation-General Goal: Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA Conservation-General Goal: Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is similar to the multiple Community Plan and General Plan goals referenced.	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#230	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	1. 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.	County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/procguid.html (particularly Guidelines for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Aesthetics and Visual Resources)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> During the CEQA review of subdivisions, projects are reviewed against the standards found in the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance. Guidelines relevant to this proposed policy include the Guidelines for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Aesthetics and Visual Resources. Interested stakeholders should review these guidelines to get an understanding of actions that constitute significant impacts that must be mitigated. Onsite preservation is a common mitigation practice for these types of resources.	Land Use - Subdivisions	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#231	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	2. Retain natural vegetation, rock outcroppings, and natural drainage.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) GP: LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance	Land Use-Residential Policy 1: Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements. Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas. Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and situating that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommended for Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated.	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features		
#232	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	3. Require grading for building pads and roads to follow the natural contours of the land. Prohibit flat building pads on slopes greater than 25%. Require stepped foundations to accommodate the natural terrain.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) GP: LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance	Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and situating that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommend for Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated. In particular, the 2012 proposed policy in row 24 of this matrix is focused on the same issue. The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into steep slopes (>25%) based on the percentage of the property containing steep slopes.	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features		
#233	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	4. Require developers to locate buildings, construction activities and construction staging areas in such a way that special features are protected from damage during construction, and	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no description of what is meant by "special features."	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#234	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Goal	6-2 Retain the character that distinguishes the sub-area. Site designs are consistent with the image, scale and diversity of the surrounding semi-rural neighborhood.	CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #10 (CP Land Use-General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #11 (CP Land Use-Residential Goal) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-3 Diversity or Residential Neighborhoods	Land Use-General Goal: Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design. Land Use-Residential Goal: Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley Center CPA.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is mostly covered in the existing goals referenced. To suggest consistency with image and scale, but then wanting diversity could make this wording confusing.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		
#235	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	1. Emulate the pattern of diverse home site designs and home styles that characterize neighborhoods of custom homes.	GP: LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> As this is in the section of the draft referring to Semi-Rural residential, it would not be considered for the Design Guidelines as proposed Village focused design policies would. This is clear enough to include as a policy.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#236	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	2. On larger properties create interconnected smaller neighborhoods separated by open space; avoid a sprawl of houses or independent enclaves.	GP: LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity County Subdivision Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which calls for clustered development, is required in SR-10, RL-20/40/80 and is optional in others. See Section 81.401r of the County's Subdivision Ordinance for the requirements of Conservation Subdivisions. The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, 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.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#237	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	3. New development should blend inconspicuously both into the natural setting and topography and into the built environment.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography	Land Use-Residential Policy 4: Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and situating that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommended for Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and General Plan goals and policies, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		
#238	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	4. Prohibit monotonous site designs: this means checkerboard layouts, uniform lot sizes, repetitious architecture, uniform building materials, and pretentious branding that cites the natural features the project has just destroyed.	GP: LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This issue is covered in the policy proposal in Item 235 of this matrix and the issue is covered in a more generalized style in GP Policy LU-3.2. The County doesn't regulate the types of marketing materials referenced.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#239	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	5. Encourage mingled diversity of lot sizes and shapes, and architectural genres design in all subdivisions. In larger subdivisions, encourage master planning that allows for this kind of variety.	GP: LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects	NA	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This proposal should be reviewed in comparison to the proposal in Item 235 of this matrix. Item 235 seems to cover the issue sufficiently.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		
#240	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	6. Incorporate non-motorized cross-country trails into the site design.	CP: Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) GP: M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan	CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan. The County does not have the authority to require that developers obtain off-site trail easements. The language lacks clarity and seems to require cross country trails for any project in the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Section 81.402u of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#241	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	7. Screen new Semi-Rural residential development from the road when the residence (including appurtenant structures such as garages, barns, swimming pools, etc.) is close to the road.	Zoning Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Most Semi-Rural areas in Valley Center have a "C" setback designator per the associated zoning development designators. This designator requires a front yard setback of 60 feet from the road centerline (Zoning Ordinance section 4810). As such, new residences will not be constructed close to the road.	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development		
#242	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	8. Landscape road edges in accord with VC's J-36 ROW Development Standards	J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that calls for adhering to an existing applicable regulation.	Land Use - Landscaping		
#243	Land Use - Semi-Rural Residential Development & Character	Policy	9. Provide safety turn-outs for school buses in subdivisions of 10 units or more.	Road Design	NA	<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.	Mobility - Transit	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#244	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Goal	Rural lands protect natural vegetation, provide areas for agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry, and act as buffers between Valley Center and adjacent planning areas.	GP: LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands	NA	Recommend Inclusion This expands on the GP goal referenced, and includes suitable language for a goal.	Land Use - Rural Lands Development		
#245	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	1. Goals and Policies are needed to achieve the stated goal of retaining and protecting agriculture in Valley Center. The failure to protect agriculture and food production is a significant problem with this General Plan. What should these be in VC????	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #45 (Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3) GP: COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations County Subdivision Ordinance (specifically the Conservation Subdivision program) County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program	Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3: Prohibit residential development that would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> (there is no policy proposal) GP Policy COS-6.2 is one of the longest, most detailed policies in the General Plan, discussing measures to protect agricultural operations. Stakeholders should review that policy, which applies to Valley Center and all other unincorporated communities. Per the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources, direct impacts to agricultural resources occur when the site contains significant agricultural resources as determined by the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) model and the project would convert agricultural resources that meet the soil quality criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The guidelines also go into detail on what would constitute indirect and cumulative impacts. Mitigating direct impacts typically requires onsite preservation via conservation easements or limited building zone (LBZ) easements, or purchase of an offsite agricultural conservation easement (County PACE program). In addition, agricultural resources are one of the resources that can be preserved through the Conservation Subdivision program. See the referenced documents for additional information on all the County regulations and programs to preserve agriculture.	Agriculture	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#246	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	2. Encourage crops that need less water?	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This proposal was written with a question mark as unfinished. Farmers are motivated to use less water due to the cost of water and rate of return on investment for various crop types.	Agriculture		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#247	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	3. Support equestrian and other commercial enterprises that support our rural economy.	NA	NA	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>With the reference to, "other commercial enterprises that support our rural economy" this proposal would be inconsistent with existing CP policies and 2012 proposals that discourage commercial uses outside the Villages. This would leave it open for interpretation on what those other commercial enterprises could include and make it difficult for staff to suggest commercial use types would be inconsistent with this policy. The proposed revision below includes an assumption that the community wants to support equestrian and agriculture related commercial outside the Villages, but not necessarily other types of commercial.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas, support horse stables and agriculture-related commercial activities that can be allowed in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (subject to limitations) when in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements.</p>	Equestrian Uses		
#248	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	4. Ensure zoning that protects home-owners with multiple horses and other large animals	Zoning Ordinance	NA	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>The number of horses and other large animals allowed is determined by the animal designator, which is part of the zoning development designators. Some areas where residences are in close proximity are not appropriate for multiple horses and other large animals, but there are areas of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that allow this. If stakeholders see as an issue (property owner complaints about the appropriateness of their zoning animal designator), a policy proposal should be focused on a particular area.</p>	Equestrian Uses		
#249	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	5. Encourage farmers to participate in County programs to establish conservation easements on agriculture land, and to transfer density to areas designated for development.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #44 (CP Land Use-Agricultural Policy 2) GP: COS-6.4 Conservation Easements Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program	Land Use-Agricultural Policy 2: Encourage the formation of Agricultural Preserves in areas with active agricultural operations and in locations that will be optimal for future agricultural production.	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>The County's Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program allows willing agricultural property owners to be compensated for placing a perpetual easement on their property that limits future uses to agriculture. As a result, the agricultural land is preserved and the property owner receives compensation making the land's continued use for agriculture more viable.</p> <p>Regarding transferring density, the County does not currently have a process to allow this; however, a Transfer of Development Rights pilot is under development.</p> <p>Proposed Revision (same revision proposed for the existing CP policy referenced): Support the continued promotion of the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program and outreach to eligible property owners. Encourage property owner participation in this program in order to preserve agriculture in Valley Center.</p>	Agriculture		
#250	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	6. Minimize development in hazardous wildfire areas and other immitigable hazardous area.	GP: LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards	NA	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>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>	Wildland Fire Protection		<p><i>No Change to Recommendation</i></p> <p>Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.</p>
#251	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	7. (See the section below on Conservation Subdivisions, as well as the County Conservation Subdivision Program and County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions.)	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>This is not written as a policy and there is no need for a policy that calls for reading another section of the Community Plan.</p>	Conservation Subdivisions		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#252	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Goal	LU-6.4: Agri-Businesses continue to serve and support the rural economy as they have historically.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #42 (CP Land Use - Agricultural Goal)	Land Use - Agricultural Goal: Preserve and enhance future agricultural uses in the Valley Center Community Plan.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> There will be some confusion with using the term agribusiness, as that is just referring to commercial agriculture. Proposed revision: Promote businesses supporting agriculture as a component of the Valley Center community.	Agri-business		
#253	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	1. Encourage and facilitate historic agri-business uses in semi-rural and rural areas such as well drilling and servicing businesses, veterinary hospitals, produce stands, animal boarding, breeding, and training. (while at the same time limiting customer serving commercial businesses such as convenience stores and gasoline stations to the village core.)	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> See Item 247 in this matrix for information on agricultural tourism use type allowances in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (zones that cover almost all of the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas). The types of uses listed can all be allowed in these zones, subject to limitations. Well drilling is not confined to certain zones, but limited by Department of Environmental Health (DEH) permitting requirements. The same revision is recommended here as in Item 247 of this matrix. Proposed revision: Within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas, support horse stables and agriculture-related commercial activities that can be allowed in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (subject to limitations) when in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements.	Agri-business		
#254	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	2. Support enterprises that support our rural economy like horse breeding, boarding and training facilities, wedding chapels and other special event venues, antiques shops, farm stands and unique enterprises like the Lavender Fields and Mathilde's Mouse where consistent with the Noise Element.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> See Item 247 for information on agricultural tourism use type allowances in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (zones that cover almost all of the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas). The types of uses listed can all be allowed in these zones, subject to limitations, with the exceptions of wedding facilities and antique shops. Wedding facilities would require a Major Use Permit in these zones and antique shops are classified like other retail uses (mostly limited to commercial zones). The County is recommending the same revision here as in row 248 of this matrix. It would not be appropriate for a community plan policy to call out special preference for an individual business establishment. Proposed revision: Within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands Regional Category areas, support horse stables and agriculture-related commercial activities that can be allowed in Rural Residential and Agricultural zones (subject to limitations) when in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements.	Agri-business		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#255	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	3. Prohibit general commercial and industrial enterprises which are incompatible with rural residential and agricultural development such as conventional convenience stores and gas stations.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)	Land Use Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> Policy proposals in this section dealing with commercial outside the Villages are contradicting, so it's not clear on the intent. For example, this policy proposal speaks of not wanting general commercial uses, then the next one refers to wanting something like Harvest Farms, which has several types of general commercial uses. General language and/or and contradicting policies lead to inconsistent implementation. Please review Sections 1200-1800 of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides definitions of use types. These use types are referred to in Sections for each zone, to note which are allowed, which require special discretionary permits, and which are not allowed. If a policy provides a list of Zoning Ordinance use types that should not be allowed outside Villages, that will provide sufficient direction on which zones should not be used outside Villages.	Commercial Uses	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing or revising the policy.
#256	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	4. Encourage unique, specialty properties such as Bates Nut Farm on Woods Valley Road and Harvest Farms on Lilac Road which have housed rural commercial enterprises for a number of years	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)	Land Use - Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Policy language is unclear. Unique and special could be interpreted in many ways. It would not be appropriate for a community plan policy to call out special preference for an individual business establishment, and should refrain from providing those types of examples in policy language.	Commercial Uses		
#257	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	5. Prohibit spot commercial zoning	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Per case law, zoning for specific properties that is unique to the area can be allowed if findings can be made to support a benefit to the community and consistency with the General Plan.	Commercial Uses		
#258	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	6. Encourage development of combined agriculture and residential uses.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Proposed Revision: Encourage development of combined residential uses with low nuisance agricultural uses that are compatible with residential development	Agriculture		
#259	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	7. Encourage the establishment of “green” small family owned farms and vineyards.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This policy is unclear as currently worded. Are stakeholders looking to encourage sustainable farming practices, low GHG emission agriculture, organic farms?	Agriculture		
#260	Land Use - Agribusiness and Other Commercial Enterprises in Sem-Rural and Rural Areas	Policy	8. Provide convenient agricultural supply and support commercial facilities outside the Villages or away from other Village commercial uses.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)	Land Use - Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This would not be consistent with existing and 2012 proposed policies about keeping commercial within the Villages. There is not a zoning use classification for retail that only provides agricultural supply.	Commercial Uses		
#261	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Goal	LU 6-5.1: Conservation Subdivision design preserves natural resources and creates interconnected networks of open space through Rural, Semi-Rural and even Village areas.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommended Inclusion</i> This is suitable language for a goal, relating desired outcomes for Valley Center through ongoing use of the Conservation Subdivision Program.	Conservation Subdivision		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#262	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU- 1. Support Conservation Subdivisions for the purposes of protecting resources on individual sites and for progressively expanding interconnected networks of open space for wildlife habitats, agriculture, pasture land, animal husbandry, and recreation.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Proposed revision: Encourage applicants to pursue a Conservation Subdivision process within the land use designations where it is optional (SR-4 and higher densities), in order to allow for greater preservation of sensitive habitats, cultural resources and agricultural resources. Support reductions in minimum lot sizes typically associated with this process when the requisite findings can be made.	Conservation Subdivision		
#263	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-2. Require a clear and significant conservation objective for clustering, such as preservation of important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcropping, or archaeological and cultural resources which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions. Section 81.401r6 provides criteria for the areas to be avoided through the process and notes open space easements and/or other conservation easements are required for the areas to be avoided. It notes the easements shall be dedicated to the County or other conservation agency approved by the Director. With regard to open space, the section calls for the largest blocks of unfragmented and interconnected open space to be conserved, maximizing surface to perimeter ratios to avoid "slivers or fingers" of open space, and located in areas to provide the maximum amount of connectivity with offsite open space. In addition to protecting sensitive habitat areas, drainages, and cultural resources, agricultural resources can also be protected through the Conservation Subdivision process. In addition to the Subdivision Ordinance section, here is a link to a page with additional information on the Conservation Subdivision process - https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/conservationssubdivision.html (or search, County of San Diego Conservation Subdivision Program)	Conservation Subdivision	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#264	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-3. Determine on a case-by-case basis through the discretionary permitting process how best to implement the program on each particular site.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is how the program currently works, so there is no need for this policy proposal.	Conservation Subdivision		
#265	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-3. Vary minimum lot sizes and other design features according to the character of each sub-area and property location.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program) Zoning Ordinance Section 4230	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Findings of compatibility with neighborhood character and the size of adjacent lots is already required, in order to realize the reductions in zoning minimum lot sizes associated with a Conservation Subdivision process. When not associated with a Specific Plan, Lot Area Averaging is the process used for seeking the creation of lots that would be smaller than the zoning minimum lot size, in developing a Conservation Subdivision. With lot area averaging, approval of an Administrative Permit is required and the necessary findings for the Administrative Permit include that the size, design, grading, and location of the proposed lots shall be compatible with and will not adversely affect adjacent uses, residents, buildings, structures, or natural resources, with consideration given to: -Harmony in lot size and configuration, building setbacks and orientation; -The harmful effect, if any, upon desirable neighborhood character including compatibility with adjacent lots (where not adjacent to open space); -The suitability of the site for the type and intensity of the proposed use or development; -Any harmful effects upon environmental quality and natural resources; and -Other relevant impacts See Zoning Ordinance Section 4230 for additional information on the required Administrative Permit findings.	Conservation Subdivision		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#266	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-4. Clustering shall in no instance be used to create a greater number of lots than the underlying density would allow in a conventional subdivision. Yield calculations are subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #21 (CP Land Use -Residential Policy 7) GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program) Zoning Ordinance Section 4230	Land Use-Residential Policy 7: Clustering, planned development, lot area averaging, and Specific Plan projects which utilize the clustering technique shall in no instance within the Valley Center CPA be used to create a greater number of lots than the property would have been entitled to without the use of the above mentioned techniques. Yield calculations shall be subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> As discussed above, the Zoning Ordinance provides guidance on lot area averaging in Section 4230 and the GP does not allow projects to go above the GP density/allowed # of lots (unless of course, a General Plan Amendment is approved with the project), even if using the Conservation Subdivision process, lot area averaging, planned developments, specific plans, or other mechanisms. Therefore, the policy is not needed, as this restriction is already in place. The Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) doesn't impact allowed General Plan density, but it does limit potential areas of development footprint (thus potentially limiting feasible yields, depending on the extent of RPO-protected constraints). All subdivisions are subject to RPO requirements. Therefore, this policy proposal is covered by existing regulations.	Conservation Subdivision		
#267	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-5. Prohibit uniform lots lined up in teeth-like rows. Minimum lot sizes are established for each sub-area of Valley Center. However, the community encourages diversity, for example: a mingled mix of lot sizes and shapes that follow natural land forms, varied setbacks, individually determined structure orientations that take advantage of particular views, climatic concerns and the like.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) GP: LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program) Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is one of a few different policies that call for diversity in subdivision design. See also Items 282 and 283 of this matrix. Potential rewrite (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided."	Conservation Subdivision		
#268	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-6 Conservation areas should be laid out so that open space set-asides on adjacent properties join together to form interconnected open space network throughout the planning area.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #107 (CP Open Space Policy 2) GP: LU-6.7 Open Space Network	Open Space Policy 2: Integrate open space dedications in private developments with surrounding uses to maximize a functional open space/recreation and wildlife management system.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions. Section 81.401.r.i and iii note the following for Conservation Subdivisions: -The largest blocks of unfragmented and interconnected open space shall be conserved. - Open Space shall be located in areas with the maximum amount of connectivity with off-site open space.	Conservation Subdivision	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#269	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-7 Avoid "double loading" (building solidly on both sides of street). Views of the countryside from the street are desirable.	GP: COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Single-loaded road developments can require more land be devoted to roads than developments with double-loaded roads. This runs counter to the land conservation goal of the conservation subdivision ordinance. Developments can be designed in ways that both make efficient use of the land and provide views/physical access to open spaces. Proposed revision: Conservation Subdivision projects should be designed to preserve or create views of scenic natural areas, as viewed from public roads traversing the subdivision.	Conservation Subdivision		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#270	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-8 Lot sizes in a conservation subdivision should be no smaller than five times the footprint of the main dwelling unit on each lot and in no event less than one-third acre.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Some subdivision applications do not include plans for houses or development footprint. Findings of compatibility with neighborhood character and the size of adjacent lots is already required, in order to realize the reductions in zoning minimum lot sizes associated with a Conservation Subdivision process. When not associated with a Specific Plan, Lot Area Averaging is the process used for seeking the creation of lots that would be smaller than the zoning minimum lot size, in developing a Conservation Subdivision. With lot area averaging, approval of an Administrative Permit is required and the necessary findings for the Administrative Permit include that the size, design, grading, and location of the proposed lots shall be compatible with and will not adversely affect adjacent uses, residents, buildings, structures, or natural resources, with consideration given to: -Harmony in lot size and configuration, building setbacks and orientation; -The harmful effect, if any, upon desirable neighborhood character including compatibility with adjacent lots (where not adjacent to open space); -The suitability of the site for the type and intensity of the proposed use or development; -Any harmful effects upon environmental quality and natural resources; and -Other relevant impacts See Zoning Ordinance Section 4230 for additional information on the required Administrative Permit findings.	Conservation Subdivision		
#271	Land Use - Conservation Subdivision	Policy	LU-9 Conservation areas shall be preserved and maintained through deed restrictions in perpetuity by one, or more, of the following: individual owners through a dedicated conservation easement; a homeowner's association; a private land trust; a public agency such as the County Parks Department or Valley Center Parks and Recreation Department, or combinations of the above entities.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions already includes the details on the easement restrictions and would be more restrictive than what is proposed here. Included in Section 81.401.r.6.vi is the following: "The avoided lands shall be protected with an easement dedicated to the County of San Diego or a conservancy approved by the Director."	Conservation Subdivision		
#272	Land Use - Specific Plans and Specific Plan Areas	Goal	LU-6.1: Detailed Specific Plans govern development of large properties, unique properties and multiple-parceled Village properties.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> One of the main advantages of specific plans is that they allow for flexibility in applying regulations over a development. By developing a clear set of policies in this update, we can help to ensure specific plans and other application types achieve consistency with the vision for the community. Those policy proposals from the 2012 specific plan section that are recommended for inclusion below could be included under a different goal applicable to the issue addressed in the policy proposal.	Specific Plans		
#273	Land Use - Specific Plans and Specific Plan Areas	Policy	1. Encourage Specific Plans for the development of large properties, unique properties and multiple-parceled Village properties.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not clear enough for a policy, with regard to what constitutes a large property and what constitutes a unique property, as referenced. Staff will already recommend the specific plan process for project proposals that would benefit from the flexibility allowed in that process. The costs associated with the process would limit the feasibility of using it for smaller projects. This recommendation is also in consideration of limiting the number of policies that will have little to no impact.	Specific Plans		
#274	Land Use - Specific Plans and Specific Plan Areas	Policy	2. Amendments to Specific Plans adhere to the character and underlying density of the original Specific Plan.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The community plan cannot prohibit a property owner or applicant from requesting an amendment that varies from existing entitlements. If changes are requested, applicants must undergo all required analyses, notifications, and hearings for a Specific Plan Amendment and/or General Plan Amendment, and those proposals would be evaluated for compatibility with existing environmental resources and planned development patterns.	Specific Plan		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#275	Land Use - Specific Plans and Specific Plan Areas	Policy	2. "Open Space" in a Specific Plan shall not be converted to any other use type, nor shall its acreage be used to reduce the otherwise allowable density elsewhere within the Specific Plan."	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There are different types of open space references applied in development projects. It's not always biological open space protected by easements. A policy shouldn't remove Specific Plan flexibility in applying various types of open space.	Specific Plan		
#276	Land Use - Specific Plans and Specific Plan Areas	Policy	3. Specific Plans "expire" after a period of time. Existing designated Specific Plan Areas shall expire and be removed from the Land Use Map if the related Specific Plan and other required discretionary approvals are not obtained within two years of BOS approval of the General Plan Update, and substantial progress made on implementation of the Specific Plan within one year after Specific Plan approval. Lands within the SP Area shall then be assigned (automatically revert to) the General Plan Land Use designation applicable to the majority of its surrounding parcels, unless and until the owner obtains a GPA assigning different designation(s).	GP: Land Use Element p. 17 (description of the Specific Plan Area GP land use designation)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is now outdated, since two years from the GP Update adoption has passed. Re: the rest of the language, "substantial progress" is unclear and open to different interpretations. The CPG can include expiration recommendations on a project by project basis when bringing forward recommendations on individual specific plan projects.	Specific Plans	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#277	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	NA	Safety	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section. The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written differently than other sections, including the lack of goal statements.	Mobility - Safety		
#278	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.1.1 The safety needs of all road users: automobiles, cyclists, pedestrians, and animals (horses with riders, domestic pets and wild critters) are met.	<i>Note: The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written a bit different than other sections, including the lack of goal statements. Given that a goal statement was not included by the stakeholders for this group of policies, we are treating this like a goal, since it almost matches the referenced goal in the Existing Community Plan.</i> CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal [not numbered]) GP: M-4 Safe and Compatible Roads	Mobility Goal (not numbered): A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Goals</i> This is very similar to the goal referenced from the existing CP. Staff recommends that one goal cover the intent of this policy to ensure consistency in implementation.	Mobility - Safety		
#279	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.1.2 Roads have adequate capacity, safe road design with adequate shoulders, and safe lines of sight.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #56 (CP Mobility Policy 9) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 9: Require that the road system function at a level of service no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County Public Road Standards address requirements for safe road design and sight distance. Capacity is covered in the General Plan. Policy M-2.1 calls for maintaining Level of Service (LOS; relates to discussions of road capacity) of D or better, but provides allowance for accepting failing LOS pursuant to criteria in the policy. General Plan Table M-4 calls out road segments (including some in Valley Center) that have been accepted at failing LOS by the General Plan, in accordance with criteria for accepting failing LOS.	Mobility - Safety		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#280	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.1.3 Traffic enforcement be improved during school drop off and pick up times.	GP: S-12.1 New Law Enforcement Facilities	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Traffic enforcement in the vicinity of schools is conducted by the County Sheriff's Department and outside of the scope of the Community Plan. Residents concerned with enforcement should contact the Valley Center Sheriff Substation.	Mobility - Traffic Enforcement		
#281	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	NA	2.1.2. Access	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Access		
#282	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.2.1 The uncontrolled access from private driveways and private roads onto Mobility Element roads is minimized.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #50 (CP Mobility-Policy 3) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads County Public Road Standards	Mobility-Policy 3: Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the Existing Community Plan policy (recommended for inclusion/to remain) and the General Plan policy.	Mobility - Access		
#283	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.2.2 The direct access points onto Mobility Element roads are minimized in commercial areas to promote unimpeded traffic flow. This shall be achieved by requiring that new commercial development provide indirect access through the use of new road access points.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Mobility-Policy 7) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads County Public Road Standards	Mobility-Policy 7: To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in existing Community Plan and General Plan policies. Additionally, the County Public Road Standards (Section 6.1) require that Non-Mobility roads (includes driveways) entering into a Mobility Element road shall have their centerlines separated by at least 300 feet.	Mobility - Access		
#284	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.2.3 The access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined and during the planning process, the new subdivision roads will be connected to critical roads to improve access and connectivity. Where a circulation need is identified that will benefit the overall community, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12) GP: M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads County Public Road Standards County Subdivision Ordinance	Mobility-Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Section 81.402 of the County Subdivision Ordinance has guidance on when public road dedication is required and when private roads can be allowed based on General Plan land use designations. The needs for roads and the timing of their construction are determined on a project by project basis.	Mobility - Access	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#285	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.2.4 Future major subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility Policy 12) GP: M-4.4 Accommodate Emergency Vehicles County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code	Mobility Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The referenced Existing Community Plan policy contains almost the same wording and the end of the policy, and is recommended for removal. Major subdivisions can be as small as five lots and we don't want to remove the discretion of the Fire Marshal/fire code official in determining sufficient access for fire protection and evacuations. When projects are not exceeding the maximum dead end road length (Section 503.1.3 of the Consolidated Fire Code), one access road can be allowed under certain circumstances. Section 503.1.2 of the Consolidated Fire code notes, "The fire code official is authorized to require more than one fire apparatus access road based on the potential for impairment of a single road by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions or other factors that could limit access. When additional fire apparatus access roads are necessary as mitigation for the exceedance of the maximum allowable dead-end road length, the additional fire apparatus road must be remote from the primary fire apparatus access road."	Mobility - Access		
#286	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	NA	2.1.3 Capacity	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Capacity		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#287	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.1 The road system should be required to function at a measured average level of service level of "D" or better by retaining and upgrading roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #56 (CP Mobility Policy 9) GP: M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria	Mobility Policy 9: Require that the road system function at a service level no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This conflicts with General Plan Policy M-2.1, calling for Level of Service (LOS) D or better, but providing allowance for accepting failing LOS pursuant to criteria in the policy. It also conflicts with GP Table M-4, which calls out road segments (including in Valley Center) that have been accepted at failing LOS by the GP.	Mobility - Capacity		
#288	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.2 Casino and through traffic should move safely through our town with minimum impact on local circulation.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) GP: M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character	Mobility-Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Traffic counts along with future traffic from planned developments are used in developing traffic improvements and mitigation measures in traffic studies for development projects. The traffic counts do not differentiate between casino traffic and other traffic. Proposed revision: Consider the impacts of casino traffic and other through traffic when developing traffic improvement plans.	Mobility - Capacity		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> Slightly revised wording is proposed to reflect the shift in CEQA analysis from Level of Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Proposed revision: Consider the extent of casino traffic and other through traffic when developing traffic improvement plans.
#289	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.3 The majority of roads on the Mobility Element map should remain 2 lanes.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character		<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Mobility Element map is a component of the Community Plan update and is determined by existing and proposed traffic capacity. Please see related General Plan policies.	Mobility - Capacity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>Recommend Removal (revised rationale)</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> In consideration of inter-departmental input, we have the following proposed revision to the rationale: The Mobility Element Network for Valley Center will be evaluated for potential updates as part of the Community Plan Update process. Proposed updates to the Mobility Element Network are determined through analysis of existing and proposed traffic, in relation to applicable standards. Please see the related General Plan policies.
#290	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.4 Improved direct access routes to I-15 should be considered to support the daily commuters and facilitate evacuation during natural disasters, such as periodic wildfires.	GP:	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The current Mobility Element network for Valley Center includes access to the I-15 through Mirar de Valle. The construction of Mobility Element roads is dependent on funding and proposed development projects.	Mobility - Connectivity		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision (proposed revision was accidentally left out of the public review matrix)</i> The current Mobility Element network for Valley Center includes access to the I-15 through Mirar De Valle. The construction of Mobility Element roads is dependent on funding and proposed development projects. Proposed revision: Prioritize improvements associated with planned Mobility Element connections to I-15 as road construction funding becomes available, in order to improve evacuation capabilities and reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) from the Villages to I-15.
#291	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.5 On steep grades, passing lanes should be available to enhance capacity, efficiency and safety.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #228 (CP Mobility Policy 4) GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Mobility-Policy 4: Road alignment shall minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> A minor edit is needed to clarify the policy isn't recommending passing lanes on steep grades, but on roads that traverse steep grades. Proposed revision: On Mobility Element roads that traverse steep grades, consider the addition of passing lanes where it is safe to do so, in order to enhance capacity, efficiency, and safety.	Mobility - Road Design		
#292	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.6 Traffic lights should be synchronized to control traffic throughout (rate) and speed.		NA	<i>Recommend Revision</i> Synchronization is determined by the Department of Public Works and is intended to control traffic and speed.	Mobility - Intersection Control	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Should be removed	<i>Recommend Removal (reference to revision in public review matrix was in error)</i> The rationale would remain unchanged.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#293	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.7 Our road network must safely and efficiently accommodate realistic projected population growth.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal [not numbered]) <i>We are comparing this policy proposal to an existing goal because the proposal reads more like a goal.</i> GP: M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria	Public Facilities and Services-General Goal: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan Goal and in the referenced General Plan policies.	Mobility - Capacity		
#294	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.3.8 Right and left turn pockets added at key intersections are preferred versus adding lanes in order to improve carrying capacity and safety.	GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility - Capacity		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> With the shift to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for CEQA analysis, staff recommends reducing the references to road capacity. The proposed revision still covers the assumed intent of the policy. Proposed revision: The inclusion of right and left turn pockets at key intersections is preferred versus adding lanes, in order to improve operations and safety.
#295	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	NA	2.1.4 Connectivity	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Connectivity		
#296	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.4.1 The road system must be flexible, combining a sufficient network of public and private roads with a smaller number of Mobility Element Roads to achieve connectivity that permits alternative circulation choices for residents.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal [not numbered]) <i>We are comparing this policy proposal to an existing goal because the proposal reads more like a goal.</i> GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network	Mobility Goal (not numbered): A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal.	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#297	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.4.2 The system should serve Valley Center residents well, but not act as a conduit for growth.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal [not numbered]) <i>The County is comparing this policy proposal to an existing goal because the proposal reads more like a goal.</i> GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network	Mobility Goal (not numbered): A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal.	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#298	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.4.3 The system should help locals use local businesses – keep businesses here.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #28 (CP Land Use-Commercial Policy 3) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity	Land Use-Commercial- Policy 3: Ensure that all commercial areas are served by Mobility Element roads or local roads which meet the standards of the County of San Diego. Whenever possible, require new commercial development to provide secondary road access as opposed to access from major through roads.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This idea is addressed more clearly in the referenced existing Community Plan policy. This would have no impact as a policy, as there would not be a way to determine policy consistency.	Mobility - Connectivity		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#299	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.4.4 The system should provide easy access throughout the community, while preserving our open spaces.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal [not numbered]) <i>We are comparing this policy proposal to an existing goal because the proposal reads more like a goal.</i> GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network	Mobility Goal (not numbered): A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced existing Community Plan goal. This would have no impact as a policy, as there would not be a way to determine policy consistency.	Mobility - Connectivity		
#300	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.4.5 In the village(s), streets will connect the businesses using internal circulation roads, with no direct access to Major and Boulevard roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Mobility Policy 7) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 7: To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by the Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policy. We can't prohibit all direct access to roads classified as Major Roads and Boulevards in the Mobility Element, but these policies call for limiting that and the County Public Road standards require minimum separation of non-Mobility Element roads entering Mobility Element roads, as discussed in similar policy proposals.	Mobility - Connectivity		
#301	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	NA	2.1.5 MOBILITY ELEMENT ISSUES:	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Mobility Element Classifications		
#302	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.5.1 Our villages need a circulation network with enough roads and connectivity without using Major/Prime Arterial roads. For example, use one-way roads instead of 4-6 lanes roads to carry capacity in walkable villages.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Mobility Policy 7) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 7: To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is partially covered by the referenced Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies. A revision is proposed to address the last part. Proposed revision: Consider the use of one way internal circulation roads within Villages to improve traffic capacity.	Mobility - Capacity		
#303	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.5.2 Roads need to be designed based on realistic land use needs versus buildout capacity.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal [not numbered]) <i>We are comparing this policy proposal to an existing goal because the proposal reads more like a goal.</i> GP: M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria	Public Facilities and Services-General Goal: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan Goal and in the referenced General Plan policies.	Mobility - Capacity		
#304	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.5.3 Add new alternative roads that reduce traffic on existing roads and increase connectivity versus adding lanes to existing roads.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network County Public Road Standards County Capital Improvement Program 5 Year Plan		<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has concerns with the implications of a policy like this. A number of new alternative roads (New Road 3, New Road 14, New Road 19) were added as Valley Center Mobility Element alignments during the General Plan Update. These roads are very slow to come to fruition, as the County will often have to rely on many development projects to come in along the alignments, to pay for their portion of the road. The County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) more commonly addresses improvements to existing roads in their five-year plans, as opposed to taking on the construction of new roads. Maintaining rural character in road design is addressed in other existing and 2012 proposed policies.	Mobility - Road Capacity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#305	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.5.4 Improved local connectivity could reduce the amount of traffic serving dispersed facilities by offering alternative routes.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network		<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy, but as a rationale of why connectivity is optimal. In addition, see the input in the row for Item 304 above.	Mobility - Connectivity		
#306	Circulation and Mobility - Integrated Mobility and Access	Policy	2.1.5.5 Many existing roads cannot be widened or improved because of terrain limitations and residential properties preventing expansion of right-of-way.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design		<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy, it's just providing a reason why certain roads can't be widened.	Mobility - Connectivity		
#307	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.1 Each future subdivision needs to be assessed for its potential to provide linkages for long-term circulation improvement, while still allowing for a road design in keeping with a "rural neighborhood" character.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads County Subdivision Ordinance	Mobility-Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This item is being compared to the referenced policy in the Existing Community Plan, which is proposed for removal. A road design in keeping with a "rural neighborhood" character is addressed in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards, as it seems the community values the right of way design components outside of the travel lanes, detailed in that document. It is not clear on how one would establish consistency with a rural design for the travel lanes. More clarity would be needed there. In terms of connectivity, there needs to be a "nexus" in terms of how the subdivision application is connected to this and associated impacts/mitigation to off-site circulation. The County recommends providing this excerpt from the County Subdivision Ordinance to understand existing requirements. It reads, "A subdivision shall be designed so that a street or road easement providing access to a parcel located on a subdivision boundary, shall not terminate in a cul-de-sac when it is feasible for the street or road easement in an existing or proposed, adjacent subdivision. If there is no street or road easement on the adjacent property, the street or road easement shall be designed to allow a connection to an adjacent property, in case the adjacent property is developed in the future."	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#308	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.2 Developers be required to provide un-gated interconnections between roads rather than creating more unconnected networks of roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads County Subdivision Ordinance	Mobility-Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> See the reference to existing regulations (covering this issue) of the County Subdivision Ordinance in the row for item 307 above.	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#309	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.3.1 Add new alternative roads that reduce traffic on existing roads and increase connectivity versus adding lanes to existing roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility-Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network	Mobility-Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community. Mobility-Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is a repeat of Item 304 above (we are including the repeat in this matrix because it was repeated in the 2012 draft Mobility policies).	Mobility - Connectivity		
#310	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.3.2 Improved local connectivity could reduce the amount of traffic serving these dispersed facilities by offering alternative routes.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility-Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility-Policy 12) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network	Mobility-Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community. Mobility-Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is a repeat of item 305 above (we are including the repeat in this matrix because it was repeated in the 2012 draft Mobility policies).	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#311	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.3.3 Many existing roads cannot be widened or improved because of terrain limitations and residential properties preventing expansion of right-of-way.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility-Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #51 (CP Mobility Policy 4) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Mobility-Goal- A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community. Mobility Policy 4: Road alignment shall minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is a repeat of item 305 above (we are including the repeat in this matrix because it was repeated in the 2012 draft Mobility policies).	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#312	Circulation and Mobility - Local Public Road Network [Non-Mobility Element Roads]	Policy	2.2.3.4 The County needs a better way to convert private roads to public roads to allow connectivity and improve safety and .	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy.	Mobility - Connectivity	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#313	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	NA	2.3.1 Access	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Access		
#314	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.1.1 Additional routes are provided to reduce congestion, spread traffic, and allow alternate evacuation routes in case of fire or other emergency.	GP: M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads		<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County is not clear on how a policy consistency determination would be made for this.	Mobility - Access	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#315	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.1.2 Temporary “emergency only” evacuation routes must be developed.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #63 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal) GP: S-3.5 Access Roads Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal- 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. Public Facilities and Services-General Goal: 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.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> There is concern among public safety officials, including Fire Chiefs with designating evacuation routes with signage, as conditions of particular events can make certain routes unsafe. Public safety officials need to be able to direct evacuations based on the characteristics of the incident, weather conditions, road capacity, etc. The Community Planning Group's Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee has been working with VCFPD Chief Napier, County Fire Authority staff, and Sheriff staff to research issues associated with evacuation, including emergency only private roads. While there will be concerns with liability, based on individual road easement situations, we can recommend the revision below. Proposed revision: The same revision is proposed for Items 323 and 522 in this matrix, that address the same issue. Of course only one occurrence would be needed. Coordinate with property owners of private roads and continue to investigate the potential for community access easements on private roads, for use in emergency situations.	Mobility - Evacuation		
#316	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Goal	2.3.2 Evacuation Plan	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section. The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written a bit different than other sections, including the lack of goal statements. Once the County goes through a process of consolidating goals and policies, the County can determine groupings and whether additional goals are needed for policies that are being carried forward.	Mobility - Evacuation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#317	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.2.1 Evacuation routes need to be identified, followed by community education and appropriate signage.	GP: S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) note primary and secondary community access and evacuation routes in section B.1.1. However, there is concern among public safety officials, including Fire Chiefs with designating official evacuation routes with signage, as conditions of particular events can make certain routes unsafe. Public safety officials need to be able to direct evacuations based on the characteristics of the incident, weather conditions, road capacity, etc. The Community Planning Group's Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee has been working with VCFPD Chief Napier, County Fire Authority staff, and Sheriff staff to research issues associated with evacuation, including emergency only private roads. Proposed revision: The same revision is proposed for item 521 in this matrix. Only one occurrence is needed. Continue to update evacuation information in Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs), while maintaining guidance on the need for maintaining flexibility for emergency responders, in directing traffic in response to specific emergency events.	Mobility - Evacuation		
#318	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.2.2 All areas of VC are able to evacuate during emergencies.	GP: S-3.5 Access Roads Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There would be no way to determine policy consistency with this proposal. Evacuation is addressed in the CWPPs and in Fire Protection Plans (FPPs) for projects. Access requirements in the Consolidated Fire Code were developed in consideration of evacuations, in addition to access for fire protection equipment.	Mobility - Evacuation		
#319	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Goal	2.3.3 Safety	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section. The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written a bit different than other sections, including the lack of goal statements. Once the County goes through a process of consolidating goals and policies, the County can determine groupings and whether additional goals are needed for policies that are being carried forward.	Goal		
#320	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.3.1 Fire Department friendly gates are required on all gated private roads.	County Consolidated Fire Code	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already required per County Consolidated Fire Code Section 503.6, which is applicable to the Valley Center and Deer Springs Fire Protection Districts.	Mobility - Evacuation	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#321	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	NA	2.3.4 ISSUES:	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	N/A		
#322	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.4.1 Locked gates that prevent Valley Center residents egress during emergency evacuations.	County Fire Codes	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy. See item 319 above.	Mobility - Evacuation		
#323	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.4.2 Few fire exits in emergency. Establish "emergency only" legal access to grove roads in cooperation with DPW, Fire District and Farm Bureau as part of the evacuation plan. Private property liability issues should be investigated.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #63 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal [not numbered]) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal [not numbered]) GP: S-3.5 Access Roads Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal (not numbered): 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. Public Facilities and Services-General Goal (not numbered): 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.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> There is concern among public safety officials, including Fire Chiefs with designating evacuation routes with signage, as conditions of particular events can make certain routes unsafe. Public safety officials need to be able to direct evacuations based on the characteristics of the incident, weather conditions, road capacity, etc. The Community Planning Group's Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee has been working with VCFPD Chief Napier, County Fire Authority staff, and Sheriff staff to research issues associated with evacuation, including emergency only private roads. While there will be concerns with liability, based on individual road easement situations, we can recommend the revision below. Proposed revision: The same revision is proposed for Items 315 and 444 in this matrix, that address the same issue. Of course only one occurrence would be needed. Coordinate with property owners of private roads and continue to investigate the potential for community access easements on private roads, for use in emergency situations.	Emergency Evacuation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#324	Circulation and Mobility - Fire Access/Egress Routes	Policy	2.3.4.3 Development of staging areas at several locations to accommodate emergency vehicles.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Mobility-Policy 7) GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads S-3.5 Access Roads	Mobility-Policy 7: To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There would be no way to determine policy consistency with this proposal. This issue is addressed more clearly in Item 397 of this matrix, which is proposed for inclusion with a minor revision.	Safety - Staging Areas		
#325	Circulation and Mobility - Local Transit	Goal	2.4.1 Casinos increase financial contributions toward traffic mitigation and mass transit.	GP: M-3 Transportation Facility Development M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County can't bring forward policy directives for sovereign nations associated with tribal reservations. In addition (even if that wasn't the case), this wouldn't work for the long-term scope of the community plan, as applying it would bring the question of what level it needs to be increased over. The County has a process of negotiations with tribes and obtaining mitigation for impacts on County facilities (including roads) associated with casino development or expansion.	Mobility - Mitigation		
#326	Circulation and Mobility - Local Transit	Goal	2.4.2 Public and School Transportation.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section. The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written a bit different than other sections, including the lack of goal statements. Once we go through a process of consolidating goals and policies, The County can determine groupings and whether additional goals are needed for policies that are being carried forward.	Mobility - Transit		
#327	Circulation and Mobility - Local Transit	Policy	2.4.2.1 Public transportation options are increased with a smaller mini bus type transit or van pools to run within villages and to schools.	GP: M-5.1 Regional Coordination M-8 Public Transit System	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Following the goal of consolidation for a more impactful plan, this revision addresses one of the components in Item 328 Policy Proposal below. Proposed revision: Coordinate with the North County Transit District and SANDAG to improve transit options for Valley Center, such as increased use of mini-buses (NCTD FLEX System), and transit amenities, such as covered bus stop shelters.	Mobility - Transit		
#328	Circulation and Mobility - Local Transit	Policy	2.4.2.2 Areas are dedicated for school bus, covered mass transit shelters, pick-up and wait, and park and ride.	GP: M-5.1 Regional Coordination M-8 Public Transit System	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The shelters are covered in Item 327 above, so the County would have a consolidated policy on transit improvements sought. Proposed revision: Seek opportunities for the development of areas dedicated to school bus pick-up and areas for park and ride lots.	Mobility - Transit		
#329	Circulation and Mobility - Pedestrian	Policy	2.5.1Pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic are safely separated from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility Policy 13) GP: M-3.1 Public Road Right-of-Way M-11.7 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design	Mobility Policy 13: Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> It's not clear if this is suggesting a desire for only Class I bike facilities (completely separate bike path) or Class IV (cycle track on the road with a physical barrier separation). Or, is this suggesting only the Class III bike route (not separate lane for bikes) should be prohibited? Additional specificity will be necessary to provide any impact for the policy, as safety for all users is of course already a top priority in road design.	Mobility - Road Design		
#330	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	NA	2.6.1 Access	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.			

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#331	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.1.1 A policy be developed to add new connecting trails and paths to the CMTP as development occurs.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #98 (CP Conservation-Policy 17) GP: COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails Community Trails Master Plan	Conservation Policy 17: During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> As the text indicates, this is not exactly a policy proposal. This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy. As stakeholders can see, a revision is proposed to that existing policy as follows, "Ensure the continued implementation of the planned Valley Center trails network within the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), by requiring trail easement dedication on project sites that contain a planned trail alignment from the CTMP.	Mobility - Trails		
#332	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.1.2 Development projects are required to plan, dedicate and construct internal trails that integrate with the community's trails master plan to increase overall trail connectivity.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #98 (CP Conservation-Policy 17) GP: COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails	Conservation Policy 17: During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan and there is no need for a policy requiring this, as it is already required. Adding new trails outside of CTMP alignments is of course not feasible in small developments. Section 81.402u of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided.	Mobility - Trails	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#333	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.1.3 Non-motorized local travel is promoted	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility-Policy 13) GP: M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks	Mobility-Policy 13: Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced.	Mobility - Trails	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#334	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.1.4 Bike lanes are added along existing roads as shown on the San Diego County Regional Bike Trails Map.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility Policy 13) GP: M-11.3 Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element Valley Center Mobility Element Network (part of the General Plan) County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 13: Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	<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.	Mobility - Bike Lanes	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#335	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.1.5 Bike lanes should be added within 1 mile of schools, (i.e. Fruitvale and Lilac Schools).	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility Policy 13) GP: M-11.3 Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element Valley Center Mobility Element Network (part of the General Plan) County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 13: Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Interested stakeholders should review the latest Valley Center Mobility Element Network map (updated with the adoption of the County Active Transportation Plan in 2018), linked at the bottom of the General Plan web page - https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/generalplan.html Each of the Mobility Element alignments (existing and planned) calls for either a Class II bike land or Class IV bike way (physical barrier separating the bike lane from car traffic). Specific examples near schools include: Lilac School/Class II bike lane along Lilac Rd.; Valley Center Elementary School and Valley Center High School/Class II bike lane along Cole Grade Road; and Valley Center Primary School/Class II bike lane along Fruitvale Road. Proposed revision: Updates to the Mobility Element Network for Valley Center should continue to apply either Class II or Class IV bike lanes/bike ways to Mobility Element alignments. Prioritize bicycle safety considerations near schools.	Mobility - Bike Lanes		
#336	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	NA	2.6.2 Design Standards	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.			

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#337	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.2.1 Type D Special Pathways should be on one side only, consistent with our Trails Master Plan. ROW on pathways should be 15 feet width, the extra 5 feet ROW coming from a reduction on the other side of the road.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #18 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 5) Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards Community Trails Master Plan	Land Use-Residential Policy 5: Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid "urbanizing" improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center's Community Right of Way Development Standards	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is addressed in the VC Community Right of Way Development Standards as well as in the Community Trails Master Plan (Goal: SG 4).	Mobility - Right-of-Way Design		
#338	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.2.2 Bike paths should be included in shoulders.	Public Road Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> County Public Road Standards includes information regarding the design of bike paths such as the different requirements for the various Classes of bike lanes/bike ways (from a separate right of way designed bike path to a shared pedestrian/motorist bike route). It is not necessary to include bike lane design standards in the Community Plan.	Mobility - Bike Lanes		
#339	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.2.3 All roads that are designated for a bike lane need to have at least the minimum area on each side of the road, as shown in County Road Standards.	GP: Mobility Element Network Classifications (necessary right-of-way considerations) County Public Road Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that calls for adhering to existing applicable requirements of another ordinance or regulation. This is covered in the County Public Road Standards.	Mobility - Bike Lanes		
#340	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.2.4 Equestrian trails should be set back from Mobility Element roads for safety, where feasible.	Public Road Standards County Trails Master Plan	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the County Public Road Standards and the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP; Section 7 - Design and Construction Guidelines)	Mobility - Trails		
#341	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.3.1 We need a method to prevent motorized use (motorbikes, ATVs) of trails and pathways.	Community Trails Master Plan	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Per the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), all trails in the CTMP are intended for non-motorized use. This is not written as a policy, so we have a suggested revision. Proposed Revision: Signage should be provided at trail and pathway staging areas and other main trail entry points to note that motorized use is not allowed.	Mobility - Trails		
#342	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.3.2 Crime and security concerns on trails.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not written as a policy proposal.	Mobility - Trails		
#343	Circulation and Mobility - Bicycle and Trails	Policy	2.6.3.3 Prevention of the placement of utilities in pathway/trail rights-of-way.	Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards County Public Road Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County Public Road Standards provides guidance on placement of above ground utilities which must be placed a minimum of 5 feet from back of the road curb or berm or on the opposite side of the street from the pathway and that additional right-of-way may be required to provide a clear, unobstructed pathway. The Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards also covers the issue of appropriate utility placement in Section 3.3.4.	Mobility - Trails		
#344	Circulation and Mobility - Aviation	Policy	2.7.1The airports are kept small and private.	GP: M-7 Airport Facilities M-7.1 Meeting Airport Needs	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This would have inconsistency issues with the General Plan goal and policy referenced.	Mobility - Airports		
#345	Circulation and Mobility - Trip Reduction Strategies	Policy	2.8.1 Centralization of these types of facilities is encouraged to minimize the length and number of trips within the planning area.	GP: M-7.1 Meeting Airport Needs S-15.1 Land Use Compatibility S-15.4 Private Airstrip and Heliport Location	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The intro text in this section of the draft before this policy proposal refers to schools, libraries, parks, and fire stations. There are already these types of facilities centrally located; however, the population of Valley Center is widely dispersed and it's optimal to have schools, parks and fire stations within close proximity to populations outside the Villages, when feasible.	Mobility - Trip Reduction		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#346	Circulation and Mobility - Trip Reduction Strategies	Policy	2.8.2.1 There is heavy traffic going to the schools for AM and PM "rush hour". School district should encourage more students to ride school buses, establish student "car pools" and establish more drop-off points to alleviate peak-hour congestion and improve traffic flow at the school sites.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> While of course the County doesn't have authority over school district operations, a policy like this could be included in the community plan to reflect needs and provide information the school district can use in their planning processes. While most of the components would work, we have concern with calling for more drop off/pick up points at a single school site. Schools typically want to consolidate drop off/pick up areas or only have one to maximize the safety of students. If students are dropped off at numerous spots around the school, there is more potential for traffic-pedestrian conflicts. Proposed revision: Coordinate with the Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District to encourage more students/families to utilize school buses and car pools, in order to reduce traffic congestion around schools during the morning and afternoon drop off and pick up times.	Mobility - Trip Reduction	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is a correction of the intended initial staff recommendation reference (the removal recommendation was in error). The rationale and proposed revision would remain the same.
#347	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	NA	2.9.1 Design Standards	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.			
#348	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	Policy	2.9.1.1 Parking regulations serve community needs, enhance community character, and are consistent with the Community Plan.	County Public Road Standards Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is written more like a goal, but the County is not recommending inclusion of the underlying policies. As a policy, it would have little impact, as it would be open to interpretation on policy consistency. Interested stakeholders can review the types of parking expected (or not allowed) on certain Mobility Element alignments and local roads per the County Public Road Standards and detailed parking regulations in the Zoning Ordinance to determine if there issues they would like to see addressed in future updates of these. It will be problematic to have separate parking regulations for only Valley Center.	Mobility - Parking		
#349	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	Policy	2.9.1.2 Emergency off-street parking is available in the unpaved shoulders outside the villages.	County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The shoulder widths and design are covered in the County Public Road Standards and the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards. Beyond these designated widths, it doesn't make sense for the community plan to dictate where cars can be parked in an emergency situation.	Mobility - Parking		
#350	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	NA	2.9.2 Access	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Goal		
#351	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	Policy	2.9.2.1 Adequate off-street parking should be provided at school bus stops.	County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795	NA	<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.	Mobility - Parking	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#352	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	Policy	2.9.2.2 Encourage the development and enhancement of park and ride facilities. Provide park and ride facilities in South and North Villages and other key intersections.	GP: M-8.5 Improved Transit Facilities M-8.6 Park and Ride Facilities	NA	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> The County has covered this in the policy proposed for inclusion in row 328 of this matrix. This goes beyond the General Plan policy referenced (specifics for Valley Center), but it will be helpful to consider realistic expectations in terms of how many park and ride facilities are feasible in Valley Center, with the cost of land.	Mobility - Parking	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#353	Circulation and Mobility - Parking	Policy	2.9.2.3 Paved on-street parking is available where large public gatherings may occur, such as the schools and community center.	GP: M-10.1 Parking Capacity M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity M-10.3 Maximize On-Street Parking County Public Road Standards Sections 6750-6795	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced.	Mobility - Parking	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#354	Circulation and Mobility - Other Topics/Issues	Policy	2.11.1The General Plan Mobility Element needs to look forward to the future by allowing and encouraging new technologies and designs that may require and be co-located with existing infrastructure.	GP: M-9.1 Transportation Systems Management	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County is proposing a revision to reflect a community plan policy. Proposed Revision: Encourage the application of new technologies and design that may be co-located with existing or future infrastructure improvements.	Mobility - New Technologies		
#355	Circulation and Mobility - Other Topics/Issues	Policy	2.11.2 Revenue from TransNet (funds generated by County Sales Tax) should be aggressively sought as a source with which to bring about needed large-scale capital improvements.	GP: M-8.1 Maximize transit Service Opportunities M-11.5 Funding for Bicycle Network Improvements County TransNet Program	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This recommendation is in the interest of trying to develop a consolidated list of impactful policies. Though SANDAG controls TransNet funding, seeking these TransNet funds to help fund various County transportation projects has been ongoing and will continue. There is no need for a policy. Part of the Community Plan Update funding comes from a SANDAG grant, which includes some TransNet funding.	Mobility - Road Funding		
#356	Circulation and Mobility - Other Topics/Issues	Policy	2.11.3 The community will prioritize how the Valley Center TIF fees will be spent.	Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This will not always be feasible and not all transportation facilities are TIF-eligible.	Mobility - Road Funding		
#357	Circulation and Mobility - Other Topics/Issues	Policy	2.11.4 Planning Group to be notified on all road plans no later than the 30% design stage.	Board Policy I-1	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Board Policy on Community Planning Groups (I-1) details specific policies for planning group notifications. The Community Plan does not include policies related to the CPG.	Mobility - Road Design		
#358	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Goal	2.12.1 Non-Village Design Standards	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section. The Mobility section of these stakeholder-proposed policies was written a bit different than other sections, including the lack of goal statements. Once the County goes through a process of consolidating goals and policies, the County can determine groupings and whether additional goals are needed for policies that are being carried forward.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#359	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.1 Decomposed granite or alternative natural materials be used for walking/jogging paths in lieu of concrete sidewalks.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #58 (CP Mobility Policy 11) Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 11: Implement community right-of-way development standards for the Valley Center Planning Area to achieve a rural character and alternative features within the shoulder portion of dedicated right-of-way. Such improvements will identify the community's desire to modify County development standards permitted by Board of Supervisors Policy J-36. These standards shall include: a. Provide decomposed granite walking/jogging paths in lieu of sidewalks; b. Where edge of pavement barrier is necessary, use mountable asphalt dike (small dike); and c. Provide a bike lane within the "travel way".	<i>Recommend Removal.</i> The Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards direct where decomposed granite is appropriate and where sidewalks are appropriate. It's possible these policy proposals were prepared before adoption of that document.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#360	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.2 Urban style concrete curbs and gutters are prohibited. Swales, berms, rolled curbs, and small dikes will be used on the road edge.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #58 (CP Mobility Policy 11) Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 11: Implement community right-of-way development standards for the Valley Center Planning Area to achieve a rural character and alternative features within the shoulder portion of dedicated right-of-way. Such improvements will identify the community's desire to modify County development standards permitted by Board of Supervisors Policy J-36. These standards shall include: a. Provide decomposed granite walking/jogging paths in lieu of sidewalks; b. Where edge of pavement barrier is necessary, use mountable asphalt dike (small dike); and c. Provide a bike lane within the "travel way".	<i>Recommend Removal.</i> The Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards direct the appropriate road edge treatments based on location. It's possible these policy proposals were prepared before adoption of that document.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#361	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.3 New roads and road improvements should be designed to minimize impacts on multiple species.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #85 (CP Conservation Policy 4) GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design DPW Policies County Public Road Standards North County MSCP	Conservation Policy 4: Protect riparian habitat and other types of wetlands from loss or modification by dedicating open space easements with adequate buffer zones and by other means to avoid impacts from adjacent land uses. Road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat should be minimized and only allowed when alternatives have been considered and determined infeasible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Impact mitigation and context sensitive road design is included as part of the General Plan and the existing Community Plan. Roads are to be designed and located to minimize impact to significant biological resources and compatible with the local terrain.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#362	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.4 Intersection turn radii shall be such that they safely accommodate agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy referenced, which the County is recommending for inclusion (to retain).	Mobility - Road Design		
#363	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.5 Road alignment should minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #51 (CP Mobility Policy 4) GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Mobility Policy 4: Road alignment shall minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy referenced, which the County is recommending for inclusion (to retain).	Mobility - Road Design		
#364	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.6 Design is selected to minimize grading impacts yet to maintain safety and capacity.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy B) GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards	Land Use-Residential 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roads that follow topography and minimize grading;• Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography;• Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain;• Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets;• Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies referenced.	Mobility - Road Design		
#365	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.7 Road size and right-of-way is minimized, yet achieves safe and efficient conditions.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standard	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the General Plan policies referenced. The County has so many unfunded road improvement needs, it wouldn't make sense to construct wider roads, when a two-lane can safely and efficiently accommodate traffic.	Mobility - Road Design		
#366	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.8 Significant existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" and medians of all public roads should be transplanted, if practical, or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #53 (CP Mobility Policy 6) GP: COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development Valley Center Design Guidelines County Public Road Standards Community Right of Way Development Standards	Mobility Policy 6: Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is almost identical to the Existing Community Plan Policy, but that one is recommended for removal. This type of issue is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right of Way Development Standards.	Mobility - Road Design		
#367	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.1.9 Roads near High School are redesigned for safety and prevent medians from being used as passing lanes.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services - General Goal) GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design M-4.6 Interjurisdictional Coordination County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Cole Grade Road Improvement Project will include safety improvements near the high school. The Environmental Impact Report has now been certified. Right of way acquisition negotiations and other actions will be moving forward in 2020, prior to start of construction. Therefore, this is already covered and there is no need for a policy.	Mobility - Road Design		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#368	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	NA	2.12.2 Village Road Standards	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	Mobility - Villages		
#369	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.1 Significant existing trees and vegetation within the Villages, or any village designation private roads, will also comply with the public roads policy of transplanting, if practical, or replacing existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way".	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #53 (CP Mobility Policy 6) GP: COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development Valley Center Design Guidelines Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Mobility Policy 6: Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is nearly identical to an existing policy in the Community Plan that is also recommended to be removed. This type of issue is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right to Way Development Standards.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#370	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.2 Speed limits within Villages are lower.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) GP: M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards Road Design Manual California Manual for Setting Speed Limits	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Speed limits are set per California Vehicle Code 22349, and must be based on an Engineering and Traffic Survey (E&TS). When speed limits are lowered without an E&TS, with some exceptions, speeding violations issue to drivers may be thrown out in court.	Mobility - Villages		
#371	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.3 Once in the Village, the public should be able to move between their stops without needing to drive.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal) GP: M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Mobility Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced General Plan Policy M-4.1.	Mobility - Walkable Villages		
#372	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.4 Parking areas are visually de-emphasized in Villages.	GP: M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity Valley Center Design Guidelines Parking Design Manual County Public Road Standards	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> As this applies specifically to design and site layout (parking areas) within the Villages, it would have to be addressed in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can provide this as a recommendation to carry forward in the Design Guidelines update (covered in the existing Valley Center Design Guidelines).	Mobility - Parking		
#373	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.5 In the villages, shopping is enhanced by the development of bike and walking trails.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #29 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 3) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) GP: M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards Community Trails Master Plan Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards General Plan Mobility Element Network	Land Use - Commercial Policy 3: Commercial and civic uses shall be located in areas which have adequate roads for circulation and provide easy and safe multi-purpose pathways and trails. Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This doesn't read like a policy and the County is not clear on the intent. There are several existing and planned bike lanes and trails within the Villages. There are also several policies in the General Plan, existing Community Plan, and 2012 proposals promoting pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements.	Mobility - Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements		
#374	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.6 Bus stops and car pool areas are required	GP: M-8.1 Maximize Transit Service Opportunities M-8.4 Transit Amenities M-9.3 Preferred Parking Mobility Element Network County Public Road Standards	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is not clear on where and under what circumstances these are required. The referenced General Plan Policy M-8.1 covers this issue with direction for County coordination with transit provision agencies to maximize transit opportunities and facilities	Mobility - Transit		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#375	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.7 Road alignment minimizes the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #51 (CP Mobility Policy 4) M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 4: Road alignment shall minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan Policy.	Mobility - Road Design		
#376	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.8 Reduce road size and right-of-way yet achieve safe and efficient conditions.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) GP: M-1.3 Treatment of High-Volume Roadways M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	Recommend Removal This policy is not clear, especially in comparison to all of the right of way elements desired in other policy proposals in this section. Minimizing necessary road widening is covered in the General Plan policies referenced. The County has so many unfunded road improvement needs, it wouldn't make sense to construct wider roads, when a two-lane can safely and efficiently accommodate traffic.	Mobility - Road Design		
#377	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.9 Curb treatment may be concrete.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #18 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 5) GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Land Use - Residential Policy 5: Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid “urbanizing” improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center’s Community Right of Way Development Standards.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards and in the County Public Road Standards	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#378	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.10 Sidewalks should be more organic than Portland concrete, such as colored, stamped concrete.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #18 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 5) GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Land Use - Residential Policy 5: Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid “urbanizing” improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center’s Community Right of Way Development Standards.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Acceptable sidewalk/pathway types by location are covered in the Community Right of Way Development Standards.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#379	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.11 On-street parking in residential areas should be minimized.	GP: M-10.1 Parking Capacity M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity M-10.6 On-Street Parking County Public Road Standards Zoning Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Introduces repetitive policies. See referenced General Plan policies related to parking, especially Policy M-10.6, which speaks to the advantages of limiting on-street parking outside of Villages.	Mobility - Right of Way Design		
#380	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.12 The Village road network should integrate and connect to the existing roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility Policy 12) GP: M-1.1 Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Mobility Element County Road Standards	Mobility Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Introduces repetitive policies. See referenced General Plan policies related to an integrated street network, especially Policy M-1.2 and M-4.2.	Mobility - Villages		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#381	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.11 Existing traffic signals at Mobility Element roads should be maximized before adding new ones.	GP: M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria County Public Road Standards Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (MUTCD)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Development projects adding a significant number of trips to an intersection are required to submit a signal warrant analysis as they get to certain stages of pre-occupancy for residences or non-residential buildings. The evaluation of these signal warrant analyses and requiring the construction of traffic signals or other intersection controls is governed by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) of the Federal Highway Administration. The MUTCD defines the standards used by road managers nationwide to install and maintain traffic control devices on all public streets, highways, bikeways, and private roads open to public travel. Therefore, it wouldn't be appropriate to have a community plan policy on when a traffic light is needed.	Mobility - Intersection Control		
#382	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.2.12 The road network is able to carry capacity with low speeds without using wide roads. One-way roads should be considered.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Mobility Policy 7) GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads County Public Road Standards	Mobility Policy 7: To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is partially covered by the referenced Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies. In addition, a similar proposal is found in Item 302 of this matrix. The same revision below is proposed for that Item 302 and this proposal. Proposed revision: Consider the use of one way internal circulation roads within Villages to improve traffic capacity.	Mobility - Capacity		
#383	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	NA	2.12.3 ISSUES:	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This seems to be a header or placeholder for the section.	NA		
#384	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.11.1 Within the residential village area, wide side walks to encourage pedestrian traffic.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #47 (CP Mobility Goal) GP: M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads County Public Road Standards Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Mobility Goal: A circulation system that achieves the combined objectives of connectivity and safety for all users (automobiles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians), and also preserves the rural character of the community.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards and in the County Public Road Standards.	Mobility - Sidewalks		
#385	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.11.2 Slow traffic in commercial areas with traffic calming such as shade trees in areas such as Valley Center Road.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #52 (CP Mobility Policy 5) GP: M-1.3 Treatment of High-Volume Roadways M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Mobility Network Element	Mobility Policy 5: Required roadside and median landscaping shall reflect standards as outlined in the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Roadside landscaping is covered in the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards.	Mobility - Traffic Calming		
#386	Circulation and Mobility - Road Design Standards	Policy	2.12.11.3 Roundabouts should be considered to keep traffic moving in Villages.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #50 (CP Mobility Policy 3) GP: M-1.3 Treatment of High-Volume Roadways M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Mobility Network Element	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated. Mobility Policy 3: Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Roundabouts are currently being considered for Valley Center Road as part of the Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan project.	Mobility - Intersection Control		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#387	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Goal	Goal COS 1.1 Minimal soil erosion incidental to development and preservation of Valley Center’s unique soil characteristics.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #78 (CP Conservation Goal) GP: COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains COS-5.3 Downslope Protection LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts Regulatory Ordinance	Conservation Goal: Minimize soil erosion incidental to development in order to preserve Valley Center’s unique soil characteristics.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is essentially the same as an existing Community Plan goal, which is recommended for inclusion (to remain).	Conservation - Erosion		
#388	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	Policy COS 1.1.1 Protect raw land from grading or other disturbances prior to approval and permit processes.	GP: COS-5.3 Downslope Protection Grading Ordinance Watershed Protection Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in existing regulations, as the Grading Ordinance has several requirements for protecting exposed soils from erosion. See Grading Ordinance Sections 87.101d, 87.208b7, and 87.414.	Conservation - Erosion		
#389	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	Policy COS 1.1.2. Prohibit grading from changing the natural land contours, in order to reduce erosion and siltation	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #92 (CP Conservation Policy 11) GP: LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design COS-5.3 Downslope Protection Grading Ordinance Watershed Protection Ordinance	Conservation Policy 11: Grading associated with discretionary permits shall not change natural land contours and shall be minimized to reduce erosion and siltation and damage to downstream properties.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Though all grading includes some change to natural land contours, this text is otherwise almost the same as GP Policy LU-6.9.	Conservation - Grading		
#390	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	Policy COS 1.1.3 Require landscaping to prevent erosion on graded sites and, if the area is contiguous with undisturbed wildlife habitat, plans must include re-vegetation with native plant species.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #90 (CP Conservation Policy 9) GP: LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management COS-1.9 Invasive Species COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement Watershed Protection Ordinance	Conservation Policy 9: Landscaping should be required to prevent erosion on graded sites and, if the area is contiguous with undisturbed wildlife habitat, the plan should include revegetation with native plant species.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> As seen in the reference, this is almost the same as the existing policy. Staff recommends maintaining the existing policy to cover this, using the "should" language for landscaping (from the existing policy), as not all graded sites require landscaping to prevent erosion control. The Grading Ordinance requires this type of planting for the face of cut and fill slopes, in excess of three feet in vertical height.	Conservation - Grading		
#391	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Goal	COS 1.2 Protection and encouragement of agricultural activity and agri-business.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #42 (CP Land Use-Agricultural Goal) GP: LU-7 Agricultural Conservation COS-6 Sustainable Agricultural Industry	Land Use-Agricultural Goal: Preserve and enhance existing and future agricultural uses in the Valley Center Community Plan.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the existing CP Goal referenced, which is recommended for inclusion (to remain).	Agriculture		
#392	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.1 Encourage the formation of Agricultural Preserves and “Agricultural Conservation Easements” in areas with active agricultural operations and in locations that will be optimal for future agricultural production.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #44 (CP Land Use-Agricultural Policy 2) GP: LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation	Land Use-Agricultural Policy 2: Encourage the formation of Agricultural Preserves in areas with active agricultural operations and in locations that will be optimal for future agricultural production.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff proposes a revision to the current policy and a similar 2012 proposed policy in this matrix, to reflect the current emphasis on the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program. Proposed revision (same revision proposed for the existing CP policy referenced and another similar policy proposal in this matrix): Support the continued promotion of the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program and outreach to eligible property owners. Encourage property owner participation in this program in order to preserve agriculture in Valley Center.	Agriculture		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#393	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.2 Allow residential development only where shown in subareas on the CP Land Use Map which would NOT have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses. Support the "Right to Farm Ordinance" and require any residential project that adversely affects existing adjoining agricultural uses to mitigate the identified impact.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #45 (GP Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3) GP: COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources	Land Use-Agricultural Policy 3: Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff recommends removal of the existing policy referenced. The County cannot prohibit residential development in areas zoned for it when they have addressed impacts to significant agricultural resources in accordance with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Agricultural Resources. GP Policy COS-6.2 is one of the longest, most detailed policies in the General Plan, discussing measures to protect agricultural operations. Stakeholders should review that policy, which of course applies to Valley Center and all other unincorporated communities. Per the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources, direct impacts to agricultural resources occur when the site contains significant agricultural resources as determined by the Local Agricultural Resource Assessment (LARA) model and the project would convert agricultural resources that meet the soil quality criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The guidelines also go into detail on what would constitute indirect and cumulative impacts. Mitigating direct impacts typically requires onsite preservation via conservation easements or limited building zone (LBZ) easements, or purchase of an offsite agricultural conservation easement (County PACE program). In addition, agricultural resources are one of the resources that can be preserved through the Conservation Subdivision program. See the referenced documents for additional information on all the County regulations and programs to preserve agriculture.	Agriculture	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#394	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.3 Encourage development of combined compatible agricultural and residential uses, and the establishment of "green" small family owned farms and vineyards.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This repeats two policies recommended in the "Land Use - Agribusiness" section of this matrix and combines them into one. The County has addressed those two policy proposals there.	Agriculture		
#395	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	1.2.4 Limit intensive commercial livestock operations and types of agricultural operations detrimental to the residential population, such as dairy, pig and poultry farms, and require substantial buffers for new residential development from existing intensive operations.	Zoning Ordinance Section 3100-3120	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Using the word "limit" in a policy without additional guidance can lead to different interpretations and inconsistent implementation. These types of uses are already limited by the Zoning Animal Designator, and even where allowed, additional requirements apply per the Zoning Ordinance sections referenced. Below the County is trying to maintain the rest of the policy proposal. Proposed revision: Buffer new residential development from existing intensive commercial livestock operations, such as dairy, pig and poultry farms.	Agriculture		
#396	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.5 Encourage public/private partnerships to provide recreation, open space, and multi-use non-motorized trails in the agriculture/development interface to implement or enlarge the Community Open Space Plan and/or the Community Trails Master Plan. Incorporate provisions to reduce or eliminate potential liability or other frustration of the agricultural operation, while protecting recreational users from injuries, such as from pesticide spraying.	Community Open Space Plan Community Trails Master Plan	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The second half of the proposed policy is unclear in its desired outcome or methodology to achieve. Staff recommends the revision below. Proposed revision: Encourage public/private partnerships to provide recreation, open space, and multi-use non-motorized trails in the agriculture/development interface.	Agriculture	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#397	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.6 Strongly encourage Community Gardens in the Villages. They will encourage older residents transitioning from larger semi-rural and rural parcels to remain in their community, have ready access to a pleasurable pastime and promote healthier eating.	Zoning Ordinance (most zones allow agricultural uses by right).	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The policy is beneficial, but does not need to include extended text specifying benefits to senior citizens, as citizens of all ages benefit from community gardens. Recommend revision by shortening and removing age-specific text. Proposed revision: Promote healthier eating and access to agricultural opportunities by encouraging community gardens in the Villages.	Agriculture		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#398	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.7 Provide convenient commercial agricultural supply and support facilities away from other Village commercial uses.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #33 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 8)	Land Use-Commercial Policy 8: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is contrary to existing policies (including the referenced policy in this row) and other 2012 proposed policies. Commercial uses that are allowed per the property's zone will require Site Plan review or satisfactory completion of the Design Review Checklist process, to ensure consistency with the Design Guidelines, but not for debate or required findings on the appropriateness of the use on the property. The County doesn't have separate commercial zones that allow agricultural supply/support, but not other commercial operations. Many agriculture tourism uses do not require a commercial zone. See Item 248 and a policy proposal in Item 254.	Agriculture		
#399	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.8 Seek public/private partnerships to locate farmer's markets near high population areas, and with high visibility for local residents, tourists, and casino visitors.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Agriculture		
#400	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.9 Support and aggressively educate the community about Board Policy I-133 and the "Farming Program Plan"	Board of Supervisors Policy I-133	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This Board of Supervisors Policy is to develop and implement programs designed to support and encourage farming in San Diego County. The existing CP and 2012 proposed policies already cover this and the County has several ongoing initiatives to encourage and support agriculture. The Draft North County MSCP proposes measures to encourage agricultural conservation and preserve sensitive species within agricultural areas with high habitat values, but it's still a draft plan.	Agriculture		
#401	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.10 Encourage and aggressively educate the community about the "Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Program"	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This could be revised into one policy generally covering educating the community on programs providing incentives for agriculture; however, as discussed above, the County is already actively promoting many incentive programs.	Agriculture		
#402	Conservation and Open Space - Agricultural Soils and Production	Policy	COS 1.2.11 Support agricultural best practices and mitigation measures to prevent invasive non-native vegetation spreading into the native habitat.	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources, Agricultural Resources	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Agriculture		
#403	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Goal	COS 2.1 Preservation of native vegetation and wildlife habitat	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #77 (CP Conservation Goal) GP: COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment	Conservation Goal: Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i>	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#404	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	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.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #86 (CP Conservation Policy 5) GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design LU-6.3 Conservation Oriented Project Design Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources	Conservation Policy 5: 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.	<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.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#405	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.2 Preserve the native habitat by dedication of open space easements and other means that will ensure their long-term protection and survival. Make acquisition of land within the MSCP PAMA and increasing the size of Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) a very high priority. Aggressively work with the county to adopt ordinances requiring their protection and enhancement.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #87 (CP Conservation Policy 6) GP: COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System LU-6.3 Conservation Oriented Project Design Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources	Conservation Policy 6: Preserve the native habitat of sensitive plants and animals by dedication of open space easements and other means that will ensure their long term protection and survival.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This overlaps with other GP policies and County regulations and lacks any specific standards/requirements for Valley Center. The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance Biological Resources calls out standard mitigation practices (including on-site preservation or off-site mitigation) depending on the site characteristics and impacts. Review of Resource Conservation Areas are part of the community plan update process.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
#406	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.3 Preserve and encourage wildlife corridors including buffer areas, which are essential to the long-term viability of wildlife populations, through open space easements, public acquisition, or other appropriate means. Sensitive habitat should not be isolated in "islands" or "pockets"	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #266 (CP Conservation Policy 8) GP: LU-6.3 Conservation Oriented Project Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features Into Project Design COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources	8. Preserve and encourage wildlife corridors which are essential to the long term viability of wildlife populations through open space easements or other appropriate means.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> While this is generally covered in existing regulations, it expands a bit from the existing policy with reference to buffers and avoiding islands/pockets of habitat to provide. The County understands how the issue warrants emphasis in the community plan, with the draft nature of the North County MSCP.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
#407	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.4 Encourage the establishment and support the activities of a Valley Center-oriented land trust, conservancy, or similar private non-profit entity to hold title to, consolidate, and manage in perpetuity Mitigation Banks, open space easements and other properties within the Community Open Space Plan (unless owned or maintained by the County or the VC Parks & Recreation District).	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4)	Open Space Policy 4: Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	<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.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#408	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.5 Require that project mitigation be located in the Valley Center Planning Area whenever possible.	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is almost the same policy proposal as Item 164. 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. The text is also vague on the type of mitigation. Proposed revision (supported by County Counsel and the BOS for other CPs) (same proposed revision as Item 164): 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.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
#409	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	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.	Draft North County MSCP	NA	<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.	Conservation - MSCP		
#410	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.7 Encourage expansion of Hellhole Canyon Open Space Preserve and ensure a continued viable connection between the Guejito and Hellhole Preserve.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #108 (CP Open Space Policy 3)	Open Space Policy 3: Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Staff recommends adding clarification text. Proposed revision: Encourage expansion of Hellhole Canyon Open Space Preserve and ensure a continued viable wildlife corridor connection between Rancho Guejito and the Hellhole Canyon Preserve.	Open Space		
#411	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.1.8 Increase total preserved open space acreage through actively pursuing grants, donations, private endowments, non-profit acquisition, and public trusts.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions COS-1.5 Regional Funding COS-1.6 Assemblage of Preserve Systems	Open Space Policy 4: Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space. Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the existing Community Plan policies recommended for inclusion (to remain) and the existing General Plan policies.	Open Space		
#412	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Goal	COS 2.2 Preservation of native trees and woodlands.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #77 (Conservation Goal)	Conservation Goal: Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The policy provides additional detail than the existing CP goal referenced, in that it is referring to native trees and woodlands.	Conservation - Trees		
#413	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.2.1 Require public and private development to protect heritage trees and large native trees such as oaks, sycamores, pines and other individual specimen trees, which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #88 (CP Conservation Policy 7)	Conservation Policy 7: Preserve oaks, sycamores, eucalyptus, olive trees, pines and other individual specimen trees which contribute to the community character and provide wildlife habitat.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The way this is written, it could apply to all trees of any kind and any size. The current Design Guidelines include good criteria for preservation of oaks and sycamores.	Conservation - Trees		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#414	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.2.2 Require public and private development to plant trees, and discourage the unnecessary removal of trees in new development, including public rights-of-way and parking lots. This will stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production. Require native trees adjacent to natural habitats.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #91 (CP Conservation Policy 10)	Conservation Policy 10: It is strongly encouraged that trees be planted wherever possible to stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The existing CP policy referenced is recommended for inclusion (to remain). The first sentence of this proposal is unclear and would seem to apply to every development type. To cover additional components, staff recommends the revision below. Proposed revision: Encourage new tree plantings in public and private development and discourage the unnecessary removal of trees. Tree plantings adjacent to natural habitats should be limited to native trees.	Conservation - Trees	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is a correction of the intended initial staff recommendation reference (the noted recommend removal was in error). The rationale and proposed revision would remain the same.
#415	Conservation and Open Space - Plant, and animal habitats and wildlife corridors	Policy	COS 2.2.3 Encourage pursuit of grants/agreements from the Wildlife Conservation Board pursuant to the Woodland Conservation Act of 2001 to purchase Oak Woodland Conservation easements	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The web page for this program (wcb.ca.gov/Programs/Oaks) notes that almost all funding for the program has been allocated. Considering the long term focus of the Community Plan Update process, it would be best to not have policies that call for applying to specific grants, as the policy may quickly become outdated.	Conservation - Trees		
#416	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Goal	COS 3.1 An "astronomical dark sky" that retains the rural setting and is compatible with astronomical research at Palomar Observatory.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #80 (CP Conservation Goal) GP: COS-13 Dark Skies	Conservation Goal (not numbered): Provide for a "dark sky" which would retain the rural setting and not detract from astronomical research at Palomar Mountain.	<i>Recommend Removal.</i> This is covered in the existing Community Plan.	Conservation - Light Pollution		
#417	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.1.1 Prohibit street lighting, except in the villages as necessary for safety. Discourage area lighting, unless necessary for safety.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #100 (CP Conservation Policy 19) GP: COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna	Conservation Policy 19: Support implementation and enforcement of the County's ordinance on lighting standards including lamp types and shielding for both public and private sector projects.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There may be instances where street lighting is needed outside the Villages for safety reasons. The County's Light Pollution Code contains strict requirements for lamp types and shielding within Zone A (15 mile buffer from Palomar Observatory), which covers most of Valley Center.	Conservation - Light Pollution	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#418	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.1.2 Require low sodium lights and light shielding for new development and for discretionary permits.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #99 (CP Conservation Policy 18) GP: COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna	Conservation Policy 18: Use low sodium lights and light shielding for new subdivisions and use permits as required by the "Dark Sky" Ordinance for those properties within a specified radius of the observatory at Palomar Mountain.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> These are already requirements in the County's Light Pollution Code for properties within Zone A (15 mile buffer from Palomar Observatory), which covers most of Valley Center.	Conservation - Light Pollution		
#419	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Goal	COS 3.2 Natural ridgelines and scenic horizons	GP: COS-12 Preservation of Ridgelines and Hillsides	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Staff recommends additional wording to reformat into sentence structure. Proposed revision: Preserve existing natural ridgelines and scenic horizons.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		
#420	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.1 Prohibit ridgeline development.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Land Use - Residential Policy 3: Prohibit ridgeline development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This would be a significant additional requirement for projects. As written, it would apply even to small projects like accessory structures, and requirements for visual impact analyses are covered elsewhere. See Section 4 of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Visual Resources for an explanation of project visual impacts that would be considered significant, requiring mitigation. If projects entail any of those items, a visual resources analysis would typically be required, which would include recommended project design components and mitigation measures to reduce impacts to below a significance level.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#421	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.2 Prohibit water storage tanks on ridgelines, and encourage screening from public view.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Land Use - Residential Policy 3: Prohibit ridgeline development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered more effectively in the existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policy. Also, see the item 3 in Section 4 of the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources. As detailed there, ridgeline development would be considered a significant CEQA impact when viewable from a public road, a trail, a scenic vista, or a recreational area.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		
#422	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.3 Restrict radio, cellular, and television antennas and other man-made structures on ridgelines, and require facilities be disguised to blend with the natural surroundings, whenever possible, in order to protect view sheds and aesthetic qualities.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Land Use - Residential Policy 3: Prohibit ridgeline development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered more effectively in the existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policy. Also, see the item 3 in Section 4 of the County's CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics and Visual Resources. As detailed there, ridgeline development would be considered a significant CEQA impact when viewable from a public road, a trail, a scenic vista, or a recreational area.	Conservation - Scenic Resources	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#423	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.4. Require a visual analysis for all projects in the Valley Center Planning Area, to protect viewsheds and aesthetic qualities.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #15 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 3) GP: LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design	Land Use - Residential Policy 3: Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This would be a significant additional requirement for projects. As written, it would apply even to small projects like accessory structures, and requirements for visual impact analyses are covered elsewhere. See Section 4 of the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Visual Resources for an explanation of project visual impacts that would be considered significant, requiring mitigation. If projects entail any of those items, a visual resources analysis would typically be required, which would include recommended project design components and mitigation measures to reduce impacts to below a significance level.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		
#424	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.5 Prohibit development on slopes in excess of ??% [Ask Bob].	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 1) GP: LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography Resource Protection Ordinance	Land Use - Residential Policy 1: Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This appears to be an unfinished idea from the 2012 proposals. The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into seep slopes (>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%.	Conservation - Steep Slopes		
#425	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	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.	NA	NA	<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.	Mobility - Right-of-Way Special Features		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#426	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Goal	COS 4.1 Floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses preserved in their natural state.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #270 (CP Conservation Policy 12) <i>Though we don't typically compare policies to goals, this referenced policy has almost the same wording as this proposed goal.</i> GP: COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources	Conservation Policy 12: Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is not consistent with the underlying proposed policies. Proposed revision below. Proposed revision: Wetlands are preserved in their natural state and development is limited in non-wetland areas of floodplains.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		
#427	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 4.1.1. Retain watercourses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas. Limit use of floodplains and natural stream courses to permanent open space or recreational or light agriculture uses. Require adequate setbacks from all watercourses to protect lives and property, improve water quality, provide riparian habitat, and enhance aesthetic quality of the riparian environment.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #93 (CP Conservation Policy 12) 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 Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance	Conservation Policy 12: Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The policy proposal doesn't define "flood prone area" so it's not clear on the proposed prohibition related to that reference. 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. In particular, land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses. The Resource Protection Ordinance requires buffers (setbacks) from wetland areas of 50 to 200 feet, depending on the habitat values and other environmental values of the wetland. Proposed revision: Prohibit development within delineated wetlands, with the exception of road crossings, when meeting the requirements of the Resource Protection Ordinance.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		
#428	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.1.2 Support as a high priority the development of open space corridors, community non-motorized multi-use trails, and parkland along watercourses.	CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #84 (CP Conservation Policy 4) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #119 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 6)	Conservation Policy 4: Protect riparian habitat and other types of wetlands from loss or modification by dedicating open space easements with adequate buffer zones and other means to avoid impacts from adjacent land uses. Road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat should be minimized and only allowed when alternatives have been considered and deemed infeasible. Parks and Recreation Policy 6: Acquire and develop outstanding scenic areas, cultural, biological and historical resources. The establishment of park locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> As written, this policy is inconsistent with other policy proposals in this section that call for maintaining water courses in their natural state. The County is already seeking to add open space in riparian areas.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#429	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.1.3 Preserve, and support the enhancement (restoration, invasive species removal, etc.) of native vegetation along streams, and in wetlands and floodplains.	GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement COS-5.4 Invasive Species	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Staff recommends adding clarifying text as streams are typically also delineated wetlands. Proposed revision: Preserve, and support the enhancement (restoration, invasive species removal) of native vegetation along stream corridors and in other wetlands and floodplains.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		
#430	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.1.4 Prohibit the construction of concrete lined flood control channels except where necessary because of existing improvements which block flood flow.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #40 (CP Land Use - Industrial Policy 4) 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 Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines	Land Use - Industrial Policy 4: Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This issue is covered in the Design Guidelines, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and to a certain extent, the GP policies listed (especially S-9.2). Design Guidelines state: Concrete channels and other mechanical measures of stabilization are not permitted unless no other alternative exists. Resource Protection Ordinance states: 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.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		
#431	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.1.5 Minimize road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat. Only allow these, with mitigation, when alternatives have been considered and determined infeasible.	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 Resource Protection Ordinance Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The Resource Protection Ordinance covers this issue (with very similar wording) for wetlands, but this addresses riparian habitat. There are areas where riparian habitat in areas that are not delineated as wetlands. Therefore, the policy proposal is not repetitive.	Conservation - Wetlands & Riparian Habitat		
#432	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Goal	COS 4.2 Improved water quality in Valley Center's streams, wetlands, and floodplains.	GP: COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This goal provides a suitable overview of what the subsequent policies should accomplish. However, the policies below are not recommended for inclusion and don't fit the goal (policies are only focused on agricultural and animal keeping uses).	Conservation - Water Quality		
#433	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.2.1 Encourage organic gardening and use other agricultural best practices, to eliminate harmful runoff which pollutes groundwater.	GP: COS-6.5 Best Management Practices	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced General Plan Policy, which encourages agricultural best management practices to protect watersheds.	Conservation - Water Quality		
#434	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	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.	GP: COS-6.5 Best Management Practices County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance	NA	<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.	Conservation - Water Quality		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#435	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Goal	COS 4.3 Reduced property damage and threats to life and limb from localized flooding.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #97 (CP Conservation Policy 16), #112 (CP Open Space Policy 7) <i>Though we don't typically compare policies to a proposed goal, the referenced Existing CP policies don't have a corresponding goal.</i> GP: S-9 Protection of Life and Property	Conservation Policy 16: 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. Open Space Policy 7: Support low intensity land use zoning in undeveloped mapped floodplains, such as agricultural and low density residential zoning, to protect downstream areas from flooding hazards, to minimize impacts on wildlife habitat and to provide scenic open space.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This is almost the same as the General Plan goal referenced, but the recommendation of inclusion is applied in order to provide a goal that corresponds with underlying policies. A very minor wording revision is recommended. Proposed revision: Reduced property damage and personal injury due to localized flooding	Safety - Flood Hazards		
#436	Conservation and Open Space - Surface, groundwater and watersheds	Policy	COS 4.3.1 Prohibit development that would increase the existing flooding problem in the central valley.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #54 (CP Conservation Policy 16) GP: COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains S-9.1 Floodplain Maps 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 Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance	Conservation Policy 16: 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.	<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> This already generally covered in the existing regulations, including the referenced General Plan policies. See Section 811.104 and 811.501 of the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, which outline standards for raising the lowest floor 1 foot above the base flood elevation, and standards for allowing the entry and exit of floodwaters. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per the referenced GP Policy S-10.1 and per the Resource Protection Ordinance. In addition, no floodway encroachments whatsoever are allowed within the floodway unless a "No Rise" Certification is obtained, demonstrating that the proposed encroachment shall not result in any increase in flood levels or the volume or velocity of flood flows during the occurrence of the base flood discharge (Section 811.506 of the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance). Since there is only one recommended policy in this section, the flood policies could be consolidated, and if a revision is desired for this policy, it could focus on a particularly problematic area for floodwater obstructions.	Safety - Flood Hazards	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#437	Conservation and Open Space - Mineral resources	Goal	COS 5.1 Preservation of property owners' mining rights while protecting the environment and the safety of residents.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff recommends removal because the underlying policies are recommended for removal.	Conservation - Mining		
#438	Conservation and Open Space - Mineral resources	Policy	COS 5.1.1 Prohibit open-pit mining, slant drilling, oil shale extraction, or in-situ leaching.	GP: COS-10.1 Siting of Development COS-10.2 Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Open pit mining in the County is mostly limited to mining for aggregate materials and granite. While areas that contain both the potential for significant aggregate mineral resources and far enough from existing residential development are very limited in Valley Center, there are a couple areas that would fit the description in the far northeast portion of the community and possibly the southwestern end, near Daley Ranch. Prohibiting this type of mining where potentially significant mineral resources are found would be inconsistent with the referenced General Plan policies COS-10.1 and COS-10.2. Slant drilling is allowed for water wells. Oil shale extraction could occur offshore, but our geology staff is not aware of any economically viable deposits anywhere in the County. In-situ leaching is a process to recover materials such as copper and uranium through boreholes. County geology staff is not aware of any in-situ leaching anywhere in the County (so that part of the proposal would address something that's not an issue/ not applicable to VC).	Conservation - Mining		
#439	Conservation and Open Space - Mineral resources	Policy	COS 5.1.2 Require owners to seal access to mines or water wells, when unattended, to prevent accidental falls or cave-in incidents.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has regulatory authority (along with the State and Federal Governments) in overseeing surface mines, but there are none in Valley Center. California OSHA Mining and Tunneling Unit is responsible for inspecting underground mines/tunnels. Also, the Mine Safety Health Administration (MSHA) is a federal agency that inspects underground mines. It's not clear what is referred to as unattended wells.	Conservation - Mining	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#440	Conservation and Open Space - Mineral resources	Policy	COS 5.1.3 Require any extraction of mineral resources, but especially within the “Aggregate Overlay Area” with regard to sand and gravel, be carried out in a manner which minimizes or mitigates adverse impacts to the community, including noise, safety hazards from increased truck traffic, surface and groundwater pollutions, and degradation of scenic resources.	GP: COS-10.8 New Mining Facilities Zoning Ordinance Sections 6550-6557	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> All mining operations require approval of a Major Use Permit, which must include approval of a Reclamation Plan. All of these issues are addressed through the Major Use Permit Findings and CEQA Analysis required, including mitigation where necessary to address these issues.	Conservation - Mining		
#441	Conservation and Open Space - Mineral resources	Policy	COS 5.1.4 Phase mining activities so that re-vegetation of a completed section of the site is implemented prior to beginning activities in another. Require site grading, reclamation, and re-vegetation plans to facilitate phasing.	GP: COS-10.5 Reclamation Plans	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The referenced General Plan Policy already requires this phased approach so that reclamation can be initiated at the earliest possible time on those portions of the mined lands that will not be subject to further disturbance by the surface mining operation.	Conservation - Mining		
#442	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Goal	COS 6.1 Improved air quality in the Valley Center Planning Area.	GP: COS-14 Sustainable Land Development	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Recommend inclusion of this goal, although there will need to be some consolidation and possible regrouping of the repetitive policies under this goal.	Conservation - Air Quality		
#443	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.1 Support programs that maintain and improve air quality, such as tree planting and development of light agriculture.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #268 (CP Conservation Policy 10)	Conservation Policy 10: It is strongly encouraged that trees be planted wherever possible to stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Encouraging tree planting and light agriculture are already included in other existing policies and 2012 proposals.	Conservation - Air Quality		
#444	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.2 Discourage industrial uses that are detrimental to air quality.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies #19, (CP Land Use Policy 6) GP: COS-14.8 Minimize Air Pollution	Land Use Policy 6: Buffer residential areas from incompatible activities which create heavy traffic, noise, odors, dust, and unsightly views through the use of landscaping and preservation of open space.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Air Quality		
#445	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.3 Construct the network of pathways and trails for non-motorized transportation shown on the CTMP.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #98 (CP Conservation Policy 17) GP: M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan County Subdivision Ordinance	Conservation Policy 17: During the discretionary permit process, encourage the dedication of trails to form a local trail network with a central unifying hub near Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The County already has existing regulatory mechanisms to require trail dedication when development sites include alignments from the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP). The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the CTMP or the Regional Trails Plan. See section 9.1 of the CTMP and Section 81.402u of the Subdivision Ordinance for information on how trail easement dedication is secured on private property through the subdivision review process and in the review of other discretionary permit types.	Mobility - Trails		
#446	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.4 Encourage County, or public/private partnership, to recover methane from Aerie Park (former landfill site) as a source of energy generation.	GP: COS-14.9 Significant Producers of Air Pollutants	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Per the Department of Public Works Closed Landfills Division, there is an operating landfill gas extraction and flare system at this site. The volume of landfill gas generated by this site (landfill closed in 1978) is not sufficient to support a gas to electricity operation.	Conservation - Air Quality		
#447	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.5 Maximize use of low-emission vehicles and equipment on public and private development.	GP: COS-14.10 Low-Emission Construction Vehicles and Equipment	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced General Plan Policy.	Conservation - Air Quality		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#448	Conservation and Open Space - Air Quality	Policy	COS 6.1.6 Establish design standards which will prevent or minimize “heat islands” in the Villages and other larger projects.	GP: COS-14.12 Heat Island Effect Valley Center Design Guidelines	NA	<i>Design Guidelines</i> This is covered in the referenced General Plan policy. If stakeholders would like to recommend more specificity on Village (and commercial, industrial outside the Villages) design standards to address this, recommendations can be considered during the Design Guidelines update process.	Design Guidelines		
#449	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Goal	COS 7.1 Decreased need for imported water.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #71 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal) LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection COS-4 Water Management Climate Action Plan Landscape Ordinance	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal (not numbered): Ensure that enough water is available from both local and outside sources to adequately supply all users in the community plan area.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Landscape Ordinance and the Climate Action Plan.	Conservation - Imported Water	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#450	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 7.1.1 Encourage the use of recycled water.	GP: COS-4.5 Recycled Water COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by the existing GP policies referenced. In the Land Use - Village Development and Character section of this matrix, we are recommending inclusion of a similar policy proposal because it provides additional specifics on preferred uses of recycled water (beyond the GP policy referenced).	Conservation - Imported Water		
#451	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 7.1.2 Implement educational programs that encourage the conservation of imported water.	NA	NA	<i>Recommend Removal.</i> This recommendation is following the objective of developing a concise group of impactful policies. This could be discussed in another section of the updated Community Plan on various training programs sought in the community. It doesn't really serve the purpose of a policy.	Conservation - Imported Water		
#452	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 7.1.3 Support cost effective storage facilities such as emergency storage facilities located near demand areas or away from earthquake faults (while preserving scenic vistas per LU Policy ????).	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #72 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 1) GP: LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Item A of the existing policy, which is proposed for inclusion with a minor revision.	Conservation - Imported Water		
#453	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 7.1.4 Support water reclamation where reclamation and reuse facilities can provide significant sources of "new" irrigation water to help offset demands on imported water.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #72 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 1) GP: LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply COS-4.5 Recycled Water COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Item B of the existing CP policy referenced. That portion of the existing policy is not proposed for carrying forward because it is covered in GP Policy COS-19.2 and wastewater is currently reclaimed by the VCMWD for irrigation.	Conservation - Imported Water		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#454	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 7.1.5 Support 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.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #72 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 1)	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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in item c of the existing CP policy referenced. That portion of the existing policy is not proposed for carrying forward. 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 could have negative impacts to commercial agriculture in Valley Center.	Conservation - Imported Water		
#455	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Goal	COS 8.1. Increased availability of alternative energy	GP: COS-14 Sustainable Land Development COS-18 Sustainable Energy	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the GP goals referenced.	Conservation - Renewable Energy		
#456	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	Policy	COS 8.1.1 Encourage solar energy in all new development, also wind farms. Require sufficient buffers to mitigate potential adverse noise effects.	GP: COS-14.6 Solar Access for Infill Development COS-14.7 Alternative Energy Sources for Development Projects	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the GP policies referenced.	Conservation - Renewable Energy		
#457	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Goal	9.1 A balanced system of local, and regional parks, open space, and non-motorized trails and pathways that incorporate the outstanding natural features of Valley Center, and meet the varied active and passive recreational needs of our community's residents.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #113 (Parks and Recreation Goal [not numbered]) GP: COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities	Parks and Recreation Goal (not numbered): Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is almost the same as the existing CP goal referenced. Stakeholders can consider which wording is preferred between the two choices.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of this proposed goal and the recommendation on the similar existing goal (existing Goals & Policies matrix #113) will be changed to recommend removal.
#458	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.1 Require parklands to protect our scenic and riparian areas and our biological resources.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #87 (CP Conservation Policy 6) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #119 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 6) GP: COS-21.4 Regional Parks COS-23.1 Public Access Board Policy I-138: Mitigation on County-Owned Land Managed by DPR	COS-Conservation Policy 6: Preserve the native habitat of sensitive plants and animals by dedication of open space easements and other means that will ensure their long term protection and survival. COS-Parks and Recreation Policy 6: Acquire and develop outstanding scenic areas, cultural, biological and historical resources. The establishment of park locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is covered under existing General Plan, Community Plan and Board Policies related to parks. With the existing Community Plan, conservation policies and parks and recreation policies cover both the preservation of native habitat and the use of park location and design to develop scenic, cultural and biological areas. Additionally, GP policies COS-21.4 and COS-23.1 address the use of park design to consider surrounding resources and to preserve natural/cultural features. Board Policy I-138 establishes a process to mitigate for biological resource impact through land preservation with management by DPR, speaking directly to the acquisition and funding of parkland projects.	Parks & Recreation		
#459	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.2 Prohibit public or private recreational off-road and all-terrain vehicle use areas.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #127 (CP Noise-Temporary and/or Nuisance Noise Policy 4) Noise Ordinance - Noise from Off-Road Recreational Vehicles Community Trails Master Plan	Noise-Temporary and/or Nuisance Noise Policy 4: Encourage the use of buffering devices on off-road vehicles and provide strict enforcement of noise regulations for off-road vehicles.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Noise Ordinance provides direction on noise standards for recreational off-road vehicles for private and public property. The CTMP policy CIS 1.3 prohibits motorized vehicles on "non-motorized trails." The Noise Ordinance limits the operation of off-road vehicles on private property at certain sound levels based on the time of day. When in compliance with Noise Ordinance requirements, APCD requirements, easement restrictions, and trail restrictions, the County can't further regulate off-road vehicle use on private property unless it involves commercial use.	Parks & Recreation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#460	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.3 Encourage voluntary dedication of non-motorized multi-use pathways and trails throughout Valley Center, and implementation of the Community Trails Master Plan, especially connecting segments that have been previously dedicated.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #79 (CP Conservation - General Goal 5) GP: M-11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity Trail Defense and Indemnification Ordinance CTMP CP 3.9 CTMP CIS 3.2 ATP 11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity	Conservation-General Goal 5: Encourage and promote a system of interconnecting trails and paths for horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) policy CP 3.9 encourages the voluntary dedication of trail easements through incentives and implementation strategy CIS 3.2 provides indemnity to persons granting trail easements and landowners adjacent to trails, as does the Trail Defense and Indemnification Ordinance. Combining these ordinances and policies with the existing CP policy that promotes interconnecting trails already speaks to the intent of this policy. Together they encourage voluntary dedication of non-motorized trails/pathways without legal implications.	Parks & Recreation		
#461	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.4 Give higher priority to Community and Neighborhood Parks in keeping with the rural character of the Valley Center community.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #117 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 4)	Parks and Recreation Policy 4: In keeping with the rural character of the Valley Center community, Community and Neighborhood Parks will be encouraged.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The proposal is not clear, especially on the intent. It could be interpreted to limit the establishment of preserves and/or regional parks.	Parks & Recreation		
#462	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.5 Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails Master Plan.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9)	Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is identical to the existing policy, which the County is recommending for inclusion.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update :</i> After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #122) which was recommended for inclusion. A slight wording change is proposed for that referenced existing policy. See Item 122 in the Existing Matrix.
#463	Conservation and Open Space - Park needs, locations, and facilities	Policy	COS 9.1.6 Require new residential developments in the Villages to include pocket parks	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #290 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal) GP: COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Board Policy I-44 Procedure for Designing New County-owned Local Parks	Parks and Recreation Goal: Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Parkland dedication and/or payment of in-lieu fees is determined based on the requirements of the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. Not all development within Villages will require park land dedication. Board Policy I-44 details the public participation for local public park design, and we can't limit that process by requiring pocket parks every time. Changing the language to "encourage" from "require" would better reflect what was written as a similar policy for the Ramona CP (Policy LU 2.3.8). The proposed revision addresses this proposal and the proposal in row 470 of this matrix. Proposed revision: Encourage new residential developments in the Villages and other new large residential developments to include pocket parks.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend removal. Pocket parks should be considered on a case by case basis, based on project characteristics and public input received during individual project review processes. Pocket parks won't always be appropriate in Village developments.
#464	Conservation and Open Space - Park acquisition, development, and improvements	Goal	COS 9.2 A stable, predictable set of funding sources for the acquisition and management of our parks and recreational facilities.	GP: COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding	NA (though there are related policies, they don't provide an appropriate comparison to a high level goal)	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> General Plan Goal COS-24 is similar to the proposed goal. However, this goal statement provides a framework for further refinement with following policies.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> This seems to be a goal proposed in consideration of the funding situation of the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District (VCPRD) at the time of the preparation of these 2012 drafts. In consideration of comments received and the current process to consider a proposed transfer of assets and operations to the County Department of Parks and Recreation, a revision is proposed. Proposed revision: Fund the acquisition and management of County parks and recreation facilities to the extent possible.
#465	Conservation and Open Space - Park acquisition, development, and improvements	Policy	COS 9.2.1. Encourage the utilization of all potential sources of funding and aid that will improve the viability of recreational facilities for all age groups.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities	Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is similar to the existing policy referenced, which staff is recommending inclusion of, except for the last sentence. To improve further, the policy could recommend specific funding sources, that aren't always used, like sponsorships (if supported).	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update :</i> After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #118) and the recommendation on this similar proposed policy has been changed to recommend removal.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#466	Conservation and Open Space - Park acquisition, development, and improvements	Policy	COS 9.2.2. Support modification of VC Parks & Recreation District boundaries, and voter approval of a funding mechanism for maintenance of its facilities so that more than just user fees support the district.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #114 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #115 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-23.2 Regional Coordination COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance FY 19-20 Operational Plan for the PLDO Area 38 Valley Center Fund (Board Letter of 11 20, 2019)	Parks and Recreation Policy 1: Prior to the expenditure of Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds for development of a park in the Valley Center Community Planning Area, a funding agency for operations and maintenance of that park must be identified. Parks and Recreation Policy 2: If a park is established outside of these boundaries, the District must be expanded or an alternative funding agency must be identified. Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Valley Center Parks & Recreation District (VCPRD) receives funding for operations and maintenance from property taxes on parcels within its service area. A Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) between the VCPRD and the County has been in effect since 1994, including amendments, providing Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds for park land acquisition and active recreation improvements, including infrastructure upgrades. On 7/15/19 the VCPRD took action to formally investigate and pursue the transfer of its assets and powers to the County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). DPR is and continues to coordinate with the VCPRD on the potential transfer of its assets and powers. Any transfer of assets and powers would require further consideration and approval by both the Board of Supervisors and the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and is estimated to take more than a year to process. Therefore, staff is recommending removal due to the reference not accurately reflecting VCPRD funding and the potential transfer of assets from the VCPRD.	Parks & Recreation		
#467	Conservation and Open Space - Park acquisition, development, and improvements	Policy	COS 9.2.3. Pursue additional funding sources to acquire, develop, and maintain parkland in addition to Park Lands Dedication Ordinance funds, such as grants and community bond issues.	CP: Existing Goals and Policies matrix #114 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-1.5 Regional Funding COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Parks Master Plan	Parks and Recreation Policy 1: Prior to the expenditure of Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds for development of a park in the Valley Center Community Planning Area, a funding agency for operations and maintenance of that park must be identified. Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> If COS 9.2.1 above is selected for inclusion over the existing Parks and Recreation Policy 5, this should be combined with that. This provides additional specifics than that proposal.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #118) and the recommendation on this similar proposed policy has been changed to recommend removal.
#468	Conservation and Open Space - Park acquisition, development, and improvements	Policy	COS 9.2.4. Encourage the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District to coordinate with developers to establish cooperative agreements in order to develop functioning local and neighborhood parks and recreational facilities.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Given recent DPR/VCPRD actions (see Item 466 above), this policy may be made irrelevant in which case it would not be necessary to include. In addition, this already a common practice, so would not need a dedicated policy.	Parks & Recreation		
#469	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Goal	COS 9.4. To the maximum extent possible, park and recreation facilities shall conserve and incorporate unique features in park development.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #119 (CP COS-Parks and Recreation Policy 6) GP: COS-21.4 Regional Parks COS-23.1 Public Access Board Policy I-138: Mitigation on County-Owned Land Managed by DPR	Parks and Recreation Policy 6: Acquire and develop outstanding scenic areas, cultural, biological and historical resources. The establishment of park locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> GP policies COS-21.4 and COS-23.1 cover this issue. Board Policy I-138 establishes a process to mitigate for biological resources impacts through land preservation with management by DPR, speaking directly to the acquisition and funding of parkland projects. In addition, this policy is generally unclear.	Parks & Recreation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#470	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.1 Encourage public pocket parks in large residential developments	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #113 (CP Parks and Recreation Goal) GP: COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design Parks Master Plan Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Board Policy F-26 Utilization of Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Fees and Interest Board Policy I-44 Procedure for Designing New County-owned Local Parks	Parks and Recreation Goal: Develop a comprehensive plan of local, neighborhood, community and regional parks and facilities directed to the needs of all age levels and which use, whenever feasible, outstanding natural features of the CPA.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Item 463 of this matrix.	Parks & Recreation		
#471	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.2 Coordinate with land conservation and open space agencies regarding the preservation of cultural, biological and historical resources, open space, and unique scenic areas. The establishment of park locations and designs shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #119 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 6) GP: COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions COS-21.3 Park Design COS-23.2 Regional Coordination Parks Master Plan	Parks and Recreation Policy 6: Acquire and develop outstanding scenic areas, cultural, biological and historical resources. The establishment of park locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> While this is mostly covered in General Plan policies COS-1.4, COS-21.3 and COS-23.2, this includes more specificity and provides clarity on the intent of the existing policy, which has language that could lead to unintended interpretation. As the existing policy is recommended for removal for this reason, this new text could cover the idea.	Parks & Recreation		
#472	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.3 Establish priorities and encourage early acquisition to minimize public cost	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5)	Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the referenced existing policy, which is recommended for inclusion.	Parks & Recreation		
#473	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.4 Integrate open space dedications in private developments with surrounding uses to maximize a functional open space/recreation and wildlife management system.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #107 (CP Open Space Policy 2) GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	Open Space Policy 2: Integrate open space dedications in private developments with surrounding uses to maximize a functional open space/recreation and wildlife management system.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is already covered in the existing General Plan policies referenced and in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources.	Open Space		
#474	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.5 Development of park facilities shall comply with the County's Ordinance relating to the regulation of Light Pollution.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #121 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 8)	Parks and Recreation Policy 8: Development of park facilities shall comply with the County's Ordinance No. 7155 relating to the regulation of Light Pollution.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Staff recommends removal of the identical existing policy. There is no need for a policy that requires compliance with an existing ordinance that is already applicable to Valley Center.	Parks & Recreation		
#475	Conservation and Open Space - Park compatibility with adjoining land uses	Policy	COS 9.4.6 Ensure preservation of a potential trailhead, staging area and connection between the Guejito and Hellhole Canyon Open Space Preserve.	NA	NA	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> See the proposal in Item 410 of this matrix.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of a similar proposed policy (Item #410 in this matrix; recommended for inclusion) and the recommendation on this similar proposed policy has been changed to recommend removal.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#476	Conservation and Open Space - Opportunities for the joint use of schools and other public facilities for park and recreational uses	Goal	COS 9.5 Identified opportunities for joint use facilities.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #116 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 3) <i>While this is a policy being compared to the proposed goal, it provides a similar idea.</i> GP: LU-18.2 CoLocation of Civic Uses COS-21.2 Location of Parks	Parks and Recreation Policy 3: Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities will be coordinated with local school facilities whenever possible by establishing Joint Powers Agreements to promote joint development, operation and maintenance.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a separate goal for this. The existing policy is recommended for inclusion and adding one or both of the policies below would not be problematic, as they could fall under the goal proposal in Item 457 of this matrix.	Parks & Recreation		
#477	Conservation and Open Space - Opportunities for the joint use of schools and other public facilities for park and recreational uses	Policy	COS 9.5.1 Encourage the VC P&R District, VC/Pauma School District, VCMWD, and VC Library to create multiple-use facilities that include recreation features. Joint use agreements should include a fair distribution of operational costs, as well as periodic review and potential adjustment of such costs.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #116 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 3) GP: LU-18.2 CoLocation of Civic Uses COS-21.2 Location of Parks	Parks and Recreation Policy 3: Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities will be coordinated with local school facilities whenever possible by establishing Joint Powers Agreements to promote joint development, operation and maintenance.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Although the policy as written is duplicative and vague, the County understands the intent and offer the proposed revision below. Proposed revision: Encourage the Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District, the Valley Center Municipal Water District and the Valley Center Library to establish Joint Powers Agreements with local parks and recreation providers to create multiple-use facilities that include recreation features.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i> <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, staff prefers the inclusion of the existing policy (existing Goals & Policies matrix #116) and the recommendation on this similar proposed policy has been changed to recommend removal.
#478	Conservation and Open Space - Opportunities for the joint use of schools and other public facilities for park and recreational uses	Policy	COS 9.5.2 Encourage the county and local public agencies to establish Joint Powers Agreements in order to jointly develop park and recreational facilities, to minimize public cost. Such agreements with the school district must satisfy the district’s requirement to comply with state-imposed minimum essential facilities criteria.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #116 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 3) GP: LU-18.2 CoLocation of Civic Uses COS-21.2 Location of Parks	Parks and Recreation Policy 3: Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities will be coordinated with local school facilities whenever possible by establishing Joint Powers Agreements to promote joint development, operation and maintenance.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The policy as written is duplicative of the Community Plan policy related to Joint Powers Agreements between local school facilities and park and recreation. With the added specificity and proposed revision of the Item 479 policy proposal, this policy becomes unnecessary to include.	Parks & Recreation		
#479	Conservation and Open Space - Commercial recreation facilities	Goal	COS 9.6 Identified opportunities for commercial recreational development	Zoning Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> To provide clarity, staff is recommending: Proposed revision: Identify opportunities for commercial recreational development and maintain the zoning to allow such uses by right or with discretionary permits.	Parks & Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The reference to removal was in error. This goal is proposed for inclusion with the proposed revision: Identify opportunities for commercial recreational development and maintain the zoning to allow such uses by right or with discretionary permits.
#480	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Goal	COS 10.1 A network of open space that is adequate to preserve the unique natural elements of the community, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve scenic resources, and retain the rural community character.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #105 (CP Open Space Goal [not numbered]) GP: COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System	Open Space Goal (not numbered): Support a system of open space that is adequate to preserve the unique natural elements of the community, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve scenic resources, and retain the rural community character.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> For clarity, staff is recommending: Proposed revision: Support a system of open space that preserves the unique natural elements of the community, enhances recreational opportunities, conserves scenic resources, and helps retain the rural community character.	Open Space		
#481	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.1 Use acquisition, conservation easements, mitigation, and conservation subdivision development to set aside open space preserves, corridors for wildlife, pathways and trails, while dealing fairly with the financial and other interests of property owners	GP: COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System COS-1.6 Assemblage of Preserve System COS-1.8 Multiple-Resource Preservation Areas County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources Resource Protection Ordinance	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in existing General Plan policies and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources includes considerations for requiring on-site easements and/or off-site mitigation to address impacts to biological resources.	Open Space		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#482	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.2 Coordinate with public agencies and other organizations on the planning, establishment, and maintenance of preserves and corridors for wildlife.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #106 (CP Open Space Policy 1) GP: COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions COS-1.5 Regional Funding	Open Space Policy 1: Encourage coordination with other jurisdictions in trading and otherwise negotiating land transfers to consolidate holdings for conservation and recreational uses.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Open Space		
#483	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.3. Require new residential development to be designed in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space, and integrates open space dedications with surrounding uses, to maximize a functional open space/recreation and wildlife management system.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #110 (CP Open Space Policy 5) GP: LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity	Open Space Policy 5: Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The first part of this policy matches the Existing Community Plan policy referenced. That existing policy is recommended for removal due to lack of clarity. "Atmosphere of openness" could mean many different things and not all biological open space easements allow hiking, etc. The revision below addresses the second part of the policy proposal. The recreational open space connections component could become part of a separate policy. Proposed revision: Where applicable and feasible, biological open space dedications associated with new development shall be used to improve wildlife corridor opportunities, in consideration of adjacent open space.	Open Space		
#484	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.4 Incorporate public and semi-public lands into a functional open space system wherever feasible.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #108 (CP Open Space Policy 2)	Open Space Policy 2: Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is identical to the referenced Open Space Policy in the Existing Community Plan, which is proposed for inclusion (to remain).	Open Space		
#485	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.5 Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space and establishing trails.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4)	Open Space Policy 4: Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is identical to the referenced Open Space Policy in the Existing Community Plan, which is proposed for inclusion (to remain).	Open Space		
#486	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.6 Require that at least one land trust/conservancy (preferably one local to Valley Center) be named as a grantee when an open space easement is created.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4) GP: LU-6.8 Oversight of Open Space COS-1.3 Management COS-1.11 Volunteer Preserve Monitor County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	Open Space Policy 4: Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County does not have the authority to determine the grantee of open space easements.	Open Space		
#487	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.7 Ensure County Department of Public Works includes culverts for animals to safely cross roadways and minimize risk to drivers.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #89 (CP Conservation Policy 8) GP: LU-6.7 Open Space Network M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design	Conservation Policy 8: Preserve and encourage wildlife corridors which are essential to the long term viability of wildlife populations through open space easements or other appropriate means.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> This seems to require wildlife crossing culverts in all new road design. Due to costs, considerations should include species distribution, sensitive species status, and critical wildlife corridor connections, among other factors. Culverts are often included as mitigation (and/or project design considerations) resulting from biological resources analysis for road projects. Proposed revision: Encourage the increased use of wildlife crossing road culverts, to facilitate wildlife movement, species distribution, and to minimize risks to drivers.	Mobility - Road Design		
#488	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Goal	COS 10.2 A stable, predictable set of funding sources for the acquisition, management and maintenance of facilities in the Open Space Plan, once acquired.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding	NA (though there are related policies, they don't provide an appropriate comparison to a high level goal)	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced General Plan goals and any underlying policies associated with this proposal could go with other goals.	Open Space		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#489	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.2.1. Use all potential sources of funding and aid that will improve the viability of the open space system.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #109 (CP Open Space Policy 4) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-1.5 Regional Funding COS-1.7 Preserve System Funding COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities	Open Space Policy 4: Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space. Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The idea behind this policy is not covered in the existing Community Plan as it relates specifically to funding for the open space system rather than park land acquisition. It could be combined with the existing policy on utilizing all potential park funding sources.	Open Space		
#490	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.2.2. Support modification of VC Parks & Recreation District boundaries, and voter approval of a funding mechanism for participation in the open space system.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #114 (CP Parks and recreation Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #115 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #118 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 5) GP: COS-1.5 Regional Funding COS-1.7 Preserve System Funding COS-23.2 Regional Coordination Park Lands Dedication Ordinance	Parks and recreation Policy 1: Prior to the expenditure of Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds for development of a park in the Valley Center Community Planning Area, a funding agency for operations and maintenance of that park must be identified. Parks and Recreation Policy 2: If a park is established outside of these boundaries, the District must be expanded or an alternative funding agency must be identified. Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Establish priorities and encourage the early acquisition of park lands to minimize public cost. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms. Valley Center Planning Group and Valley Center Community Services District will cooperate to be sure major developers provide park land and park facilities.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Valley Center Parks & Recreation District (VCPRD) receives funding for operations and maintenance from property taxes on parcels within its service area. A Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) between the VCPRD and the County has been in effect since 1994, including amendments, providing Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds for park land acquisition and active recreation improvements, including infrastructure upgrades. On 7/15/19 the VCPRD took action to formally investigate and pursue the transfer of its assets and powers to the County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). DPR is and continues to coordinate with the VCPRD on the potential transfer of its assets and powers. Any transfer of assets and powers would require further consideration and approval by both the Board of Supervisors and the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and is estimated to take up to 18 months to process. Therefore, the County is recommending removal due to the in flux current state of the VCPRD.	Parks & Recreation		
#491	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Goal	COS 11.1 Preserve archaeological and historic sites.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #81 (CP Conservation Goal [not numbered])	Conservation Goal (not numbered): Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the Existing Community Plan Goal.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#492	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.1.1 Encourage public and private Developers, to the maximum extent possible, to incorporate historic and cultural presentations in the design and construction of Projects that impact cultural and historic resources, along with pathway and trail facilities implementing the Community Trails Master Plan.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #104 (CP Conservation Policy 23) GP: COS-7.1 Archaeological Protection COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources	Conservation Policy 23: Require owners of significant historic and/or architectural sites to dedicate open space easements to preserve significant examples of California history and archaeology in the course of discretionary permit processing in order to register for Landmark Zoning with the County Historic Site Board.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Though the wording is clear, the assumed intent is covered by the referenced Existing Community Plan policy (Conservation Policy 23 proposed for inclusion with a minor revision) and General Plan policies.	Conservation - Cultural Resources	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Again, some should be included in some form, others to be revised, and others to be clarified or amplified. Note: those items not referenced here I can agree with or concede that it's hopeless to resist.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#493	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	Policy COS 11.1.2. Establish vibrant, ongoing liaison between the VCCPG and local tribes to consult and identify cultural resources to be preserved, and appropriate mitigation when preservation is infeasible. Require the participation of cultural organizations to establish scientific, historic and cultural facts	GP: COS-7.4 Consultation with Affected Communities COS-11.4 Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions COS-11.5 Collaboration with Private and Public Agencies California Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52 (SB18/AB52 consultation)	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This type of consultation between the County and Native American tribes is already required per the referenced General Plan policy and state law (Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52 - SB18/AB52 consultation).	Conservation - Cultural Resources		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#494	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.1.3 Encourage the Valley Center Historical Society and History Museum to inventory, catalog and aggressively seek designation of historic buildings, objects, trails, landscapes and districts in Valley Center, especially Community Hall, stagecoach facilities, and the meadow runway near Cole Grade and Cool Valley Roads.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #81 (CP Conservation - General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #102 (CP Conservation Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #103 (CP Conservation Policy 22) GP: COS-7.1 Archaeological Preservation COS-7.3 Archaeological Collections COS-7.6 Cultural Resource Data Management COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptative Reuse	Conservation - General Goal: Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources. Conservation Policy 1: Pursue the possibility of obtaining funding from the State Office of Historic Preservation to survey the Valley Center area and nominate all significant resources to the National Register of Historic Places or the County Register. Conservation Policy 22: Request the County Historic Site Board review all nominations of prehistoric and historic sites which qualify for inclusion in the County Register of Historic Landmarks.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The listing of specific resources provides guidance that adds a level of specificity to this policy. Similar policies exist in both the existing Community Plan and the General Plan, especially as related to general resource preservation and archiving of historical resources. This policy lists a specific organization that would be encouraged to catalog and seek designation for historic/cultural sites, providing further direction.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#495	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.1.4 Promote the location of a Native American cultural information center in Valley Center to facilitate community understanding of the region's cultural history.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #101 (CP Conservation Policy 20) GP: COS-7.6 Cultural Resource Data Management COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptative Reuse COS-8.2 Education and Interpretation	Conservation Policy 20: Require the location of an information center in Valley Center to facilitate community understanding of the region's cultural history.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Please see referenced existing Community Plan policy.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#496	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.1.5. Promote the landmark designation by the Historic Site Board of significant historic buildings and routes in the Planning Area and encourage public and private agencies and individuals to consider the reuse of historic structures	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #102 (CP Conservation Policy 21) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #104 (CP Conservation Policy 23) GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse	Conservation Policy 21: Pursue the possibility of obtaining funding from the State Office of Historic Preservation to survey the Valley Center area and nominate all significant resources to the National Register of Historic Places or the County Register. Conservation Policy 23: Require owners of significant historic and/or architectural sites to dedicate open space easements to preserve significant examples of California history and archaeology in the course of discretionary permit processing in order to register for Landmark Zoning with the County Historic Site Board.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> See the referenced CP Conservation Policy 23 in the Existing Community Plan. The second part of this policy proposal is covered by General Plan policy COS-8.1, which speaks to the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes.	Conservation - Historic Resources		
#497	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.1.6 Prohibit development, trenching, grading, clearing and grubbing, and other related activities which could damage significant prehistoric or historic sites.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #81 (CP Conservation - General Goal) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #104 (CP Conservation Policy 23) GP: COS-7.1 Archaeological Protection COS-7.2 Open Space Easements Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Cultural Resources	Conservation Policy 23: Require owners of significant historic and/or architectural sites to dedicate open space easements to preserve significant examples of California history and archaeology in the course of discretionary permit processing in order to register for Landmark Zoning with the County Historic Site Board.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by the Resource Protection Ordinance, which states: "Development, trenching, grading, clearing and grubbing, or any other activity or use damaging to significant prehistoric or historic site lands shall be prohibited, except for scientific investigations with an approved research design prepared by an archaeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists."	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#498	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Goal	COS 11.2 A stable, predictable set of funding sources for the survey and processing nominations of significant resources for county, state, and/or the federal Registers of Historic Places.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #81 (CP Conservation Goal [not numbered])	Conservation Goal (not numbered): Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This policy is covered by other cultural resources policies and no separate goal is needed.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#499	Conservation and Open Space - Cultural and historic resources	Policy	COS 11.2.1 Encourage the County and the Valley Center Historical Society and History Museum to investigate all possible sources of funding.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #102 (CP Conservation Policy 21)	Conservation Policy 21: Pursue the possibility of obtaining funding from the State Office of Historic Preservation to survey the Valley Center area and nominate all significant resources to the National Register of Historic Places or the County Register.	<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> The Community Plan does not have authority to encourage organizations to pursue funding for their mission nor turn away funding.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#500	Safety - Seismic and geologic risks	Goal	S4.1.a – Adequate water supplies exist in an emergency.	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #71 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal [not numbered]) GP: LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Goal (not numbered): Ensure that enough water is available from both local and outside sources to adequately supply all users in the community plan area.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan policy.	Safety - Water Supply		
#501	Safety - Seismic and geologic risks	Policy	S4.1.a.1 – Educate and encourage residents to have water storage in the event that there is disruption to the supply of city water and/or well water due to seismic activity.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #72 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 1)	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Many properties cannot support water storage facilities as referenced here. See the referenced row in the Exiting Community Plan matrix for supporting information on the staff recommended revision for that policy. The proposed revision reads: "Support the continued development of emergency storage facilities located near demand areas and away from earthquake faults." As a member agency of the SD County Water Authority, the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) has supported the development of SDCWA Emergency Storage Project and Carryover Storage Project which together added 190,000 acre feet of storage to the region. The VCMWD also supported development of the Carlsbad Desalination Plant, which produces 50,000 acre feet of desalted seawater, and of course is away from the major fault lines. The VCMWD has access to these regional sources in cases of emergency. Within the VCMWD service area, the VCMWD has 41 covered reservoirs with 441 acre feet of storage, providing up to 10 days of emergency supply with the service area. As such, Valley Center has extensive sources of emergency supply.	Safety - Water Supply		
#502	Safety - Seismic and geologic risks	Policy	S4.1.a.2 – Valley Center will have emergency storage caches of potable drinking water for emergency use. The location of these caches will be identified.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #72 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 1)	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service Policy 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.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> See Item 501 above.	Safety - Water Supply		
#503	Safety - Seismic and geologic risks	Goal	S4.1.b – Reduced risks to residents in the event of seismic activity.	GP: S-7 Reduced Seismic Hazards S-7.1 Development Location. S-7.2 Engineering Measures to Reduce Risk. S-7.3 Land Use Location. S-7.4 Unreinforced Masonry Structures S-7.5 Retrofitting of Essential Facilities		<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered by the referenced General Plan goal.	Safety - Seismic		
#504	Safety - Seismic and geologic risks	Policy	S4.1.b.2 - Do not allow subterranean parking under occupied residences. Limit structures to 2 stories in liquefaction areas.	GP: S-7.1 Development Location S-7.2 Engineering measures to Reduce Risk County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Geologic Hazards Uniform Building Code California Building Code	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> These types of issues are addressed in the General Plan policies referenced, in compliance with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code, and in adopting mitigation measures for projects with the potential for significant impacts, in accordance with the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Geologic Hazards. Section 5.3 of these Guidelines provide an overview of required hazard assessments in liquefaction areas and mitigation measures to reduce risks.	Safety - Seismic		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#505	Safety - Flooding	Goal	S4.1.a – All of the dams in Valley Center have an emergency action plan in place. Residents, particularly those close to the flood zone areas, are educated about the emergency procedures.	GP: S-9 Protection of Life and Property County of San Diego Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> With only one underlying policy, that could go with another safety goal, and per the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP), each of the dams in Valley Center already has an emergency action plan. The proposed revision to the policy below addresses the public awareness.	Safety - Dam Inundation		
#506	Safety - Flooding	Policy	S4.1.a.1 – All of the dams in Valley Center have an emergency action plan in place. The action plan is updated on a regular basis.	GP: S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Emergency Response	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Dam evacuation plans are maintained by the County Office of Emergency Services (OES), including current plans for the dams in Valley Center (Turner Dam, Upper Stehly Dam and Lower Stehly Dam). These plans contain information on the physical situation, affected jurisdictions, evacuation routes, unique institutions and even responses. Maps are provided, showing direction of flow, inundation area boundaries, hospitals, schools, and multipurpose staging areas, command posts/sites, and mass care and shelter facilities/sites. Unique institutions (in relation to dam inundation zones) include facilities that would pose issues with quick evacuation, including hospitals, schools, retirement homes, mental health facilities, child care facilities, jails/prisons, and stadiums/arenas. When a project proposes to place a unique institution like these in a dam inundation zone, they can be allowed under certain circumstances with mitigation applied including construction of structures at high enough elevations or construction to allow flow through of floodwaters and remove the need for evacuation; or the preparation of an emergency evacuation plan to the satisfaction of PDS and OES. The County already has evacuation plans for the dams in Valley Center, and their update intervals are guided by state regulations. County OES also works with dam owners to maintain Dam Emergency Response Plans, which are more focused on local guidelines, but there is not a fixed schedule for updates. They are updated on an as-needed basis as determined by OES.	Safety - Dam Inundation		
#507	Safety - Flooding	Goal	S4.1.b – Reduce the risks to residents of new developments in flood zone areas.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #94 (CP Conservation Policy 13) Existing Goals & Policy matrix #95 (CP Conservation Policy 14) <i>Though we typically wouldn't compare policies to a proposed goal, there isn't an Existing CP goal that corresponds with these referenced Existing CP policies.</i> GP: S-9 Protection of Life and Property. S-10 Floodway and Floodplain Capacity	Conservation-Policy 13: New developments shall be required to provide on and off site natural flood control improvements, when necessary, to ensure that water released from the project will not have an adverse environmental impact. Conservation-Policy 14: Prohibit discretionary permits that exacerbate problems in a currently identified downstream flooding area.	<i>Recommend Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> The underlying policy is proposed for removal, so this goal could be considered in comparison to the proposed related goal in Item 435 of this matrix.	Safety - Flood Hazards		
#508	Safety - Flooding	Policy	S4.1.b.1 – Require new developments in flood zone areas to be a minimum of 20' above creek bed.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #93 (CP Conservation-Policy 12) Existing Goals & Policy matrix #94 (CP Conservation-Policy 13) Existing Goals & Policy matrix #95 (CP Conservation-Policy 14) GP: 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 fringes S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance	Conservation-Policy 12- Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas. Conservation-Policy 13- New developments shall be required to provide on and off site natural flood control improvements, when necessary, to ensure that water released from the project will not have an adverse environmental impact. Conservation-Policy 14- Prohibit discretionary permits that exacerbate problems in a currently identified downstream flooding area.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) 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. In particular, 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. This proposal doesn't provide a definition or reference for the creek bed. The proposed revision in Item 161 of this matrix may cover the intent of this proposal, and reads as follows: "Maintain greenbelts along ephemeral streams and FEMA or County-mapped floodways."	Design Guidelines - Safety - Floods		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#509	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Goal	S4.1.c – Residents in Valley Center are educated with the latest fire science information and will take all precautions to prevent and, if necessary, to respond to wildland fire disasters to minimize loss of life and property, should they occur. Residents are in Compliance with their Fire Districts and with their Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP's).	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #64 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection Goal [not numbered]) GP: S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards Valley Center Community Wildfire Protection Plan	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection Goal (not numbered): Protect all life and property from fire hazard potential and minimize those elements within the natural, and human-made environment that pose a clear and significant fire hazard. Ensure adequate levels of fire protection.	<i>Recommend Similar Existing/Proposed Goals</i> This should be reviewed in comparison to the referenced goal from the Existing Community Plan.	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#510	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.1 – Promote implementation of “Valley Center Firewise” programs through information and education programs, community outreach, and fuel modification. Utilize and comply with the fire code and the Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP's) developed by the Valley Center Fire District, Deer Springs Fire Protection District, Valley Center Fire Safe Council, and Deer Springs Fire Safe Council.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #66 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2) GP: S-3.1 Defensible Development S-3.2 Development in Hillside and Canyons S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs Valley Center Community Wildfire Protection Plan County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection Policy 2: Encourage the establishment of a community fuel management program and fire safety program in accordance with fire district policy.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> Please see referenced Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#511	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.2 – Comply with fuel management/modification and defensible space boundaries specified by the Valley Center and Deer Springs Fire Districts and detailed by the fire code and the Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP's). For example, if the CWPP requires the removal of dead orchards, then dead orchards must be removed.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #66 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2) GP: S-3.1 Defensible Development S-3.2 Development in Hillside and Canyons S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs Valley Center Community Wildfire Protection Plan County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2: Encourage the establishment of a community fuel management program and fire safety program in accordance with fire district policy.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> The Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) are not regulatory documents. They identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments and recommend measures to reduce ignitability of structures, in addition to other fire protection recommendations. General Plan Policy S-4.1 addresses this issue and states: "Support programs and plans, such as Strategic Fire Plans, consistent with state law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats." Ⓜ	Safety - Fire		
#512	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.3 – Require property owners to remove orchards and other agriculture that they do not longer water and to re-vegetate the area with indigenous vegetation to avoid to erosion.	GP: S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code	NA	<i>Recommend Removal</i> This is covered in Section 4907.3.2 of the County Consolidated Fire Code, which reads, "All orchards, groves and vineyards shall be kept in a healthy state and free of combustible debris and vegetation, including dead or downed trees. A 10-foot firebreak shall be cleared around the perimeter of any orchard, grove or vineyard."	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#513	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.4 – Clear 100 foot perimeter around houses and barns.	GP: S-3.1 Defensible Development S-3.2 Development in Hillside and Canyons S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code		<i>Recommend Removal</i> Section 4907.2 of the County Consolidated Fire Code requires a 100-foot fuel modification zone (FMZ), which does not translate to clearing a 100-foot perimeter. The first 50 feet from the structure shall be cleared of non fire resistant vegetation and replanted with fire-resistant plans. The area 50 to 100 feet from a structure dead and dying vegetation shall be removed, but healthy native vegetation can remain, provided that fuel modification is performed as necessary so that combustible vegetation does not occupy more than 50% of the square footage of that area.	Safety - Fire Hazards		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#514	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.5 – Provide residents with landscape and vegetation management tips in landscape design and in selecting fire-resistant plants as well as in vegetation clearing methods.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #66 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2) GP: S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs S-4.2 Coordination to Minimize Fuel Management Impacts Valley Center and Deer Springs Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2: Encourage the establishment of a community fuel management program and fire safety program in accordance with fire district policy.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Educational programs by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District, the Valley Center Fire Protection District, and the Deer Springs and Greater Valley Center Fire Safe Councils have been conducted in the past and are ongoing (see p. 24 of the Deer Springs CWPP and p. 15 of the Greater Valley Center CWPP and websites for the fire districts). For consolidation of similar proposals, this policy proposal should be combined with the policy proposal in row 390 below. Proposed revision: Support the ongoing efforts of the Valley Center and Deer Springs Fire Protection Districts and Fire Safe Councils to educate residents on fuel management and other fire hazard reduction practices.	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#515	Safety - Wildland fire/urban fire	Policy	S4.1.c.6 – Pursue funding and a program to assist low-income residents and senior citizens in maintaining defensible space.	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #66 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2) GP: S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs S-4.2 Coordination to Minimize Fuel Management Impacts Valley Center and Deer Springs Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection-Policy 2: Encourage the establishment of a community fuel management program and fire safety program in accordance with fire district policy.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision (same revision as proposed for Item 514 above; combine into one policy)</i> See Item 514 of this matrix above. This proposal and Item 514 should be combined as one policy. The same proposed revision covers both policy proposals. Proposed revision: Support the ongoing efforts of the Valley Center and Deer Springs Fire Protection Districts and Fire Safe Councils to educate residents on fuel management and other fire hazard reduction practices.	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#516	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Goal	S4.2.a – Residents of Valley Center have a partially completed Community Protection and Evacuation Plan (CPEP) in place. Residents are educated about the CPEP and emergency procedures. All organizations, Sheriffs Dept, Fire Districts, Fire Safe Councils, VCPUSD School District (the certificated staff are mandatory emergency responders), CERT teams and other Volunteers, coordinate their efforts to assist in the education and emergency preparedness of the citizens of VC. Also these groups coordinate their efforts during an actual emergency. (S2.6)	CP: Existing Goals & Policy matrix #64 (CP Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection Goal [not numbered]) GP: S-2 Emergency Response S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards S-5 Regional Fire Protection Valley Center and Deer Springs Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services-Fire Protection Goal (not numbered): Protect all life and property from fire hazard potential and minimize those elements within the natural, and human-made environment that pose a clear and significant fire hazard. Ensure adequate levels of fire protection.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no adopted Community Protection and Evacuation Plan (CPEP) for Valley Center and they are no longer being prepared in the County. Emergency response agencies and organizations coordinate through the Community Wildfire Protection Plans adopted for Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs Fire Protection District.	Safety - Emergency Response		
#517	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.a.1 – In cooperation with OES, create a Community Protection and Evacuation Plan (CPEP) for Valley Center. Include all pertinent agencies (Valley Center Fire District, Deer Springs Fire Protection District, San Diego County Sheriffs Department, Valley Center Fire Safe Council, VCPUSD School District, Deer Springs Fire Safe Council, Community Emergency Response Teams etc.) Update the (CPEP) on a regular basis. Regulatory compliance; Community risk assessment; Mitigation strategies; Community protection and evacuation plans; Fire agencies response plans; Law enforcement response plans; Animal services response plans; utilities response plans; mass casualty and other medical response plans; Shelters, fire safe zones and emergency services response plans; should be in place and updated periodically.	GP: S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs Valley Center and Deer Springs Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> See the information in the row above about the past CPEP process and the current CWPPs. Proposed revision: Coordinate with fire districts, fire safe councils, and other emergency response agencies, in updating Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) at regular intervals, to address updated information.	Fire Evacuation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#518	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.a.2 – Valley Center should have a communication plan in place which incorporates Major Power/communication Lines Map; HAM Radio operations, and Community Notification (Master callout phone tree, radio, reverse 911, 211). Have a “Community personnel, Phone Numbers & Function List” which gives the names, telephone numbers and functions of First Responders and key community personnel. (Incorporate into CPEP) The list should be revised at least biannually.	GP: S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs		<i>Recommend Removal</i> Please refer to the referenced General Plan policies. As well, the County has resources to help residence prepare household emergency action plans.	Fire Evacuation		
#519	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Goal	S4.2.b – Residents of Valley Center will identify multiple evacuation routes.	GP: S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) note primary and secondary community access and evacuation routes in section B.1.1. Proposed revision 317 The same revision is proposed for item 189 in this matrix. Only one occurrence is needed. Continue to update evacuation information in Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs).	Fire Evacuation		
#520	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.b.1 – Secondary Access: Require secondary access for all developments without exception. (S-3.5) (Require development to include multiple access/egress routes)	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility Policy 12) GP: S-3.5 Access Roads Section 503.12 County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Wildland Fire and Fire Protection	Mobility Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Inclusion</i> The County Consolidated Fire Code provides the project discretion to the Fire Marshal/fire code official for determining access. Per Section 503.12, "The fire code official is authorized to require more than one fire apparatus access road based on the potential for impairment of a single road by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions or other factors that could limit access. When additional fire apparatus access roads are necessary as mitigation for exceedance of the maximum allowable dead-end road length, the additional fire apparatus access road must be remote from the primary fire apparatus access road." This policy proposal references General Plan Policy S-3.5, which requires secondary access "when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently." The following revision is proposed in order to avoid inconsistency with discretion allowed for in the Fire Code.	Safety - Fire Evacuation		
#521	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.b.2 – Emergency access roads. Require all existing dead-end streets with 10 or more residences to identify a secondary emergency exit (dirt or DG roads built to CalFire standards marked with reflectors are acceptable). (Incorporate into CPEP)	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #59 (CP Mobility Policy 12) GP: S-3.5 Access Roads County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Wildland Fire and Fire Protection	Mobility Policy 12: Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public Works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads from at least two separate access points.	<i>Recommend Removal</i> See the input on the policy proposal above. Additionally, the Community Plan does not have the authority to require.	Safety - Fire Evacuation		

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#522	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.b.3 – Emergency access roads. Identify “emergency only” Evacuation routes (grove roads). For example Cole Grade to Lilac road. Build to CalFire standards and marked with reflectors. (Incorporate into CPEP	CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #63 (CP Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal [not numbered]) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #62 (CP Public Facilities and Services-General Goal [not numbered]) GP: S-3.5 Access Roads Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection-Goal (not numbered): 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. Public Facilities and Services-General Goal (not numbered): 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.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Public safety officials need to be able to direct evacuations based on the characteristics of the incident, weather conditions, road capacity, etc. Proposed revision: (The same revision is proposed for Items 315 and 323 of this matrix and only one occurrence is needed). Continue to update evacuation information in Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs).	Safety - Fire Evacuation		
#523	Safety - Emergency Preparedness and Response	Policy	S4.2.b.4 – Identify Multiple use staging areas. Combine trail staging areas with emergency staging areas. (Incorporate into CPEP)	Community Trails Master Plan	NA	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> Section 6.6 of the Community Trails Master Plan discusses emergency response considerations in the development of final trail alignments, access points, and staging areas. Proposed revision: Identify multi-use staging areas that could be utilized in emergency situations, including evaluating the use of trail staging areas.	Safety - Emergency Response		
New Proposed Policies and Related Input									
#528								D Simms: Land Use/Housing I'm working in the Casino but have to commute 30 minutes each way because no affordable housing in VC. Why are there no houses in between the casino and VC village? I see plenty of open spaces right next to the road. Can these not be developed sensibly with low and mid-priced housing?	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion:</i> There are houses between the Villages and the Valley View Casino and Harrah's Rincon. Staff is assuming the commenter is referring to the portion of Valley Center Road just east of Vesper, where the extent of existing housing is more limited and some of the homes in this area are not visible from the road. The limited development in this area is partially due to constraints, including a floodplain, some sensitive habitat, and (perhaps the most significant reason) a high groundwater table in this area, limiting the feasibility of conventional septic systems on some properties. The current General Plan Land Use Map allows 1 dwelling unit per 4 acres in much of that area. Staff will consider this comment in the development of subareas, where focused updates to General Plan land use designations and zoning will be considered. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #9 Similar 2012 Proposals: Item # 147 & 154
#529								D Simms: Mobility Commuting to Escondido every time you want to buy something is terrible for the environment with all the CO2 emissions and traffic noise and fumes. We need LOCAL housing to cut down on commutes and traffic.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the comment. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #9 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 139, 176, 187 & 290
#530								D Simms: Conservation/Open Space/Parks Need more playing fields, polo, soccer, etc	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 7 & 9 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #139, 154, 176 & 187
#531								D Simms: Other: More Businesses We need local work and local housing	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #80

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#532								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Other: Outside Lighting The following comments pertain to the five SPAs: Live Oak Ranch; Woods Valley Ranch; Ridge Ranch 1; Ridge Ranch 2; and Orchard Run: Lighting: Given our proximity to Palomar Observatory and the scientific work still being done at the Observatory, all of Valley Center should have strict adherence to all Dark Sky rules and beyond. Our night sky is an asset to this community and we should do all we can to protect our night sky. No streetlights. All outside lighting should be shielded and directed down. No private street lights by property owners. Outside residential, as well as commercial / parking lot outside light should on timers (off by 10 PM) or on motion sensors.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Some of these suggestions are already covered in the County's Light Pollution Code. Most of Valley Center is within Zone A (15-mile buffer from the Palomar Observatory) with the most stringent requirements, but there are also restrictive measures in the Code for Zone B (all other properties in the unincorporated County). Suggestions for updates could be considered during updates to the Light Pollution Code. There is not a policy proposal provided in these comments, and staff is not clear on why suggestions on new restrictions would only apply to specific plan areas.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #47</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 189 & 396</p>
#533								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Mobility Trails, pathways, equestrians: Should be replaced by the term “non-motorized” trails and pathways. This would then be defined as to include walkers, bicycles (real bicycles and not the E-bikes) and equestrians. All trails and pathways should be open and available to the public and not limited to only the residents of a particular development (SPA). The trails / pathways within each SPA should connect to trails outside of the SPA that are part of the Valley Center Trails Masterplan which is in turn part of the County-wide Trails Master Plan. However, the community at large should have access to trails within each SPA. When a developer builds trails with the walls of gated community and the trail is only available to residents he is constructing an “amenity” that he can use as marketing tool to attract buyers. This “members only” trail is not a community asset. As was stated before, “What value is this trail to the community?” if there is no public / community access? Consideration should also be made for parking to allow for access to trails by non-resident users.</p>	<p><i>See a Similar Proposed Policy</i></p> <p>Trails in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) cannot be closed off to public access. While the comment provides some explanation of connectivity issues and problems with private trails, there is not a clear policy proposal to evaluate, Staff recognizes the issue with private trails and this has been brought up by other stakeholders. Please see new Item #566 in this matrix for a new policy proposal to address the issue of private trails.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 105, 106, 108, 109, 118</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 153, 396, 412, 464, 483</p>
#534								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing Open Space: All of the SPAs as well as other portions of the Community Plan have reference to Open Space preservation. This is very good. However, much open space is mere “eye candy” and developers are often very willing to give it away and sound so generous by proclaiming that “40% of the property will be set aside for open space” when the reality is that due to topography, floodplain designation, rocks, or the inability to “perk” they could not build on that land anyway. But open space is open space. So never turn it down. However, how will the open space be managed? Will native vegetation be restored? Will the public have access to the property? Many “appropriate conservation organizations” merely take title to these open space easements and then put up no-trespassing signs and /or fences to keep the public out. What value is this to the community?</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Considerations for potential public access to proposed open space will be evaluated during the project reveiw process, in developing mitigation for impacts to biological resources.</p>
#535								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing Golf Course: Does Valley Center really need or even want another golf course? From my quick internet search, I believe I count four golf courses in VC plus sixteen more within 25 miles. In the Woods Valley SPA, dump the golf course idea and replace it with a Nature Preserve, habitat restoration, parkland. We don't need more grass to keep green with water we don't have now and definitely will not have in the future.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Staff is not clear on what is being suggested or if a response is needed. Staff is not assuming the commenter is seeking a ban on golf courses, but there is no policy proposal. Approved Specific Plans will not be considered for re-designation (Specific Plan Amendments) as part of this Communityi Plan Update process.</p>

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#536								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Mobility</p> <p>1. All road improvements should require pathway designation and construction within the county right-of-way.</p> <p>2. All new home developments need to require pathway construction within and around the perimeter of the designated development. These trails need to connect to existing trails / pathways that are part of the County Trails Master Plan. This has been implemented on limited basis over the last twenty years.</p> <p>3. After the pathways are constructed, home owners need to be educated that landscaping on the pathway is forbidden. This is complaint often heard that the walkers & equestrians are forced into the street to go around the landscaping planted by a few homeowners.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>The County's Public Road Standards allow the construction of pathways within the road right of way when shown on adopted trail plan maps, including the CTMP. The Director of Public Works can also require a pathway within the right of way when recommended by the Community Planning Group. GP Policy M-12.4 requires development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways when the alignment would cross the property subject to the development proposal/application. On new home developments where there is no planned trail or pathway alignment crossing the subject property(ies), it's not as easy to identify, but depends on the size of the project, proximity to exisiting trail networks, mitigation requirements, and other factors.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 79 & 122</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 189 & 302</p>
#537								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Mobility</p> <p>4. These trails need to be available for not only residents of these neighborhoods but the community at large. Private trails within gated communities are not a community asset but an "amenity" the developer builds as a sales tool. These community trails need to provide parking for the community to access the trails.</p> <p>5. All public space needs to add to the trails network by offering a safe walking space within or around the property. This would include parks, shopping centers, schools, golf courses and other public buildings. To date, Valley Center has done a poor job of taking advantage of these opportunities.</p> <p>6. Utility and water district easements need to include a trail element where possible.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>See the response to the public review comment in Item #536 of this matrix. For example, trails wouldn't be required on a golf course for safety reasons. Parks, shopping centers, schools, and public buildings would not always be on properties large enough to allow a new trail when not already called out in the CTMP or Regional Trails Plan. Even with utility and water district easements, there is a liability component to consider in evaluating the addition of public trail access to the easement language.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 153 & 396</p>
#538								<p>F Wollman:</p> <p>Mobility</p> <p>7. The community needs to actively encourage the County to acquire additional land for parks in our community.</p> <p>a. Some of these parks can be for ball fields, community center, & swimming pools.</p> <p>b. Some of this land can remain in their natural state to provide habitat for wildlife in addition to humans enjoying a natural environment.</p> <p>8. Land that cannot be developed due to topography, rock formations, floodplains, and land that wont "perk" is often set aside as "open space." Because developers don't want the responsibility of retaining ownership of open space they often donate this land to Land Conservation Trusts. In many cases, these land managers will restore habitat but then forbid all public access to the land. For them, human interaction represents headaches and liability and the easiest way to manage these problems is to prohibit human access. Yes, it can be argued that human access is troublesome. However, what value to the community is land that can only be enjoyed through the fence. Land Trusts should be encouraged to partner with local organizations to open the property to the public with by partnering for supervision and clean-up.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Considerations for potential public access to proposed open space will be evaluated during the project reveiw process, in developing mitigation for impacts to biological resources.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 105, 113</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 464 & 483</p>
#539								<p>J Simms:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing</p> <p>My adult children cannot afford to buy a property in Valley Center due to house and lot sizes. We need to make Valley Center affordable to hard working individuals, seniors and families that are seeking housing away from the coast in a rural setting. There is plenty of open space along Valley Center Road heading east towards the school and the casino. These properties are perfect for development. The range of development should exceed the space immediately close to the south and north village. That makes no sense! Please create developments with 0.5-1 acre lots that are inclusive rather than exclusive!</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>There are houses between the Villages and the Valley View Casino and Harrah's Rincon. Staff is assuming the commenter is referring to the portion of Valley Center Road just east of Vesper, where the extent of existing housing is more limited and some of the homes in this area are not visible from the road. The limited development in this area is partially due to constraints, including a floodplain, some sensitive habitat, and (perhaps the most significant reason) a high groundwater table in this area, limiting the feasibility of conventional septic systems on some properties. The current General Plan Land Use Map allows 1 dwelling unit per 4 acres in much of that area. Staff will consider this comment in the development of subareas, where focused updates to General Plan land use designations and zoning will be considered. In addition to providing this information for the commenter, staff has made note of the input provided.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #9</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 147 & 154</p>

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#540								J Simms: Mobility If we build more housing, we won't have as much CO2 emissions from commuters. Please create round-about to slow the traffic down. Commuting to Escondido for groceries is bad for the environment and bad for traffic. We need a local supermarket and infrastructure	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #47 & 49 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #386
#541								J Simms: Conservation/Open Space/Parks We need soccer fields and recreational areas for families to enjoy the outdoors. This build community, character and a healthy environment for future generations.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 105, 113 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #477
#542								J Simms: Safety More housing means less traffic from commuters and safer roads!	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #9 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #140
#543				CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) 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 GP: COS-6.5 Best Management Practices LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Topography Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.			J Vick Mobility Plant shade trees along all Circulation Element roads to provide shade and to enhance the rural character of VC.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Landscaping in the public right-of-way in Valley Center is covered in section 3.2.4 of the Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards. Those standards don't include a blanket requirement of planting trees along all Mobility Element roads, so this proposal would create an inconsistency issue. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #49 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 148 & 165
#544				GP: N-4 Transportation-Related Noise Generators Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards County Public Road Standards				J Vick Mobility and Noise Require the use of rubberized asphalt to reduce noise when roads are resurfaced.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Requiring the use of rubberized asphalt on all Valley Center roads would result in substantially increased costs and therefore, could limit the extent of road resurfacing projects that can be completed in the community. Rubberized asphalt is being used on the Cole Grade Road widening project because a noise study showed that the project would otherwise increase noise levels beyond the threshold of 3 decibels. However, issues associated with a blanket requirement for rubberized asphalt include increased cost, potential for decreased performance, limitations on where it can be used, limitations on material availability, increased design requirements, and limitations on the use of RAP (reclaimed asphalt pavement). Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #126

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#545				GP: N-1.3 Sound Walls COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design Valley Center Design Guidelines				J Vick Land Use/Housing and Mobility Prohibit the use of sound walls for new developments.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> General Plan Policy N-1.3 covers this issue by discouraging noise walls and combining with earthen berms and screening when they can't be avoided. Completely banning them could excessively limit potential housing locations. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #124
#546				CP: Existing Goals & Policies #6 (CP Community Character Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies #27 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies #31 (CP Land Use - Commercial Policy 6) GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Valley Center Design Guidelines Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Community Character Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character. Land Use - Commercial Policy 2: Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, landforms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and viewshed shall be incorporated in the design of future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area. Land Use - Commercial Policy 6: Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.			J Vick Land Use/Housing Require that the size of new commercial structures be scaled to fit the community character of a rural community. Do not allow "big box stores"	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> During the update of the Design Guidelines, stakeholders can recommend components to ensure compatible design with the Villages and for additional properties zoned for commercial or industrial, outside the Villages. The architectural, parking, and building placement guidelines covered in the Design Guidelines can address unfavorable design components typically associated with larger development.
#547				CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #49 (CP Mobility Policy 2) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #50 (CP Mobility Policy 3) GP: M-1.3 Treatment of High-Volume Roadways M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Mobility Policy 2: Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated. Mobility Policy 3: Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.			J Vick Mobility A circulation system that keeps traffic moving on VC Road by use of roundabouts wherever practical in lieu of traffic lights.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 47 & 49 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #386
#548				GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design Mobility Network Element Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards				J Vick Mobility The addition of more landscaped medians along VC Road to provide separation of traffic with frequent breaks to allow for U-turn to facilitate safe shopping.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 47 & 49 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #148
#549				NA				J Vick Mobility Establish speed limits in the North and South business zones to facilitate safe shopping. 25 MPH to 30 MPH is recommended.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Speed limits are determined by Speed Zone Surveys, the 85th percentile speed (speed at or below which, 85 percent of the traffic is travelling), and additional engineering analysis. The County cannot raise or reduce speed limits based on community plan policies.

Key

	= All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
	= At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
	= The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
	= A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#550				CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #60 (CP Mobility Policy 13) Mobility Network Element Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards	Mobility Policy 13: Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.			J Vick Mobility Add DG trails (non-motorized) along all Circulation Element roads to promote safe walking and equestrian use.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Planned pathways are called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP), with design considerations discussion in the Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards and the County Public Road Standards. Through the process of updating the Community Plan, stakeholders can recommend changes to the CTMP. Stakeholders should review the planned pathways in the CTMP to see where new planned pathways are needed. Staff does not support a blanket statement to require pathways in every portion of every Mobility Element Road alignment, as these alignments cross through areas of very low residential densities. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #341
#551								T Tuluie: Land Use/Housing PLEASE allow smaller lot housing for families Poway is a good example for clustering We need to think about the future: More Solar!!! 1/2 acre lots and 1 acre lot developments are reasonable for Valley Center. Who can afford to buy 4 acres?? Make housing for mid-range incomes! Put housing clusters along commercial roads	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 9 & 22 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 154
#552								T Tuluie: Mobility Bike lanes to and from Pauma Valley to the village, so people can bike safely including children Walking paths along Valley Center road	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. The current Mobility Element for Valley Center includes planned Class II bike lanes along Cole Grade Rod and and the portion of Valley Center Road that leads to Pauma Valley. Bike lanes are part of the Cole Grade Road widening project. There is a current walking path (the Heritage Trail) on the west and north sides of Valley Center Road through Villages.
#553								T Tuluie: Conservation/Open Space/Parks Trails for runners and bicyclists - look at San Pasqual Valley and Poway for their trail system in nature We need more solar to prepare for development. Upgrade the substation to accommodate the load!!	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Trails throughout the unincorporated County are planned through the Community Trails Master Plan. There are various mechanisms for implementation. The typical process for obtaining easements through private property is via the discretionary project review process. Staff has made note of the input provided. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #122 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 335 & 396
#554								T Tuluie: Safety Slower speeds along Valley Center Road	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process.
#555								T Tuluie: Land Use/Housing Downtown VC needs an upgrade and more businesses like they have in Julian and Temecula Make downtown walkable You can feel and look rural if housing has planned communities. Build a Supermarket such as Sprouts or Trader Joes	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process. Staff has made note of the other input provided. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 7, 9, 26 & 33 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 176 & 187

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#556								T Tuluie: Conservation/Open Space/Parks Open space for families to hike and do activities. Parks and horseback riding trails	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 105 & 113 Similar 2012 Proposals: Item # 483 & 489
#557								T Tuluie: Safety Designated Bike lanes please along Valley Center Road Slow down Valley Center Road - reduce speeds	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> There are currently Class II bike lanes along Valley Center Road through the Villages. Class IV bike lanes (physical separation from traffic) are planned through the Villages and up to North Lake Wohlford Road. Class II bike lanes are planned for other portions of Valley Center Road. The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #47
#558								Tol: Land Use/Housing It's easy to think of "rural character" when you don't live here and are driving by, but we don't live in a Hollywood western set. I have lived in Valley Center for 28 years, and things are changing, but it's manageable. Nothing is getting "ruined". What matters more is what rural feels like when I'm at home. Rural is not big executive homes using up lots of land on big lots and running their lawn movers every week. Rural is smaller single-level homes, smaller plots, set together to give some open space as well separation from existing homes, so we feel we are not hemmed in. Rural is a mix – farming, houses, small business, stores. And yes, instead of oil rigs and wind mills now solar too these days. I'd prefer all new houses to be built in a fixed space, rather than one big lot getting sold and only a few executive homes being built. That is a waste of space. Better to build more and smaller/medium homes in a set away a bit. That will alleviate the housing needs of the people who actually work here and can't afford to live here.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 6, 8, & 9 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #148
#559								Tol: Land Use/Housing and Noise No new houses within or behind established neighborhoods. Next to, fine, as long as the new house traffic doesn't have to go through my neighborhood. No in-filling! No new roads or widening roads. The worst thing about more houses are not the houses, but the traffic they create. Don't allow them to build new/wider roads through our neighborhoods. Put them along Cole Grade road or Valley Center road outside the village.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar Existing: Item #8 & 49 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #148
#560								Tol: Land Use/Housing Put the new houses in a space that we don't have to see from our homes. It's not always quite possible, but try to only affect a few houses, not all. I don't care if I see it while driving by, but I don't want to see the houses instead of the mountains when at home.	<i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment. Similar Existing: Item #8 Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #149
#561								Tol: Land Use/Housing No more houses in the village! We have had enough. Put them outside the village.	<i>Not recommended for inclusion</i> Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment.

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Valley Center Goals and Policies - 2012 Proposals

Item #	Element Referenced	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	County Staff Recommendation/Response
#562								<p>Tol:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing Farming is no longer sustainable and farmers shouldn't have to bare the cost of land because it 'looks rural'. The land can be used in a much more funtional capacity that allows for low to mid sensible housing and retains the look and feel of Valley Center</p> <p>Farmland along commercial roads is suitable for housing clusters as well as solar developments.</p> <p>It makes sense to cluster housing developments between the village and the casino, as the road is already heavily trafficked.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Staff has made note of the input provided. There is not an apparent policy proposal in the comment.</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item #258</p>
#563								<p>Tol:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing Upgrade the sewer systems to reach beyond the village. Build the infrastructure now</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Staff has made note of the input provided.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item #75</p>
#564								<p>Tol:</p> <p>Land Use/Housing and Mobility Create a walkable downtown Valley Center to attract visitors and generate revenue.</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Staff has made note of the input provided.</p> <p>The Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan will be brought forward for potential Board of Supervisors adoption at the same time as the Community Plan Update. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing process, the Corridor Concept Plan will be considered by the Community Planning Group and the Planning Commission for recommendations. There will be additional opportunities to participate in the plan development during workshops and other opportunities to provide input. Recommendations for Valley Center Road through the Villages will be covered in that plan. Roundabouts are being considered through that process under the various themes/alternatives and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input throughout the process.</p> <p>Similar items from Existing Matrix: Item # 7, 9, 26 & 33</p> <p>Similar items from 2012 Matrix: Item # 176 & 187</p>
#565								<p>Tol</p> <p>Other: our future San Diegan homeowners Plan and consider future generations such as millennials that will start families and need a place to raise their families.</p> <p>Look at villages north of San Diego, such as Mill Valley, Larkspur, Fairfax. They retain their charm yet balance housing for median income families</p>	<p><i>Not Recommended for Inclusion</i></p> <p>Staff has made note of the input provided.</p>
#566			<p>New staff policy proposal to address multiple stakeholder concerns:</p> <p>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 priortize public access and connectivity to the CTMP.</p>					<p>New staff policy proposal to address multiple stakeholder concerns:</p> <p>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 priortize public access and connectivity to the CTMP.</p>	

Key

- = All public review comments were in agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = At least one public review comment was not in full agreement with the initial staff recommendation
- = The initial staff recommendation changed as a result of a public review comment or further internal analysis
- = A mistake was found in the initial staff recommendation cell shown in the public review matrix (example: accidentally leaving out the proposed revised policy when a revision was proposed)

Item #	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category
Unique number identifier given to each existing and proposed goal or policy	Existing "Element" (community plan section) where goal/policy is contained.	Either goal or policy. For each goal, there must be at least one supporting policy. There is no limit on the number of policies per goal.	Text of the goal or policy as it currently appears or is proposed for the Valley Center Community Plan or as proposed as a new policy. Revised policy text is located in columns to the right.	Number identifier and title of General Plan goals and policies related to the content of the community plan goal or policy. Community plan goals or policies should not repeat General Plan goals and policies – they should be more detailed and discuss considerations that are specific to Valley Center.	Text of the referenced similar existing Community Plan goal or policy.	<p>Initial clarifications/ recommendations/ questions developed by County staff for consideration by the Community Plan Update Subcommittee to the CPG and public at large.</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion</i> Staff does not find any issues and recommends inclusion of the goal or policy in the Community Plan Update.</p> <p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The goal or policy is recommended to be included in the Community Plan Update after revision. The proposed revision is provided in the staff recommendation cell of the applicable matrix row.</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal</i> The goal or policy is not recommended to be included in the Community Plan Update. Issues staff has found are explained in the staff recommendation cell of the applicable row.</p> <p><i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i> The goal or policy is recommended to be removed or would need to be revised if included in the Community Plan Update. This choice is not frequently used but is appropriate where the intent of the goal or policy may not be clear, and stakeholders can provide proposed revised text if they don't agree with removing it.</p> <p><i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies</i> This is used when there are multiple goals/policies and/or goal/policy proposals that may not be exact duplicates but are almost the same. Staff has provided the matrix row(s) for comparison and stakeholders can comment on the best wording.</p> <p><i>Design Guidelines</i> The Valley Center Design Guidelines are applicable to site design and structure design review for all properties in the Villages and additional commercial and industrial properties that are outside the Villages. These Guidelines will be updated as part of the Community Plan Update process. The existing or proposed goal or policy addresses issues that would be covered in the Design Guidelines and stakeholders can bring forward such proposals during the workshops and other public outreach for the Design Guidelines Update. These items are not proposed for inclusion as Community Plan goals or policies.</p>	General category of the goal or policy.

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Guiding Principal	Guiding Principal 2	Promote health and sustainability by locating new growth near existing and planned infrastructure, services, and jobs in a compact pattern of development.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System	A regionally managed, inter-connected preserve system that embodies the regional biological diversity of San Diego County.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System	Identify and develop a coordinated biological preserve system that includes Pre-Approved Mitigation Areas, Biological Resource Core Areas, wildlife corridors, and linkages to allow wildlife to travel throughout their habitat ranges.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.3 Management	Monitor, manage, and maintain the regional preserve system facilitating the survival of native species and the preservation of healthy populations of rare, threatened, or endangered species.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions	Collaborate with other jurisdictions and trustee agencies to achieve well-defined common resource preservation and management goals.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.5 Regional Funding	Collaborate with other jurisdictions and federal, state, and local agencies to identify regional, long-term funding mechanisms that achieve common resource management goals.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.6 Assemblage of Preserve Systems	Support the proactive assemblage of biological preserve systems to protect biological resources and to facilitate development through mitigation banking opportunities.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.7 Preserve System Funding	Provide adequate funding for assemblage, management, maintenance and monitoring through coordination with other jurisdictions and agencies.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.8 Multiple Resource-Preservation Areas	Support the acquisition of large tracts of land that have multiple resource preservation benefits, such as biology, hydrology, cultural, aesthetics, and community character. Establish funding mechanisms to serve as an alt
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.9 Invasive Species	Require new development adjacent to biological preserves to use non-invasive plants in landscaping. Encourage the removal of invasive plants within preserves.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.11 Volunteer Preserve Monitor	Encourage the formation of volunteer preserve managers that are incorporated into each community planning group to supplement professional enforcement staff.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment	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.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement	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.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design	Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development	Require development projects to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; and ■ Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydromodification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species.
Conservation & Open Space	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.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping	Require efficient irrigation systems and in new development encourage the use of native plant species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-4.5 Recycled Water	Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources	Protection and maintenance of local reservoirs, watersheds, aquifer-recharge areas, and natural drainage systems to maintain high-quality water resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains	Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5.3 Downslope Protection	Require development to be appropriately sited and to incorporate measures to retain natural flow regimes, thereby protecting downslope areas from erosion, capturing runoff to adequately allow for filtration and/or infiltration, and protecting downstream biological resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5.4 Invasive Species	Encourage the removal of invasive species to restore natural drainage systems, habitats, and natural hydrologic regimes of watercourses.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6 Sustainable Agricultural Industry	A viable and long-term agricultural industry and sustainable agricultural land uses in the County of San Diego that serve as a beneficial resource and contributor to the County's rural character and open space network.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations	Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations ■ Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses ■ Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and design development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development ■ Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture ■ Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations ■ Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.4 Conservation Easements	Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and programs that preserve agricultural lands.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices	. 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.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7 Protection of Preservation of Archaeological Resources	Protection and preservation of the County's important archaeological resources for their cultural importance to local communities, as well as their research and educational potential.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7.1 Archaeological Protection	Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7.2 Open Space Easements	Require development to avoid archeological resources whenever possible. If complete avoidance is not possible, require development to fully mitigate impacts to archaeological resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7.3 Archaeological Collections	Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner. <p><i>The determination of what constitutes appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections should be based on existing federal curation standards in combination with consultation with the affected community, such as the tribes. Many collections should be placed in a local collections curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79. The proper storage and treatment of these collections should also be based on consultation with the affected community, such as the tribes. In addition, existing federal and state law governs the treatment of certain cultural items and human remains, requires consultation, and in some circumstances, repatriation. The County is committed to conduct an inventory of collections it holds or are held by cultural resources consulting firms.</i></p>

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7.4 Consultation with Affected Communities	<p>Require consultation with affected communities, including local tribes to determine the appropriate treatment of cultural resources.</p> <p><i>Consultation should take place with the affected communities concerning the appropriate treatment of cultural resources, including archaeological sites, sacred places, traditional cultural properties, historical buildings and objects, artifacts, human remains, and other items. The County is required by law, Senate Bill 18 Protection of Traditional Tribal Cultural Places (SB-18), to consult with the appropriate tribes for projects that may result in major land use decisions including General Plans, General Plan Amendments, Specific Plans and Specific Plan Amendment. In addition to these types of permits, it is County policy to consult with the appropriate tribes on all other projects that contain or are likely to contain, archaeological resources. Consultation may also include active participation by the tribes as monitors in the survey, testing, excavation, and grading phases of the project</i></p>

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7.6 Cultural Resource Data Management	Coordinate with public agencies, tribes, and institutions in order to build and maintain a central database that includes a notation whether collections from each site are being curated, and if so, where, along with then ature and location of cultural resources throughout the County of San Diego. <i>This database should be accessible to all qualified individuals while maintaining the confidentiality of the location and nature of sensitive cultural resources, such as archaeological sites. The County maintains a partnership with the local repository of the database, the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, which provides direct access by qualified County personnel to the database so that the information it contains may be used to design development projects to avoid cultural resources at an early point in the process.</i>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse	Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-8.2 Education and Interpretation	Encourage and promote the development of educational and interpretive programs that focus on the rich multicultural heritage of the County of San Diego
Conservation & Open Space	COS-10.1 Siting of Development	Encourage the conservation (i.e., protection from incompatible land uses) of areas designated as having substantial potential for mineral extraction. Discourage development that would substantially preclude the future development of mining facilities in these areas. Design development or uses to minimize the potential conflict with existing or potential future mining facilities. For purposes of this policy, incompatible land uses are defined by SMARA Section 3675.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-10.2 Protection of State-Classified or Designated Lands	Discourage development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), as well as potential mineral lands identified by other government agencies. The potential for the extraction of substantial mineral resources from lands classified by the State of California as areas that contain mineral resources (MRZ-3) shall be considered by the County in making land use decisions.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-10.5 Reclamation Plans	Require all mining projects to be conducted in accordance with a reclamation plan that meets the minimum reclamation standards required by the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and the associated State Mining and Geology Board regulations. Require the reclamation plan to include a phasing plan that provides for the completion of the surface mining on each segment of the mined lands so that the reclamation can be initiated at the earliest possible time on those portions of the mined lands that will not be subject to further disturbance by the surface mining operation.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-10.8 New Mining Facilities	Develop specific permit types and procedures for the authorization of new mining facilities that recognize the inherent physical effects of mining operations and the public necessity for available mineral resources adequate to meet local demand, in accordance with PRC Section 2762.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources	Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections	Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors, such as scenic highways and regional trails.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design	Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following: ■ Creative site planning ■ Integration of natural features into the project ■ Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape ■ Minimal disturbance of topography
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.4 Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions	Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to protect scenic resources and corridors that extend beyond the County's land use authority, but are important to the welfare of County residents.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.5 Collaboration with Private and Public Agencies	Coordinate with the California Public Utilities Commission, power companies, and other public agencies to avoid siting energy generation, transmission facilities, and other public improvements in locations that impact visually sensitive areas, whenever feasible. Require the design of public improvements within visually sensitive areas to blend into the landscape.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-12 Preservation of Ridgelines and Hillside	Ridgelines and steep hillsides that are preserved for their character and scenic value.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges	Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13 Dark Skies	Preserved dark skies that contribute to rural character and are necessary for the local observatories.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare	Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna	Minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the impact of development on the dark skies surrounding Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories to maintain dark skies which are vital to these two world-class observatories by restricting exterior light sources within the impact areas of the observatories.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14 Sustainable Land Development	Land use development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment. [See also Goal LU-6]
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.6 Solar Access for Infill Development	Require that property setbacks and building massing of new construction located within existing developed areas maintain an envelope that maximizes solar access to the extent feasible.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.7 Alternative Energy Sources for Development Projects	Encourage development projects that use energy recovery, photovoltaic, and wind energy .
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.8 Minimize Air Pollution	Minimize land use conflicts that expose people to significant amounts of air pollutants.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.9 Significant Producers of Air Pollutants	. Require projects that generate potentially significant levels of air pollutants and/or GHGs such as quarries, landfill operations, or large land development projects to incorporate renewable energy, and the best available control technologies and practices into the project design. <i>The recovered methane from landfills can be pumped through turbines to generate power. This provides a mutual benefit by generating energy and reducing the amount of CO2 and methane being released from landfills. Other uses for closed facilities include photovoltaic (solar) panels, wind, and microturbines, as appropriate for the area they would be located in.</i>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.10 Low-Emission Construction Vehicles and Equipment	Require County contractors and encourage other developers to use low-emission construction vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-14.12 Heat Island Effect	Require that development be located and designed to minimize the "heat island" effect as appropriate to the location and density of development, incorporating such elements as cool roofs, cool pavements, and strategically placed shade trees. <i>Heat islands formed as urbanized areas replace natural land cover with pavement, buildings, and other infrastructure, resulting in significantly higher average temperatures than the rural areas surrounding them.</i>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-15.1 Design and Construction of New Buildings	Require that new buildings be designed and constructed in accordance with "green building" programs that incorporate techniques and materials that maximize energy efficiency, incorporate the use of sustainable resources and recycled materials, and reduce emissions of GHGs and toxic air contaminants.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-18 Sustainable Energy	Energy systems that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources and reduce GHG and other air pollutant emissions while minimizing impacts to natural resources and communities.
Conservation & Open Space	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.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities	Park and recreation facilities that enhance the quality of life and meet the diverse active and passive recreational needs of County residents and visitors, protect natural resources, and foster an awareness of local history, with approximately ten acres of local parks and 15 acres of regional parks provided for every 1,000 persons in the unincorporated County.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.1 Diversity of Users and Services	Provide parks and recreation facilities that create opportunities for a broad range of recreational experiences to serve user interests.

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.2 Location of Parks	Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers where feasible, so that they may function as the “heart” of a community.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.3 Park Design	Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.4 Regional Parks	Require new regional parks to allow for a broad range of recreational activities and preserve special or unique natural or cultural features when present.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks	Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-23.1 Public Access	Provide public access to natural and cultural (where allowed) resources through effective planning that conserves the County's native wildlife, enhances and restores a continuous network of connected natural habitat and protects water resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-23.2 Regional Coordination	Coordinate the planning, acquisition, protection, development, and management of open space among governmental agencies and private organizations to maximize opportunities to link regional open space lands.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding	Adequate funding for acquisition, development, maintenance, management, and operation of parks, recreation facilities, and preserves.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions	Require development to provide fair-share contributions toward parks and recreation facilities and trails consistent with local, state, and federal law.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities	Maximize funding opportunities for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The acquisition, expansion, and development of parks, recreation facilities, preserves, and trails ■ The operation, maintenance, and management of parks, recreation facilities, preserves, and trails
Housing	H-1 Housing Development and Variety	A housing stock comprising a variety of housing and tenancy types at a range of prices, which meets the varied needs of existing and future unincorporated County residents, who represent a full spectrum of age, income, and other demographic characteristics.
Housing	H-1.2 Development Intensity Relative to Permitted Density	Encourage a development intensity of at least 80 percent of the maximum permitted gross density for sites designated at 15 to 30 dwelling units per acre in development projects.
Housing	H-1.6 Land for All Housing Types Provided in Villages	Provide opportunities for small-lot single-family, duplex, triplex, and other multi-family building types in Villages.
Housing	H-1.7 Mix of Residential Development Types in Villages	Support the design of large-scale residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) in villages that include a range of housing types, lot sizes, and building sizes.
Housing	H-3.3 Density Bonus as a means to Develop Affordable Housing	Provide a local density bonus program to encourage the development of housing affordable to lower income households and special needs housing.
Housing	H-3.4 Housing for Moderate-Income Families in Villages	Facilitate the production of housing for moderate income families within Villages by permitting developments that offer affordable housing to incorporate other compatible housing types within areas zoned for single-family residential development.
Land Use	LU-1 Primacy of the Land Use Element	A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.
Land Use	LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development	Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries.
Land Use	LU-1.3 Development Patterns	Designate land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve surrounding rural lands.
Land Use	LU-1.4 Village Expansion	Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding ■ Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network ■ Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents ■ The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area
Land Use	LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character	Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.
Land Use	LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes	Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.
Land Use	LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character	Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.
Land Use	LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts	Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or area detrimental to human health and safety.
Land Use	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character	Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.
Land Use	LU-3 Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods	A land use plan that accommodates a range of building and neighborhood types suitable for a variety of lifestyles, ages, affordability levels, and design options.
Land Use	LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types	Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.
Land Use	LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects	Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation	Ensure the preservation of existing open space and rural areas (e.g., forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, and groundwater recharge areas) when permitting development under the Rural and Semi Rural Land Use Designations.
Land Use	LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability	Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.
Land Use	LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design	Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design	Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management	Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development techniques as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County's LID Handbook.
Land Use	LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design	Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.
Land Use	LU-6.7 Open Space Network	Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Land Use	LU-6.8 Oversight of Open Space	Require that open space associated with future development that is intended to be preserved in perpetuity either be: 1) Retained in private ownership of the property owner or a third party with a restrictive easement that limits use of the land as appropriate; or 2) Transferred into public ownership of an agency that manages preserved open space. The owner of the open space will be responsible for the maintenance and any necessary management unless those responsibilities are delegated through an adopted plan or agreement. Restrictive easements shall be dedicated to the County or a public agency (approved by the County) with responsibilities that correspond with the purpose of the open space. When transferred to a third party or public agency, a funding mechanism to support the future maintenance and management of the property should be established to the satisfaction of the County.
Land Use	LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography	Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.
Land Use	LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigated Hazards	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.
Land Use	LU-7 Agricultural Conservation	A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.
Land Use	LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores	Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.
Land Use	LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations	Support the development and implementation of design guidelines, Village-specific regulations for roads, parking, and noise, and other planning and regulatory mechanisms that recognize the unique operations and character of Villages, Town Centers, and transportation nodes. Ensure that new development be compatible with the overall scale and character of established neighborhoods.
Land Use	LU-9.5 Village Uses	Encourage development of district areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types.
Land Use	LU-9.6 Town Center Uses	Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Villages or Rural Villages at transportation nodes. Exceptions to this pattern may be allowed for established industrial districts and secondary commercial districts or corridors.
Land Use	LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design	Plan and guide the development of Town Center and transportation nodes as the major focal point and activity node for Village areas. Utilize design guidelines to be compatible with the unique character of a community. Roadways, streetscapes, building facades, landscaping, and signage within the town center should be pedestrian oriented. Wherever possible, locate public facilities, such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks in Town Centers and Villages.
Land Use	LU-9.10 Internal Village Connectivity	Require that new development in Village areas are integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway, and recreational open space networks, including pedestrian and bike paths.
Land Use	LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands	Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.
Land Use	LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity	Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.
Land Use	LU-10.3 Village Boundaries	Use Semi-Rural and Rural land use designations to define the boundaries of Villages and Rural Land Use designations to serve as buffers between communities.
Land Use	LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity	Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.
Land Use	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character	Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.
Land Use	LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.
Land Use	LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions	Locate transitions of medium-intensity land uses or provide buffers between lower intensity uses, such as low-density residential districts and higher intensity development, such as commercial or industrial uses. Buffering may be accomplished through increased setbacks or other techniques such as grade differentials, walls, and/or landscaping but must be consistent with community design standards.
Land Use	LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development	Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.
Land Use	LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development	Require the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services needed by new development prior to that development, either directly or through fees. Where appropriate, the construction of infrastructure and facilities may be phased to coincide with project phasing.
Land Use	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.
Land Use	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.
Land Use	LU-14.1 Wastewater Facility Plans	Coordinate with wastewater agencies and districts during the preparation or update of wastewater facility masters plans and/or capital improvement plans to provide adequate capacity and assure consistency with the County's land use plans.
Land Use	LU-14.4 Sewer Facilities	Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or extant Urban Limit Lines, whichever is more restrictive, except: ■ When necessary for public health, safety, or welfare; ■ When within existing sewer district boundaries; ■ When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or ■ Where specifically allowed in the community plan.
Land Use	LU-18.2 Colocation of Civic Uses	Encourage the co-location of civic uses such as County library facilities, community centers, parks, and schools. To encourage access by all segments of the population, civic uses should be accessible by transit whenever possible.
Mobility	M-1 Balanced Road Network	A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.
Mobility	M-1.1 Prioritized travel within Community Planning Areas	Provide a public road network that accommodates travel between and within community planning areas rather than accommodating overflow traffic from State highways and freeways that are unable to meet regional travel demands.
Mobility	M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network	Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies.
Mobility	M-1.3 Interconnected Road Network	Consider narrower rights-of-way, flexibility in design standards, and lower design speeds in areas planned for substantial development in order to avoid bisecting communities or town centers. Reduce noise, air, and visual impacts of new freeways, regional arterials, and Mobility Element roads, through landscaping, design, and/or careful location of facilities.
Mobility	M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria	Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.
Mobility	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads	Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Mobility	M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design	Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.
Mobility	M-3 Transportation Facility Development	New or expanded transportation facilities that are phased with and equitably funded by the development that necessitates their construction.
Mobility	M-3.1 Public Road Right-of-Way	Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards, Active Transportation Plan and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.
Mobility	M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation	Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and equestrian.
Mobility	M-4 Safe and Compatible Roads	Roads designed to be safe for all users and compatible with their context.
Mobility	M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads	Encourage multi-modal roads in Villages and compact residential areas with pedestrian-oriented development patterns that enhance pedestrian safety and walkability, along with other non-motorized modes of travel, such as designing narrower but slower speed roads that increase pedestrian safety.
Mobility	M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads	Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.
Mobility	M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character	Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Mobility	M-4.4 Accommodate Emergency Vehicles	Design and construct public and private roads to allow for necessary access for appropriately-sized fire apparatus and emergency vehicles while accommodating outgoing vehicles from evacuating residents.
Mobility	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.
Mobility	M-4.6 Interjurisdictional Coordination	Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions so that roads within Spheres of Influence (SOIs) or that cross jurisdictional boundaries are designed to provide a Road in Valle de Oro with bicycle lane and multi-use pathway consistent cross-section and capacity. To the extent practical, coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions to construct road improvements concurrently or sequentially to optimize and maintain road capacity.
Mobility	M-5.1 Regional Coordination	Coordinate with regional planning agencies, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions to provide a transportation system with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sufficient capacity consistent with the County General Plan Land Use Map ■ Travel choices, including multiple routes and modes of travel to provide the opportunity for reducing vehicle miles traveled ■ Facilities sited and designed to be compatible with the differing scales, intensities, and characteristics of the unincorporated communities while still accommodating regional, community, and neighborhood travel demands ■ Maximized efficiency to enhance connectivity between different modes of travel
Mobility	M-7 Airport Facilities	Viable and accessible airport facilities whose continuing operations effectively serve the evolving needs of the region while minimizing any adverse impacts of airport operations.
Mobility	M-7.1 Meeting Airport Needs	Operate and improve airport facilities to meet air transportation needs in a manner that adequately considers impacts to environmental resources and surrounding communities and to ensure consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.
Mobility	M-8 Public Transit System	A public transit system that reduces automobile dependence and serves all segments of the population.
Mobility	M-8.1 Maximize Transit Service Opportunities	Coordinate with SANDAG, the CTSA, NCTD, and MTS to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities ■ Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes ■ Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible ■ Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops
Mobility	M-8.4 Transit Amenities	Require transit stops that are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists; and provide amenities for these users' convenience.
Mobility	M-8.5 Improved Transit Facilities	Require development projects, when appropriate, to improve existing nearby transit and/or park and ride facilities, including the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, provisions for bus transit in coordination with NCTD and MTS as appropriate including, but not limited to, shelters, benches, boarding pads, and/or trash cans, and to provide safe, convenient, and attractive pedestrian connections.
Mobility	M-8.6 Park and Ride Facilities	Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.
Mobility	M-9.1 Transportation Systems Management	Explore the provision of operational improvements (i.e. adding turn lanes, acceleration lanes, intersection improvements, etc.) that increase the effective vehicular capacity of the public road network prior to increasing the number of road lanes. Ensure operational improvements do not adversely impact the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks.
Mobility	M-9.3 Preferred Parking	Encourage and provide incentives for commercial, office, and industrial development to provide preferred parking for carpools, vanpools, electric vehicles and flex cars. [Refer also to Policy COS-16.3 (Low-Emission Vehicles) in the Conservation and Open Space Element.] Encourage parking cash out programs to reimburse employees for the cost of "free" on-site parking to provide incentives to use alternate modes of travel and to reduce parking requirements (see also Policy M-10.5).
Mobility	M-10.1 Parking Capacity	Require new development to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 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
Mobility	M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity	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.
Mobility	M-10.3 Maximize On-Street Parking	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.
Mobility	M-10.6 On-Street Parking	Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside Villages and Rural Villages where on-street parking is not needed, to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside Villages and Rural Villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Mobility	M-11.3 Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element	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.
Mobility	M-11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity	Require development in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and countywide networks.
Mobility	M-11.5 Funding for Bicycle Network Improvements	Seek outside funding opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian network improvement projects, particularly those that provide safe and continuous pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools, town centers, parks, park-and-ride facilities, and major transit stops.
Mobility	M-11.7 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design	Promote pedestrian and bicycle facility standards for facility design that are tailored to a variety of urban and rural contexts according to their location within or outside a Village or Rural Village.
Mobility	M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails	Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Safety	S-2 Emergency Response	Effective emergency response to natural or human-induced disasters that minimizes the loss of life and damage to property, while also reducing disruptions in the delivery of vital public and private services during and following a disaster.
Safety	S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs	Sponsor and support education programs pertaining to emergency/disaster preparedness and response protocols and procedures. Distribute information about emergency preparedness to community groups, schools, religious institutions, transient occupancy establishments, and business associations.
Safety	S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs	Develop, implement, and maintain an effective evacuation program for areas of risk in the event of a natural disaster.
Safety	S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards	Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.
Safety	S-3.1 Defensibility Development	Require development to be located, designed, and constructed to provide adequate defensibility and minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildland fires.
Safety	S-3.2 Development in Hillside and Canyons	Require development located near ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles, or other areas where the terrain or topography affect its susceptibility to wildfires to be located and designed to account for topography and reduce the increased risk from fires.
Safety	S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation	Site and design development to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures by minimizing pockets or peninsulas, or islands of flammable vegetation within a development.
Safety	S-3.5 Access Roads	Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.
Safety	S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures	Ensure that development located within fire threat areas implement measures that reduce the risk of structural and human loss due to wildfire.
Safety	S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs	Support programs and plans, such as Strategic Fire Plans, consistent with state law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.
Safety	S-4.2 Coordination to Minimize Fuel Management Impacts	Consider comments from CAL FIRE, U.S. Forest Service, local fire districts, and wildlife agencies for recommendations regarding mitigation for impacts to habitat and species into fuel management projects.
Safety	S-5 Regional Fire Protection	Regional coordination among fire protection agencies.
Safety	S-7 Reduced Seismic Hazards	Minimized personal injury and property damage resulting from seismic hazards.
Safety	S-7.1 Development Location	Locate development in areas where the risk to people or resources is minimized. In accordance with the California Department of Conservation Special Publication 42, require development be located a minimum of 50 feet from active or potentially active faults, unless an alternative setback distance is approved based on geologic analysis and feasible engineering design measures adequate to demonstrate that the fault rupture hazard would be avoided.
Safety	S-7.2 Engineering Measures to Reduce Risk	Require all development to include engineering measures to reduce risk in accordance with the California Building Code, Uniform Building Code, and other seismic and geologic hazard safety standards, including design and construction standards that regulate land use in areas known to have or potentially have significant seismic and/or other geologic hazards.
Safety	S-7.3 Land Use Location	Prohibit high occupancy uses, essential public facilities, and uses that permit significant amounts of hazardous materials within Alquist-Priolo and County special studies zones.
Safety	S-7.4 Unreinforced Masonry Structures	Require the retrofitting of unreinforced masonry structures to minimize damage in the event of seismic or geologic hazards.
Safety	S-7.5 Retrofitting of Essential Facilities	Seismic retrofit essential facilities to minimize damage in the event of seismic or geologic hazards.
Safety	S-9 Protection of Life and Property	Minimized personal injury and property damage losses resulting from flood events.
Safety	S-9.1 Floodplain Maps	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.
Safety	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains	Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.
Safety	S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas	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.
Safety	S-9.4 Development in Villages	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.
Safety	S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe	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.
Safety	S-10 Floodways and Floodplain Capacity	Floodways and floodplains that have acceptable capacity to accommodate flood events.
Safety	S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways	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.
Safety	S-12.1 New Law Enforcement Facilities	Coordinate new law enforcement facilities and services with new development in ways that sustain the provision of comprehensive services at levels consistent with substantially similar areas of the County.
Safety	S-15.1 Land Use Compatibility	Require land uses surrounding airports to be compatible with the operation of each airport.
Safety	S-15.4 Private Airstrip and Heliport Location	Locate private airstrips and heliports outside of safety zones and flight paths for existing airports where they are compatible with surrounding established and planned land uses, and in a manner to avoid impacting public roadways and facilities.