

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal The General Plan has strict policies (LU-1.2, LU-1.4) on GPAs proposing changes from Semi-Rural or Rural to a Village Regional Category and land use designation. This policy would remove the flexibility to allow stakeholders and decision-makers to consider changed circumstances (infrastructure/service extents, market conditions, public facilities, parks/open space, etc.) in the evaluation of land use proposals.	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.	No Change to Recommendation 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	Recommend Removal or Revision The policy will be open to interpretation because there is no definition of "built out" and the text in parentheses is outdated now.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.	No Change to Recommendation 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	Recommend Removal or Revision 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing or revising 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	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion 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	Recommend Inclusion 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.	Recommend Removal These issues are already considered on a project by project basis.	Land Use - Infrastructure Availability		
#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 Concurrency 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Recommend Inclusion 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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 siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	Recommend Inclusion 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		
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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: • 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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with same-model elevations should be avoided."	Land Use - Varied Design		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		Recommend Inclusion with Revision <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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision The different component on this one is the reference to landscaping, but that should be covered in the Design Guidelines for areas subject to design review, or in the Community Right of Way Development Standards covering the parkway portion of the public road right of way. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design		
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies This policy is not specific to Village areas or other commercial/industrial areas, so it is not recommended to be included in the Design Guidelines update. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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.	Recommend Removal Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.	Habitat Preservation - Policy		
#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 watershed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with the proposed revision.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#161	Land Use - Community Growth Policy	Policy	LU-3.4.3 Maintain green belts along streams and flood prone areas.	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #93 (CP Conservation Policy 12)</p> <p>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</p> <p>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Zoning Ordinance</p>	Conservation Policy 12: Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance have specific requirements for development within floodplains and floodways. In addition, the General Plan has restrictive policies that cover this type of issue. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per GP Policy S-10.1 and the RPO. Therefore, the proposed revision clarifies terminology references.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along ephemeral streams and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.</p>	Conservation - Riparian Areas		<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p><i>Post-public review update:</i> Slightly revised wording is proposed to ensure that this language covers all creeks in Valley Center.</p> <p>Proposed revision: Maintain greenbelts along creeks and FEMA or County-mapped floodways.</p>
#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!	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #8 (CP Land Use- General Goal)</p> <p>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</p> <p>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance</p>	Land Use-General Goal: A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>Please refer to related existing Community Plan and General Plan policies.</p>	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.	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #88 (CP Conservation Policy 7)</p> <p>GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines</p>	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.	<p><i>Recommend Removal</i></p> <p>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."</p>	Conservation - Tree Preservation		
#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.	County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources	NA	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>This type of policy has been addressed by County Counsel and revised language has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for other community plans. Determining the appropriate biological mitigation must be based on biological considerations such as species distribution, ecological boundaries, and quality of mitigation site. Having a mitigation policy based on community planning boundaries would not be defensible.</p> <p>Proposed revision: When considering the appropriate mitigation for impacts to biological resources within the Valley Center Community Plan Area (VCCPA), consider local community options first. The acceptance of biological mitigation options outside the VCCPA is strongly discouraged when appropriate mitigation is available within the VCCPA.</p>	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.	<p>CP: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use- Residential Policy 1) Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use- Residential Policy 2)</p> <p>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</p> <p>Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines Resource Protection Ordinance</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Land Use-Residential Policy 2: Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.</p>	<p><i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Conservation - Native Landscaping		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.
#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.
#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.
#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		
#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		
#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		
#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		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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		
#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. Proposed revision: In developing and evaluating plans for public parkland dedication and development of other public spaces, the development of a "village green" for the North Village should be considered a priority. The community desires this type of park amenity to help facilitate public gatherings.	Public Spaces - Villages		
#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		
#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		
#220	Land Use - Village Commercial and Industrial Character	Goal	LU5-3B.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.
#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		
#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.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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 siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	Recommended Removal 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 siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	Recommended Removal 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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Recommend Removal This is mostly covered in the existing goals referenced. To suggest consistency with image and scale, but then wanting diversity could make this wording confusing.	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	Recommend Inclusion 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		
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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	Recommend Removal This issue is covered in the policy proposal in Item 235 of this matrix and the issue is covered in a more generalized style in GP Policy LU-3.2. The County doesn't regulate the types of marketing materials referenced.	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.	No Change to Recommendation 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	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Recommend Removal or Revision (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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#247	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	3. Support equestrian and other commercial enterprises that support our rural economy.	NA	NA	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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. 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.	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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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. Regarding transferring density, the County does not currently have a process to allow this; however, a Transfer of Development Rights pilot is under development. 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.	Agriculture		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#250	Land Use - Rural Residential Development and Character	Policy	6. Minimize development in hazardous wildfire areas and other unmitigable hazardous area.	GP: LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards	NA	Recommend Removal 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.	Wildland Fire Protection		No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal or Revision 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 Hutcheson: 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 or revising the policy.
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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	Recommend Removal or Revision This policy is unclear as currently worded. Are stakeholders looking to encourage sustainable farming practices, low GHG emission agriculture, organic farms?	Agriculture		
#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	Recommended Inclusion This is suitable language for a goal, relating desired outcomes for Valley Center through ongoing use of the Conservation Subdivision Program.	Conservation Subdivision		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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 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.	County Subdivision Ordinance (Conservation Subdivision Program)	NA	Recommend Removal 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/conservation_subdivision.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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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.	Recommend Removal This is already covered in the Subdivision Ordinance section on Conservation Subdivisions. Section 81.401r.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.	No Change to Recommendation 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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		
#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	Recommend Removal 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	Recommend Removal 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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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	Recommend Removal 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		
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Goals 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		Recommend Inclusion with Revision <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		Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Removal (revised rationale) <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.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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: Existing Goals & Policies matrix #228 (CP Mobility Policy 4)	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		
#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.
#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.
#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		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal 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		Recommend Removal 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.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Removal 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.
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.
#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.	Recommend Removal 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	Recommend Removal 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.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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		Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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		
#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 CMTMP 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 lane 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		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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.
#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	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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.	No Change to Recommendation 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 Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6795	NA	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#354	Circulation and Mobility - Other Topics/Issues	Policy	2.11.1 The 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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		
#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.	GP: 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: • 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.	Recommend Removal This is covered in the Existing Community Plan policy and General Plan policies referenced.	Mobility - Road Design		
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion Roundabouts are currently being considered for Valley Center Road as part of the Valley Center Road Corridor Concept Plan project.	Mobility - Intersection Control		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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		
#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.
#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.		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		
#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		
#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		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Recommend Inclusion 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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion 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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision Staff recommends additional wording to reformat into sentence structure. Proposed revision: Preserve existing natural ridgelines and scenic horizons.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#424	Conservation and Open Space - Scenic resources and highways	Policy	COS 3.2.5 Prohibit development on slopes in excess of 25% [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.	Recommend Removal This appears to be an unfinished idea from the 2012 proposals. The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into steep 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	Recommend Revision or Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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		
#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		
#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.
#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		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#449	Conservation and Open Space - Water and energy	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) 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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies This is almost the same as the existing CP goal referenced. Stakeholders can consider which wording is preferred between the two choices.	Parks & Recreation		Recommend Inclusion <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.
#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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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		
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies This is identical to the existing policy, which the County is recommending for inclusion.	Parks & Recreation		Recommend Removal <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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		Recommend Removal <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)	Recommend Inclusion 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		Recommend Inclusion with Revision <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.

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.
#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.
#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.
#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.
#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		
#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		
#486	Conservation and Open Space - Community Open Space Plan	Policy	COS 10.1.6 Require that at least one land trust/consevanry (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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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.	Recommend Inclusion 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		
#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.	Recommend Removal 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.	No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
#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 Adaptive 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.	Recommend Inclusion 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		
#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.	Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies The Community Plan does not have authority to encourage organizations to pursue funding for their mission nor turn away funding.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
#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.	Recommend Removal This is covered in the referenced Existing Community Plan policy.	Safety - Water Supply		
#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.	Recommend Similar Existing/Proposed Policies 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		
#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.	Recommend Similar Existing/Proposed Goals This should be reviewed in comparison to the referenced goal from the Existing Community Plan.	Safety - Fire Hazards		
#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.	Recommend Inclusion with Revision 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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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</i> <i>(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		
#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		
#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 with Revision</i> The County Consolidated Fire Code provides the project discretion to the Fire Marshal/fire code official for determining access. Per Section 503.12, "The fire code official is authorized to require more than one fire apparatus access road based on the potential for impairment of a single road by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions or other factors that could limit access. When additional fire apparatus access roads are necessary as mitigation for exceedance of the maximum allowable dead-end road length, the additional fire apparatus access road must be remote from the primary fire apparatus access road." This policy proposal references General Plan Policy S-3.5, which requires secondary access "when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently." The following revision is proposed in order to avoid inconsistency with discretion allowed for in the Fire Code. Proposed revision: Evaluate the adequacy of access routes to and from fire hazard areas relative to the degree of development or use (e.g., road width, road type, length of dead-end roads, etc.).	Safety - Fire Evacuation		
#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		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

- = Items pulled for further discussion
- = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights

- = 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)

Discussion Items

Item #	Element Referenced/Existing Element	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/Post-Public Review Recommendation
#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 prioritize 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 prioritize public access and connectivity to the CTMP.</p>	

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights
 = Items pulled for further discussion
 = Items passed on consent which were recommended for inclusion or comparing policies

Post Public Review Highlights
 = 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)