

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
1	Community Character	Goal	1. Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Villages - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
2	Community Character	Goal	1.A. Village: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
3	Community Character	Goal	1.B. Semi-Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the semi-rural areas.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
4	Community Character	Goal	1.C. Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the rural lands area outside the semi-rural area.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category

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
6	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.	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)		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  This policy does not refer to other related proposals to consider in the 2012 matrix. Projects are required to be consistent with the Community Plan and that requirement will carry forward to the Community Plan Update.
7	Land Use - General	Goal	Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages where dense residential uses, as well as commercial and industrial uses, are contained.	GP: LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Villages		
8	Land Use - General	Goal	A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Community Character		
9	Land Use - General	Goal	A pattern of development that accommodates people of diverse ages, lifestyles, occupations, and interests with opportunities for village, semi-rural and rural living.	GP: LU-3 Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Varied Design		
10	Land Use - General	Goal	Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character  Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Goals</i>  There are several goals about maintaining rural character (in the existing CP and 2012 drafts) that provide better wording.	Land Use - Community Character	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The proposed goal is vague and could lead to inconsistent application. Other goals/policies (existing and 2012 proposals) to consider include: - Existing matrix Item 6 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 147 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 148 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 152 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 176 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 235
13	Land Use - Residential	Policy	1. Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undeveloped steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. There are other existing policies, 2012 proposals, and other regulations that address these types of resources and this type of broad stroke policy without clear definitions would lead to inconsistencies with other regulations and inconsistent interpretations.		Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item #13 Page 11. A-1) All open space easements must have public access. These are natural trails and therefore should be available to public access. Consideration should also be given for appropriate parking to allow for persons not living adjacent to the property to be able to use it.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The County accidentally excluded this policy from the matrix, but it was numbered correctly in the Community Plan pdf with matrix item numbers. The County is also clear on Fred's reference with the note of p. 11, A-1 from the Community Plan. That being said, the comment doesn't seem to fit the existing policy as it doesn't refer to public access within open space easements. Most large open space preserves allow trails and public access; however, there are many open space easement areas that do not have trails nor allow public access in order to allow for the necessary resource protection required.

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
<del>13</del> 14	Land Use - Residential	Policy	2. Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  This is similar to Residential Policy 1 of the Existing Community Plan, 2012 proposals, and GP Policies LU-6.1 and LU-6.6.	Land Use - Habitat Preservation	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
15	Land Use - Residential	Policy	3. Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a views shed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridgelines		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This provides an additional level of specificity beyond the referenced General Plan policies.	Land Use - Ridgelines		
17	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.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  If so desired by stakeholders, retaining this one could provide value and it does expand on GP policies. Issues that should be addressed while preserving parts of the policy if preferred: -All grading disturbs the natural terrain -Owners cannot be required to retain agriculture unless it's part of conditioned mitigation for an on-site agricultural conservation easement, or for purchase of off-site PACE credits/easements. GP Policy COS-6.2 details policy requirements to minimize impacts to agriculture. -The last dot point could refer to native vegetation and end with "as much as possible" or start with "encourage." Retaining all natural vegetation in all VC projects is not feasible when seeking to get close to allowed GP densities.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 17. Page 11 B-4) The current document calls for preservation of "natural contours and natural terrain to not be disturbed".....so please explain what has happened to the natural contours / terrain on the corner of Valley Center Road and Miller Road?	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  As explained in the initial staff recommendation, there are certain problematic components. If the County wants the policies strictly followed, they must be clear and implementing the policies must be feasible. During the CPU Subcommittee meetings, the County can discuss the issues presented in the initial staff recommendation in order to adjust the wording.
18	Land Use - Residential	Policy	5. Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid "urbanizing" improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center's Community Right of Way Development Standards.	GP: LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design  Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is not consistent with the Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards, which allow different treatments in different areas.	Mobility - Road Design	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 18. Page 11 B-5) The document calls for no curbs, gutters or sidewalks. Insist on decomposed granite pathways in all right-of-ways and specifically prohibit property owners from landscaping within the right-of-way. Many folk new to the country do NOT understand that their property does NOT include the pathway and feel they are allowed to plant in the right-of-way if it is not concrete or pavement.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development standards do allow curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in the Villages and the Industrial area. See Table 1 on p. 13, Table 2 on p. 14, and Table 3 on p. 15. In addition, section 3.2.1 states, "As shown in the tables in Section 3.1, there are several options for the design of the travel way edge: a natural swale, no curb, asphalt curbs, rolled concrete and concrete curbs and gutters." It goes on to state concrete curbs and gutters are allowed only in the Industrial Zone 1 and in Zone 2 (both Villages).  There is nothing in the policy about landscaping in the right of way.

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
19	Land Use - Residential	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.	GP: LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions LU-11.10 Integrity of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses LU11.11 Industrial Compatibility with Adjoining Uses M-2.4 Roadway Noise Buffers N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies  Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is very similar to GP Policies LU-11.9, 10, and 11, but it's possible it could be retained with the specifics on using landscaping and open space. Stakeholders should review the referenced GP policies to see if they are sufficient to cover the issue.	Land Use - Buffering	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 19. Page 12. B-6) If a builder is constructing a "sound barrier" made of solid material such as concrete, they must be required to hide that wall from public view with landscaping that can be maintained in such a way as to obstruct the view of the wall from the street. The landscaping will also prevent "taggers" from making the wall even uglier than it is.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  It seems the comment submitted does not note a disagreement with including this current policy in the update, but calls for additional policy language for screening of noise walls. GP Policy N-1.3 discourages noise walls and calls for berms, landscaping, or other screening when noise walls can't be avoided.
22	Land Use - Residential	Policy	8. Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewered, and providing that:  a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency. AND: b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The recommended inclusion would include the CPG-approved (5/8/17) revision (see below) associated with the PSRs GPA, which is now on hold due to the Climate Action Plan litigation. In addition to the CPG recommendation of approval, staff has recommended approval, and the Planning Commission recommended approval, prior to the project being put on hold.  This one serves a different purpose than Residential Policy 7 (current row 21), as it calls for minimum lot sizes for clustering. GP Policy LU-6.3 and Conservation Subdivision guidelines specifically call for seeing CPs for applicable policies. A few CPs have these and it's within their purview.  Here is the revision recommended for approval by the CPG and Planning Commission: "...0.5 acre in SR-1 and SR-2, 1 acre in SR-2, 1 acres in SR-4..."  As explained during the 2015-2017 outreach on this proposed policy revision - Outside of Champagne Blvd (former Champagne Gardens specific plan properties included in PSRs GPA) this policy revision would currently only potentially affect one other parcel in the CPA, as the revision only applies to properties designated SR-2 or SR-4 and also within the VCMWD sewer service area. The policy revision does not affect allowed density in any way, just the configuration of lots within a subdivision. The additional clustering allowance would facilitate better preservation of sensitive resources.	Conservation Subdivision	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 22. Page 12. C-8a) Another comment about preservation of "rock outcropping" so again I reference the destruction of natural outcropping on the corner of Miller and VC Rd.  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The list in item a of the policy provides examples of environmental resources present on a project site to justify the clustered minimum lot sizes shown. It doesn't provide new requirements in dealing with rock outcroppings.
24	Land Use - Residential	Policy	9. Prohibit residential development which would prematurely subdivide land and require expansion of public utilities and services to such developments.	GP: LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There is no explanation of what would constitute prematurely subdividing land. Public utility/infrastructure expansion policies are already covered in a separate section and in the GP.	Land Use - Residential	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
25	Land Use - Commercial	Goal	Commercial uses are concentrated within the boundaries of two compact scale, "rural villages" that are consistent in scale and design with a low density rural residential and agricultural community.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  - Compact scale and low density are conflicting descriptions - There are existing commercial uses outside the Villages. Through public review and Subcommittee meetings, it can be determined whether stakeholders want a goal of removing those.	Land Use - Commercial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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
26	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	1. Prohibit strip commercial development by containing commercial uses in the Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road area and the Mirar de Valle Road and Valley Center Road area. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The "prohibit" language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy.	Land Use - Commercial		
28	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	3. Ensure that all commercial areas are served by Mobility Element roads or local roads which meet the standards of the County of San Diego. Whenever possible, require new commercial development to provide secondary road access as opposed to access from major through roads.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This can be especially relevant for development of the North Village. The policy expands on GP Policy M-2.2, connecting it to commercial uses.	Land Use - Commercial	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 28 3) You need to be more specific about how to access the development if not from the main thoroughfare.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  This policy discourages driveways to businesses being right on a Mobility Element road like Valley Center Road. Each development would need to evaluate the safest way to access the site, which may not be the same way in every instance.
30	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	5. Future commercial development shall be planned so that strip commercial development will be avoided. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The 'prohibit' language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy.	Land Use - Commercial		
31	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	6. Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character  Valley Center Design Guidelines		<i>Design Guidelines</i>  The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.	Design Guidelines		
32	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	7. Commercial/civic uses shall be periodically reviewed to ensure that the standards for noise, light, traffic, odors and all other conditions of approval are continuing to be met.			<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Once condition satisfaction is completed, the County has to rely on people contacting Code Compliance for issues with commercial uses not complying with ongoing requirements or violating noise, lighting, etc. regulations. Code Compliance doesn't have enough staff to actively search for violations and this is the case with most jurisdictions.	Land Use - Commercial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
33	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.	GP: LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  - Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy "Clearly demonstrated as needed" is too vague when referring to commercial uses. That part should be removed, while staff doesn't see an issue with retaining the rest if desired. The CPU will include a market analysis to look at the extent commercial zoning that can be supported.  Proposed revision: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the GP Update in August 2011.	Land Use - Commercial	Tania Tuluie: Agree	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The only comment received is in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.

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
35	Land Use - Industrial	Goal	Well planned and contained industrial uses which are clean, non-polluting, and compatible with the rural low density residential character of the community.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Land Use - Industrial		
36	Land Use - Industrial	Goal	The retention of established industrial uses outside of the FEMA floodway.	GP: S-9.2 Development in Floodplains		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Land Use - Industrial		
37	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	1. Require all industrial development to adhere to the Valley Center Design Guidelines on file with the Clerk of the Board.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Design Guidelines		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy.	Land Use - Industrial		
39	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	3. Require new industrial development to adhere to floodplain preservation criteria outlined in Design Guidelines for Valley Center. Hazards of flood inundation and stream bank erosion shall be minimized while protecting the scenic and aesthetic values of the floodplain. As per Design Guidelines for Valley Center, the environmentally sensitive floodplain areas or any mapped plan shall be protected as open space.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy.	Land Use - Industrial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
40	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	4. Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This issue is covered in the Design Guidelines, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and to a certain extent, in the GP policies listed.	Land Use - Industrial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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
41	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	5. Re-designate upon the receipt of revised floodway mapping by FEMA, existing industrial uses in Valley Center with the appropriate land use designation, use regulation and other Zoning development regulations.	GP: S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Proposed revision: There are six parcels located along Keys Creek, adjacent to the southern boundary of the North Village, which have a history of industrial uses and are mostly within the County-mapped floodway. If updated floodplain/floodway mapping is completed for this area and it shows the properties are no longer in the floodway, a Limited Impact Industrial General Plan land use designation is recommended for the properties, along with zoning components consistent with that land use designation.	Land Use - Industrial	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
42	Land Use - Agricultural	Goal	Preserve and enhance existing and future agricultural uses in the Valley Center Community Plan.	GP: LU-7 Agricultural Conservation		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
43	Land Use - Agricultural	Policy	1. Support agricultural uses and activities throughout the CPA, by providing appropriately zoned areas in order to ensure the continuation of an important rural lifestyle in Valley Center.	GP: LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations  Zoning Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff recommends the proposed revision below.  Proposed Revision: Support continued agricultural uses and agriculture supporting businesses in the CPA, by providing areas of A72 (General Agricultural) zoning, areas of commercial zoning that allows open storage of products supporting agriculture (C37, C38, and C40), and the continued widespread application of A70 (Limited Agricultural) zoning.	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
44	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.	GP: COS-6.4 Conservation Easements  Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  This should be updated to reflect the current emphasis on the PACE Program.  Proposed Revision: Support the continued promotion of the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program and outreach to eligible property owners. Encourage property owner participation in this program, in order preserve agriculture in Valley Center.	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
45	Land Use - Agricultural	Policy	3. Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	GP: COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations  County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The language is vague and leaves it open for interpretation, re: adverse impact on existing ag uses. Please see GP Policy COS-6.2 and the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources for discussion of significant agricultural impacts and mitigation.	Agriculture	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
47	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.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.

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
48	Mobility	Policy	1. Where appropriate, minimize private driveway and private road access on to Mobility Element roads.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is repetitive of GP Policy M-2.2. In addition, the County Public Road Standards (Section 6.1) note the minimum separation between non-Mobility Element roads and driveways entering a Mobility Element road.	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
49	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.	GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is similar to GP Policy M-4.3, but provides additional considerations with the example.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
50	Mobility	Policy	3. Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.	GP: M-4 Safe and Compatible Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
51	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.	GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  While this is similar to the GP policies referenced, staff doesn't consider it a duplicate because of the reference to following existing the existing topography as much as possible.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
53	Mobility	Policy	6. Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design  Valley Center Design Guidelines Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This type of issue is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right of Way Development Standards. In addition, "significant visual benefit" is open for interpretation.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
54	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.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
55	Mobility	Policy	8. Woods Valley Road from Valley Center Road, east to Paradise Mountain Road and, Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Highway 76 are significant aesthetic resources. Future improvements should maintain as much of their original character as possible without compromising safety.	GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
56	Mobility	Policy	9. Require that the road system function at a service level no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	GP: M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This conflicts with GP M-2.1, calling for D or better, but providing allowance for accepting failing LOS pursuant to criteria in the policy. It also conflicts with GP Table M-4, which calls out road segments (including in VC) that have been accepted at failing LOS by the GP, in accordance with criteria for accepting failing LOS.	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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
59	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.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Residential Subdivision Design  County Subdivision Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Section 81.402 of the County Subdivision Ordinance has detailed guidance on when public road dedication is required and when private roads can be allowed (GP designations are a factor). Staff wants to make sure policies are not inconsistent with that or vague with text like "clear circulation need" and "benefits the overall community" as people could make the argument that the Subdivision Ordinance should be updated with separate standards for VC (for consistency with the CP).	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
60	Mobility	Policy	13. Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	GP: M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  This will need to have more clarity/specificity on what is being suggested so that it can be an impactful policy.	Mobility		
61	Mobility	Policy	14. To mitigate cumulative traffic impacts, endorse a Bridge and Thoroughfare Traffic Mitigation Program for the establishment of a fee to be collected at the building permit stage.	GP: M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The Transportation Impact Fee serves this purpose (a fee collected at the building permit stage).	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff is adding the following to the rationale:  In addition, the implementation of SB743 (switch to Vehicle Miles Traveled [VMT] for CEQA analysis) will change how traffic impacts are determined.
62	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.	GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This a common practice among agencies serving Valley Center and covered in the General Plan Goal referenced.	Infrastructure		
63	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.	GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development LU-17 Adequate Education S-12 Adequate Law Enforcement Facilities  County Subdivision Ordinance County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There are processes in place for service availability forms, addressing deficiencies in fire protection services via development mitigation, Sheriff operations adjusting to population changes, right-of-way dedication and share of road construction through development conditions, among other processes.	Infrastructure	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
64	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection	Goal	Protect all life and property from fire hazard potential and minimize those elements within the natural, and human-made environment which pose a clear and significant fire hazard. Ensure adequate levels of fire protection.	GP: S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Safety - Wildland Fire		
68	Public Facilities and Services - Education	Goal	Ensure the provision of adequate services and facilities to meet the educational needs of all the residents of the CPA.	GP: LU-17 Adequate Education		<i>Recommend inclusion</i>  Though the County doesn't handle planning and permitting for public schools, there is some agency coordination and this is ok as a goal.	Schools	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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
70	Public Facilities and Services - Education	Policy	2. Develop schools in conjunction with neighborhood and community recreation facilities.	GP: LU-17.2 Compatibility of Schools with Adjoining Uses		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The County does not have control over school facilities planning, so a minor change would be appropriate here.  Proposed revision: Encourage the development of schools in conjunction with neighborhood and community recreation facilities.	Schools		
72	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service	Policy	1. Adopt and support the Board of Supervisors' water supply and conservation policies which include:  a. Support of cost effective storage facilities such as emergency storage facilities located near demand areas or away from earthquake faults. b. Support water reclamation policy where reclamation and reuse facilities can provide significant sources of "new" irrigation water to help offset imported demands of local water supplies for non-potable purposes. c. Support necessary changes in the water allocation priority formula that will provide agriculture with assurances that those who participate in conservation and/or water reclamation programs will be entitled to an adequate water supply during water shortages.	GP: LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply COS-4.5 Recycled Water COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff couldn't find this in the Board of Supervisors policies. GP Policy COS-19.2 already covers item b and wastewater is currently reclaimed by the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) for irrigation. With regard to item c, commercial agriculture customers are afforded a water price reduction (in comparison to residential and commercial/industrial customers) through the SD County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Transitional Special Agricultural Water Rate (TSAWR) Program. The agricultural customers receive this price differential because they provide the SDCWA the water management benefit of having accepted a lower level of supply reliability in times of water shortage or disaster related emergency which might limit supplies to the SDCWA service area. The loss of this price differential would be economically devastating to commercial agriculture in Valley Center. A minor revision is proposed for item a, as noted below.  Proposed revision: Support the continued development of emergency storage facilities located near demand areas and away from earthquake faults.	Infrastructure - Water		
75	Conservation - General	Goal	Ensure the provision of sewage disposal and treatment in a manner that minimizes any adverse impacts to the health, safety and welfare of the community.	GP: LU-14 Adequate Wastewater Facilities		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Infrastructure - Sewer		
76	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve Valley Center's unique, natural and cultural resources while supporting its traditional semi-rural lifestyle.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-6 Development-Environmental Balance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Although this is similar to GP goals, it acts as a priming goal for the conservation section.	Conservation		
77	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA.	GP: COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  Preserving all native vegetation is not feasible; however, there are several similar/related 2012 proposals to consider within that matrix.	Conservation		
78	Conservation - General	Goal	Minimize soil erosion incidental to development in order to preserve valley Center's unique soil characteristics.	GP: COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources  Grading Ordinance Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Though the Grading Ordinance and Watershed Protection Ordinance contain requirements to address this issue, it could be retained as a high level goal. Reviewers may consider more focus and/or a goal from the 2012 draft to cover the issue.	Conservation		
79	Conservation - General	Goal	Encourage and promote a system of interconnecting trails and paths for horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.	GP: COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities  Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP)		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This will work as a high level goal, though it is a current and ongoing effort. Once we get through a process of removing existing and proposed policies, we'll determine which policies will go with which goals and there may be further filtering out of certain goals if necessary.	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
80	Conservation - General	Goal	Provide for a "dark sky" which would retain the rural setting and not detract from astronomical research at Palomar Mountain.	GP: COS-13 Dark Skies County Light Pollution Code		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This may have been in the CP since before the more restrictive "Zone A" requirements of the County's Light Pollution Code. Most of Valley Center is within Zone A. Though this is sufficient as a goal, underlying policies are recommended for removal, so there should be discussion on whether this should be a separate goal with a group of policies. Stakeholders may find that it's not needed, as existing Light Pollution Code requirements are restrictive in Zone A.	Conservation - Light Pollution		
81	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	GP: COS-7 Protection and Preservation of Archaeological Resources COS-8 Protection and Conservation of the Historical Built Environments		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is already covered in the GP goals referenced, and there are unique goal proposals addressing this issue in the 2012 Proposals matrix, which can serve as lead for related policies.	Conservation - Cultural Resources	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
82	Conservation	Policy	1. Subdivisions should be designed to preserve scenic viewsheds. Radio and T.V. antennas that obscure scenic ridgelines are discouraged.	GP: COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility Residential Subdivision Design  County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics & Visual Resources		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  Please see GP Policy COS-12.2.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		
85	Conservation	Policy	4. Protect riparian habitat and other types of wetlands from loss or modification by dedicating open space easements with adequate buffer zones and by other means to avoid impacts from adjacent land uses. Road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat should be minimized and only allowed when alternatives have been considered and determined infeasible.	GP: LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability COS-3.1 Wetland Protection COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development  Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is covered in the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO; see Section 86.604a.5); however, the RPO is not applicable to Site Plans exempt from CEQA. Therefore, staff is recommending inclusion to expand the coverage of the issue in a community plan policy for Valley Center.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
86	Conservation	Policy	5. Projects within or in the vicinity of a Resource Conservation Area should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on the resources the RCA was created to protect.	GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Through the CPU process, more specific language may be considered for RCA descriptions that are vague, in terms of resources to be protected.	Conservation - Resource Conservation Areas		
88	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.	GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design  Valley Center Design Guidelines		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The way this is written, it could apply to all trees of any kind and any size. The Design Guidelines have detailed guidance for preservation of oaks and sycamores based on size, in addition to grading proximity considerations, and other factors.	Conservation - Trees		

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
90	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.	GP: LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management COS-1.9 Invasive Species COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement  Watershed Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The Grading Ordinance and Watershed Protection Ordinance address erosion control requirements and recommend native or otherwise drought-tolerant species. However, this policy specifically calls out preference for native plant species.	Conservation - Erosion		
91	Conservation	Policy	10. It is strongly encouraged that trees be planted wherever possible to stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production.	GP: COS-6.5 Best Management Practices		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Trees		
92	Conservation	Policy	11. Grading associated with discretionary permits shall not change natural land contours and shall be minimized to reduce erosion and siltation and damage to downstream properties.	GP: LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design COS-5.3 Downslope Protection  Grading Ordinance BMP Design Manual Watershed Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Though all grading includes some change to natural land contours, this text is otherwise almost the same as GP Policy LU-6.9.	Grading		
93	Conservation	Policy	12. Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The policy doesn't define "flood prone area" so it's not clear on where structures and development would be prohibited. The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Zoning Ordinance have specific requirements for development within floodplains and floodways. In addition, the GP has restrictive policies that cover this type of issue. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per GP Policy S-10.1 and the RPO.	Flood Hazards	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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
95	Conservation	Policy	14. Prohibit discretionary permits that exacerbate problems in a currently identified downstream flooding area.	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 Watershed Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This already covered in the existing regulations. See Section 811.104 of the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.	Flood Hazards	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
98	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.	GP: M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions  Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the CTMP or the RTP.  Proposed revision: Ensure the continued implementation of the planned Valley Center trails network within the CTMP, by requiring trail easement dedication on project sites that contain a planned trail alignment from the CTMP.	Mobility - Trails		
102	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.	GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
104	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.	GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse  Zoning Ordinance Section 5700-5749		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  This could use some revision for clarity related to discretionary review. Regarding the proposed revision below, there is a Land Development Code (LDC) Update currently underway for the County. If the "H" zoning special area designator is changed to some other mechanism for addressing the corresponding requirements, the policy proposal could be updated prior to the hearing process. If such an LDC change were to happen after the Community Plan Update adoption, a future General Plan Clean-Up project could address any reference change needed.  Proposed revision: During the discretionary project review process, it is recommended that all sites with significant historic resources receive an "H" zoning special area designator, so that future development will be subject to the Historic Landmark regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.	Conservation - Cultural 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
105	Open Space	Goal	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.	GP: COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff recommends the following revision to clarify "adequate."  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 to retain the rural community character.	Conservation - Open Space		
108	Open Space	Policy	3. Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	GP: COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System COS-23.2 Regional Coordination		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Strive for a functional open space system with passive recreational opportunities where feasible.
109	Open Space	Policy	4. Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	GP: COS-1.10 Public Involvement COS-1.11 Volunteer Preserve Monitor		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Open Space		
110	Open Space	Policy	5. Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This language is not clear enough to be impactful as a policy. Some biological open space easement areas prohibit access.	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff finds a revision can be proposed to maintain the intent of the policy.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Design new residential development to preserve existing public access points to surrounding open space.
112	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.	GP: COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains COS-5.3 Downslope Protection S-9.4 Development in Villages S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is not considered repetitive, as it addresses zoning in these areas.	Flood Hazards		
116	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.	GP: LU-18.2 Colocation of Civic Uses COS-21.2 Location of Parks		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update :</i> After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities are encouraged through continued collaboration with public agencies whenever possible. This collaboration may include Joint Powers Agreements or similar mechanisms to promote cooperation in development, operation and maintenance.

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
118	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.	GP: COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The first two sentences are ok, but staff recommends removing the last sentence. Developer requirements (fees and/or land dedication) are covered under the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO).  Proposed revision: 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.	Parks and Recreation	Kevin Smith: Agree - The proposed revision is better.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, the staff recommended revision has been slightly changed, as shown below.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Establish priorities and encourage the acquisition of park lands while minimizing public costs. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms.
119	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.	GP: COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design  County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Park Design Manual		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  It is assumed the intent is to develop parks in these areas; however, it is assumed the intent wasn't to develop active parks in areas of outstanding biological resources. Stakeholders should determine whether the text of GP Policy COS-21.3 is sufficient to cover the intent, so that this policy is not needed.	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Acquire outstanding scenic areas; cultural, biological and historic resources. The establishment of preserve locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.
120	Parks and Recreation	Policy	7. All park lands dedicated in conjunction with the development of a Specific Plan Area (SPA) land use designation will consist of a reasonable amount of flat land suitable for play fields and other similar local park activities.	GP: COS-22.1 Variety of Recreational Programs		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  - While new Specific Plans can be allowed, applying new Specific Plan Area land use designations is not allowed (see GP Land Use Element p. 17). New Specific Plans would have conventional land use designations to reflect densities allowed. - The way it reads now, they wouldn't be able to designate open space preserve land, without this "reasonable amount of flat land..."  Proposed revision: When park land dedication is required for specific plans that include residential uses, dedicated land shall include one or more areas of relatively flat land suitable for play fields and similar local park activities.	Parks and Recreation	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
122	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.	GP: COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks  Community Trails Master Plan		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center trails system.
123	Noise	Goal	Maintain an environment free of excessive noise by providing control of noise at its source, along the noise transmission path and at the receiver site.	GP: LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts N-2 Protection of Noise Sensitive Uses N-4 Transportation-Related Noise Generators N-5 Non-transportation-Related Noise Sources		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  While similar to the GP's Noise Element goals, the wording is unique enough to retain it as a goal.	Noise		

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
124	Noise	Policy	1. Develop and implement land use plans and circulation patterns that will minimize noise in residential neighborhoods.	GP: N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses N-2.2 Balconies and Patios LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Noise		
125	Noise	Policy	2. Permit residential development in areas with projected exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) exceeding 60 decibels near main roads only when traffic noise impacts can be mitigated.	GP: N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses N-2.2 Balconies and Patios LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations  County Noise Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The GP allows decision-makers to approve residential projects where the CNEL is above 60 decibels (and not fully mitigated to below 60) under extraordinary circumstances. This goes a step beyond that, to call for not permitting residential development under these circumstances. Therefore, we don't find it to be repetitive, but within the purview of issues CP policies can address.	Noise		

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
126	Noise	Policy	3. Design subdivisions to retain natural and landscaped sound barriers in preference to earth berms or walls, where they are needed.	GP: N-1.3 Sound Walls COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The GP policy only discourages noise walls when they can be avoided. It doesn't discourage earthen berms. Therefore, staff recommends inclusion to note the CP preference for retaining natural sound barriers.	Noise		

**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)

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
1	Community Character	Goal	1. Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Villages - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
2	Community Character	Goal	1.A. Village: Enhance the rural village character of Valley Center's North and South villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
3	Community Character	Goal	1.B. Semi-Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the semi-rural areas.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category
4	Community Character	Goal	1.C. Rural Lands: Preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the rural lands area outside the semi-rural area.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The existing General Plan goals referenced cover these subjects. The 2012 Proposals matrix provides similar goals that the community may want include instead.	Land Use - Community Character	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: - Item 139 discusses concentrating commercial, office, industrial, and compact (higher density) residential uses in the Villages - Item 176 is a goal that discusses the purpose/function of the two town centers within the Villages. - Item 220 is a goal that references a diversity of housing product types in Village - Item 244 is a goal that summarizes the purpose of the Rural Lands Regional Category

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



Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
5	Community Character	Policy	1. Require that future projects are consistent with the goals, policies, and recommendations contained in the Valley Center Community Plan.	GP: LU-2.1 Community Plans LU-2.2 Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This requirement is inherent in CPs, as part of the GP.	Land Use - Community Character		
6	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.	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)		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course): Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided.	Land Use - Varied Design	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  This policy does not refer to other related proposals to consider in the 2012 matrix. Projects are required to be consistent with the Community Plan and that requirement will carry forward to the Community Plan Update.
7	Land Use - General	Goal	Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages where dense residential uses, as well as commercial and industrial uses, are contained.	GP: LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Villages		
8	Land Use - General	Goal	A pattern of development that conserves Valley Center's natural beauty and resources, and retains Valley Center's rural character.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Community Character		
9	Land Use - General	Goal	A pattern of development that accommodates people of diverse ages, lifestyles, occupations, and interests with opportunities for village, semi-rural and rural living.	GP: LU-3 Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Goal statements can be high level, without providing the additional specificity needed in policies.	Land Use - Varied Design		
10	Land Use - General	Goal	Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character  Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Review Similar Existing/Proposed Goals</i>  There are several goals about maintaining rural character (in the existing CP and 2012 drafts) that provide better wording.	Land Use - Community Character	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The proposed goal is vague and could lead to inconsistent application. Other goals/policies (existing and 2012 proposals) to consider include: - Existing matrix Item 6 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 147 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 148 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 152 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 176 - 2012 Proposals matrix Item 235
11	Land Use - Residential	Goal	Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley CPA.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is duplicative of other existing goal statements.	Land Use - Community Character		
12	Land Use - Residential	Policy	A. Environmental Concerns and Issues:			N/A - heading for policy list			
13	Land Use - Residential	Policy	1. Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undeveloped steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory) Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The policy would need additional clarity to be enforced and would ideally separate out different resources. There are other existing policies, 2012 proposals, and other regulations that address these types of resources and this type of broad stroke policy without clear definitions would lead to inconsistencies with other regulations and inconsistent interpretations.		Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item #13 Page 11. A-1) All open space easements must have public access. These are natural trails and therefore should be available to public access. Consideration should also be given for appropriate parking to allow for persons not living adjacent to the property to be able to use it.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The County accidentally excluded this policy from the matrix, but it was numbered correctly in the Community Plan pdf with matrix item numbers. The County is also clear on Fred's reference with the note of p. 11, A-1 from the Community Plan. That being said, the comment doesn't seem to fit the existing policy as it doesn't refer to public access within open space easements. Most large open space preserves allow trails and public access; however, there are many open space easement areas that do not have trails nor allow public access in order to allow for the necessary resource protection required.

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
<del>13</del> 14	Land Use - Residential	Policy	2. Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory) Resource Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  This is similar to Residential Policy 1 of the Existing Community Plan, 2012 proposals, and GP Policies LU-6.1 and LU-6.6.	Land Use - Habitat Preservation	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.
15	Land Use - Residential	Policy	3. Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridgelines		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This provides an additional level of specificity beyond the referenced General Plan policies.	Land Use - Ridgelines		
15	Land Use - Residential	Policy	3. Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.	GP: COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridgelines		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This provides an additional level of specificity beyond the referenced General Plan policies.	Land Use - Ridgelines		
16	Land Use - Residential	Policy	B. Rural Compatibility Issues:			N/A - heading for policy list			
17	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.	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 (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  If so desired by stakeholders, retaining this one could provide value and it does expand on GP policies. Issues that should be addressed while preserving parts of the policy if preferred: -All grading disturbs the natural terrain -Owners cannot be required to retain agriculture unless it's part of conditioned mitigation for an on-site agricultural conservation easement, or for purchase of off-site PACE credits/easements. GP Policy COS-6.2 details policy requirements to minimize impacts to agriculture. -The last dot point could refer to native vegetation and end with "as much as possible" or start with "encourage." Retaining all natural vegetation in all VC projects is not feasible when seeking to get close to allowed GP densities.	Land Use - Community Character	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 17. Page 11 B-4) The current document calls for preservation of "natural contours and natural terrain to not be disturbed"....so please explain what has happened to the natural contours / terrain on the corner of Valley Center Road and Miller Road?	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  As explained in the initial staff recommendation, there are certain problematic components. If the County wants the policies strictly followed, they must be clear and implementing the policies must be feasible. During the CPU Subcommittee meetings, the County can discuss the issues presented in the initial staff recommendation in order to adjust the wording.
18	Land Use - Residential	Policy	5. Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid "urbanizing" improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center's Community Right of Way Development Standards.	GP: LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design  Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is not consistent with the Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development Standards, which allow different treatments in different areas.	Mobility - Road Design	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 18. Page 11 B-5) The document calls for no curbs, gutters or sidewalks. Insist on decomposed granite pathways in all right-of-ways and specifically prohibit property owners from landscaping within the right-of-way. Many folk new to the country do NOT understand that their property does NOT include the pathway and feel they are allowed to plant in the right-of-way if it is not concrete or pavement.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The Valley Center J-36 Community Right of Way Development standards do allow curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in the Villages and the Industrial area. See Table 1 on p. 13, Table 2 on p. 14, and Table 3 on p. 15. In addition, section 3.2.1 states, "As shown in the tables in Section 3.1, there are several options for the design of the travel way edge: a natural swale, no curb, asphalt curbs, rolled concrete and concrete curbs and gutters." It goes on to state concrete curbs and gutters are allowed only in the Industrial Zone 1 and in Zone 2 (both Villages).  There is nothing in the policy about landscaping in the right of way.

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
19	Land Use - Residential	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.	GP: LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions LU-11.10 Integrity of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses LU11.11 Industrial Compatibility with Adjoining Uses M-2.4 Roadway Noise Buffers N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies  Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is very similar to GP Policies LU-11.9, 10, and 11, but it's possible it could be retained with the specifics on using landscaping and open space. Stakeholders should review the referenced GP policies to see if they are sufficient to cover the issue.	Land Use - Buffering	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 19. Page 12. B-6) If a builder is constructing a "sound barrier" made of solid material such as concrete, they must be required to hide that wall from public view with landscaping that can be maintained in such a way as to obstruct the view of the wall from the street. The landscaping will also prevent "taggers" from making the wall even uglier than it is.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  It seems the comment submitted does not note a disagreement with including this current policy in the update, but calls for additional policy language for screening of noise walls. GP Policy N-1.3 discourages noise walls and calls for berms, landscaping, or other screening when noise walls can't be avoided.
20	Land Use - Residential	Policy	C. Clustering:			N/A - heading for policy list			
21	Land Use - Residential	Policy	7. Clustering, planned development, lot area averaging, and Specific Plan projects which utilize the clustering technique shall in no instance within the Valley Center CPA be used to create a greater number of lots than the property would have been entitled to without the use of the above mentioned techniques. Yield calculations shall be subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design  County Subdivision Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The Zoning Ordinance provides guidance on lot area averaging in Section 4230 and the GP does not allow projects to go above the GP density/allowed # of lots (without a GPA). Therefore, the policy is not needed, as this restriction is already in place. The Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) doesn't impact allowed GP density, but it does limit potential areas of development footprint (thus potentially limiting feasible yields, depending on the extent of RPO-protected constraints). All subdivisions are subject to RPO requirements. Therefore, this policy is completely covered by the GP and RPO. Stakeholders should review GP Policy LU-6.3 to see if any additional specifics for VC are needed (beyond that GP policy language and existing regulations referenced here).	Conservation Subdivision	Fred Wollman: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
22	Land Use - Residential	Policy	8. Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewer, and providing that:  a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency. AND: b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The recommended inclusion would include the CPG-approved (5/8/17) revision (see below) associated with the PSRs GPA, which is now on hold due to the Climate Action Plan litigation. In addition to the CPG recommendation of approval, staff has recommended approval, and the Planning Commission recommended approval, prior to the project being put on hold.  This one serves a different purpose than Residential Policy 7 (current row 21), as it calls for minimum lot sizes for clustering. GP Policy LU-6.3 and Conservation Subdivision guidelines specifically call for seeing CPs for applicable policies. A few CPs have these and it's within their purview.  Here is the revision recommended for approval by the CPG and Planning Commission: "...0.5 acre in SR-1 <u>and SR-2, 1 acre in SR-2, 1 acres in SR-4...</u> "  As explained during the 2015-2017 outreach on this proposed policy revision - Outside of Champagne Blvd (former Champagne Gardens specific plan	Conservation Subdivision	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 22. Page 12. C-8a) Another comment about preservation of "rock outcropping" so again I reference the destruction of natural outcropping on the corner of Miller and VC Rd.  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The list in item a of the policy provides examples of environmental resources present on a project site to justify the clustered minimum lot sizes shown. It doesn't provide new requirements in dealing with rock outcroppings.
23	Land Use - Residential	Policy	D. Infrastructure Issues:			N/A - heading for policy list			

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
24	Land Use - Residential	Policy	9. Prohibit residential development which would prematurely subdivide land and require expansion of public utilities and services to such developments.	GP: LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There is no explanation of what would constitute prematurely subdividing land. Public utility/infrastructure expansion policies are already covered in a separate section and in the GP.	Land Use - Residential	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
25	Land Use - Commercial	Goal	Commercial uses are concentrated within the boundaries of two compact scale, "rural villages" that are consistent in scale and design with a low density rural residential and agricultural community.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  - Compact scale and low density are conflicting descriptions - There are existing commercial uses outside the Villages. Through public review and Subcommittee meetings, it can be determined whether stakeholders want a goal of removing those.	Land Use - Commercial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
26	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	1. Prohibit strip commercial development by containing commercial uses in the Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road area and the Mirar de Valle Road and Valley Center Road area. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The "prohibit" language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy.	Land Use - Commercial		
27	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	2. Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, landforms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and viewshed shall be incorporated in the design of future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Commercial properties have a "B" designator requiring compliance with the Design Guidelines, so there is no need for a policy. Any rezones to add commercial zoning include the application of the B designator.	Design Guidelines	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
28	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	3. Ensure that all commercial areas are served by Mobility Element roads or local roads which meet the standards of the County of San Diego. Whenever possible, require new commercial development to provide secondary road access as opposed to access from major through roads.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This can be especially relevant for development of the North Village. The policy expands on GP Policy M-2.2, connecting it to commercial uses.	Land Use - Commercial	Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 28 3) You need to be more specific about how to access the development if not from the main thoroughfare.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  This policy discourages driveways to businesses being right on a Mobility Element road like Valley Center Road. Each development would need to evaluate the safest way to access the site, which may not be the same way in every instance.
29	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	4. Commercial and civic uses shall be located in areas which have adequate roads for circulation and provide easy and safe multi-purpose pathways and trails.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Adhering to the entire policy limits commercial to the north and west side of Valley Center Road through the Villages (Heritage Trail).	Land Use - Commercial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Fred Wollman: Disagree - Item 29 - 4) A multi-use path-way already exists along Valley Center Rd with Heritage Trail. Additional pathways need to be constructed along Miller Rd and Cole Grade as further development occurs. Heritage Trail also needs to expand past Cole Grade Rd as development occurs north and east along Valley Center Rd.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation. The explanation text in the initial staff recommendation refers to the fact that the Heritage Trail currently only exists on the west/north side of VC Road through the Villages. Based on the existing wording of the policy, one could interpret it as that is the only location where commercial and civic uses shall be allowed.

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
30	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	5. Future commercial development shall be planned so that strip commercial development will be avoided. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the General Plan Update in August 2011.	GP: LU-9.6 Town Center Uses LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  -Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy This policy was fairly recently revised (2015 GP Clean-Up) to add the exception language. The 'prohibit' language goes beyond the language of GP LU-11.1, 11.3, but it is within the purview of CPs to address this. These commercial policies should be discussed in the meetings, to understand the current sentiment on this issue. Strip commercial development is defined for GP policy review purposes in GP Policy LU-11.3 and it would be optimal to add that definition to this policy.	Land Use - Commercial		
31	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	6. Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character  Valley Center Design Guidelines		<i>Design Guidelines</i>  The wording is not clear and open to various interpretations. This type of issue is better suited for specific Design Guidelines standards.	Design Guidelines		
32	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	7. Commercial/civic uses shall be periodically reviewed to ensure that the standards for noise, light, traffic, odors and all other conditions of approval are continuing to be met.			<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Once condition satisfaction is completed, the County has to rely on people contacting Code Compliance for issues with commercial uses not complying with ongoing requirements or violating noise, lighting, etc. regulations. Code Compliance doesn't have enough staff to actively search for violations and this is the case with most jurisdictions.	Land Use - Commercial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
33	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.	GP: LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  - Depending on whether there is still support for this type of policy "Clearly demonstrated as needed" is too vague when referring to commercial uses. That part should be removed, while staff doesn't see an issue with retaining the rest if desired. The CPU will include a market analysis to look at the extent commercial zoning that can be supported.  Proposed revision: Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages. Exceptions to this policy can be made for those parcels that were zoned commercial in July 2011, and were rezoned to a non-commercial use regulation with the adoption of the GP Update in August 2011.	Land Use - Commercial	Tania Tuluie: Agree	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The only comment received is in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
34	Land Use - Commercial	Policy	9. The application of Land Use Designation Semi-Rural and Regional Category of Semi-Rural Lands are proposed for those properties that are currently zoned commercial and are located outside of the Villages.	GP: LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This was a policy recommendation for the GP Update process and is now outdated. After the GP Update, the CPG has made a couple recommendations for bringing back commercial GP/zoning for certain properties outside the Villages (that had commercial prior to the GP Update). The issue will be addressed in the review of other existing commercial policies above and in review of 2012 proposed policies.	Land Use - Commercial		
35	Land Use - Industrial	Goal	Well planned and contained industrial uses which are clean, non-polluting, and compatible with the rural low density residential character of the community.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Land Use - Industrial		
36	Land Use - Industrial	Goal	The retention of established industrial uses outside of the FEMA floodway.	GP: S-9.2 Development in Floodplains		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Land Use - Industrial		
37	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	1. Require all industrial development to adhere to the Valley Center Design Guidelines on file with the Clerk of the Board.	GP: LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character Design Guidelines		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy.	Land Use - Industrial		

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
38	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	2. Require that industrial uses be served by appropriate roads which provide for necessary levels of use by industrial businesses while at the same time minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding rural residential uses.	GP: LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is too vague to be of value as a policy. All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator requiring discretionary Site Plan review or Design Review Checklist process for adherence to the Valley Center Design Guidelines. 24' paved access roads are required.	Land Use - Industrial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
39	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	3. Require new industrial development to adhere to floodplain preservation criteria outlined in Design Guidelines for Valley Center. Hazards of flood inundation and stream bank erosion shall be minimized while protecting the scenic and aesthetic values of the floodplain. As per Design Guidelines for Valley Center, the environmentally sensitive floodplain areas or any mapped plan shall be protected as open space.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  All properties zoned for industrial in Valley Center have a B Designator, requiring compliance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. It is not necessary to have this as a separate policy.	Land Use - Industrial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
40	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	4. Channeling of environmentally sensitive floodplain areas is prohibited.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This issue is covered in the Design Guidelines, the Resource Protection Ordinance, and to a certain extent, in the GP policies listed.	Land Use - Industrial	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
41	Land Use - Industrial	Policy	5. Re-designate upon the receipt of revised floodway mapping by FEMA, existing industrial uses in Valley Center with the appropriate land use designation, use regulation and other Zoning development regulations.	GP: S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Proposed revision: There are six parcels located along Keys Creek, adjacent to the southern boundary of the North Village, which have a history of industrial uses and are mostly within the County-mapped floodway. If updated floodplain/floodway mapping is completed for this area and it shows the properties are no longer in the floodway, a Limited Impact Industrial General Plan land use designation is recommended for the properties, along with zoning components consistent with that land use designation.	Land Use - Industrial	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
42	Land Use - Agricultural	Goal	Preserve and enhance existing and future agricultural uses in the Valley Center Community Plan.	GP: LU-7 Agricultural Conservation		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
43	Land Use - Agricultural	Policy	1. Support agricultural uses and activities throughout the CPA, by providing appropriately zoned areas in order to ensure the continuation of an important rural lifestyle in Valley Center.	GP: LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations  Zoning Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff recommends the proposed revision below.  Proposed Revision: Support continued agricultural uses and agriculture supporting businesses in the CPA, by providing areas of A72 (General Agricultural) zoning, areas of commercial zoning that allows open storage of products supporting agriculture (C37, C38, and C40), and the continued widespread application of A70 (Limited Agricultural) zoning.	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.



Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
44	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.	GP: COS-6.4 Conservation Easements  Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  This should be updated to reflect the current emphasis on the PACE Program.  Proposed Revision: Support the continued promotion of the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program and outreach to eligible property owners. Encourage property owner participation in this program, in order preserve agriculture in Valley Center.	Agriculture	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
45	Land Use - Agricultural	Policy	3. Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	GP: COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations  County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The language is vague and leaves it open for interpretation, re: adverse impact on existing ag uses. Please see GP Policy COS-6.2 and the County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Agricultural Resources for discussion of significant agricultural impacts and mitigation.	Agriculture	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
46	Housing	N/A	Refer to County Housing Element for Goals and Policies.	Housing Element		N/A			
47	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.	GP: LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character M-1 Balanced Road Network		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
48	Mobility	Policy	1. Where appropriate, minimize private driveway and private road access on to Mobility Element roads.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is repetitive of GP Policy M-2.2. In addition, the County Public Road Standards (Section 6.1) note the minimum separation between non-Mobility Element roads and driveways entering a Mobility Element road.	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
49	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.	GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is similar to GP Policy M-4.3, but provides additional considerations with the example.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
50	Mobility	Policy	3. Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.	GP: M-4 Safe and Compatible Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
51	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.	GP: M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  While this is similar to the GP policies referenced, staff doesn't consider it a duplicate because of the reference to following existing the existing topography as much as possible.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
52	Mobility	Policy	5. Required roadside and median landscaping shall reflect standards as outlined in the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	GP: M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character  Valley Center Design Guidelines Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right of Way Development Standards.	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
53	Mobility	Policy	6. Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design  Valley Center Design Guidelines Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This type of issue is covered in the Design Guidelines and the Community Right of Way Development Standards. In addition, "significant visual benefit" is open for interpretation.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
54	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.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
55	Mobility	Policy	8. Woods Valley Road from Valley Center Road, east to Paradise Mountain Road and, Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Highway 76 are significant aesthetic resources. Future improvements should maintain as much of their original character as possible without compromising safety.	GP: M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
56	Mobility	Policy	9. Require that the road system function at a service level no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	GP: M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This conflicts with GP M-2.1, calling for D or better, but providing allowance for accepting failing LOS pursuant to criteria in the policy. It also conflicts with GP Table M-4, which calls out road segments (including in VC) that have been accepted at failing LOS by the GP, in accordance with criteria for accepting failing LOS.	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
57	Mobility	Policy	10. Right-of-way development standards for private roads shall be compatible with the standards as outlined in Policy 6 of this section.	GP: M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way  County Standards for Private Roads		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The referenced Policy 6 refers to preserving or transplanting trees determined to be of "significant visual benefit." That would be too vague to objectively implement.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
58	Mobility	Policy	11. Implement community right-of-way development standards for the Valley Center Planning Area to achieve a rural character and alternative features within the shoulder portion of dedicated right-of-way. Such improvements will identify the community's desire to modify County development standards permitted by Board of Supervisors Policy J-36. These standards shall include:  a. Provide decomposed granite walking/jogging paths in lieu of sidewalks; b. Where edge of pavement barrier is necessary, use mountable asphalt dike (small dike); and c. Provide a bike lane within the "travel way."	GP: M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This policy was developed before the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards were adopted. Now that those are in effect, there is no need for this policy.	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
59	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.	GP: M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads Residential Subdivision Design  County Subdivision Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Section 81.402 of the County Subdivision Ordinance has detailed guidance on when public road dedication is required and when private roads can be allowed (GP designations are a factor). Staff wants to make sure policies are not inconsistent with that or vague with text like "clear circulation need" and "benefits the overall community" as people could make the argument that the Subdivision Ordinance should be updated with separate standards for VC (for consistency with the CP).	Mobility	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
60	Mobility	Policy	13. Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	GP: M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way  County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  This will need to have more clarity/specificity on what is being suggested so that it can be an impactful policy.	Mobility		

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
61	Mobility	Policy	14. To mitigate cumulative traffic impacts, endorse a Bridge and Thoroughfare Traffic Mitigation Program for the establishment of a fee to be collected at the building permit stage.	GP: M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The Transportation Impact Fee serves this purpose (a fee collected at the building permit stage).	Mobility		<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff is adding the following to the rationale:  In addition, the implementation of SB743 (switch to Vehicle Miles Traveled [VMT] for CEQA analysis) will change how traffic impacts are determined.
62	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.	GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is a common practice among agencies serving Valley Center and covered in the General Plan Goal referenced.	Infrastructure		
63	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.	GP: LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development LU-17 Adequate Education S-12 Adequate Law Enforcement Facilities  County Subdivision Ordinance County Public Road Standards		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There are processes in place for service availability forms, addressing deficiencies in fire protection services via development mitigation, Sheriff operations adjusting to population changes, right-of-way dedication and share of road construction through development conditions, among other processes.	Infrastructure	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
64	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection	Goal	Protect all life and property from fire hazard potential and minimize those elements within the natural, and human-made environment which pose a clear and significant fire hazard. Ensure adequate levels of fire protection.	GP: S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Safety - Wildland Fire		
65	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection	Policy	1. All new development utilizing imported water shall provide infrastructure for fire suppression (such as pipes and hydrants) in accordance with the prevailing standards.	GP: S-6.1 Water Supply  County Consolidated Fire Code		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  These types of requirements are determined based requirements in the County Consolidated Fire Code and fire district (VC and Deer Springs)-specific standards and this is already a requirement . There is not a need for a policy like this in the CP and there shouldn't be anything that conflicts with Fire Code regulations.	Safety - Wildland Fire		
66	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.	GP: S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs  Valley Center Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) Deer Springs FPD Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This policy was developed before there was a Greater Valley Center and Deer Springs FPD Fire Safe Councils and their corresponding Community Wildfire Protection Plans. These plans cover the issue the policy is seeking to address.	Safety - Wildland Fire		
67	Public Facilities and Services - Fire Protection	Policy	3. New site locations for fire stations within the plan area should be centrally and strategically located.	GP: S-6 Adequate Fire and Medical Services		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This lacks enough clarity to have impact. Staff assumes stakeholders will want to update or rely on other policies for more impact. If stations are only centrally located, response times will be deficient for the outer edges of the community.	Safety - Wildland Fire		
68	Public Facilities and Services - Education	Goal	Ensure the provision of adequate services and facilities to meet the educational needs of all the residents of the CPA.	GP: LU-17 Adequate Education		<i>Recommend inclusion</i>  Though the County doesn't handle planning and permitting for public schools, there is some agency coordination and this is ok as a goal.	Schools	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
69	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.	GP: LU-17.1 Planning for Schools		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  School service availability forms are required for residential development applications. With the signing of the form, the district is confirming that they have adequate capacity to serve the estimated school age population. The form also notes any requirements for fees, dedication, etc. per Education Code 17620 allowance.	Schools	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
70	Public Facilities and Services - Education	Policy	2. Develop schools in conjunction with neighborhood and community recreation facilities.	GP: LU-17.2 Compatibility of Schools with Adjoining Uses		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The County does not have control over school facilities planning, so a minor change would be appropriate here.  Proposed revision: Encourage the development of schools in conjunction with neighborhood and community recreation facilities.	Schools		
71	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service	Goal	Ensure that enough water is available from both local and outside sources to adequately supply all users in the community plan area.	GP: LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The water district already does this and water service availability forms are required for development that would use imported water.	Infrastructure - Water		
72	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service	Policy	1. Adopt and support the Board of Supervisors' water supply and conservation policies which include:  a. Support of cost effective storage facilities such as emergency storage facilities located near demand areas or away from earthquake faults. b. Support water reclamation policy where reclamation and reuse facilities can provide significant sources of "new" irrigation water to help offset imported demands of local water supplies for non-potable purposes. c. Support necessary changes in the water allocation priority formula that will provide agriculture with assurances that those who participate in conservation and/or water reclamation programs will be entitled to an adequate water supply during water shortages.	GP: LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply COS-4.5 Recycled Water COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff couldn't find this in the Board of Supervisors policies. GP Policy COS-19.2 already covers item b and wastewater is currently reclaimed by the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) for irrigation. With regard to item c, commercial agriculture customers are afforded a water price reduction (in comparison to residential and commercial/industrial customers) through the SD County Water Authority's (SDCWA) Transitional Special Agricultural Water Rate (TSAWR) Program. The agricultural customers receive this price differential because they provide the SDCWA the water management benefit of having accepted a lower level of supply reliability in times of water shortage or disaster related emergency which might limit supplies to the SDCWA service area. The loss of this price differential would be economically devastating to commercial agriculture in Valley Center. A minor revision is proposed for item a, as noted below.  Proposed revision: Support the continued development of emergency storage facilities located near demand areas and away from earthquake faults.	Infrastructure - Water		
73	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.	GP: LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) is already doing this. The recommendation for removal follows along the lines of developing a streamlined list of clear, focused, and impactful policies.	Infrastructure - Water		
74	Public Facilities and Services - Water Service	Policy	3. All new development shall provide programs for water conservation in accordance with County policy.	GP: COS-4.1 Water Conservation COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping COS-4.5 Recycled Water  Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is repetitive of requirements in the Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, Building Code, the GP, the Climate Action Plan, etc. This policy has been in the CP for many years and staff recommends removal or more specificity, as water conservation requirements are covered in other regulations already.	Infrastructure - Water		
75	Conservation - General	Goal	Ensure the provision of sewage disposal and treatment in a manner that minimizes any adverse impacts to the health, safety and welfare of the community.	GP: LU-14 Adequate Wastewater Facilities		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Infrastructure - Sewer		
76	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve Valley Center's unique, natural and cultural resources while supporting its traditional semi-rural lifestyle.	GP: LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character LU-6 Development-Environmental Balance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Although this is similar to GP goals, it acts as a priming goal for the conservation section.	Conservation		
77	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the Valley Center CPA.	GP: COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  Preserving all native vegetation is not feasible; however, there are several similar/related 2012 proposals to consider within that matrix.	Conservation		

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
78	Conservation - General	Goal	Minimize soil erosion incidental to development in order to preserve valley Center's unique soil characteristics.	GP: COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources  Grading Ordinance Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Though the Grading Ordinance and Watershed Protection Ordinance contain requirements to address this issue, it could be retained as a high level goal. Reviewers may consider more focus and/or a goal from the 2012 draft to cover the issue.	Conservation		
79	Conservation - General	Goal	Encourage and promote a system of interconnecting trails and paths for horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.	GP: COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities  Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP)		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This will work as a high level goal, though it is a current and ongoing effort. Once we get through a process of removing existing and proposed policies, we'll determine which policies will go with which goals and there may be further filtering out of certain goals if necessary.	Mobility - Trails		
80	Conservation - General	Goal	Provide for a "dark sky" which would retain the rural setting and not detract from astronomical research at Palomar Mountain.	GP: COS-13 Dark Skies  County Light Pollution Code		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This may have been in the CP since before the more restrictive "Zone A" requirements of the County's Light Pollution Code. Most of Valley Center is within Zone A. Though this is sufficient as a goal, underlying policies are recommended for removal, so there should be discussion on whether this should be a separate goal with a group of policies. Stakeholders may find that it's not needed, as existing Light Pollution Code requirements are restrictive in Zone A.	Conservation - Light Pollution		
81	Conservation - General	Goal	Preserve archeological and historical sites and encourage further identification and protection of these community resources.	GP: COS-7 Protection and Preservation of Archaeological Resources COS-8 Protection and Conservation of the Historical Built Environments		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is already covered in the GP goals referenced, and there are unique goal proposals addressing this issue in the 2012 Proposals matrix, which can serve as lead for related policies.	Conservation - Cultural Resources	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
82	Conservation	Policy	1. Subdivisions should be designed to preserve scenic viewsheds. Radio and T.V. antennas that obscure scenic ridgelines are discouraged.	GP: COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility Residential Subdivision Design  County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Aesthetics & Visual Resources		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  Please see GP Policy COS-12.2.	Conservation - Scenic Resources		
83	Conservation	Policy	2. Restrict hillside cutting and scarring, loss of wildlife habitat, loss of riparian habitat and loss of floodplains.	GP: LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-3.1 Wetland Protection COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains COS-12.1 Hillside and Ridgeline Development Density  Grading Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Watershed Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance (CEQA Guidelines - policy connects to multiple subject matter documents of the overall Guidelines)		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This would need more specificity to be an effective policy. In addition, these issues are addressed in multiple GP policies, existing CP policies, and 2012 policy proposals.	Conservation	Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
84	Conservation	Policy	3. Support the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Species Management Habitat Conservation Plan for the least Bell's vireo as it pertains to Valley Center.	GP: LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System  Draft North County MSCP Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Removal or Revision</i>  This is a very old policy and the document referenced could not be found. It looks like it was put in the plan prior to the 1986 listing on the federal endangered species list. The least Bell's vireo is a covered species in the draft North County MSCP and is on state and federal endangered species lists. The strict protections associated with endangered species status likely cover the original intent of the policy.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
85	Conservation	Policy	4. Protect riparian habitat and other types of wetlands from loss or modification by dedicating open space easements with adequate buffer zones and by other means to avoid impacts from adjacent land uses. Road crossings or other disturbances of riparian habitat should be minimized and only allowed when alternatives have been considered and determined infeasible.	GP: LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability COS-3.1 Wetland Protection COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development  Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is covered in the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO; see Section 86.604a.5); however, the RPO is not applicable to Site Plans exempt from CEQA. Therefore, staff is recommending inclusion to expand the coverage of the issue in a community plan policy for Valley Center.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
86	Conservation	Policy	5. Projects within or in the vicinity of a Resource Conservation Area should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on the resources the RCA was created to protect.	GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Through the CPU process, more specific language may be considered for RCA descriptions that are vague, in terms of resources to be protected.	Conservation - Resource Conservation Areas		
87	Conservation	Policy	6. Preserve the native habitat of sensitive plants and animals by dedication of open space easements and other means that will ensure their long term protection and survival.	GP: COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features Into Project Design LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design  Resource Protection Ordinance County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This overlaps with other GP policies and County regulations and lacks any specific standards/requirements for Valley Center. The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources calls out standard mitigation practices (including on-site preservation or off-site mitigation) depending on the site characteristics and impacts.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation		
88	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.	GP: COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design  Valley Center Design Guidelines		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The way this is written, it could apply to all trees of any kind and any size. The Design Guidelines have detailed guidance for preservation of oaks and sycamores based on size, in addition to grading proximity considerations, and other factors.	Conservation - Trees		
89	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.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System  County Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The 2012 draft policies reviewed include more specifics beyond the GP policies. This current policy is repetitive of GP policies and the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance-Biological Resources.	Conservation - Habitat Preservation	Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 406</li> <li>• 480</li> <li>• 486</li> <li>• 487</li> </ul>

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

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
90	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.	GP: LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management COS-1.9 Invasive Species COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement  Watershed Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The Grading Ordinance and Watershed Protection Ordinance address erosion control requirements and recommend native or otherwise drought-tolerant species. However, this policy specifically calls out preference for native plant species.	Conservation - Erosion		
91	Conservation	Policy	10. It is strongly encouraged that trees be planted wherever possible to stabilize soil conditions and contribute to atmospheric oxygen production.	GP: COS-6.5 Best Management Practices		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Trees		
92	Conservation	Policy	11. Grading associated with discretionary permits shall not change natural land contours and shall be minimized to reduce erosion and siltation and damage to downstream properties.	GP: LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design COS-5.3 Downslope Protection  Grading Ordinance BMP Design Manual Watershed Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Though all grading includes some change to natural land contours, this text is otherwise almost the same as GP Policy LU-6.9.	Grading		
93	Conservation	Policy	12. Retain water courses in their natural state and prohibit all structures and future development within flood prone areas.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The policy doesn't define "flood prone area" so it's not clear on where structures and development would be prohibited. The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Zoning Ordinance have specific requirements for development within floodplains and floodways. In addition, the GP has restrictive policies that cover this type of issue. Land uses within floodways are limited to agriculture, recreation, open space and other such low intensity uses, per GP Policy S-10.1 and the RPO.	Flood Hazards	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.
94	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.	GP: S-10.2 Use of Natural Channels S-10.3 Flood Control Facilities S-10.5 Development Site Improvements  Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance Resource Protection Ordinance Watershed Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Revision or Removal</i>  This issue is addressed in the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Section 86.604c.1 and d.1).	Flood Hazards	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
95	Conservation	Policy	14. Prohibit discretionary permits that exacerbate problems in a currently identified downstream flooding area.	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 Watershed Protection Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This already covered in the existing regulations. See Section 811.104 of the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.	Flood Hazards	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
96	Conservation	Policy	15. Discourage the use of imported water for agriculture, irrigation, recreation, industry, and other uses.			<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This must be a very old policy and the rationale is not clear, as overuse of groundwater has more problematic implications. Most of the water use in the CPA is imported water, and this text discourages that.	Water Service		
97	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.	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		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is already 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.	Flood Hazards		
98	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.	GP: M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails COS-21.5 Connection to Trails and Networks COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions  Community Trails Master Plan Regional Trails Plan		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the CTMP or the RTP.  Proposed revision: Ensure the continued implementation of the planned Valley Center trails network within the CTMP, by requiring trail easement dedication on project sites that contain a planned trail alignment from the CTMP.	Mobility - Trails		
99	Conservation	Policy	18. Use low sodium lights and light shielding for new subdivisions and use permits as required by the "Dark Sky" Ordinance for those properties within a specified radius of the observatory at Palomar Mountain.	GP: COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna  County Light Pollution Code		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  These are already requirements in the County's Light Pollution Code for properties within Zone A, which is a 15-mile buffer from the Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories. Most of the Valley Center Community Planning Area is within Zone A.	Conservation - Light Pollution		
100	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.	GP: COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna  County Light Pollution Code		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There is no need for policies calling for adherence to an existing ordinance that is already applicable to Valley Center.	Conservation - Light Pollution		

Post September 16 Meeting Highlights

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



## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
101	Conservation	Policy	20. Require the location of an information center in Valley Center to facilitate community understanding of the region's cultural history.	GP: COS-8.2 Education and Interpretation COS-21.2 Location of Parks		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The policy has likely been in place since prior to 2003, when the Valley Center History Museum opened, so we're assuming the History Museum covers the original intent of the policy (with the reference to "cultural history").	Public Facilities		
102	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.	GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
103	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.	GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse  County Mills Act Contract Ordinance (see link on the web page referenced in the recommendation section of this row)		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is already required. See this web page for additional information and frequently asked questions - <a href="https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/4Historic/main.html">https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/4Historic/main.html</a>	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
104	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.	GP: COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse  Zoning Ordinance Section 5700-5749		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  This could use some revision for clarity related to discretionary review. Regarding the proposed revision below, there is a Land Development Code (LDC) Update currently underway for the County. If the "H" zoning special area designator is changed to some other mechanism for addressing the corresponding requirements, the policy proposal could be updated prior to the hearing process. If such an LDC change were to happen after the Community Plan Update adoption, a future General Plan Clean-Up project could address any reference change needed.  Proposed revision: During the discretionary project review process, it is recommended that all sites with significant historic resources receive an "H" zoning special area designator, so that future development will be subject to the Historic Landmark regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.	Conservation - Cultural Resources		
105	Open Space	Goal	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.	GP: COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  Staff recommends the following revision to clarify "adequate."  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 to retain the rural community character.	Conservation - Open Space		
106	Open Space	Policy	1. Encourage coordination with other jurisdictions in trading and otherwise negotiating land transfers to consolidate holdings for conservation and recreational uses.	GP: COS-23.2 Regional Coordination COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  Though it is similar to the two policies listed, it gets more specific with reference to land transfers.	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  Post-public review update: After additional review, staff noted General Plan policies that call for land transfer coordination with other jurisdictions. The recommendation will be changed to Recommend Removal.

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
107	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.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System  County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Biological Resources		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The 2012 draft policies we are reviewing include more specifics beyond the GP policies. This current policy is repetitive of GP policies and biological resources guidelines.	Conservation - Open Space	Steve Hutchison: Disagree - Kevin, some should be included and other could be rewritten to condense the text, while others need clarification or amplification.  Kevin Smith: Disagree - It was not possible to properly consider staff comments when reference is made to the 2012 Proposal without identifying the matrix item within the 2012 Proposal.	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  The text of the referenced General Plan policies is provided in the separate tab of the matrix (or separate bookmark if using the pdf). The following policies from the 2012 matrix are recommended for inclusion and address this issue and/or are closely related: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 153</li><li>• 262</li><li>• 396</li><li>• 483</li></ul>
108	Open Space	Policy	3. Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	GP: COS-1 Inter-connected Preserve System COS-23.2 Regional Coordination		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Strive for a functional open space system with passive recreational opportunities where feasible.
109	Open Space	Policy	4. Support efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in preserving open space.	GP: COS-1.10 Public Involvement COS-1.11 Volunteer Preserve Monitor		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Conservation - Open Space		
110	Open Space	Policy	5. Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	GP: LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This language is not clear enough to be impactful as a policy. Some biological open space easement areas prohibit access.	Conservation - Open Space		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff finds a revision can be proposed to maintain the intent of the policy.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Design new residential development to preserve existing public access points to surrounding open space.
111	Open Space	Policy	6. Sensitive plant life or irreplaceable, high quality plant and animal communities shall be preserved through planned residential developments and dedicated open space easements.	GP: COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features Into Project Design LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This overlaps with other GP policies and County regulations and lacks any specific standards/requirements for Valley Center.	Land Use - Habitat Preservation		
112	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.	GP: COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains COS-5.3 Downslope Protection S-9.4 Development in Villages S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  This is not considered repetitive, as it addresses zoning in these areas.	Flood Hazards		
113	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.	GP: COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> Staff received a comment noting a preference for the similar policy in the 2012 matrix (Item 457). Staff concurs with this preference and the recommendation on this item has therefore changed to recommend removal.

## Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
114	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.	GP: LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development  Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Board of Supervisors Policy I-136		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This is already required (a funding mechanism [not agency] for operations and maintenance) per the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance and Board of Supervisors Policy I-136.	Parks and Recreation		
115	Parks and Recreation	Policy	2. If a park is established outside of these boundaries, the District must be expanded or an alternative funding agency must be identified.	GP: COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  It is not known what "these boundaries" is referring to, but it is assumed this is referring to the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District (VCPDR), which is currently undergoing a process to formally investigate and pursue the transfer of its assets and powers to the County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Any expansion of the associated County Service Area would go through a process with the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to address the issues presented in this policy.	Parks and Recreation		
116	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.	GP: LU-18.2 Colocation of Civic Uses COS-21.2 Location of Parks		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision</i> : Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities are encouraged through continued collaboration with public agencies whenever possible. This collaboration may include Joint Powers Agreements or similar mechanisms to promote cooperation in development, operation and maintenance.
117	Parks and Recreation	Policy	4. In keeping with the rural character of the Valley Center community, Community and Neighborhood Parks will be encouraged.	GP: COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  The text needs more detail and it's not clear if this is to be interpreted as favoring community and neighborhood parks over regional parks, preserves, etc.	Parks and Recreation		
118	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.	GP: COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  The first two sentences are ok, but staff recommends removing the last sentence. Developer requirements (fees and/or land dedication) are covered under the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO).  <i>Proposed revision</i> : 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.	Parks and Recreation	Kevin Smith: Agree - The proposed revision is better.	<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, the staff recommended revision has been slightly changed, as shown below.  <i>Proposed revision</i> : Establish priorities and encourage the acquisition of park lands while minimizing public costs. Implement a park acquisition program which will use all possible acquisition and funding mechanisms.
119	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.	GP: COS-21.2 Location of Parks COS-21.3 Park Design  County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Park Design Manual		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  It is assumed the intent is to develop parks in these areas; however, it is assumed the intent wasn't to develop active parks in areas of outstanding biological resources. Stakeholders should determine whether the text of GP Policy COS-21.3 is sufficient to cover the intent, so that this policy is not needed.	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update</i> : After additional review, the staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision</i> : Acquire outstanding scenic areas; cultural, biological and historic resources. The establishment of preserve locations and design shall incorporate these features whenever possible.

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
120	Parks and Recreation	Policy	7. All park lands dedicated in conjunction with the development of a Specific Plan Area (SPA) land use designation will consist of a reasonable amount of flat land suitable for play fields and other similar local park activities.	GP: COS-22.1 Variety of Recreational Programs		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  - While new Specific Plans can be allowed, applying new Specific Plan Area land use designations is not allowed (see GP Land Use Element p. 17). New Specific Plans would have conventional land use designations to reflect densities allowed. - The way it reads now, they wouldn't be able to designate open space preserve land, without this "reasonable amount of flat land..."  Proposed revision: When park land dedication is required for specific plans that include residential uses, dedicated land shall include one or more areas of relatively flat land suitable for play fields and similar local park activities.	Parks and Recreation	D Simms: Agree - I agree with staff!  Jenna Simms: Agree - I agree with all proposed changes by staff! I do not support leaving them unchanged!  Tania Tuluie: Agree - I agree with the recommendation by staff  Tol: Agree - I agree with staff	<i>No Change to Recommendation</i>  All comments received are in agreement with the initial staff recommendation.
121	Parks and Recreation	Policy	8. Development of park facilities shall comply with the County's Ordinance No. 7155 relating to the regulation of Light Pollution.	GP: COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna  County Light Pollution Code		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  There is no need for a policy that requires compliance with an existing ordinance that is already applicable to Valley Center.	Parks and Recreation		
122	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.	GP: COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks  Community Trails Master Plan		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Parks and Recreation		<i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i>  <i>Post-public review update:</i> After additional review, staff recommendation will be changed to recommend inclusion with revision.  <i>Proposed revision:</i> Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center trails system.
123	Noise	Goal	Maintain an environment free of excessive noise by providing control of noise at its source, along the noise transmission path and at the receiver site.	GP: LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts N-2 Protection of Noise Sensitive Uses N-4 Transportation-Related Noise Generators N-5 Non-transportation-Related Noise Sources		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  While similar to the GP's Noise Element goals, the wording is unique enough to retain it as a goal.	Noise		
124	Noise	Policy	1. Develop and implement land use plans and circulation patterns that will minimize noise in residential neighborhoods.	GP: N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses N-2.2 Balconies and Patios LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>	Noise		
125	Noise	Policy	2. Permit residential development in areas with projected exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) exceeding 60 decibels near main roads only when traffic noise impacts can be mitigated.	GP: N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses N-2.2 Balconies and Patios LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations  County Noise Ordinance		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The GP allows decision-makers to approve residential projects where the CNEL is above 60 decibels (and not fully mitigated to below 60) under extraordinary circumstances. This goes a step beyond that, to call for not permitting residential development under these circumstances. Therefore, we don't find it to be repetitive, but within the purview of issues CP policies can address.	Noise		
126	Noise	Policy	3. Design subdivisions to retain natural and landscaped sound barriers in preference to earth berms or walls, where they are needed.	GP: N-1.3 Sound Walls COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design		<i>Recommend Inclusion</i>  The GP policy only discourages noise walls when they can be avoided. It doesn't discourage earthen berms. Therefore, staff recommends inclusion to note the CP preference for retaining natural sound barriers.	Noise		

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

### Original List

Number	Existing Element	Type	Text	Related General Plan/Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulations (Empty Cells = N/A)	Referenced Related Existing VC CP Text	Initial PDS Notes/Recommended Changes	Category	Public Comments Received	Post-Public Review Recommendation
127	Noise	Policy	4. Encourage the use of buffering devices on off-road vehicles and provide strict enforcement of noise regulations for off-road vehicles.	GP: N-6.2 Recurring Intermittent  County Noise Ordinance		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  County Code Compliance does not have the ability to regulate equipment on off-road vehicles. Section 36.416 of the Noise Ordinance covers the noise limits by time of day/night for off-road vehicles. There is no need for a policy that calls for adhering to an existing ordinance that is already applicable to Valley Center.	Noise		
128	Noise	Policy	5. Minimize traffic noise impacts by means of roadway alignment and design and the management of traffic flows.	GP: N-4.1 Traffic Noise N-4.2 Traffic Calming N-4.5 Roadway Location N-4.6 Road Improvement Projects		<i>Recommend Removal</i>  This issue is fully addressed with more detailed policy text in the GP policies listed.	Noise		

**Post September 16 Meeting Highlights**

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

# Header Descriptions

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

# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1 Inter-Connected Preserve System	A regionally managed, inter-connected preserve system that embodies the regional biological diversity of San Diego County.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System	Identify and develop a coordinated biological preserve system that includes Pre-Approved Mitigation Areas, Biological Resource Core Areas, wildlife corridors, and linkages to allow wildlife to travel throughout their habitat ranges.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.4 Collaboration with Other Jurisdictions	Collaborate with other jurisdictions and trustee agencies to achieve well-defined common resource preservation and management goals.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.9 Invasive Species	Require new development adjacent to biological preserves to use non-invasive plants in landscaping. Encourage the removal of invasive plants within preserves.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.10 Public Involvement	Ensure an open, transparent, and inclusive decision-making process by involving the public throughout the course of planning and implementation of habitat conservation plans and resource management plans.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-1.11 Volunteer Preserve Monitor	Encourage the formation of volunteer preserve managers that are incorporated into each community planning group to supplement professional enforcement staff.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment	Sustainable ecosystems with long-term viability to maintain natural processes, sensitive lands, and sensitive as well as common species, coupled with sustainable growth and development.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement	Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design	Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-3.1 Wetland Protection	Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development	Require development projects to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; and</li> <li>■ Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydromodification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species.</li> </ul>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-4.1 Water Conservation	Require development to reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County's dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping	Require efficient irrigation systems and in new development encourage the use of native plant species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-4.5 Recycled Water	Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources	Protection and maintenance of local reservoirs, watersheds, aquifer-recharge areas, and natural drainage systems to maintain high-quality water resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains	Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-5.3 Downslope Protection	Require development to be appropriately sited and to incorporate measures to retain natural flow regimes, thereby protecting downslope areas from erosion, capturing runoff to adequately allow for filtration and/or infiltration, and protecting downstream biological resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations	Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations</li> <li>■ Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses</li> <li>■ Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and design development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development</li> <li>■ Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture</li> <li>■ Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations</li> <li>■ Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process</li> </ul>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.4 Conservation Easements	Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and programs that preserve agricultural lands.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices	Encourage best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to protect watersheds, reduce GHG emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-7 Protection of Preservation of Archaeological Resources	Protection and preservation of the County's important archaeological resources for their cultural importance to local communities, as well as their research and educational potential.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-8 Protection and Conservation of Historical Built Environments	Protection, conservation, use, and enjoyment of the County's important historic resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse	Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-8.2 Education and Interpretation	Encourage and promote the development of educational and interpretive programs that focus on the rich multicultural heritage of the County of San Diego.

# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources	Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections	Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors, such as scenic highways and regional trails.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design	Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Creative site planning</li> <li>■ Integration of natural features into the project</li> <li>■ Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape</li> <li>■ Minimal disturbance of topography</li> </ul>
Conservation & Open Space	COS-12.1 Hillside and Ridgeline Development Density	Protect undeveloped ridgelines and steep hillsides by maintaining semi-rural or rural designations on these areas.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-12.2 Development Location on Ridges	Require development to preserve the physical features by being located down and away from ridgelines so that structures are not silhouetted against the sky.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13 Dark Skies	Preserved dark skies that contribute to rural character and are necessary for the local observatories.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare	Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna	Minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the impact of development on the dark skies surrounding Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories to maintain dark skies which are vital to these two world-class observatories by restricting exterior light sources within the impact areas of the observatories.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development	Require the use of recycled water in development wherever feasible. Restrict the use of recycled water when it increases salt loading in reservoirs.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21 Park and Recreational Facilities	Park and recreation facilities that enhance the quality of life and meet the diverse active and passive recreational needs of County residents and visitors, protect natural resources, and foster an awareness of local history, with approximately ten acres of local parks and 15 acres of regional parks provided for every 1,000 persons in the unincorporated County.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.2 Location of Parks	Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers where feasible, so that they may function as the "heart" of a community.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.3 Park Design	Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-21.5 Connections to Trails and Networks	Connect public parks to trails and pathways and other pedestrian or bicycle networks where feasible to provide linkages and connectivity between recreational uses.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-22.1 Variety of Recreational Programs	Provide and promote a variety of high quality active and passive recreation programs that meet the needs of and benefit County residents.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-23.2 Regional Coordination	Coordinate the planning, acquisition, protection, development, and management of open space among governmental agencies and private organizations to maximize opportunities to link regional open space lands.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24 Park and Recreation Funding	Adequate funding for acquisition, development, maintenance, management, and operation of parks, recreation facilities, and preserves.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions	Require development to provide fair-share contributions toward parks and recreation facilities and trails consistent with local, state, and federal law.
Conservation & Open Space	COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities	Maximize funding opportunities for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The acquisition, expansion, and development of parks, recreation facilities, preserves, and trails</li> <li>■ The operation, maintenance, and management of parks, recreation facilities, preserves, and trails</li> </ul>
Land Use	LU-1.4 Village Expansion	Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding</li> <li>■ Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network</li> <li>■ Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents</li> <li>■ The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area</li> </ul>
Land Use	LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character	Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.
Land Use	LU-2.1 Community Plans	Maintain updated Community Plans, as part of the General Plan, to guide development to reflect the character and vision for each individual unincorporated community, consistent with the General Plan.
Land Use	LU-2.2 Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan	Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.



# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Land Use	LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts	Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or area detrimental to human health and safety.
Land Use	LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character	Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.
Land Use	LU-3 Diversity of Residential Neighborhoods	A land use plan that accommodates a range of building and neighborhood types suitable for a variety of lifestyles, ages, affordability levels, and design options.
Land Use	LU-3.1 Diversity of Residential Designations and Building Types	Maintain a mixture of residential land use designations and development regulations that accommodate various building types and styles.
Land Use	LU-3.2 Mix of Housing Units in Large Projects	Require new large residential developments (generally greater than 200 dwelling units) to integrate a range of housing types and lot and building sizes. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-6 Development-Environmental Balance	A built environment in balance with the natural environment, scarce resources, natural hazards, and the unique local character of individual communities.
Land Use	LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability	Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.
Land Use	LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design	Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design	Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Land Use	LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management	Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development techniques as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County's LID Handbook.
Land Use	LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design	Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.
Land Use	LU-6.7 Open Space Network	Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.
Land Use	LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography	Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.
Land Use	LU-7 Agricultural Conservation	A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.
Land Use	LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development	Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.
Land Use	LU-9 Distinct Villages and Community Cores	Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community's identity and character.
Land Use	LU-9.3 Village and Community Core Guidelines and Regulations	Support the development and implementation of design guidelines, Village-specific regulations for roads, parking, and noise, and other planning and regulatory mechanisms that recognize the unique operations and character of Villages, Town Centers, and transportation nodes. Ensure that new development be compatible with the overall scale and character of established neighborhoods.
Land Use	LU-9.6 Town Center Uses	Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Villages or Rural Villages at transportation nodes. Exceptions to this pattern may be allowed for established industrial districts and secondary commercial districts or corridors.
Land Use	LU-10 Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands	Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities.
Land Use	LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development	Limit the establishment of commercial and industrial uses in Semi-Rural and Rural areas that are outside of Villages (including Rural Villages) to minimize vehicle trips and environmental impacts.
Land Use	LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity	Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.
Land Use	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character	Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.
Land Use	LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers	Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.
Land Use	LU-11.9 Development Density and Scale Transitions	Locate transitions of medium-intensity land uses or provide buffers between lower intensity uses, such as low-density residential districts and higher intensity development, such as commercial or industrial uses. Buffering may be accomplished through increased setbacks or other techniques such as grade differentials, walls, and/or landscaping but must be consistent with community design standards.

# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Land Use	LU-11.10 Integrity of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses	Protect designated Medium and High Impact Industrial areas from encroachment of incompatible land uses, such as residences, schools, or other uses that are sensitive to industrial impacts. The intent of this policy is to retain the ability to utilize industrially designated locations by reducing future development conflicts.
Land Use	LU-11.11 Industrial Compatibility with Adjoining Uses	Require industrial land uses with outdoor activities or storage to provide a buffer from adjacent incompatible land uses (refer to Policy LU-11.9 for examples of buffering).
Land Use	LU-12 Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development	Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.
Land Use	LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development	Require the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services needed by new development prior to that development, either directly or through fees. Where appropriate, the construction of infrastructure and facilities may be phased to coincide with project phasing.
Land Use	LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility	Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts; for Mobility Element roads identified in Table M-4, an LOS D or better may not be achieved.
Land Use	LU-13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection	A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to ensure the long-term viability of San Diego County's water quality and supply.
Land Use	LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply	Coordinate water infrastructure planning with land use planning to maintain an acceptable availability of a high quality sustainable water supply. Ensure that new development includes both indoor and outdoor water conservation measures to reduce demand.
Land Use	LU-14 Adequate Wastewater Facilities	Adequate wastewater disposal that addresses potential hazards to human health and the environment.
Land Use	LU-17 Adequate Education	Site new solid waste management facilities identified in the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan, in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts and prevents groundwater degradation, and in accordance with applicable local land use policies.
Land Use	LU-17.1 Planning for Schools	Encourage school districts to consider the population distribution as shown on the Land Use Map when planning for new school facilities.
Land Use	LU-17.2 Compatibility of Schools with Adjoining Uses	Encourage school districts to minimize conflicts between schools and adjacent land uses through appropriate siting and adequate mitigation, addressing such issues as student drop-off/pick up locations, parking access, and security.
Land Use	LU-18.2 Colocation of Civic Uses	Encourage the co-location of civic uses such as County library facilities, community centers, parks, and schools. To encourage access by all segments of the population, civic uses should be accessible by transit whenever possible.
Mobility	M-1 Balanced Road Network	A safe and efficient road network that balances regional travel needs with the travel requirements and preferences of local communities.
Mobility	M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria	Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.
Mobility	M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads	Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.
Mobility	M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design	Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.
Mobility	M-2.4 Roadway Noise Buffers	Incorporate buffers or other noise reduction measures consistent with standards established in the Noise Element into the siting and design of roads located next to sensitive noise-receptors to minimize adverse impacts from traffic noise. Consider reduction measures such as alternative road design, reduced speeds, alternative paving, and setbacks or buffers, prior to berms and walls.
Mobility	M-3.1 Public Road Right-of-Way	Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards, Active Transportation Plan and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.
Mobility	M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation	Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and equestrian.
Mobility	M-4 Safe and Compatible Roads	Roads designed to be safe for all users and compatible with their context.
Mobility	M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads	Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.

# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Mobility	M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character	Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]
Mobility	M-4.5 Context Sensitive Road Design	Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.
Mobility	M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails	Require development projects to dedicate and improve trails or pathways where the development will occur on land planned for trail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan.
Noise	N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies	Require the following strategies as higher priorities than construction of conventional noise barriers where noise abatement is necessary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Avoid placement of noise sensitive uses within noisy areas</li> <li>■ Increase setbacks between noise generators and noise sensitive uses</li> <li>■ Orient buildings such that the noise sensitive portions of a project are shielded from noise sources</li> <li>■ Use sound-attenuating architectural design and building features</li> <li>■ Employ technologies when appropriate that reduce noise generation (i.e. alternative pavement materials on roadways)</li> </ul>
Noise	N-1.3 Sound Walls	Discourage the use of noise walls. In areas where the use of noise walls cannot be avoided, evaluate and require where feasible, a combination of walls and earthen berms and require the use of vegetation or other visual screening methods to soften the visual appearance of the wall.
Noise	N-2 Protection of Noise Sensitive Uses	A noise environment that minimizes exposure of noise sensitive land uses to excessive, unsafe, or otherwise disruptive noise levels.
Noise	N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses	Require an acoustical study to identify inappropriate noise level where development may directly result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to noise levels equal to or greater than 60 CNEL and require mitigation for sensitive uses in compliance with the noise standards listed in Table N-2.
Noise	N-2.2 Balconies and Patios	Assure that in developments where the exterior noise level on patios or balconies for multi-family residences or mixed-use developments exceed 65 CNEL, a solid noise barrier is incorporated into the building design of the balconies and patios while still maintaining the openness of the patio or balcony.
Noise	N-4 Transportation-Related Noise Generators	A noise environment that reduces noise generated from traffic, railroads, and airports to the extent feasible.
Noise	N-4.1 Traffic Noise	Require that projects proposing General Plan amendments that increase the average daily traffic beyond what is anticipated in this General Plan do not increase cumulative traffic noise to off-site noise sensitive land uses beyond acceptable levels.
Noise	N-4.2 Traffic Calming	Include traffic calming design, traffic control measures, and low-noise pavement surfaces that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise in development that may impact noise sensitive land uses.
Noise	N-4.5 Roadway Location	Locate new or expanded roads designated in the Mobility Element in areas where the impact to noise sensitive land uses would be minimized.
Noise	N-4.6 Road Improvement Projects	For County road improvement projects, evaluate the proposed project against ambient noise levels to determine whether the project would increase ambient noise levels by more than three decibels. If so, apply the limits in the noise standards listed in Table N-2 for noise sensitive land uses that may be affected by the increased noise levels. For federally-funded roadway construction projects, use the limits in the applicable Federal Highway Administration Standards.
Noise	N-5 Non-transportation-Related Noise Sources	A noise environment that provides minimal noise spillovers from industrial, commercial, agricultural, extractive, and similar facilities to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
Noise	N-6.2 Recurring Intermittent	Minimize impacts from noise in areas where recurring intermittent noise may not exceed the noise standards listed in Table N-2, but can have other adverse effects.
Safety	S-3 Minimized Fire Hazards	Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.
Safety	S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs	Support programs and plans, such as Strategic Fire Plans, consistent with state law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries and when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.
Safety	S-6 Adequate Fire and Medical Services	Adequate levels of fire and emergency medical services (EMS) in the unincorporated County.
Safety	S-6.1 Water Supply	Ensure that water supply systems for development are adequate to combat structural and wildland fires.
Safety	S-9.1 Floodplain Maps	Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.

# General Plan Policy Text

Land Use	General Plan Goal/Policy	Text
Safety	S-9.2 Development in Floodplains	Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal floodproofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.
Safety	S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas	Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding. Dam
Safety	S-9.4 Development in Villages	Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.
Safety	S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe	Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.
Safety	S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways	Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.
Safety	S-10.2 Use of Natural Channels	Require the use of natural channels for County flood control facilities except where necessary to protect existing structures from a current flooding problem and where natural channel use is deemed infeasible. The alternative must achieve the same level of biological and other environmental protection, such as water quality, hydrology, and public safety.
Safety	S-10.3 Flood Control Facilities	Require flood control facilities to be adequately sized, constructed, and maintained to operate effectively.
Safety	S-10.5 Development Site Improvements	Require development to provide necessary on- and off-site improvements to stormwater runoff and drainage facilities.
Safety	S-12 Adequate Law Enforcement Facilities	Timely development of law enforcement facilities in located that serve the unincorporated areas of the County.