

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations
11/12/2020 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #234	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	Goal 6-2 Retain the character that distinguishes the sub-area. Site designs are consistent with the image, scale and diversity of the surrounding semi-rural neighborhood.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Removal This is mostly covered in the existing goals referenced. To suggest consistency with image and scale, but then wanting diversity could make this wording confusing. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	Existing Goals and Policies matrix #10 Development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.	Subcommittee Comment: * Recommend retain with revision. * The following policies may be repeating this goal. * Exclude villages? * Only the word #239 as policies * Keep policy #236 Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages. Public Comment: * May be amenable to achieve. Consider design and cost with General Plan density requirements. * Consider each area uniquely and work with developers - premature to place limitations. Motion: Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238. Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
			Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Removal The County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which calls for clustered development, is required in SR 30, RL-20/40/80 and is optional in others. See Section 8.404 of the County's Subdivision Ordinance for the requirements of Conservation Subdivisions. The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, pathway/trails, and open space networks. Road/vacations to parcels on a subdivision boundary shall not terminate in a dead-end when it is feasible for the road/segment to serve as a through street. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	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.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #11 Preserve and enhance the rural character of the Valley Center CPA.	Subcommittee Comment: See item #234. * Do Villages need to be specifically considered as this is covering Land Use - Semi-Rural? Public Comment: Motion: Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238. Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
2012 Proposals #236	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	Policy 2. On larger properties create interconnected smaller neighborhoods separated by open space; avoid a sprawl of houses or independent enclaves.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Removal The County's Conservation Subdivision Ordinance, which calls for clustered development, is required in SR 30, RL-20/40/80 and is optional in others. See Section 8.404 of the County's Subdivision Ordinance for the requirements of Conservation Subdivisions. The General Plan policy referenced addresses the issues of providing connectivity in Semi-Rural areas, via streets, pathway/trails, and open space networks. Road/vacations to parcels on a subdivision boundary shall not terminate in a dead-end when it is feasible for the road/segment to serve as a through street. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.	County Subdivision Ordinance	Subcommittee Comment: See item #234. * Do Villages need to be specifically considered as this is covering Land Use - Semi-Rural? Public Comment: Motion: Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238. Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
2012 Proposals #238	Land Use - Semi-Rural Development	Policy 4. Prohibit monotonous site designs: this means checkerboard layouts, uniform lot sizes, repetitious architecture, uniform building materials, and pretentious branding that cites the natural features the project has just destroyed.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Removal This issue is covered in the policy proposal in item 235 of this matrix and the issue is covered in a more generalized style in GP Policy LU-3.2. The County doesn't regulate the types of marketing materials referenced. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	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. 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.]	NA	Subcommittee Comment: See item #234. Issue with the word "require" in item #234 goal. * Currently have #236 and #239 on consent. * Without the word "require", give too much flexibility to developers. Reference item #236 (on consent): Evaluate the pattern of diverse home site designs and home styles that characterize neighborhoods of custom homes. Public Comment: Motion: Recommend retain with revision of goal item #234 and retain item #236. Remove item #238. Recommended revision: Emphasize diversity of lot sizes, shapes, and architectural genres outside of the Villages. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1
Existing #6	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Inclusion with Revision Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course). Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation This policy does not refer to other related proposals to consider in the 2023 matrix. Projects are required to be consistent with the Community Plan and that requirement will carry forward to the Community Plan Update.	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. 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.]	Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Subcommittee Comment: * Covered by item #148. Recommend retain #148 and #152. * Agree with staff revision. Public Comment: * Subdivision lots have to be the same size, careful of what constraints are put on Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #152	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	Policy LU-3.4.7 Prohibit repetitive cookie-cutter development that destroys local character.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Inclusion with Revision Proposed revision (also proposed for similar existing and 2012 proposed policies so if included, only one occurrence is needed of course). "Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with same-model elevations should be avoided." Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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. 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.]	Existing Goals & Policies #6 (CP 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. Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Retain staff recommendation with revision. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #154	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	Policy LU-3.3.9 Require a diversity and mix of lot sizes and housing types, architecture, landscaping and lot sizes to attract people of diverse lifestyles, occupations, interests, and ages.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Inclusion with Revision The different component on this one is the reference to landscaping, but that should be covered in the Design Guidelines for areas subject to design review, or in the Community Right of Way Development Standards covering the parkway portion of the public road right of way. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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. 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.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP 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. Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Retain staff recommendation with revision. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #155	Land Use - Varied Design Housing - Diversity of Types	Policy LU-3.3.10 Produce variety within the range of design options that are compatible with the character of the sub-area (see the chapter on Community Characters: Valley Center's Sub-Areas.)	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Review Similar Existing/Proposed Policies This policy is not specific to Village areas or other commercial/industrial areas, so it is not recommended to be included in the Design Guidelines update. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged. A string of homes with the same lot configurations and the same model elevations should be avoided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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. 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.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #6 (CP 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. Rural Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Retain staff recommendation with revision. Proposed revision: Diversity and distinction between homes and overall subdivisions is encouraged outside of Villages. Homes with the same lot configurations and same model elevations should be avoided. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: Recommend Removal 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. Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need information on any concerns in order to consider a different recommendation.	LU-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: * Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding * Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network * Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents * The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area	NA	Subcommittee Comment: * Recommend inclusion with revision: * Avoid discontinuous development density that would increase the cost of extending infrastructure (roads, utilities) and would defeat the intention of the community development mode. * Avoiding cost doesn't make sense. Public Comment: * This proposed language might prevent some potential projects to be developed. Add language to allow for flexibility. * Limitations might not need to be put in place if developers understand Valley Center's characteristics. Motion: Recommend inclusion with revision: Avoid discontinuous development density that would increase the cost of extending infrastructure (roads, utilities) and would defeat the intention of the community development mode. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 4 Noes: 1

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations
11/12/2020 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #149	Land Use - Subdivisions	Policy LU-3.4.4. Require site inventory maps to precede site planning in order to determine areas that should be conserved and areas that can be disturbed for development.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> This proposed policy would be difficult to implement in only Valley Center and "areas to be conserved" would not hold regulatory weight. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	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.	PDS Form #090 - Minimum Plot Plan Information Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Recommend inclusion with revision <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Take staff recommendation to remove item #149. Maker: Lisa Adams Second: Kevin Smith Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #174	Land Use - Subdivisions	Policy LU-4.1.2 Designs for major subdivisions will follow the County's manual for achieving context-sensitive project designs: "Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions"	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion with Revision</i> The County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines were intended to serve as a resource tool so mandating the Guidelines as policy regulations in Valley Center would be inconsistent with their intention. Proposed revision: Designs for major subdivisions should follow guidance in the County's Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines in order to achieve community character compatibility. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	NA	Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Accept staff proposed revision <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Accept staff revision. Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #240	Land Use - Subdivisions	Policy 6. Incorporate non-motorized cross-country trails into the site design.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The County has the authority to require trail easements on development sites when a trail alignment through the site is called out in the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) or the Regional Trails Plan. The County does not have the authority to require that developers obtain off-site trail easements. The language lacks clarity and seems to require cross country trails for any project in the Semi-Rural Regional Category. Section 81.402b of the County Subdivision Ordinance details the dedication requirements where a CTMP trail alignment crosses the property to be subdivided. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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 rail or pathway segments shown on the Regional Trails Plan or Community Trails Master Plan. 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.	Goals & Policies matrix #122 (CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9) CP Parks and Recreation Policy 9: Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Master Plan developed as baseline level of service of trails needed * We need to find opportunities to connect to existing trails, even if there isn't a CTMP alignment through the site. * Perhaps consider with the other trails proposals. <u>Public Comment:</u> * Situate with the County not taking on maintenance of all trails. Maintenance can be particularly problematic with regular equestrian use. Motion: Table for now, take up with other trail items. Maker: Second: Vote: Ayes: Noes:
Existing #19	Land Use - Buffering	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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <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. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <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.	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. 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. 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). 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. N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies Require the following strategies as higher priorities than construction of conventional noise barriers where noise abatement is necessary: * Avoid placement of noise sensitive uses within noise areas * Increase setbacks between noise generators and noise sensitive uses * Orient buildings such that the noise sensitive portions of a project are shielded from noise sources * Use sound-attenuating architectural design and building features * Employ technologies when appropriate that reduce noise generation (i.e. alternative pavement materials on roadways)	Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines (guidance in subdivision design; not regulatory)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Add text at end of existing sentence. Prioritize landscape/open space buffer. "Discourage, except as a last resort, sound walls" * Open space/landscape buffer not enough if next to major street. Recommend taking staff recommendation * Buffer walls should be last resort in VC. Item #126 (consent item) : Design subdivisions to retain natural and landscaped sound barriers in preference to earth berms or walls, where they are needed. <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend Removal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #184	Land Use - Affordable Housing	Policy 8. Integrate affordable housing units with market priced dwellings; prohibit their concentration in one area of any neighborhood.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> The integration of affordable housing into development projects is part of the countywide Housing Affordability strategy. Post-Public Review Staff Response: <i>No Change to Recommendation</i> Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	H-3.3 Density Bonus as a Means to Develop Affordable Housing Provide a local density bonus program to encourage the development of housing affordable to lower income households and special needs housing. H-3.4 Housing for Moderate-Income Families in Villages Facilitate the production of housing for moderate income families within Villages by permitting developments that offer affordable housing to incorporate other compatible housing types within areas zoned for single-family residential development.	Zoning Ordinance - Density Bonus Program (starting at Section 6350)	<u>Subcommittee Comment:</u> * Covered elsewhere, agree with staff recommendation to remove (H-3.3 & H-3.4) * Allows affordable housing units to be clustered, suggest not to concentrate but have them commingle * Would be more difficult to plan for public transit * Wouldn't break up connected housing (apt. condo) * Addressed in ZO <u>Public Comment:</u> Motion: Recommend removal Maker: Pam Wiedenheiler Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0

Proposed Valley Center Goals and Policies Subcommittee Recommendations
11/12/2020 CPU Subcommittee Meeting

Item	Category	Type & Text	County Staff Recommendation/ Response/ Post-Public Review Recommendation	Related General Plan Goals & Policies	Related Community Plan Goal/Policy or Other Regulation	CPU Subcommittee 11/12/2020 Meeting
2012 Proposals #231	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 2. Retain natural vegetation, rock outcroppings, and natural drainage.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommended Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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.	Existing Goals and Policies matrix #13 (CP Land Use - Residential Policy 1) Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				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 size, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #14 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 2) Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.	
				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.]	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • 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.	
				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.	Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance County CEQA Guidelines for Determining Significance	
				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.		
				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.		
2012 Proposals #232	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 3. Require grading for building pads and roads to follow the natural contours of the land. Prohibit flat building pads on slopes greater than 25%. Require stepped foundations to accommodate the natural terrain.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommended Removal</i> Between the Existing Community Plan and the 2012 proposals, there are several policies which address the same or similar issues. For maximum effectiveness, these should be consolidated. In particular, the 2012 proposed policy in row 24 of this matrix is focused on the same issue. The Resource Protection Ordinance limits development encroachment into steep slopes (>25%) based on the percentage of the property containing steep slopes. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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.	Existing Goals & Policies matrix #17 (CP Land Use-Residential Policy 4) Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important: • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas.	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				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.	Resource Protection Ordinance Grading Ordinance	
2012 Proposals #233	Land Use - Integrate Natural Features	Policy 4. Require developers to locate buildings construction activities and construction staging areas in such a way that special features are protected from damage during construction, and	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no description of what is meant by "special features." Post-Public Review Staff Response: No Change to Recommendation Staff would need additional information on the concerns with removing the policy.	NA	NA	Subcommittee Comment: Covered in a number of areas Public Comment: Motion: Remove items #231, 232, 233 Maker: Steve Hutchison Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
Existing #92	Grading	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.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <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. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	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.	Grading Ordinance BMP Design Manual Watershed Protection Ordinance	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Recommend removal. Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Lisa Adams Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
				COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following: • Creative site planning • Integration of natural features into the project • Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape • Minimal disturbance of topography		
2012 Proposals #185	Land Use - Recycled Water	Policy 9. Encourage use of treated water for irrigation of Village landscaping, parks and golf courses.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Inclusion</i> This gets more specific than the GP policy, to include preferred uses of recycled water. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	COS-4.5 Recycled Water Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.		Subcommittee Comment: Street landscaping considered? Public Comment: Water district policy for Villages to use recycled water. Problem is Village doesn't have recycled water capabilities currently. Motion: Include as staff recommended. Maker: Pam Wiedenkiller Second: Steve Hutchison Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0
2012 Proposals #137	Land Use - reference other sections	Policy LU-1.8 Consult chapters below on Conservation Subdivisions and Community Character, the County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivisions, and Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Initial Staff Rec/Rationale: <i>Recommend Removal</i> There is no need for a policy that asks the reader to review other policies and regulations that are already applicable to Valley Center. Post-Public Review Staff Response: NA	LU-1.8 Density Allocation on Project Sites Permit changes in density within a project site with parcels that have more than one land use designation to provide flexibility in project design when approved by Major Use Permit or Specific Plan. The policy does not allow a project to receive more units than is established by the Land Use Maps nor to supersede Housing Element requirements related to achieving the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]	Conservation Subdivision County Design Guidelines for Residential Subdivision Valley Center Design Guidelines	Subcommittee Comment: Public Comment: Motion: Recommend Removal Maker: Kevin Smith Second: Pam Wiedenkiller Vote: Ayes: 5 Noes: 0