

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSED 2010 CVMP POLICY REVISIONS**

#### **1. CV-1.6; NEW RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION CAP**

Policy CV-1.6 of the 2010 CVMP set a 266 unit cap on new residential subdivisions (the term “unit” is used to capture a variety of dwellings as well as lots). The Planning Commission recommended that the new unit cap not change, and remain at 266 new units. The proposed policy revision would reduce that cap to 190 units. Not as part of the litigation settlement, but at the request of the Carmel Valley LUAC, a sentence clarifying the term “units” as used in the policy is added at the end, and the term “auxiliary unit”, which does not have a definition, has been replaced by other terms to make the policy more clear.

#### **2. CV-2.17; TRAFFIC METHODOLOGY**

Prior to the adoption of the 2010 CVMP, traffic was counted along Carmel Valley Road using the Average Daily Trip (“ADT”) method, which counted the volume of traffic along various segments of the road. Levels of Service (“LOS”) were determined based upon historical data set forth in a report prepared by Keith Higgins.

The 2010 CVMP initially proposed changing the method for calculating LOS to Percent Time Spent Following (“PTSF”), although as adopted the data would be reported in both ADT and PTSF. LOS standards were set for each of 12 segments of the road, and traffic would be monitored twice a year at six of those segments. If traffic along any monitored segment was approaching its LOS standard, a public hearing would be held regarding traffic conditions. The 2010 CVMP also provided that the County would assess how rapidly changes in LOS are occurring, compared to predictions, and if changes were occurring more rapidly the County would consider changes to land use policies including the new subdivision unit cap in CV-1.6.

The proposed policy revision would list ADT thresholds for each of 13 segments of the road (an additional segment on Rio Road from Val Verde to Carmel Rancho would be added), and that the annual report will evaluate traffic along the six monitored segments using both ADT and PTSF. The plan would be clarified to provide for monitoring at least once while school is in session. A hearing, specifically before the Board of Supervisors, would be held if any segment, based on either PTSF or ADT, approaches its threshold. The Planning Commission recommended that traffic segment 10 (Carmel Valley Road between Carmel Rancho Boulevard and SR 1) be added to the list of segments monitored yearly, and that segment 12 (Rio Road from its eastern terminus at Val Verde

Drive to Carmel Rancho Boulevard) be removed from that list. These changes are reflected in Attachment A.

The proposed policy revision further provides that the County would monitor all segments every five years, and a segment not annually monitored approaching its threshold would be added to the annual monitoring list. LOS standards would be indicated both in PTSF and ADT. Any EIR required for a project in the Master Plan area would be required to include an evaluation of traffic using ADT, and to assess cumulative traffic impacts outside the CVMP area from development occurring within the CVMP. Finally, the County may use PTSF, or any other methodology for the purpose of road or intersection design, and the revised policy will not apply to commercial development in the Light Commercial (“LC”) zone designation under certain circumstances.

### 3. CV-2.18; CARMEL VALLEY ROAD COMMITTEE

The 2010 CVMP calls for the creation by the Board of Supervisors of a Carmel Valley Road Committee, that will have various functions related to the review of traffic conditions along Carmel Valley Road. The revised policy would provide that the Committee specifically review and comment upon proposed projects in the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (“CVTIP”), review and comment on the annual traffic report described in CV-2.17 and discussed above; and comment on any Project Study Report (“PSR”) for a traffic improvement project in the CVTIP prior to project design.

### 4. CV-3.11; TREE PROTECTION

The 2010 CVMP revised detailed language regarding the protection of oak, madrone, and redwood trees with more general language that called for the creation of an ordinance that would call-out specific protections. The revised policy would return the specific tree protection language previously set forth in the Master Plan.

### 5. CV-6.5/3.22; NON-AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ON SLOPES

While the 2010 CVMP set forth a policy limiting non-agricultural development on slopes in excess of 25% and on highly erodible soils (Policy CV-6.5), it was identified that the policy was in the wrong chapter of the CVMP (the Agriculture Chapter). For consistency, the proposed policy revisions would make clarifying language changes and relocate the policy to the Conservation/Open Space Chapter where it more logically belongs.