

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Minutes of the May 14, 2012 Meeting

**Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice Chair: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison**

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay  
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 7 June 2012

Approved: 11 June 2012

1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:										7: 03 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

**Notes:** Britsch arrives 7.08pm

**Quorum Established: 14 present**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2. Approval of Minutes: April 9, 2012**

**Motion:** Approve the 7 May 2012 Minutes

**Maker/Second** Quinley /Lewis

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0**

**3. Open Forum:**

Vick speaks as a private citizen re the Bear Valley Sculpture by Chris Marsalek and a fundraising effort Vick is undertaking to purchase the sculpture and place it at the Valley Center History Museum. The folk art sculpture was carved from a 40-foot section of a 276 year old Coulter pine that burned in the 2007 Poomacha Fire by Marsalek with incidental help from 264 community members. Vick presented a leaflet about the sculpture's theme of how "Bear Valley" got its name, and the historical significance of the event.

Dorothy Kennedy asks about CERS results and wonders about resurfacing corridor 11 within 5 years? Smith clarifies the purpose of the study and the lack of money to proceed with development of the identified corridors. Glavinic says the County responds to road fatalities as a priority and will find the money for improvements when required by such events.

**4. Discussion Items**

None

**5. Action Items:**

**5.a.**

**Discussion and vote on Major Use Permit 91-028W2M11 for the Woods Valley Ranch Golf Course located at 14616 Woods Valley Road. The Clubhouse has been permitted to have a Deli only and not a restaurant. It may not contain a dining room with a full-service restaurant. Two years ago they also received DPLU approval to construct an interim club house and golf storage facility for a period of two years until a permanent clubhouse could be constructed. At this point, they seek to renew the permit for the interim club house and to gain approval for food service (cold deli items only) inside the clubhouse. (Contact person is Mike Walker 619-647-5431) (Vick)**

**Discussion:**

Vick presents a proposal by Mr. Y. J. Kim to make permanent the existing temporary clubhouse and temporary golf cart storage. Kim wants to add a restaurant with inside dining. Kim is requesting the support of VCCPG. Hofler asks if they are planning to build a permanent clubhouse and storage facility. Kim says he had a plan for a permanent clubhouse, but he has been the victim of the present economic downturn. He says he has had

difficulty getting financing. Kim says he is still planning on a permanent structure but wants to get on with the business presently. Glavinic asks about a facelift on the existing temporary building. Kim says no facelift will be done. Smith asks about DRB review for major use permit. Davis says Kim's temporary building is already landscaped. Rudolf reviews history of interim use of clubhouse provided it doesn't have interior dining. Kim says he is asking for a replacement of the temporary permit that doesn't allow interior dining. He wants a deli with inside and outside dining. Vick agrees to change his motion to include a deli rather than a restaurant. Davis says that inside dining is sensible. Rudolf and Glavinic suggest extending the current temporary permit rather than giving permanent status to a temporary building. Vick says the County, according to Kim's consultant, is okay with making the permit permanent provided there is modification of the cold storage that would allow inside dining. Andersen says denying permit might result in closure of the golf course. Davis defends notion of granting permanent permit. Norwood-Johnson asks for clarification of permits. Bachman questions the number of permits requested. Kim notes that it is more expensive to create temporary building than a permanent one. Hofler cites the importance of having capital to run business especially in these difficult times.

**Motion:** The VCCPG supports the request by the proponent, Mr. Y.J. Kim, to extend the two temporary permits that have expired at Woods Valley Golf Course for the interim clubhouse and the golf cart storage and to include changing from a deli with outside dining to a deli that has interior and outside dining at the clubhouse, subject to the proponent obtaining the required DPLU approval of this deviation and/or any DPLU required modifications to the major use permit

**Maker/Second:** Vick/Hofler

**Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 13-0-2 Rudolf & Franck abstain

**5.b.**

**Discussion and vote Major Use Permit for Sol Orchard Valley Center Social Energy; 3300 11-027 (MUP) Log No 3910 11-08-010 (ER). Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project is a request for a Major Use Permit to authorize the construction and operation of a 7.5-megawatt solar energy project. The project consists of 46.1 acres of photovoltaic panels on a 54.6-acre site that is subject of the SR-4 General Plan Land Use Designation. Access would be provided by a private driveway that connects to Vesper Road. The project is an unmanned solar energy project and does not propose any new wastewater treatment facilities. It includes a 10-foot wide DG pathway within the right-of-way. The project is located at 15155 Vesper Road, Valley Center. Proponent is Will Pritchard, P.O. Box 222416, Carmel, CA. (DPLU planner is Mark Slovick 858-495-5172) All the Sol Orchard Valley Center (P11-027) documents can be found at: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa/3300-11-027.html>. These documents and local neighborhood input will be considered in the decision (Hofler).**

**Discussion:** Hofler presents. She reviews the history of this item. She says applicant has made most of the changes requested of them. One question is whether an adjoining orchard will be removed, and if it is, the proponents say that section of the property boundary will be landscaped. She says that the Design Review Board [DRB] is satisfied that applicant has complied with requests from the DRB. Applicant has filed several technical reports e.g. fire, noise, visual, traffic, etc. Chris Brown, Will Pritchard, Steve Bragg then present. Brown reviews the proponent's DRB appearance and other aspects of the public review. Brown says DRB asked for things such as 24" boxed trees rather than 5-gallon size. Also, DRB asked for mulch instead of hydro-seeding of exposed earth surfaces. Brown says that they are asking for additional questions from the VCCPG. Will Pritchard presents DRB review regarding screening if orchard on northwest is removed. He also included the proposed appearance of VC road frontage. He says no other aspect has changed since his presentation at the November VCCPG meeting, just landscaping. Hofler asks about the area of the project site that floods. Pritchard says it has not been addressed yet. Hofler says one email from a neighbor closest to the western edge has expressed concern about the trail along that boundary from the perspective of safety. Bragg addresses trails, from Vesper along western border to VC Road. Rudolf questions the effectiveness of screening for the neighbor along the trail. Bragg describes vegetation and other design items for screening and the neighbor's own fence and screening trees. Rudolf asks why trails are not type D trails rather than just a pathway. Bragg says county doesn't require more than path. Pritchard doesn't recall request for type D special pathway. Pritchard points out the planned maintenance of orange trees along Vesper Rd. and additional

augmentation with orange trees to limit sight lines. Rudolf faults DPW for not following community trails master plan. Suggests contacting DPW. Rudolf points out the condition of improving trails along VC Road. Pritchard says they are conditioned to provide dedication only. Kerry Christenson, audience, expresses concern about installation of an industrial solar facility in rural VC and pleads with VCCPG to deny support for this project. Smith asks about specific concerns. Christenson says such a facility may prove to be an unknown health risk, there is a danger of the company going bankrupt and leaving the facility abandoned, and that the project construction will lower property values. She says the neighbors are financially stressed and loss of property value could make their homes harder to sell. She sees no benefit to Valley Center. Norwood-Johnson asks for her location [on Almona Way]. Pritchard responds that the solar facility is benign compared to other possible uses. The company is bonded and conditioned to decommission the facility if bankrupted. He cites the history of the site for the past ten years as a blighted property. He says there is much equipment and material stored there illegally. He says his company has cleaned up 90% of property to date. Davis says DPW has had complaints about lodge pole fencing in relation to the proposed trails. He says it can be dangerous in accidents. Glavinic comments on the road edge not being mentioned in any of the documents. He asks for inclusion. He asks for safety treatment along trail [straighten from Vesper to VC Rd.] He also cites the spot zoning being requested. He questions the aesthetics of the project. He questions the determination that this project is not significant, and further suggests that it is not in character with VC. Vick asks about zoning [A70] and what other uses are permitted. Hofler responds with greenhouses, farm worker housing, mushroom farms, chicken ranches. Anderson questions how long zoning will be in effect. Hofler clarifies. Vick says he would likely rather have solar farm than chicken farm. Hofler says project is not aesthetically pretty. She adds from a land planning perspective, the community plan calls for residential in the villages. The sewer is not allowed in the project area, so it can remain A70. She questions VCCPG dictating uses on such land. She says solar farm is a permitted use. She asks if impact is low enough to override neighbors' concerns. Franck asks who will build project. Pritchard says Solar Orchard is part of the entity that will build the project, but they will hire a contractor to construct it. Franck asks who will manage project. Pritchard says 3 men will do maintenance, but it will be an unmanned project. Lewis questions use of the generated electricity by SDGE and asks if such use would prevent an outage. Pritchard says facility would go down in outage along with other customers, and would be restored systematically per the SDGE plan. Glavinic asks if proposed trail should be included on trails master plan. Expresses safety concern about corners on trail. Hofler says this is an open trail. Pritchard explains trail and that there could be no unobstructed sight line. Smith asks about fencing. Pritchard says a fence prevents entry to solar panels on one side of the trail, and barbed wire and hedge line the other side. Jackson asks about possible usage of pedestal mounts without arrays attached and expresses concern about the visual impact. Pritchard explains orientation of errant arrays. Smith cites relative safety of solar arrays compared to wind turbines. Smith says Planning Commission has restricted wind turbines in residential areas. He cites Woods Valley development to illustrate property rights. He continues to defend virtues of solar arrays in terms of noise. Comments on aesthetics by comparing solar array with a chicken ranch. Glavinic says this project is an industrial application in an agricultural area and he can't support such spot zoning. Smith responds that such facilities are limited in terms of possible locations [proximity to substation]. Pritchard says zoning for wind and solar were separated since 2010 and that his project complies fully with solar permitting. Davis asks what would make an Major Use Permit required [more than 10 acres]. Glavinic cites the lack of J-36 Community Right-of-Way Development Standards in the proposal and questions the purchase of solar materials in California. He cites that the Director of DPLU is authorized to determine if decommissioning plan is sufficient.

**Motion:** Move to approve project with conditions put forward by DPLU and DRB and provided it complies with Valley Center Trails Master Plan and Valley Center Community Right-of-Way Development Standards.

**Maker/Second:** Hofler/Quinley

**Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] A. 9-6-0

A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

**5.c.**

**Discussion and vote on bicycle transportation plan. The County is preparing a grant application to SANDAG to support the County's update of its bicycle transportation plan. The funds are available through Caltrans. The grant program has limited funds**

	<b>and the county's application will be more competitive if support can be shown from planning groups. DPLU requests this show of support by the end of May. (Rudolf)</b>	
	<b>Discussion:</b> Rudolf presents. He says County needs a bicycle transportation plan in place to get grant money. In 2003 the County wrote a similar document. The submission effort in 2008 merely re-dated the 2003 document to comply with the law. The County is now seeking community support for the plan. Hofler cites description on the web for the purpose of plan. Tom Baumgardner, audience, says that it is a bike to work issue and Sandag is trying to get money from Caltrans for use in San Diego and other urban communities. He says it won't help Valley Center. Hofler reads from the internet re bike plan emphasizing rural area's inclusion.	
	<b>Motion:</b> Move to support the County's application to SANDAG to obtain grant money to fund the update of the present bicycle transportation plan.	
	<b>Maker/Second:</b> Quinely/Hofler	<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] <b>15-0-0 Voice</b>
<b>5.d.</b>	<b>Discussion and possible vote on Lilac Hills Ranch, the development submitted to the County on April 30, 2012 by Randy Goodson and Accretive. (Project number: 3810-12-001 SP12-001) The VCCPG will consider ways of reviewing and responding to the project in a timely manner and consider issues associated with the project. (Hutchison).</b>	
	<b>Discussion:</b> Hutchison presents. He outlines the strategy for reviewing the recently released maps and documents on the Lilac Hills Ranch project. He acknowledges the response to a letter sent to Dep. County Admin. Aghassi with regard to this project. He also notes the resignation of Lael Montgomery from the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee and the need for an expeditious replacement with the help of the Nominations Subcommittee. Smith talks to the replacement issue. He sees no conflict of interest on the part of recused Britsch [chair of Nomination SC] in aiding with the replacement of Montgomery. Rudolf says VCCPG doesn't use Nomination SC for filling such vacancies. He says the subcommittee should make a recommendation for VCCPG to vote on. Rudolf then questions the validity of making comments on the documents received re the Lilac Hills Ranch project since they are manifestly incomplete. Chris Brown, consultant to Accretive, clarifies the document submission process from his perspective. Rudolf continues with his concern about the scant information. Brown defends the process but says it is the County's process. Lewis disagrees with the process as does Quinley. Bruce Christensen, area resident, comments that traffic will be an issue at the project site. He adds that safety will also be impacted in terms of emergency response times. He further objects to small lots being developed in VC. He also objects to the grading of 4.4 Million Cubic Yards of earth at the project site. Loni Gutgesell, area resident, agrees with Christensen. She expresses her concern about the small lot sizes proposed for the project. She cites the small open space allotments as being inadequate. She anticipates that the addition of so many dwelling units and commercial areas will create traffic issues. She says the fire department is too small for so many houses. She adds that a proposed three-lane road [West Lilac Rd.] doesn't comport with the two lane bridge over I-15 with which it will connect. Stephanie Eisenhower, area resident, moved to VC for quietness and agriculture. She cites water limitations as reason for not allowing more residents. She cites the West Lilac Rd./I-15 bridge width as a problem, and expects noise to increase. She cites an anticipated increase in crime. She says that the proposed sewage treatment plants will be a foul odor issue and will increase bugs and gnats while affecting all property values. She cites the dramatically increased density of the project. She would prefer to see estate homes on that project property. She cites the increased pressure on schools as a problem for the community. Dorothy Kennedy, audience, wonders why we are considering a general plan amendment when the General Plan Update is recently adopted?	
	<b>Notes:</b> Jackson/ Britsch recuse themselves based on proximity of their properties to the project site	
<b>5.e</b>	<b>Discussion and vote on the question of whether the equine ordinance should be a regular meeting agenda item, discussed in an additional regular meeting where it would be the primary item or have the equine subcommittee offer a meeting for community feedback so that not all VCCPG members would have to attend. Carl Stiehl will be invited to brief the group that meets to consider the ordinance. (Smith)</b>	
	<b>Discussion:</b> Smith presents. Carl Steihl has offered to talk to us about the equine ordinance. It would be an opportunity to ask questions. Should we make that an action item in June or July? Or, schedule an additional regular meeting on that topic. Davis thinks it's a good idea to have Carl Stiehl present to VCCPG. Glavinic has a question about the range of objectives for the ordinance. Smith says the objectives have been thinned out.	

One precept is a tiered approach to permitting horses. Hofler thinks it is useful to have Stiehl at a regular meeting, he is the one writing the ordinance. He might also have insight on Lilac Hills Ranch.

**Motion:** Move to put this on the agenda for the regular June meeting.

**Maker/Second:** Davis/Norwood-Johnson

**Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 15-0-0

**6. Subcommittee Reports & Business:**

- a) Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
- b) GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
- e) Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, Chair.
- f) Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive
- g) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair. :
- h) Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive
- i) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair:
- j) Website – Robert Davis, Chair:
- k) Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
- l) I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- m) Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair

**7. Correspondence Received for September 12, 2011 Agenda:**

- a) Final Agenda for San Diego County Planning Commission, Friday, April 13, 2012 at 9:00 at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego. Items include Dia Dang Meditation Center in Bonsall and Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (POD 11-008) for the entire county of San Diego.
- b) City of Escondido to VCCPG-Response to comments submitted on the Escondido General Plan Update. Case No. PHG 09-0020.
- c) DPLU to Valley Center Community Planning Group- Lilac Hills Ranch (formerly I-15-395 Master Planned Community, GPA 12-001, Project case number 3810-12-001, applicant is Accretive Investments, Inc., project location is 32444 Bridsong Drive, Escondido CA and West Lilac Road ; Project Contact person is John Rilling, 858-546-0700; DPLU Planner is Mark Slovick, 858-495-5272. Project proposes to develop a 608 acre mixed use pedestrian-oriented community of 1,746 dwelling units with varying lot sizes, a Senior Citizen Village component, a commercial village center, a park, public and private trails, retail uses and a school site. Also proposed are a recycling and waste transfer facility, a water reclamation facility and active orchards. (Hutchison).
- d) Final Agenda for San Diego County Planning Commission, Friday, April 27, 2012 and Friday, May 11, 2012 at 9:00 at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego. Items include Wind Energy Ordinance Amendment Workshop (POD 10-007) for the entire county of San Diego.
- e) DPLU to Valley Center Community Planning Group- Pre-Application Letter to Accretive Investments. Letter responds to questions raised about the information provided in the Major Pre-Application Summary letter to Accretive Investments. (Smith)

**8. Motion to Adjourn:**

**9.48 pm**

**Maker/Second:** Smith/Quinley

**Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 15-0-0 Voice

**Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 11 June 2012**