

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the October 15, 2012 Meeting

Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice Chair: Ann Quinley; Acting Secretary: Jon Vick

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:

Approved: 22 October 2012

1.		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:00 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 R H W O S 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	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Notes: Britsch arrived at 7:10 PM after quorum determined and approval of minutes

Quorum Established: 13/15 present

Pledge of Allegiance: Rudolf

2. Approval of Minutes: 9/17/12

Motion: Motion to approve

Maker/Second Rudolf/Jackson Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): Carries 13/0/0

3. Open Forum: none

Action Items:

4.f Additional meeting of VCCPG on 10/22/12 to review Subcommittee recommendations on the resubmittal of the Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community Project

Discussion: None

Motion: To hold an additional regular meeting on Monday, Oct 22, 2012 at 7 PM

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote 13/0/0

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 R H W O S 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
	A			A										

4.a. Norwood Trust property: 29010 Lilac Road

Discussion: Ms. Norwood-Johnson recused as she is a member of the Norwood Family Trust.

Mr. Rudolf presented history and summary, per his CPU Subcommittee report dated 10/15/12, copies of which were provided to the PG and were available to the public.

Mr. Jim Chagala presented on behalf of the Norwoods and reviewed zoning information contained in the S/C report and history of discussions with SD Co. Planners. Says they are not requesting a GP Amendment, rather they are asking for "Special circumstances" and that the zoning on the property be returned to where it was prior to the GP Update.

Ms. Norwood-Johnson made an appeal to return zoning to the same as it was when the family bought the property 25 years ago, and reviewed the communications with DPLU Planner Bob Citrano, as described in the CPU S/C report.

Mr. Rudolf presented a summary of the CPU S/C findings and recommendations, as summarized in the CPU S/C report of 10/15/12. Rudolf stated he did not believe it is the PG's perview to make decisions on equity mechanisms which have been requested but never approved by the County. Rudolf reviewed

the community goal of having 2 villages that include more than adequate commercial zoning for VC. He commented on there is currently no process, no community plan, no equity mechanism to address this and similar issues. To grant the applicants request would open the door to 150+ other requests for zoning changes and this would unravel 12 years of work creating a comprehensive community plan. CPU S/C recommends denial and suggests that this be sent to the County to determine an equity mechanism.

Marcia Townsend: Norwoods moved here over 20 years ago and purchased commercial property. Now PG is asking them to move. This is unfair to working people. Supports rezone.

Lias Del Pilar: doesn't think gas station is a good idea.

Bruce Clark: owns business on Norwood property. Supports change back to commercial. If zoning changes it would threaten the small businesses now on the property as they would have no where else to go. Supports rezone.

Leon Schwartz: Norwoods are good citizens, generous and supportive of the community. All of area should be commercial. Supports rezone.

Mel Schuler: Zoning will continue with the property but it will be a legal non-conforming use, thus a cloud over the property. Supports rezone.

Patsy Fritz: The use of this property is appropriate for the area – agricultural rural areas need gritty work spaces such as welding, large vehicle maintenance, etc., that no north or south village would want. This lot is inappropriate for residential or for split zoning. This is a legacy agricultural business and rezone to commercial should be approved by the PG. Supports rezone.

Reyna Norwood: Was raised on property. Pleads that property be left as is. Supports rezone.

Kyle Chapman: Tribes will develop land faster than in the past. 33 year-old Community Plan, referenced by Mr. Rudolf, is obsolete. Supports rezone.

John Perkins: Recycling business nearby makes this property inappropriate for residential use. Supports rezone.

Chris Korenney: entire piece of property should be commercial. Supports rezone.

Susan Glavinic: North and south villages need a sewer but this may not happen, and tribes may suck opportunity away from 2-village concept. Supports rezone.

Mark Jackson: places PG members in applicant's shoes. The PG is supposed to advise the county. Advises the County on: 1) does it conform to GP, 2) does it conform to Community Plan, 3) is it just and equitable. Motion Should reference these items.

Larry Glavinic: We should be kind and do no harm to our neighbors. Use of this property has been onerous and obnoxious for years, and it should be left as is; not suitable for residential. Supports rezone.

Deb Hofler: existing businesses would not be impacted and Norwood business could continue to be expanded. Renters will not be affected at all. But property owner will be affected by a reduction in the value of the property. We should have an equity mechanism or we have no right to change the zoning.

Bob Davis: Is there a use on this property that can not be accomplished in C-36 or C-40? Chagala can't say. There is no equity mechanism, so this is a "taking" without equity.

Bob Franck: Rezoning will not undermine the GP.

Hans Britsch: Leave as it was.

Dave Anderson: was downzoned. Votes for rezone.

Brian Bachman: torn by listening to the community; on S/C and voted to deny request. Now torn.

Ann Quinley: Doesn't want to undermine Community Plan but recognizes that this is a commercial property and is conflicted.

Oliver Smith: Recognizes the facts brought forth by the S/C. Looking at ups and downs. Does not conform but there is no equity mechanism. Lots of things change over 20-30 years. Can't rely on County to develop equity mechanism. This is a heritage commercial business area. Businesses are grandfathered in unless property is abandoned for a year or more. Businesses will stay no matter what GP decides. Property should be rezoned commercial.

Jon Vick: this property is clearly commercial and is unsuitable for residential. PG mandate is to support community plan and GP. We can not undermine CP and GP and do what is right for the Norwoods. Will abstain.

Bob Davis: changing zoning is intended to get rid of commercial. This will not happen.

Mel Schuler: equity measure is separated from update. We must create our own equity measure. In this

case we should return zoning to what it was.

Rudolf: The logic being used to argue change to commercial is desire to keep existing businesses. A sure way to get rid of existing businesses is to change to Commercial, so economic impetus will be to clear the parcel and build something allowed by right in Commercial; either by Norwood or some purchaser from the Trust.

Motion #1: Affirm the Community Plan by recommending denial of the request to rezone the Norwood trust parcel from A70 to C40 or to mixed C40/A70.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Hofler Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Fails 1/11/2

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 R H W N O S 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	N	N	N	N	A	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N

Motion #2: Restore zoning to last existing zoning of C40/A70, prior to GP update.

Maker/Second: Bob Davis/Larry Galvanic Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Carries 12/1/1

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 R H W N O S 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
Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Notes:

4.b. Tilton parcel 28241 Valley Center Road

Discussion: Rich Rudolf: CPU S/C not given complete information at the S/C meetings by the applicant. A “deal” was made by executor. Also the meaning of RC (residential/commercial) needed clarification.

Jim Chagala makes a presentation. The “deal” was never completed; property to north would not be rezoned RC according to the County. Realty office had been on this property for 50 years. Property was zoned C36. Property is at 3rd busiest intersection and is close to C40 zoning of South Village.

Mr. Tilton presents a history of the property and the family in VC. They own property north and south of subject property and is asking for restoration of previous zoning on subject property.

Christine Lewis: What are your plans for the property? Mr. Tilton responds: wants to see something built on the property but has no specific plans. CPU S/C report seems cold, much different than atmosphere at S/C meeting.

Mark Jackson: what was paid for compensation? Unknown.

Rich Rudolf: are you asking for C36 or C40? Asking for C40.

Deb Hofler: recalls that County typically compensated for loss of land and for building and business. This land very rocky – County doesn’t want blasting in this area, she recalls. County deemed property unbuildable.

Jon Vick: this is busy intersection with no commercial, and is unsuitable for new commercial. If owner wants to replace realty business then RC would allow this.

Patsy Fritz: wants to know uses allowed on C40; Chagala uncertain. County compensates for interruption of business. Rocky ground not good for leach field, etc. Not a very functional property. Traffic noise makes it unsuitable for residential.

Larry Glavinic: nobody will ever be able to use this property so it doesn’t matter what we approve.

Motion #1: Reject the Community Plan and approve the request to rezone the Tilton parcel from RC to C40

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Glavinic Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Fails by voice vote 1/12/1

Motion #2: Reject the Community Plan and revert to prior zoning

Maker/Second: Glavinic/Norwood-Johnson Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Fails by voice vote 1/12/1

Motion #3: Keep parcel as RC

Maker/Second: Hofler/Quinley Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote 12/1/1

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 R H W O S 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

Notes:

4.c. AT&T, unmanned cell tower at 30352 Circle R Lane; project number 3300-23-015

Discussion: Glavinic presented project summary and introduced Karen Adler, AT&T representative who handed out materials on project and described the new 4-G technology incorporated in the equipment to be installed, and coverage benefits.

Motion: To approve the unmanned AT&T cell tower at 30352 Circle R Lane. Karen Adler adds in a hand-written note: "AT&T will be responsible to repair any damage to the on-site and off-site private roads damaged by construction or maintenance vehicles for the life of the project"

Maker/Second: Glavinic/Hofler **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote 12/1/1

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 R H W O S 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

Notes:

4.d. JEB Sand & Gravel, 12025 Lake Wohlford Rd, ESC; project 3310-11-001

Discussion: Britsch presented info on project , which is the restoration of a gravel pit started in 1946. Not in our planning area, no action required, for information only. This is a negative declaration – a vote in favor would indicate that the PG finds nothing wrong with restoring and re-vegetating the site that has been environmentally ravaged. PG members indicate a desire to vote to show support for restoration.

Motion: Approve the negative declaration and the reclamation plan.

Maker/Second: Britsch/Quinley **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote 14/0/0

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 R H W O S 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

4.X **Motion to extend time**

Discussion:

Motion: To extend meeting to 10:20 PM

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote 14/0/0

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 R H W O S 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

Notes:

4.e Harrah's Rincon Casino Expansion Final Environmental Evaluation (FEE).

Discussion: Postponed

Motion:														
Maker/Second:										Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A]				
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 R H W O S 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
4.g		Vote on adding a new member to the Tribal Liaison subcommittee												
<p>Discussion: Glavinic presented Nikki Symington's resume. Upon questioning it appeared that she is a paid consultant for one or more of the local tribes. Rudolf, among other VCCPG members, commented that it did not seem right to have a paid consultant on our Tribal Liaison S/C. Patsy Fritz commented that it seemed very unusual for the paid consultant to be willing to come to VC's Tribal Liaison S/C meetings as she lives some distance away and not in VC.</p>														
<p>Motion: To add Nikki Symington to the Tribal Liaison S/C.</p>														
Maker/Second: Glavinic/Lewis										Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Failed 4/10/0				
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 R H W O S 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	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Notes:														
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					See summary on meeting agenda							
a)														
b)														
c)														
d)														
e)														
8.		Motion to Adjourn: made at 10:20 PM										pm		
Maker/Second Smith/Vick										Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Carries by voice vote				
Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, Oct 22 at 7 PM														