

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the June 8, 2015 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 BOS=Board of Supervisors PDS=Department of Planning & Development Services DPW=Department of Public Works DRB=Valley Center Design Review Board GP= County General Plan N=Nay P=Present PC=County Planning Commission R=Recused SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group VC= Valley Center VCPRD=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 15 June 2015

Approved: 13 July 2015

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:04 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M I L L E R	O C C O N N E R	J A N I S C H	H U T C H I S O N	B R I T S C H	P L O T N E R	Q U I N L E Y	F A J A R D O	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	V I C K	R U D O L F	G A R R I T S O N	V A C A N T
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	

Notes:

Quorum Established: 14 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
C	Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of May 11, 2015 as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/O'Conner	Carries 12-0-2 (Y-N-A): Voice Plotner/Norwood abstain - not present last month
---	---

D	Public Communication/Open Forum:
	<p>Napolean Zervas, audience, expresses concern about development events in the community. He cites a variety of community meetings regarding the General Plan [GP] and notes that he is speaking on behalf of Herb Schaefer [present in the audience] as well. He declares that too much commercial development is being reviewed and applied for within Valley Center. He says VC is "going down the tubes". He wants VC to stick to the rules of the GP 20/20. He worries that if all the projects coming before the planning group are approved, it will ruin the vision of Valley Center. Vick asks how much commercial is in plan. Jim Chagala, audience, says there is about 101 acres of commercial along VC Road. Vick asks how much VC can handle effectively. Rudolf explains how the current level of commercial land uses was arrived at. Vick says we don't want to have empty commercial in VC. Norwood says not all of the commercial may be appropriate for VC, in terms of character. Rudolf explains the history of the form-based code for South Village. Chagala says the 101 acres he cited doesn't include Lilac Plaza and Park Circle. Dennis Campbell, PDS, says Park Circle is mostly zoned mixed use. Vick asks if there is a guideline. Campbell says no. Vick says another 48,000 sq ft. of commercial development will exacerbate the over-abundance of commercial. Plotner asks if the County had a reason for designating so much commercial? Smith says it is a result of the County assigning a growth number to VC. Rudolf says nobody paid attention to commercial during the run-up to the GP approval. Norwood asks Zervas how he would address the problem. Zervas suggests sticking to the original plan and not allowing new projects. Smith notes that VC is not the only population using the commercial enterprises in VC. Folks to the east also will use it [e.g. Palomar Mtn]. He says competition will sort out the commercial enterprises. That is not the decision the VCCPG is asked to make. Herb Schaefer, audience, comments that he has worked on the VC town Center vision for years. The town center needs residential to support it. He says there is a huge surplus of commercial presently. He advises that 100K sq. ft. is what is needed in VC. Anything beyond that will attract the more shabby stores because the surplus will force rents lower attracting less desirable businesses. He says the commercial zoning is in place and VCCPG has not had anything to do with it. He cautions that VCCPG ought to be thoughtful about what it recommends. He postulates that</p>

	<p>competing town centers will make it impossible to attract a major market. He predicts that overpopulating the VC area with supermarkets or drugstores will discourage others. VCCPG needs to be careful about what is approved. Plotner cites that Schaefer said 100-acres of commercial zoning yields 1 Million sq. ft. of commercial. Campbell says commercial C36 is general commercial and allows a variety of business types, but C34 is what most are asking for. He says commercial intensity can vary within those zoning designations. He notes that floor area ratio is sometimes used. Britsch asks if the commercial zoning is by right? Campbell responds that most commercial zoning In VC is by right. Britsch asks Zervas if developers of commercial property are not playing by the rules. Zervas says developers are asking for changes in land uses and zoning. He says he played by the rules of the General Plan but the rules seem to be changing. Rudolf reminds that this discussion cannot result in a vote, and that the point has been made.</p> <p>Vick advises the VCCPG about the Form-based Code Meeting for South Village hosted by PDS on 9 June. He defines form-based code and encourages attendance.</p> <p>Smith notes there is only one project to take action on. Other projects were not ready for a vote.</p>
E	Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:
E1	<p>1) Recommendation discussion and vote on Hideaway Lakes Solar Project PDS 2015-AD-15-004; FR 15-08-005; Solar Farm on Beatitude Drive near Hideaway Lake Drive; Owner is Lilac Enterprises, contact is Jennifer Kemme at 909-754-8300 or jenkemme@visionce.com. The project is a private .02 acre solar project on 2 acres and contains 303 modules accessed by an existing asphalt drive. (Smith)</p>
<p>Discussion: Smith presents and recounts the history of data collection on this project. He cites the meeting of the Solar SC and the discussion of the project with the applicants. No one representing Hideaway Lake is present tonight. Smith describes the project objective of providing power to off-set Hideaway Lakes' corporate requirements, not individual residents. One neighbor who is nearest the project was present at the SC meeting and he expressed no objections. He will not be able to see the panels. Smith notes his concern that there was no scoping letter for the SC meeting, but one was presented afterward. He says the County asked the San Diego County Fire Authority to do the fire assessment, but that request contravenes the policy of VC Fire Protection District [VCFPD], which is the fire authority having jurisdiction. Smith says a VCFPD report has been submitted. Smith moves to approve. He then reviews other solar project applications. Rudolf says VCFPD requirements were rather extensive for this project and asks if they can be met. Hutchison and Smith say yes. Smith clarifies what is being asked of the applicant in terms of construction, design and training. He says the County Fire Authority seemed less than thorough in their review.</p>	
<p>Motion: Move to approve the project provided it meets conditions set forth in the County's scoping letter and those identified by Valley Center Fire Protection District.</p>	
Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley	Carries 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
F	Discussion items (no VCCPG advisory vote taken on the following items)
F1	<p>Presentation by Will Rogers on conceptual plans for Star Valley Park, located off Vesper Rd to the south, proposal by the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District (Vick).</p>
<p>Discussion: Vick introduces Will Rogers and summarizes the acquisition of Star Valley Park. The VC Parks and Recreation District purchased 15.5-acres of an approximately 43-acre parcel for the new park. The remaining 28-acres may be option purchased within 5 years. Will Rogers and Gary Wynn are engaged to help P&R VCPRD to assess the project. Rogers, a land planner and landscape architect, describes the current plan and location between Vesper and VC Rd. The Valley Center Vaqueros will lease part of site and create a show ring and will move existing barns on the property to the north end until other parts of the park are ready to develop. Rogers notes the new park will also eventually provide baseball and soccer fields as well as a senior center and a public event venue. He describes the need to establish a funding mechanism and describes a benefit assessment district that requires only 50% + 1 of voters to pass. O'Conner asks if the new ball fields will</p>	

replace the existing ball fields? No says Rogers. O’Conner wonders why the existing ball fields could not provide the route for the planned, but un-built, Road 19. Dennis Campbell, PDS, acknowledges the currently mapped route for Road 19 and its presence on the County’s mobility element map, but suggests that there are issues with that route. Rogers says he is presenting a 5-10 year plan. The Vaqueros facility will be the first one built. Vick says this project is important to the VCPRD and will be supplemented by other passive parks such as Lilac Ranch, and Keys Creek. Rogers wants our support. Hutchison asks about the expected financial burden per parcel to fund the park. Rogers says somewhere between \$40 and \$100. Plotner asks about how the assessment will be applied. Garritson asks if playgrounds are included. Rogers says yes and shows some locations. Kerry Garza, audience, asks about the budget for the new park. Rogers says the budget is about \$10 Million. Garza asks for more details about how it will be paid for. Much of the construction effort is to be volunteered by community members and groups according to Rogers. Rudolf clarifies the distinction between VCPRD and the County Parks & Recreation Department saying the County expects VC to fund parks. He suggests we tell VC residents about the project, but expect no help from the County. Plotner asks about how many special districts Valley Center has and if VC could get more money from the County if the district were disbanded. Rudolf says VCPRD is relatively unique, and there is no telling how much support the County would provide if VCPRD were disbanded.

Motion: None

G	Group Business
G1	Discussion and vote on subcommittee membership. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith says Rudolf is resigning from the Solar SC because of his role on the Lilac Plaza SC. Norwood has expressed interest in the Lilac Plaza SC. Ashley Mellor has expressed interest in Lilac Plaza SC as well. Hans Britsch expresses interest in Lilac Plaza SC and inquires about the possibility of an internship on that SC for his son.

Motion: Move to acknowledge the resignation of Rudolf from the Solar SC and approve the addition of Britsch, Norwood and Mellor to the Lilac Plaza SC

Maker/Second: Smith/Rudolf								Carries 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice							
G2	Discussion and vote on candidates for vacancy in Seat 15 which expires January 19, 2017 (Britsch)														

Discussion: Smith announces Lael Montgomery’s resignation from the Design Review Board. The vacancy is declared and nominations are opened. Smith then moves on to candidates to fill seat 15 of the VCCPG and defers to Britsch who announces that there is only one candidate for seat 15, Mark Jackson. He suggests that Jackson, who is present, has already expressed his interest in the seat and his background to the VCCPG at a previous meeting and he calls for a vote on Jackson’s recommendation to the BOS to fill seat 15.

Motion: Move to approve the recommendation of Jackson for seat 15 to the BOS

Maker/Second: Britsch/Smith								Carries 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]:							
M I L L E R	O C O N N E R	J A N I S C H	H U T C H I S O N	B R I T S C H	P L O T N E R	Q U I N L E Y	F A J A R D O	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	V I C K	R U D O L F	G A R R I T S O N	V A C A N T	
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

G3	Update on major South Village Area Projects Hatfield Plaza project PDS 2013; TPM-21202; PDS20123; STP-13-011 (Tentative Map and Site Plan), Hatfield Center commercial retail/office use, 6 buildings on 3.3 acres, located on the west side of the
-----------	---

Valley Center Rd and Woods Valley Rd. intersection. Applicant: Jerry Gaughan Architect: Mark Burginger. (Miller).

Tractor Supply project PDS2015-STP-15-005; Owner is Bell Holdings, LLC, Steve Flynn, President; email: steveflynn@aol.com; phone 858-753-3589; contact person is Ross Burnett; email: rburnett@sterlingwarner.com; phone: 702-210-1944; location is 27444 Valley Center Road south of Mirar de Valle. The project includes the construction of one 18,825 square foot retail store with a 15,000 square foot outdoor display area to be built on 3.70 acres and will include 90 parking stalls. In addition to tractors and tractor supplies, the store will sell livestock and pet products, hardware and tool products and work clothing among other items. (Vick for Mobility; Miller for South Village).

Park Circle project, located at the northwest corner of Valley Center and Mirar De Valle Roads (former Konym Dairy); Owner is Konym Realty Investment Company, 27634 Valley Center Road. 316 acres of residential units and 223 parking spaces —dwellings are single family detached and one or two stories. The minimum residential lot size is 2200 square feet. The project proposes to build block walls and privacy walls around the project that will wall it off from Valley Center Road

Lilac Plaza project PDS2013-MPA-13-018: PDS2015-REZ-15-004 (rezone), PDS2015-GPA-15-003 (GPA), PDS2015-TPM-21224 (TPM), and PDS2015-STP-15-006 (Site Plan). Owner is Lilac Plaza LLC at erik@erikfox.com; applicant is Jerry Gaughan as 619-204-8797 or gerrygaughan@msn.com; Location is southwest corner of Lilac Road and Valley Center Road; 10 commercial buildings, some will be two stories, and 36 residential units with a total of 7 acres. (Quinley)

Discussion:

Hatfield Plaza project PDS 2013; TPM-21202; PDS20123; STP-13-011: Miller presents. He says the project has disappeared into the County for further review. Dennis Campbell, **PDS Project Manager**, clarifies the status within the PDS. He says he is still reviewing it. He notes that the project will go out for a CEQA exemption public notice [meaning that it will rely on the General Plan (GP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)]. He is reviewing the project for compliance with DRB comments. Smith asks about the steep slopes issue. Campbell begins to reply, but Mindy Fogg, SD County PDS, suggests it is not appropriate to get into project details at this point in the review process. Smith asks about a Banbury Road issue re a gated access to the project site. Campbell says the County is okay with the proposed gate. Rudolf asks about the propriety of seeking a CEQA exemption given the considerable project issues. Fogg says it is not an exemption, but an inclusion of the project under the existing GP EIR.

Tractor Supply project PDS2015-STP-15-005: Miller describes the project location. He says that Tractor Supply Company is a national retailer. He describes their marketing program and branded architecture and their unwillingness to modify it. He notes that they presented a site plan that works for Tractor Supply Co. and works for Valley Center. He says the setback requirement for the “buildings forward” concept does not apply in south village until the proposed form-based code is in place. He suggests that there are no planning issues at this time, but that may change after receipt of a scoping letter. Norwood observes that local retailer Powerland has no objections. Vick notes that Bill Lewis is the project architect and that he worked on Butterfield Trails Ranch, which resulted in the loss of landscaped median at Sunday Dr. But, Lewis is in favor of a roundabout on VC Rd. and wants to increase the planted median in South Village, in particular in front of the project. Lewis is organizing a meeting with the County regarding the VC Road modifications. Lewis says that the Flynn [Bell] group controls 3 of the 4 corners at Mirar de Valle that would be impacted by the installation of a traffic circle. Vick notes Lewis’ contention that a traffic circle is the most effective way to control traffic speed of all the available options. Miller adds that the County controls the decision on a traffic circle. He agrees with the need for a traffic circle. Rudolf asks about Tractor Supply’s business model. Vick reports that they sell no tractors, rather, they deal in merchandise more like pet supplies and hardware. Rudolf says the addition of Tractor Supply may affect 4 or 5 other small, existing businesses in VC. Garritson says the Tractor Supply project is consistent with the American values of free enterprise. Smith notes that the community also has a right to determine what commercial enterprises enter their community.

Park Circle project: Miller cites several presentations to community groups by proponents of this project. He says the project is pretty well defined. The South Village SC understands it pretty well. He reports that it fits

existing zoning. The developer is keeping The South Village SC informed of the project's review progress. Smith asks about sound walls. Miller says the developer has pretty much eliminated previously planned sound walls by tweaking the buildings' orientations. He will be interested to see the project's scoping letter. Dennis Campbell, PDS, says the buildings will now act as sound barriers. Kerry Garza, developer, says the 8-ft sound wall has been eliminated. Vick asks about rezoning for the project. Campbell says the present land use designation and the project are consistent, and it will have to be taken out of the holding zoning [S2]. Vick questions whether 48,000 square feet of commercial uses is included in the GP. Fogg clarifies how changing the holding zone designations will occur. Vick questions the volume of commercial zoning and if this is in addition to what is allowed in the GP. Fogg says she is not sure that there is too much commercial. Rudolf suggests the GP identifies the commercial volume. Mindy says this request is for a Major Use Permit [MUP] and is discretionary. Campbell says the decision-makers will base the volume of commercial development on VCCPG and PDS recommendations. Rudolf revisits the Park Circle project and the addition of commercial zoning to it. Garza says his project has always had in mind about 50,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses. Rudolf asks if there is room for discussion on the amount of commercial uses in VC. Campbell says it is up to the community. Rudolf notes the lack of resources in VC and suggests the County has the resources to do the appropriate economic studies to determine the amount of useful commercial zoning. Campbell says the County doesn't perform market studies, just land use determinations. Quinley asks Campbell if Garza had asked for his entire project to be commercial, would it be acceptable under S2 zoning. Campbell says, yes. O'Conner asks Campbell about the commercial competition and does the County have an opinion on where commercial should be located and how much. Campbell sympathizes with O'Conner's perspective but he can only view the general plan for guidance. He identifies all the commercial along VC Rd. He says he cannot control commercial development in terms of competition. Plotner asks if a market study can be done relative to the General Plan. Smith recounts the process for the GP and how it accounts for population distribution in the future and consequently the need for commercial and industrial land uses. Hutchison suggests that based on what is being said that no one is responsible for how much commercial is being allowed in VC. Campbell says the market decides. Rudolf says the County redistributed population growth from the county to the cities within the county. He notes that commercial zoning was not completely reviewed while the focus was on other land uses and population distribution. He says the VCCPG can ask the County to do an economic study to determine what level of commercial will work. Dave Borquez, audience, asks about the limited availability of sewer connections and the need for expansion of the now expanding treatment facility before adding additional commercial buildings and housing. Jim Chagala, representing VC resident Mr. Debs, cites his opposition to moving Road 19 to the west across Debs' land rather than its present alignment. Vick clarifies the need to have an alternative to VC Rd. for connectivity within the South Village. He says Park Circle is proposing to move Road 19 from their property to someone else's property. He disagrees with that notion. He says that critical analysis is needed to determine the best way to deal with the issue. Smith says the uncertainty about Road 19 will forestall a vote on any project that impacts that road. Garza offers to make a presentation on Road 19. Smith expects a SC recommendation to move the project forward to the VCCPG. He suggests it is needed to provide clarity to the VCCPG.

Lilac Plaza project PDS2013-MPA-13-018: PDS2015-REZ-15-004 (rezone), PDS2015-GPA-15-003 (GPA), PDS2015-TPM-21224 (TPM), and PDS2015-STP-15-006 (Site Plan): Quinley presents. She says she received copies of much of the paperwork for the project but no General Plan Amendment. **She says a SC meeting is scheduled 17 June at the Community Hall to review what is known about the project.**

Motion: None

G4

Discussion and vote on letter to Board of Supervisors (Smith/Hutchison)

Discussion: Smith introduces a draft letter [attached]. Smith notes the draft was sent to all members with 72 hours notice as well as being posted publicly. Smith explains the background of the controversy over GP policy LU-1.2, the prohibition of leapfrog development, and the County's interest in reinterpreting the language of the policy to allow greater discretion for the BOS to override the limitations. He cites the extensive effort to draft and then approve the GP. Kelly Crews, audience, asks if the draft is public. Smith acknowledges that it is in draft form but, with some formatting alterations it will be sent essentially as it was posted.

Motion: Move to send this letter regarding General Plan Policy LU-1.2 to the BOS and PC		
Maker/Second: Quinley/O'Conner		Carries 11-3-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice: Garritson, Plotner, Boulos are in opposition
G5	Next regular Next VCCPG meeting: 13 July 2015	
H	Motion to Adjourn:	9.15 pm
	Maker/Second: Quinley/O'Conner	Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]
Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group		
a)	Mobility – Jon Vick, Chair	
b)	Community Plan Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair	
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair	
d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair	
e)	Parks & Recreation –LaVonne Norwood Johnson, Chair	
f)	Southern Village –Bill Miller, Chair	
g)	Tribal Liaison – James Garritson, Chair	
h)	Website – Jeana Boulos, Chair	
i)	Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair	
j)	Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair	
k)	Ad Hoc Committee on Handbook Update and Member Training – Ann Quinley, Chair	

Correspondence Received for the June Meeting:

1. PDS to VCCPG: Lilac Plaza, LLC; t PDS2013-MPA-13-018: PDS2015-REZ-15-004 (rezone), PDS2015-GPA-15-003 (GPA), PDS2015-TPM-21224 (TPM), and PDS2015-STP-15-006 (Site Plan) on April 10, 2015. Owner is Lilac Plaza LLC at erik@erikfox.com or 6190279-24728; applicant is Jerry Gaughan at 619-204-8797 or gerrygaughan@msn.com; Location is southwest corner of Lilac Road and Valley Center Road; The project site is 7 acres and there are plans to construct commercial buildings on 2.14 acres of the site and to build 1.7 acres of retail, Office/professional. (Quinley)
2. PDS to VCCPG: Park Circle, PDS2015-TM-5603, northwest corner of Valley Center Rd and Mirar de Valle, 316 acres of residential units and 223 parking spaces. Under separate cover, a site plan for the project was received. A general Plan Amendment to amend the GP Amendment Circulation Element to allow private road standards to be used with the project is proposed as well as a rezone to change current zoning from Village Residential to VR-10.9 and General Commercial. A zoning change from RR to C36 is also requested. (Miller)
3. PDS to VCCPG 05Jun2015 Drainage easement vacation by Valley Center Municipal Water District, APN 189-091-01 and 189-091-02, intent is to vacate portions of an existing drainage easement located over 2 parcels of land owned by VCMWD located on Charlan Road East of its intersection with Valley Center Road. VCMWD is planning to construct a storm water storage facility over the property, which is to be maintained by VCMWD, negating the need for the County's Drainage Easement. (Miller)
4. PDS to VCCPG, 14May2015, notice of withdrawn project, PDS2014-AD-14-039, SDG&E/IES Valley Center Solar (solar farm project on SDG&E Substation property at Valley Center Rd and Vesper Rd, project withdrawn 22Mar2015..
5. Email from VCFPD Fire Marshal to PDS (copy to VCCPG) 05Jun2015, Request to Omit Banbury Road access to project Commercial Structures (new) Hatfield Plaza, PDS2013-TPM21202; PDS2013-STP-13-011, APN 186-280-18-00, The VCFPD approved the project based upon the anticipated Banbury Road access point to insure rapid and reliable fire apparatus access and for unobstructed traffic circulation for evacuation or relocation of civilians during an emergency event. VCFPD will require this access point to remain as a part of the approved site plan. We will leave the option open for the applicant to propose an automatic gate for emergency services use only, should public traffic site distance continue to be a concern. (Miller)
6. Letter from VCFPD Fire Marshall to PDS (copy to VCCPG) 05Jun2015, Request for Agency Recommendations, Lilac Enterprises, Inc, Photovoltaic Solar System (commercial), PDS2015-AD-14-004 / PSD2015-FR-15-08-005, Hideaway Lake Lane / 185-273-04-00 (Smith)

Attachment for Item G4:

To: San Diego County Board of Supervisors
San Diego County Planning Commission

The Valley Center Community Planning Group [VCCPG] has been considering the disturbing discussion of the County's General Plan [GP] and specifically the land use policy LU-1.2, which prohibits "Leapfrog Development," that has taken place over the past several months at workshops offered by the Planning and Development Services [PDS] department and at the Board of Supervisors' [BOS] regular land use meetings. There have been suggestions by the director of PDS and his staff that LU-1.2 is too restrictive, that it was not intended to diminish the discretion of the Supervisors to approve projects that are consistent with the definition of Leapfrog Development and that a new interpretation of the "themes" of the policy is needed to allow the processing of projects in a practical way.

None of us need to be reminded that the GP required 13 years of wrenching process, cost \$18.6 million and consumed thousands of hours volunteered by the affected communities as well as County staff time. The VCCPG, along with many others in the County, has applauded the resulting smart growth document that the BOS approved 4-1. The GP addresses the critical issues of growth now and for the future with well-reasoned, practical and fully integrated goals and policies that direct new development into "smart growth" areas already served by public transit, sewers, schools, roads, fire protection, police protection, power, water, jobs and the other services needed by new communities.

Policy LU-1.2 is the focus of the smart growth tenets of the GP because it specifically provides metrics and defines where new development can take place and where it cannot. All the other goals and policies of the GP correspond with the notion that growth should be channeled to areas that can best support it without sacrificing agriculture and wildlife habitat or needlessly extending infrastructure to rural areas.

VCCPG fully supports the current plain language interpretation of the General Plan, and specifically policy LU-1.2, and does not support any effort to remove, restate or reinterpret the GP or its many policies in support of greater discretion to approve Leapfrog developments. To pursue a reinterpretation of policy LU-1.2 would necessitate a completely new environmental impact report for the GP because of the considerable interconnectedness of its goals and policies. Our community neither desires, nor can afford another lengthy and convoluted rewrite of the General Plan. We ask you to retain the GP and its policies as currently written.