

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Preliminary Minutes of the July 11, 2016 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: 12 July 2016

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									7:05 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
MILLER	O'CONNOR	JANISCH	HUTCHISON	BRITTSCH	PLOTNER	QUINLEY	FAJARDO	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	VICK	STIEMANN	GARRITSON	JACKSON	
P	P	P	P	A	P	A	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	

Notes:

Quorum Established: 12 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 13 June 2016

Maker/Second: Hutchison/O'Connor

Carries 11-0-1 (Y-N-A); Voice Steidemann abstains because he was not present last month as a member

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

None

E Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:

E1

Informational presentations by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and from the Cleveland National Forest Foundation [CNFF] on the "Keep San Diego Moving Forward" ballot measure. The measure will provide a dedicated source of revenue to invest in the region's transportation. The measure would increase the local sales tax by one half-cent to fund specific transit, highway, open space, bike and pedestrian projects. Ashley Osterhout will make the presentation for SANDAG. (Jackson)

Discussion: Mark Jackson presents an overview of the proposal to raise the sales tax one-half cent to fund transportation projects. He then introduces Tedi Jackson and Mugs Stoll of SANDAG. Jackson reviews SANDAG's role in general and more specifically in terms of transportation and land use. Stoll addresses SANDAG's proposal by first describing the membership of SANDAG's board. He says the largest part of their budget is allocated to transportation issues. He reveals that the SANDAG Board voted last Friday [8 July 2016] to put their proposal on the November ballot. The proposed half-cent sales tax measure would be in addition to the current half-cent sales tax that funds TransNet projects. Stoll says most [69%] of the 1.4 Million working residents live outside the county sub-region where they work, resulting in 3 Million work trips per day. Sixty-seven percent of working residents in the North County sub-region [1 of 6 sub-regions designated within San Diego County] commute outside of that sub-region to work. Seventy-four percent of those people working in the North County sub-region are from outside that sub-region. SANDAG is proposing a \$204M investment in transportation to provide more mobility choices, preserve more than half of the county's land as open space and exceed greenhouse gas goals etc. Stoll shows a video on SANDAG priorities. The video is intended to explain the need for the tax hike. He elaborates on the ballot measure and how funding is allocated to various jurisdictions within the county by a formula. He says the additional funds from the initiative will help to pay for management of the mitigation open spaces required by the proposed transportation projects as well as other lands purchased. He adds that there will be an independent citizens oversight committee, in fact, the same oversight committee overseeing the present half-cent sales tax expenditures. The measure will be on the ballot

in November. Tedi Jackson asks if Stoll should talk about transit corridor priorities. Stoll runs through a list of projects in other parts of the county that have immediate priority. He says being able to be a “self-help” county allows us to be more competitive for state and federal matching funds.

Garritson asks about the weighted vote to approve the measure for the ballot. Stoll explains the mechanism of voting used by the SANDAG board. O’Connor asks the reasons some board members voted against placing the measure on the November ballot. Stoll says he thought opponents were reacting to the additional tax burden. Mark Jackson explains that the SANDAG board is not directly accountable to voters and that has raised voters’ ire regarding the proposed tax hike. Smith notes the lack of projects on the I-15 corridor. Stoll says SANDAG spent about \$1.5 Billion on the I-15 corridor south of Highway 78 over past 10 years. O’Connor says the measure will likely not be approved because most of the projects are in the southern part of the county. Jack Ford, audience, observes that many development projects are coming to north county but there is no plan to address directly the anticipated additional traffic. Ford says the areas around Highway 78 and I-5 will be getting investment but none is planned north of Highway 78 on I-15. Ford expands on north county developments at I-15 and Highway 76. Norwood asks if the ballot measure’s funds will be allocated on the basis of population. Stoll responds that 24% of the funds collected will go to local jurisdictions, and the rest will be allocated according to a formula based on population. The San Diego County Board of Supervisors will administer all of the funds allocated for the unincorporated county area. Plotner asks what percentage of the funds are to go to trolley and other mass transit. Stoll says 40% of funds will be allocated to build and operate mass transit. North county doesn’t have a high enough density of users to command the construction of mass transit projects.

Jana Clark, Board member of CNFF, presents an opposing perspective on the half-cent sales tax increase. She explains the background of CNFF and the related organization Save Our Forests and Ranchlands [SOFAR] and why these organizations are commenting on transportation. She says that transportation is responsible for extending density too far away from job centers, commercial centers, etc. She cites unmitigable impacts and significant irreversible impacts, chiefly irreversible population growth and increased density. She compares the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan [RTP] to the 2015 RTP citing the lawsuit pending against the 2011 RTP. She shows the gap between GHG emission projections for the county and the 2011 RTP goal. She suggests that the 2015 RTP projections of meeting the 2020 goal for Green House Gas Emissions [GHG] relies on creative estimates of CO2 emissions based on optimistic assumptions of increased efficiency of automobiles between now and then. She says transit mode share will increase very slightly from the 2011 RTP to the 2015 RTP. She addresses the anticipated induced demand created by adding traffic lanes to freeways. She wants more transit investment in certain urban corridors to reduce vehicle miles traveled [VMT]. She claims that the tax will support a failed RTP with many unmitigable impacts. Clark suggests double-tracking the Coaster lines immediately to provide better more reliable service, not doing in the later part of the initiative program. She says the tax is regressive, overburdening the poor.

Garritson asks if CNFF is funding the opposition to this tax proposal. Clark says the organization will team with other groups, but will not be providing funding. Stiedemann asks Clark if she has ideas on how to get SANDAG to change their priorities. Clark says there is a need to change board membership to effect change. Jack Ford, audience, asks if a 2/3 vote is required for this tax. Stoll says yes. O’Connor asks why the composition of the SANDAG board is mayors and council members and not technical experts that can resolve the traffic issues. Stoll says that transportation is a regionally based issue for California’s geographically large counties and political considerations must be made along with the technical considerations. O’Connor seeks clarification of the allocation of funds. Stoll reiterates the allocation formula. Stoll notes the need for balance between urban and rural areas. Clark refutes the notion that balance exists in the plan, citing problems with GHG and infrastructure. She compares San Diego to the San Francisco area in terms of bike/walk success. Jackson thanks presenters.

Motion: None

E2

Marijuana facilities-PDS 2016-STP-16-006 Project is named Nelson Way, Phase II, located at 8530 Nelson Way and Old HWY 395. Project is a cultivation facility serving an adjacent medical marijuana dispensary. The proposed structure is a 1 story made-of-wood framing and stucco. The project is ground up and has no grading required. Owner is T and M holdings at 609-802-2301. Applicant and contact person is Darren Machulsky at 609-462-4234 or dmachulsky@yahoo.com. PDS project manager is Michelle Connors at 858-2636. (O’Connor).

Discussion: O'Connor presents. He reviews the project parameters and plans. O'Connor spoke to Michelle Conners, project planner for the County, about the current marijuana dispensary moratorium [which was extended to 10 months by the BOS] O'Connor says the County may wait to see the results of an initiative on recreational marijuana use state-wide before lifting the moratorium or implementing new regulations. Conners said this project preceded the moratorium and is moving forward regarding the dispensary. The proposal for an 81-foot by 25-foot building is intended for the indoor cultivation of marijuana for the dispensary. O'Connor says the DRB has approved the plan for the building. The nearest neighbor has asked for a fence between her property and the project. Darren Machulsky, contact person for the project, says the owner would be willing to consider putting up a fence to satisfy the community. Jack Ford says a previous owner installed the existing fencing on the east and south sides of the property. Stiedemann asks if the issue is neighborhood character or the sale of marijuana or the site plan. O'Connor asks what impact the outcome of the moratorium may have on the project. Machulsky says the project is consistent with current ordinance and can proceed with the original plan for the dispensary, but not the growing facility until the moratorium is lifted. He says the dispensary is not operating presently because of the construction currently underway. He notes that the present consideration is for the growing building only.

Plotner asks if the present construction is to get a jumpstart on approval after moratorium. She asks about the limits on the number of marijuana plants allowed for a collective. Machulsky says they want to be prepared if growing is permitted eventually. Plotner asks if there is a limit on membership in the cooperative. Moses Levin, applicant representative, says there is no limit on the number of members but there is a limit of 6 plants per patient. Plotner cites state law that allows marijuana use and federal law that does not allow such use. Levin says federal law enforcement will stand down where state law permits such activity. Levin advises that the applicant is attempting to be approved and permitted for cultivation should the law move in favor of such activity in November. Levin says that laws relating to schedule one drugs is evolving and will eventually allow such activity. Plotner cites the current need for prescriptions to be overseen by the federal Food and Drug Administration [FDA] and wonders how the FDA will regulate marijuana prescriptions for purity. Levin says likely it will be left to the patient to determine dosage and potency. He says in other countries, marijuana products are dosed reliably. He says marijuana products here cannot be prescribed in that way now. Smith says the present issue is the design of the fence and he would like to hear DRB's thoughts on fencing. Jack Ford, cites the possibility of mis-zoning of the project site and requests the project to install an electric fence on the east side of the project to restrain misguided clientele. He cites the lack of input by neighboring property owners on permitting process. He cites residential use within 1000-feet of the project and expresses a desire to change the location requirement for dispensaries to restrict them to areas outside of all residentially used areas rather than allowing dispensaries in industrially zoned areas with current residential use. Smith reviews the process and considerations leading to the moratorium. Ford expresses the concerns of neighbors having no input to approval of the dispensary. Kevin Smith, resident, asks if dispensary is already approved. Yes, Oliver Smith. Kevin Smith asks if growing marijuana is not approved, what alternatives are available to acquire marijuana. Levin explains the possibility of sharing product among members. Kevin Smith asks if the building is not approved would it stop the project. Levin says no. Smith asks to table this issue pending DRB review. Oliver Smith asks for a sense of the VCCPG on tabling the issue: Stiedemann, Fajardo, Miller, Hutchison, O'Connor, Smith, Norwood, Janisch, Plotner, and Jackson all agree with tabling the matter in anticipation of more information from the DRB. Garritson asks what kind of issues will be reviewed at DRB. DRB member, Ashly Mellor, audience, says DRB does not want a chainlink fence. Garritson and Boulos are willing to vote on the building issue tonight.

Action: Continued, pending further input on fencing from the DRB

E3

Discussion and possible vote on new letter regarding response from county to our letter on Road19/14 funding (Smith).

Discussion: No response was received from the County, although Smith reports a response is in the process of being formulated. Consequently, this item is continued pending the County's response.

E4

Country Trader-Rezoning of adjacent applicant-owned parcel. Lora Lee Stephens asks that the property adjacent to the County Trader (acquired from the Dairy) be rezoned from R-15 to C-40 during the County's next General Plan clean up. She wants to use the property for parking-- a use not allowed by the R-15 designation. When Valley Center Road

was widened it significantly changed the grade in front of her existing building making the driveway unsafe and unusable thus the Valley Center Road widening had a major effect on the use of her property. (Miller)

Discussion: Miller presents. He cites the lack of a project number for this project, but reports that the County is requiring the applicant to present it to the VCCPG for a recommendation. Will Rogers presents for the applicant, Lora Lee Stephens. He reviews the request for a zone change on the subject property to be effected in the BOS General Plan Cleanup amendment. Rogers discusses a “severe” grade issue for the existing driveway for the Country Trader building. He shows a graphic of the adjoining parcel desired for a new parking lot with access from an existing driveway cut along an existing easement to the north. He notes that the applicant has already planted new trees along the adjacent lot for screening. He shows the present zoning of parcels. He cites the flood zone that limits use of the parking lot parcel to parking. He is proposing a change in zoning from R15 to C40 for the parking lot parcel. Stephens reviews the history of the Country Trader building. She describes the difficulty of the current driveway caused by the widening of VC Road. She says the property is effectively land locked without safe ingress and egress. Jackson questions whether R15 zoning would allow a parking lot. Rogers says zoning must change for parking lot. Miller clarifies the need for commercial zoning for parking lot use. Miller explains the use of the cleanup rather than a general plan amendment. He adds the history of this project in the South Village SC. Hutchison asks about the excess commercial zoning already built into the General Plan and the penchant of the VCCPG to continue adding to that total with actions like this one. Rogers says adding an adjacent parcel to an existing use is not unusual. Smith asks about uses across the street and if those uses would generate enough warrants to add a traffic signal at Sunday Drive. Jackson, Hutchison and Rogers note the lack of warrants even with Butterfield Ranch. Jackson notes that Sunday Drive doesn’t align with the existing driveway of the Country Trader building. Rogers points out that the flood zone precludes building on the adjacent parking lot parcel, but that parcel will accommodate a parking lot. Boulos asks if a conditional use permit would achieve the goal. Rogers explains the limitations on conditional use permits. Boulos asks if building could be expanded with rezone in future. Rogers says possibly. Boulos asks Stephens if she has any ideas for what kind of tenants she would be considering. Stephens says she is thinking of special events possibly. She wants a safe entrance and a parking lot. She says it may be the oldest commercial building in VC. O’Connor asks how long its been since it was in use. Stephens says 2-years. Fajardo favorably notes previous tenants. Rogers reiterates danger of exiting driveway. Stephens expands on safety of approaching and exiting property. Boulos asks about easement and Rogers indicates that the easement is already granted.

Motion: Move to recommend rezoning request from R-15 to C-40 and placement in County General Plan Cleanup

Maker/Second: Miller/Janisch

Carries 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice

E5

As an informational item, VCCPG member Sue Janisch who experienced the 2003 Cedar fire will talk about what saved her home, and how it applies to saving homes today. Fire Chief Joe Napier will be at the meeting contribute additional information and to answer questions. (Janisch)

Discussion: Janisch presents citing the book The Fire Outside My Window. She relates her former residence in Poway and her experience with the Cedar Fire. She observed the progress of the fire as it approached her house. She presents albums of photos she took and a map of the fire’s advance. She relates the history of the Cedar Fire. She notes that, despite the high fire hazard in the area, new residential development in the burned area was approved after the Cedar Fire. She notes the vulnerability of stucco and tile roofed homes with wooden eaves that are vulnerable under the conditions presented by the Cedar Fire. She notes the scarcity of air tanker support for her portion of the Cedar Fire because of the competition with other fires that were active at the time. She advises audience to remove brush and remove flammable materials from around the house. She notes the Cedar fire is California’s largest, with 2250 homes lost along with 15 lives. O’Connor adds that removal of fuel is a key factor. He notes that adding military pilots in helicopters wasn’t possible because of lack of training.

Motion: None

E6

Discussion and recommendation vote: County staff will be recommending to the Board of Supervisors a revision to the current annual assessment of \$6.48 per benefit unit) for the San Diego County Street Lighting District. We recently retrofitted about a third of our streetlights with more efficient LED lights. The District will use some of the revenues from the proposed fee increase to retrofit the remaining County-owned streetlights with energy efficient LED lights to reduce our long term operating and maintenance costs. (Jackson, Smith)

Discussion: Smith presents saying he checked his property tax bill and found he is not part of the streetlight assessment district. Jackson notes the assessment rate will more than double from the present rate. He cites the costs of operating the district and streetlamp replacement. He says the rate increase will generate a significant surplus after the initial purchase of streetlamps. He suggests the increase should be reduced to avoid a surplus tax collection. Smith explains the history of streetlamps in relation to Palomar Observatory and the impact the new lamps will have on observations. Smith's contact at DPW said a 10-mile radius of controlled lighting is adequate to protect the observatory. However, his conversations with CalTech suggest that light contamination can be seen over 100 miles away. He suggests dimmable LEDs that can be dimmed during low traffic hours at night or a color temperature changed LED. A blue LED with amber phosphors will be more easily compensated for by the observatory and is more equivalent to the previous accommodation with low sodium fixtures. Smith suggests that white LEDs are a new generation of lights that are more expensive. He notes that VC has 50 streetlights spread over 90 square miles. Stiedemann asks about night vision and impact on it by streetlighting. Smith says the impact is dependent on atmospheric conditions. Stiedemann asks if one light type is better for preserving the night sky. Smith offers the amber phosphor LED as a good solution. Smith suggests Palomar is doing excellent work and should be respected with an accommodation of a reduced spectral interference lighting fixture. Smith expands on interference experienced by the observatory from local and distant urban areas. Smith relates the history of the observatory. Norwood asks about self-powered lighting. She then questions the allocation of fee increases to maintenance and light replacement. Audience member cites similar issue in Santa Clara County for Lick Observatory. He says LEDs are more directional. He adds that future development will use white LED lighting. Smith says we can request the use of amber LED lighting. Or, alternatively, use of directional LEDs will help.

Motion: Authorize Smith to write a letter expressing concerns about spectral interference with Palomar Observatory caused by the use of proposed new white LED lighting.

Maker/Second: Jackson/Stiedemann

Carries: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice

F

Group Business

F1

Welcome to new member Chris Stiedemann

Discussion: The welcome was accomplished during open forum time.

Motion: None

F2

Next regular meeting scheduled for 8 August 2016

G

Motion to Adjourn

9.56 pm

Maker/Second: Smith/Hutchison

Carries: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice

Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

- a) Mobility – Mark Jackson, Chair
- b) Community Plan Update – Mark Jackson, Chair
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair

d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair
e)	Parks & Recreation –LaVonne Norwood, Chair
f)	Southern Village –Bill Miller, Chair
g)	Tribal Liaison – Claire Plotner, 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
l)	Lilac Plaza – Ann Quinley, Chair

Correspondence Received for the Meeting:

- 1) PDS 2016-STP-16-006 Project is named Nelson Way, Phase II, located at 8530 Nelson Way and old HWY 395. Project is a cultivation facility serving an adjacent medical marijuana dispensary. The Proposed structure is a 1 story made-of-wood framing and stucco. The project is ground up and has no grading required. Owner is T and M holdings at 609-802-2301. Applicant and contact person is Darren Machulsky at 609-462-4234 or dmachulsky@yahoo.com. PDS project manager is Michelle Connors at 858-2636. (O'Connor).
- 2) Grant opportunity presented by the San Diego chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. The grant provides seed funds to complete projects or organize community input on local project design that will enhance local neighborhood. Applications for the 2017 Community Grants are due August 12, 2017 and can be found at ASLASD@SBCglobal.new or Jennifer Webster at jenwebster@precisionlandscapeinc.com. On July 20, 2016,
- 3) County staff will be recommending to the Board of Supervisors a revision to the current annual assessment of \$6.48 per benefit unit) for the Sand Diego County Street Lighting District. There will be a second hearing on August 3, 2016 to confirm that the assessment be placed on property tax bills. We are asking that you provide an informational update to our community on this proposed rate change. We recently retrofitted about a third of our street lights with more efficient LED lights. The District will use some of the revenues from the proposed fee increase to retrofit the remaining County-owned streetlights with energy efficient LED lights to reduce our long term operating and maintenance costs. The energy efficient LED retrofits will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide additional savings for the District as energy costs continue to rise. (Jackson, Smith)
- 4) STP15-022; Updated Rite Aid Pharmacy Site Plan showing Truck Maneuvering Plan. The project consists of an 11,900 square foot commercial building at the intersection of Valley Center and Cole Grade Road.(28535 Cole Grade Road) The site is C36 with a B Special Area Designator. The site is currently developed with an existing drive thru restaurant that would be removed. Access would be provided by Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road. Owner and Applicant is Halferty Development Company, LLC at 626-404-0956 or cpeto@halferty.com. Contact person is Gary Wynn at 760-749-8722 or Gary@wynnengineering.com (Quinley).
- 5) Planning Commission Hearing Report for Valley Center Church PDS2013-MUP-81-098W1. The hearing will be held at the County Conference Center at 5520 Overland Avenue in San Diego at 9:00 AM on July 15, 2016. This is a request for the Planning Commission to evaluate a proposed Major Use Permit Modification (MUP MOD) for the addition of a 2,700 square foot fellowship hall including a kitchen, eating area and storage rooms along with the addition of a 50-foot tall steeple and monument sign to an existing sanctuary.. The project is located at the corner of Fruitvale Road and Fruitvale Lane in Valley Center