

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Preliminary Minutes of the 12 September 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: 29 September 2016

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:02 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M I L L E R	O' C O N N O 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	S T I E D E M A N N	G A R R I T S O N	V A C A N T
P	A	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	

Notes: O'Connor arrives 7.15 pm; Quinley presides in absence of Smith

Quorum Established: 11 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 8 August 2016 as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Vick

Carries: 11-0-0 (Y-N-A); Voice

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

Hutchison asks for consideration of allowing him to approach the County Library regarding storage of VCCPG records which are accumulating at his house.

Dave Ross, audience, reporting for the Valley Roadrunner, inquires if there are any candidates running in the November election who would like to participate in a series of planned VC candidate interviews to be published in the paper. Those interested can contact him at the paper's offices.

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

E1

Presentation on county Renewable Energy Plan by Emma Shoppe
<http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/advance/CREP/2016-08-17-crep-tac-presentation.pdf>
 (Quinley)

Discussion: Quinley introduces Emma Shoppe, PDS, who presents the County's comprehensive renewable energy plan with a handout. Her presentation is an update of the plan and an opportunity for feedback from local communities. The plan originated as a result of BOS direction with linkage to the countywide sustainability project. The BOS approved the work plan that aims at energy efficiencies, best management practices [BMPs], recommendations, etc. The work plan to date is a draft phase I report [April 2016]. Shoppe and her colleagues are working in conjunction with the Climate Action Plan [CAP] for 2017. Additional opportunities to participate in developing the renewable energy plan will occur through October. The BOS will consider BMP recommendations in December 2016. The handout presented is a BMP workbook. Shoppe offers a superficial overview of the workbook contents. More information on the renewable energy plan can be found at the website www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/advance/CREP.html

Garritson asks about the cost of developing the plan. Shoppe says that phase I has cost about \$300K. Janisch asks why only the unincorporated areas are included and she wonders if this kind of action is taken in incorporated areas as well. Shoppe affirms that the plan is being applied throughout the County. Will Rogers, audience, asks about the various kinds of renewable sources of energy. Shoppe says the different types of

renewable energy are not specifically called out in the plan. Glavinic asks about power storage options. He suggests creating potential energy by the storage of water or some other medium that can be elevated during the day with solar power and then released during the nighttime. Shoppe agrees that such a scheme could be an option. Janisch inquires whether this plan will necessitate changes to the County's General Plan. Shoppe says one possible goal would be to add an energy element to the General Plan. She says the County has reached out to the public on how to revise the CAP so that it comports with the goals and requirements of the state. Rogers, audience, asks if there are centers for energy conservation that would fast track approval of projects if they comply? Yes, says Shoppe. Plotner asks if the County is considering reducing energy requirements through the use of roof gardens and landscaping techniques. Shoppe says the plan is not addressing the heat island effect of cities. However, Shoppe says that such considerations are possible above and beyond the scope of this plan. Janisch asks about small-scale wind projects and what qualifies as small scale. Shoppe says that is an aspect that will be considered in the next step of the plan. Garritson asks about additional costs of retrofitting older buildings and constructing new buildings under this plan. Quinley injects that energy cost reductions would offset increased building costs. Shoppe says an economic feasibility study is part of phase I, and it will address such costs. Hutchison asks about the impacts to the plan from large projects such as Lilac Hills Ranch [LHR], which will add considerable Vehicle Miles Traveled [VMT] that could be drastically reduced if such projects were more properly located in proximity to existing infrastructure and job centers. Shoppe says VMT is part of the calculus of the CAP and will fold into this plan. Vick challenges the purpose of the plan to provide options for energy savings and how projects like LHR will change the General Plan to avoid California Environmental Quality Act and Assembly Bill AB-32 Green House Gas requirements. Joe Farace, PDS, says other discretionary actions will be in place to address that kind of issue even if Measure B is adopted in November. Farace is not sure how the Measure B initiative will impact GHG and CAP. Janisch cites renewable energy item 8 in the workbook and a Silicon Valley project, and asks if we will emulate such projects or not? Shoppe demurs, saying it is only an example.

Motion: None, information only

E2	Valley Center Parks & Recreation District presentation on Star Valley Park made by Larry Glavinic, Vice Chair of the Board of VCPRD (Vick).
-----------	---

Discussion: Larry Glavinic presents. He indicates that he is here to create a great legacy. He notes that VC can still make useful progress. He wants to enlist VCCPG in creating public interest in parks and recreation. He is challenging the community to continue a great parks legacy for VC. He observes that VCPRD continues to lack funds for maintenance of existing facilities. He wants support to create new funding. VCPRD will offer Star Valley Park workshops in September and October. He notes that the Park Land Dedication Ordinance [PLDO] fund is one source of present funding, but it cannot be used for maintenance. VCPRD is able to generate income by renting facilities, such as the ball fields and community center. VCPRD has received about 500 surveys so far, but wants more [VC has a 20K population]. He observes that community-gathering space is insufficient, as are senior facilities and others. VCPRD is under-funded and has current budget shortfalls. The courts, fields, pool, buildings, and restrooms are not adequately maintained. Staffing is also inadequate. Facility supervision is inadequate. The park space for VC is below the state Quimby Act requirement. There are 42-acres today, but the present need is for 200-acres. He cites that VC is taxed less for parks than surrounding communities. VC is presently taxed \$22 per year per parcel. The current facilities were largely built by volunteers, but VCPRD can't maintain them with volunteers. He also notes that the available level land in the town center is diminishing.

Glavinic says according to surveys, people are willing to pay more [\$30-\$120 per year] for new facilities and are not satisfied with the present facilities. The new facilities desired are: playgrounds, picnic areas, and sports fields, an emergency evacuation center, fitness center, and a new community center. Glavinic contends that the Star Valley Park [SVP] proposal responds with an amenity list that conforms to desires expressed in surveys. Star Valley Park will be a phased build out. VCPRD is looking at an early 2017 assessment vote, 2018 ground breaking, followed by purchase of the remainder of the project site. Garritson asks about the cost of the mail-in balloting proposed. \$6K says Glavinic. Glavinic describes the SVP site with a 3-D animation. Glavinic says improving what is presently owned will cost each parcel owner \$20 to \$40 per year. The rest of the procurement of the site will raise the cost to \$120 per year. With a fitness center, the cost could rise to \$175 per year. O'Connor asks about the provision of parking, especially for large events. Glavinic says parking for large

events can be accommodated on the playing fields, and there will be other less extensive permanent parking. Glavinic says expansion with SVP will allow for a larger VCPRD staff. Will Rogers injects that it would allow after school programs and will include a splash park as well. An audience member adds that a central location is needed for several activities. Vick asks about what parents presently do for kids' activities. An audience member says they go outside of VC for many activities presently. Vick says we are pushing people away from VC because of lack of facilities. A small payment is worth having attractive facilities.

Norwood says now is the time to do this. Vick reminds we presently pay \$22 per year per parcel. He summarizes the lack of facilities and the impacts. Garritson revisits his concerns about the cost of the project. O'Connor rejoins that we are not paying enough as a community for parks. He observes that governments provide safety, water, sewer, and parks, and we are not paying enough for parks. Garritson disagrees. He suggests private funding as an alternative. However, Glavinic warns that with private/public financing, the community would lose use of the park for half the year while private groups [soccer, baseball, etc.] commanded the space. A discussion of soccer fees that could support development of parks ensues.

Motion: None

E3

Presentation and discussion by Valley Center Parks and Recreation about planning for public parks located in private projects in Valley Center. (Norwood)

Discussion: Norwood introduces Vick who passes it off to Larry Glavinic, Vice Chairman, VCPRD. Glavinic leads a discussion of the parks in private developments. Large private developments either provide dedicated land or PLDO funds to satisfy the state/county requirement for parklands. However, PLDO funds don't come to VCPRD if a developer builds a park or if the development has over 50 Equivalent Dwelling Units. Typical problems of such privately developed parks include lack of parking, restrooms etc., and pocket parks are insufficient for entire community's needs. He says the current PLDO ordinance needs to be changed to benefit VCPRD better. He adds that the community needs flexibility of uses within parks.

Vick wants VCCPG to be aware of projects that propose public parks that won't really benefit the public. He says the Park Circle public park was rejected by VCPRD for some of the reasons cited for privately developed parks. PLDO is for development not for maintenance of parks. The Park Circle park will mostly serve residents, not the public. Plotner asks about the PLDO contribution per house, how much comes back to the community. Glavinic says all that is collected is available to VCPRD. Garritson notes that PLDO is still only for capital improvement. O'Connor suggests Garritson write a letter to state Assemblywoman Marie Waldren to change state law governing PLDO funds.

Motion: None

E4

Discussion and mandatory vote on Chair's submitted VCCPG recommendations regarding the 7 alternatives presented by county staff for changing the Marijuana Collective Ordinances. (Quinley, O'Connor).

Discussion: Letter sent by Smith presented for ratification [appended below]. Motion by Vick to ratify. No comments or questions.

Motion: Move to ratify the letter sent by Smith regarding the Marijuana Collective Ordinances alternatives.

Maker/Second: Vick/miller

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

E5

Discussion and possible vote on PDS 2016-STP-16-006-- 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 609-802-23011. Applicant and contact person is Darren Machulsky at 609-462- 4234 or <i>dmachulsky@yahoo.com</i> . PDS project manager is Michelle Conners at 858-2636. (O'Connor).		
Discussion: O'Connor presents. He observes that the applicant is not present. He advises that the applicant still desires a cultivation facility along with the dispensary, but the plans are on hold at the County offices. The County is attempting to clarify the requirements for such facilities, but likely won't have definition until after a particular initiative is voted in November. There has been no contact with the DRB regarding the boundary fence for the neighbor. O'Connor says the neighbor is elderly and won't feel safe with such a facility next door. He suggests that a chainlink fence would likely suffice. Quinley asks about recreational marijuana sales at this facility. O'Connor says that is uncertain but possible. Garritson says likely.		
Motion: None		
F	Group Business	
F1	Resignation of Mark Jackson from seat number 15 of the Planning Group effective August 9, 2016; Thanks to him for his service	
Discussion: Quinley notes the resignation of Mark Jackson from the VCCPG 9 August 2016, creating a vacancy in seat 15. She observes that the community owes Jackson a debt of gratitude for his years of effort on behalf of the community. Jackson was chair of the Mobility SC and an engaged member of the VCCPG. He will be missed. Miller comments on the South Village SC meetings. He announces he return of Tractor Supply and Park Circle at end of the year, possibly after the road 19 issues have been addressed. Quinley announces the resubmittal of Lilac Plaza.		
Motion: None		
F2	Discussion and Vote on the Appointment of Jon Vick as Chair of the Mobility Subcommittee.	
Discussion: Quinley nominates Vick to replace Jackson as chair of the Mobility SC.		
Motion: Move to appoint Jon Vick to the vacant chair of the Mobility SC.		
Maker/Second: Quinley/O'Connor		Carries: 11-0-1 [Y-N-A]; Voice; Vick abstains out of modesty
F3	Next regular meeting scheduled for 10 October 2016	
G	Motion to Adjourn	8.37 pm
Maker/Second: Miller/ O'Connor		Carries12-0-0 [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) PDS2015-ERer-15-08-021; APN 1880250-19 Valley Center Rite Aid. First iteration review of Technical Studies which indicates changes that are required to the Plot Plan, compliance with Design Guidelines, Landscaping, Sewer, Access to the project, Traffic Impact Study, Preliminary Grading Plan, Stormwater Quality Management Plan, Among other issues. Chris Peto is project manager. (Quinley)
- 2) Discretionary permit for Rezone PDS2015-REZ-15-004. Lilac Plaza Development located at corner of Valley Center Road and Lilac Road. The project requests a general plan amendment to review for commercial buildings including parking area and appurtenant uses. The site is 7.0 acres. The Owner Applicant is Lilac Plaza LLC, P.O. Box 420130, San Diego, CA 92172. Telephone is 619-279-2472 PL. The PDS Planner is Benjamin Mills at 858-495-5234 or Benjamin.Mills@sdcounty.ca.gov. (Quinley)
- 3) Gorial ABC Permit; PDS2015-ABC-16-007 renewal of an alcohol sales license (#533733) at an existing market located at 27455 Valley Center Road; Owner and applicant is Thaier Gorial, at 619-795-6632. The project manager is Don Kraft at 858-694-3856. (Miller)
- 4) Park Circle Major Use Permit. PDS 2015-TM-5603 located at Mirar de Valle and Valley Center Road. Owner is Konyn Realty Investment Company; developer is Touchstone Communities at 858-586-0414. Submittal contains Plot Plan, Trails and Recreation Plan, Landscape, Walls and Fence plan. The project area is 73.93 acres with 368 lots and 318 dwelling units. Minimum size of residential lots is 2,200 SF. (Miller)**

Appended material for item E4: [next page]

TO: Joseph Farace
Group Program Manager, Advance Planning
County of San Diego Planning & Development Services

September 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Comments on amending the Zoning Ordinance section pertaining to Medical Marijuana Collective Facilities (MMCF).

Joseph,

Thank you for the opportunity for the Valley Center Community Planning Group to review the proposed amendments the Zoning Ordinance section pertaining to Medical Marijuana Collective Facilities (MMCF). As the county input needs to be received by September 5, 2016 and the next VCCPG meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2016, this response was written by the Chair and will be validated at our next meeting.

- 1) Some of the options presented appear to be non-viable. For instance, it is our understanding that changing the separation requirement from residential zoned to residential occupied reduced to number of available locations to near zero.
- 2) Is it common for a cultivation facility to be co-located with a dispensary/co-op like the one proposed at the VCCPG? Dispensaries had a very noticeable impact on the amount of loitering and traffic in an area like Santa Cruz/San Francisco. This was usually caused by dispensary rules about the number of people allowed in at one time, how far away someone had to wait (typically a few blocks), and the presence of a "bouncer" at the door. Before deciding on the exact buffer around a school/park/residence, it would be helpful to see how restrictive that would be on the number of parcels available for cultivation facilities.
- 3) Does the county offer any data regarding safety and crime around cultivation facilities without nearby dispensaries?
- 4) Limiting the number of facilities to the point where hot spots are created is also not desirable. Limiting the number per district and perhaps having a mile radius around each park/church/school/etc. creates hot spots upon which the entire county would descend. It may be preferable to see several spaced out small ones than a handful of large facilities, with more restrictive spacing between facilities.
- 5) What would requiring a MUP allow in the review process? Would it let the county and community groups take more site specific considerations into account before allowing the cultivation facility?
- 6) A city boundary offset does not appear to makes sense, especially if it's just 1000 ft, unless the goal is to eliminate cultivation facilities. If the ordinance is adopted, presumably there would be benefits (tax?) to the city housing the facility and few areas where they could be built. Placing a facility on the boundary would not make much difference over placing one 1000 ft away. However, the ordinance options to call out that the schools/parks/churches exclusion zone applies to schools/parks/churches in adjacent cities as well, so that seems restrictive enough.

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, VCCPG

cc: christopher.livoni@sdcounty.ca.gov
adam.wilson@sdcounty.ca.gov
michael.delarosa@sdcounty.ca.gov
keith.corry@sdcounty.ca.gov
tim.mcclain@sdcounty.ca.gov