

**Steering Committee Minutes
September 25, 2004**

Steering Committee Members

David Waitley	Alpine
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Shirley Driscoll	Campo/ Lake Morena
Tim McMaster	Crest / Dehesa/ H.C.
Jo Ellen Hucker	Descanso
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul / Dulzura
Gene Helsel	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Gil Jemmot	Twin Oaks
Joe Chisolm	Pala/ Pauma
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Craig Ohlson	Rainbow
Pat Uriell	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Louis Schooler	Tecate
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Sandy Smith	Valley Center

Planning Commissioner

Bryan Woods

Staff

Ivan Holler, Deputy Director
Bill Taylor, County Counsel
Rosemary Rowan, Regional Planner
Aaron Barling, Planner
Neal LaMontagne, Planner
Larry Hofreiter, Planner
Stephanie Gaines, Planner
Nick Taylor, Student Intern

Public

Mike McLeod
Debbie Rodvold
Carol Leone
Mark Turvey
Mary Allison
Julie Bugbee
William Collins
Dutch VanDierendonck
Jan VanDierendonck
Bruce
Robin Quasebarth
Larry Paris
Frankie Smith
Charlene Ayer
Lucille Goodman
Shirley Perkiss
Chuck Davis

Meeting commenced at 9:08 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS.

I. ACTION ITEM: Minutes

Woods: Review of minutes from the March 27th meeting.

Smith, Sandy: Page 17- abstained on 1st motion and voted aye on 2nd motion.

Driscoll: Page 8, change “not very incompatible” to “not very compatible”.

Morgan: Page 9, not sure if repeated, page 15 grammar correction (content ok).

Phillips: Page 4, “then I think”... page 10 “but you can’t develop all of the lots” (2x’s), Hash...”this is the coup de tant”, page 16, than instead of then –“because you got to get that back” and “so I got a real problem with that”.

Holler: Discussion of meeting minutes format. Propose minutes in abbreviated format. County will make tapes available.

MOTION: **To approve March 27 Minutes. Motion seconded and approved with corrections and additions as stated. All in favor except Pat Uriell, who abstained. Motion Passes.**

DISCUSSION ITEM

II a. Recent Board Actions

- Holler provided an overview of Board Actions. Discussion of July 2004 map and the Board Alternative maps. E.I.R analysis will be conducted on both maps. McMaster inquired whether the map with referrals is the July 2004 map. Holler clarified, Board Alternative map included Board directed changes. Uriell commented that the Board of Supervisors also directed staff to look at population percentage of housing types. Inquired what percent in the new plan is multi-family?
- Holler replied we have no answer to housing percentage at this time. Described the Critical Path items - 1) Commercial/ Industrial components, 2) Resolution to special study areas and 3) Road Network Planning issues. Conservation subdivisions will be set-aside until the first of next year.
- Neirinckx disagreed with statement on July 2004 and Board Alternative maps, understood the Board requested a “no action” alternative, no compromise for current zoning. Holler replied a “No project alternative” would be accomplished as part of the E.I.R.
- Uriell inquired what mix of percentages are used for traffic modeling. Holler responded “[land uses] that were modeled on the map”. Uriell asked whether counts are different depending on what you build? Holler replied typically, rural areas use 12 ADT’s for single-family dwellings, the model accounts for that by dwelling type. Rowan explained that we will provide more technical information at a future meeting. Smith asked if staff will run new models? Holler – yes.

- Waitley asked if staff plans to bring back Conservation Sub-Divisions? Holler stated this group voted to reject the interest group proposal, but said you would prefer to go back and review existing regulations.

II.c Meeting Minutes

- *Discussed during Agenda item I.*

II.b Community Assignments.

- Rowan explained that there have been some changes to staff's community assignments and passed out new Community Assignment Staff Contact sheet.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Commercial and Industrial Maps

III.a Economic Research Associates(ERA) Report Overview

- Holler began Commercial and Industrial overview, introduced Neal LaMontagne who will present 3 components of the commercial and industrial phase. Holler noted lead planner's will schedule a time to meet with community planning and sponsor groups, where appropriate.
- LaMontagne emphasized the [ERA] model is intended for guidance only and that the process should not be numbers driven or driven by property owner requests. Commercial and industrial designations should be what you want in your community. The amount of commercial and industrial land should be an appropriate level for your area, driven by policy, and the model numbers should be used as a check. Each map will have different numbers. Retail Commercial has relationship to population. Buying power is a function of household's mean income. Numbers are broken down by general commercial types - Neighborhood Commercial; Community Commercial; Regional/ Super-Regional (mall); Non-Center is stand-alone, strip commercial and/or "main street style". Phillips said he had a problem with the way staff is defining neighborhood commercial differently. Rowan clarified that neighborhood commercial is a generic term used by consultants, and that neighborhood commercial bears no relationship to the GP2020 neighborhood commercial designation. Jones asked if these were Countywide percentages? LaMontagne answered yes. Holler said part of the reason is because some communities shop within the incorporated areas. LaMontagne said the FAR (floor area ratio) capture rate assumes 90% of dollars spent will stay in the community. These numbers are aggressive to avoid underestimating. Assumption is based on sales per square foot. A lot of communities show a surplus of land and development for the next 20 years. Your Planner will break these numbers down.
- Chisolm said what's on the ground today - shows numbers that have commercial – and in some ways you don't get a totally accurate picture about the conditions of the community. LaMontagne agreed and added that each community needs to factor its circumstances to explain for a surplus or shortage. Commercial land used for residential, for example. Hammers said he does not think commercial in Potrero is in the right place and asked if communities will be able to change their Land Use map (with community support)? Holler replied yes. Schooler said Tecate is in a different position than everyone else and that a lot of the formulas just won't work for us. Holler emphasized the purpose of the report is to use it as a starting point. The report is an economic tool to analyze community by community and each community is unique.
- Waitley asked if [the model assumes] a 15% loss between net and gross acreage? Holler responded FAR's will change - less efficient use of land. It does account for surface parking. Barling said the model assumes FAR's of .16 in the backcountry as opposed to .25 within the CWA boundry. Waitley asked if the model assumes No visitor number/dollars. LaMontagne

responded that for industrial and office uses the numbers are based on employment projections not population projections. Russell commented that C-1 general commercial - no equation to what's in our land use designation. Uriell commented it is justified by mean income, which is a function of gross income, and asked if Rancho Santa Fe will have a need for more commercial. LaMontagne commented they are high, used different percentages. Rowan commented neighborhood commercial is classified as a non-center.

III b & c. Planning Process and Planning Principles

- LaMontagne explained the next 2 months planning staff will be in touch with communities to improve or change number. Non-residential land will be the greatest challenge. Communities should ask what will they go after in their community? Staff will send commercial/industrial requests to you and plan to finish review by the Board of Supervisors meeting next January. Chisolm commented Fallbrook's revitalization uses commercial in the right way by justifying with dollars spent – good planning needs tools. Holler reiterated the report is an economic tool to be used as a starting point and we may plan for more commercial/industrial capacity than we know will be needed. Jemmot asked if communities will revisit areas previously designated commercial? LaMontagne responded that communities will need to “reaffirm” and check to see it meets where they want to go. Barling said communities should tell staff if an item has been voted on it in the past, and staff will forward new requests to community planning groups.
- Morgan asked with the ROW with expansion on Hwy 76, if it will change our numbers and/or affect Fallbrook too. Holler responded he doesn't see a big issue with Bonsall. Other communities e.g.- Ramona will have more issues.
- Russell noted once a CPG/CSG has voted, Policy I-1 is clear not to change votes. A majority vote can only be changed with substantial new information. Barling clarified to say that he asked the groups to share with staff their previous votes. Phillips said I-1 requires a majority to reconsider. Van Dierendonck said it needed to be based on compelling new evidence. LaMontagne said need to keep record clear.
- Tisdale officially requested Aaron Barling talk with their planning group. Barling officially accepted. Smith asked do property owners have a referral because it is hard to see without refinements; unsure if you can get there by November. Rowan suggested keeping track of them to see how they relate to town center planning efforts. Also suggested charting proposed percentages and working closely with Bob Citrano. Tisdale noted several property owners have requested a change in zoning and asked if adjacent property owners be notified? Barling replied only regular notices that the CPG/CSG puts out, there will not be mail outs to each property owner and their neighbors. Holler said staff will review requests on planning principles – does not mean staff will agree with request – the request will go through the CPG/CSG. Holler further noted that some steering committee members would like staff to notify property owners of commercial and industrial requests.

15-minute break commenced at 10:20am

Reconvened- 10:43am

IV. ACTION ITEM: Land Use Framework and Refinements

IVa. High Density Residential

- Rowan explained there are 4 refinements that are proposed for the Land Use Framework-Discussion. Russell stated that currently 24 dwelling units per acre are on the map. Staff

proposes to add 20 dwelling units per acre to satisfy housing element requirements. Rick Smith asked if the State's requirement satisfaction is broken down by community, and when, where, and how could he get information on his particular area. Holler responded that it's not that simple, each community is different. Rowan added that staff is working with the numbers to detail how the map supports or doesn't support the state's requirements. Woods suggested staff present Housing Element information before the Steering Committee first, and then present it to individual communities.

- Rowan also explained changes to the land use framework. Staff is proposing to break the open space designation down into two parts, conservation and recreation. There are different levels of traffic associated these two land types. An outdoor commercial zone is proposed to be available under the General Commercial designation. Finally, a Village Core Mixed Use designation is proposed, which will help with specific, town center planning efforts. Phillips commented this is a significant change to the general commercial definition because general commercial has always meant enclosed uses that are reasonable, not outdoor uses. Rowan responded only if the outdoor commercial zone is applied and emphasized this is preliminary and staff can bring the item back. Morgan expressed concern about slope dependency not being addressed with high-density designations. Holler responded that village/core densities and slope dependency has never been an issue. The only new item regarding densities before the committee is the addition of 20 du/acre. Morgan suggested changing on page 9 C-40 rural commercial "by right" to major use permit. Also suggested changing language on page 11 to "visual impacts will [not should] be minimized through screening". Jones suggested rephrasing OS/Open Space definition so that developers know they cannot use it for their projects. Schooler explained that Tecate is unique and asked about the possibility of getting an international trade designation for the community. Woods said staff will continue to work with Tecate.

MOTION: To approve the use of 20 dwelling units per acre. Moved by Jack Phillips and Seconded by Lois Jones. All in favor- passed unanimously.

- Woods directed the group to discuss commercial. Smith stated she wants to be sure they get their fair share of high-density housing (page 5), but not more than their fair share. Smith asked what does non-conforming mean to business owners; specifically 2 feed stores, one with a commercial designation and one with an industrial designation? Rowan clarified there is a difference between General Plan designations and zones. Depends on community and what goes on around it. Smith referenced page 12 and expressed concern over warehouses and other uses. Rowan said Valley Center obviously wants their own zones and communities have a choice. If they don't want to apply a zone like this (page 12) another choice could include requiring a Major Use Permit. Russell suggested adding agriculture to outdoor service commercial on page 11. Russell also opposed L9 (enclosed building or walls) on page 12. Holler clarified the "dot" permits the use by right. Phillips stated the strongest argument communities can make is when something does not conform to the community plan, and that we will not be able to make that argument. Right now if you want those uses you must do a major use permit. Findings for that permit are associated with community compatibility. He suggested creating a new designation instead of adding a new zone. Holler said with General Commercial today, you can get the same uses via the major use permit process. What we're proposing will require a rezone instead of a major use permit. It's more flexible. Jemmot noted the Rural Commercial designation for the Golden Door does not fit. Jones suggested chairs take information back to their groups before taking an action. Uriell said C-37 became apartments and is overwhelming the Ramona town center. Holler clarified that C-37 is a zone; this is a General Plan designation.

MOTION: To approve the use of Mixed Use. Moved by Jack Phillips and Seconded by Rick Smith. Not unanimous, Pat Ureill voted NO. Motion Passed.

MOTION: To approve the use of the word “Agriculture” in Outdoor Service Commercial. Moved by Jim Russell and seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

- Jones asked what designation would allow truck parking. Woods replied Heavy Industrial. While there are similarities between VDO’s proposal and staffs proposal, Phillips expressed concern about intent of staffs Open Space proposal. Parks as open space was the intent. With active recreation as the option we need to see uses allowed in the zone. Active recreation uses may not be compatible with the character of the community. Holler asked if Phillips was suggesting using Use Permit language until the zone is created, and said he doesn’t have a problem with that since we do not yet have a zone. Russell suggested the motion does not trust County staff and is inappropriate. Jones disagreed because zoning is happening subsequent to the General Plan. Rowan explained the language change can be left on an interim basis, but is not appropriate for a General Plan designation.

MOTION: To accept the interim language (Jack’s proposal) for Open Space Descriptions. Moved by Margarett Morgan and seconded. Motion carried- 1 Abstention, Louis Schooler and 1 No vote, Pat Uriell.

- Woods opened the discussion to audience for comments and questions. VanDierendonck said the State mandates from general housing element clear statements about what can / can’t be don’t to justify table. Suggesting getting draft report from SANDAG. Turvey said regarding C-36 properties, should consider landscaping. Small businesses purchased for small business uses and no one knows requirements until code enforcement comes out. A property owner from lakeside said a contractor had to sell because he lacked a permit. The property owner said not to put it under C-36 because we need them.

**Next meeting tentatively scheduled November 6th
Meeting adjourned (approximately 12:00pm)**