

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the May 13, 2013 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 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: 15 May 2013

Approved: 10 June 2013

A										Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:					7:0 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15					
L A V E N T U R E	H U T C H I S O N	E V A N S	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		N J O O R H W O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	B O B D A V I S	B R E T D A V I S					
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	A	P	P					

Notes: Britsch arrives 7.10pm

Quorum Established: 12 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
----------	-----------------------------

C	Approval of Minutes:
----------	-----------------------------

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 8 April 2013 as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley	Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 9-0-3 Voice; Laventure, Bob Davis, & Norwood-Johnson abstain because of previous absence
--	--

D	Open Forum:
----------	--------------------

Kerry Watts, Wynn Engineering, notes the correspondence received by VCCPG re Skyline Ranch project listed in the agenda. He asks for appointment of an SC for review of that project. Smith advises that Bret Davis and Bob Frank have been assigned to review the project and report to VCCPG, possibly at the meeting in June. Watts suggests Wynn Engineering is available anytime for discussion of the project. He says printed materials for the project are available from Wynn.

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

E1	VC Industrial LLC Site Plan Modification; STP08-005W1; Owner: VC Industrial LLC at 858-404- 9314; Project Contact Person: Gary Piro at 760-744-3700 or piroengr@cs.com ; Project location: Cole Grade Road at Yuba Road. Project Description: When compete, project will contain RV storage; U-Haul or Moving Vehicles; storage of construction and farming vehicles and materials. There will be three buildings: a 30x 50 steel building used as a Weld shop; a 60x20 steel building attached to the Warehouse which has been on site for 12 years. And a 30 x 120 wood framed construction that will be used as an indoor sports training facility. (Laventure)
----	---

Discussion: Laventure presents. Recounts history of site development. Mike Schimes, owner, purchased prop 3.5 years ago. It is zoned M54 with a 'B' designator, and requires a site plan. Schimes recounts recent challenges with relocating a fence along the road. The site plan modification effort is to include the entire property under the M54 zone. The site is above the flood plain. Smith says it seems like a reasonable request. Glavinic asks about septic systems on site [Schimes says there is one system for all tenants] Smith asks about maintenance of septic system [Schimes says that he, as owner, is responsible]. Glavinic asks about scoping letter [none was sent from the County].

Motion: Move to approve modification.

Maker/Second: Laventure/Quinley	Carries/Fails: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
--	--

E2	Discussion and possible vote on a VCCPG response to the public actions of the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District [VCPUSD] on the Camp Roe CCC Buildings. (Smith)
----	---

Discussion: Smith introduces item. He says his interest concerns the process used by the VCPUSD for reviewing the subject property, as opposed to what they decided to do with it. He tells of the significant effort to draft resolution. He cites an error in the draft on item 5 of the operative clauses that includes reference to a state agency that oversees actions and activities of school boards, there apparently is none. The courts are the only alternative for redress of grievances with a school board. Glavinic says we should try to create good will rather than continue to object. He cites the poor job market for 18-30 year olds and others may have it even tougher. He says that attorneys may have job trouble even more severe. He notes that money spent on litigation is not being spent on children. He says we ought to protect children. He notes that the old CCC buildings could have been a severe hazard to children. Smith asks why it took VCPUSD two years after they purchased that property to act on that safety issue? Vick agrees with Glavinic insofar as the issue to be addressed is the VCPUSD review process. Jackson asks to whom the resolution is addressed. Hutchison says the charter of the VCCPG calls for communication of recommendations only to the County [PDS]. However, he notes the responsibility of the VCPUSD to act as transparently and to the same standards of public openness as required of the VCCPG and other boards in Valley Center [e.g. VC Municipal Water District, VC Fire Protection District, etc.]. Although the resolution is not to be sent to the VCPUSD, it will become a public document by virtue of being part of VCCPG minutes and could be more broadly reported in places such as the Roadrunner. Schimes asks if will be sent to County Counsel [Smith: not directly]. Smith says we will send it to PDS. Dave Ross, Roadrunner, asks if it can be sent to the grand jury. Smith says it could be. Vick says purpose is to make a comment on process used by elected boards and that openness is expected in public meetings and for public business. VCPUSD should not take action in closed sessions.

Motion: Move to adopt resolution with correction to operative clause number five to remove reference to state agency. [Corrected version attached below]

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley								Carries/Fails: 11-2-0 [Y-N-A]						
L A V E N T U R E	H U T C H I S O N	E V A N S	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		N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	B O B D A V I S	B R E T D A V I S
Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y

Notes: Rudolf is absent.

E3	Discussion and vote on nomination of Lael Montgomery to another term as a member of the Valley Center Design Review Board [DRB]. (Quinley)
----	--

Discussion: Quinley presents. Vick recuses because of a personal relationship to the nominee. Quinley distributes copies of the application. Quinley presents Montgomery's history on DRB as well as her planning and design qualifications. She praises Montgomery's understanding of planning. Glavinic asks if we will be doing this sort review and vote for other members of the DRB. Quinley says we only appoint one member of the five members on the DRB. Glavinic thinks there may be another member that we appoint. He thinks it is a good idea to review these board members since they are not elected. He says Lael's output is mixed in terms of results. He will not support her reappointment. He acknowledges the differences of opinion that exist between her and himself. Smith notes that 7 of 26 planning organizations are sponsor groups who are appointed rather than elected. He notes that Bonsall's sponsor group is also the Bonsall DRB. Bret Davis asks about the role of the DRB and why there are not other candidates. Smith asks Quinley if the position was published? Quinley says, no, traditionally, VCCPG does not publish reappointments. Smith says we should invite others to apply. Norwood-Johnson agrees with Smith if that is the proper procedure. Quinley defends Montgomery's candidacy. **Bob** Davis says in the past we passed up qualified candidates to seat a more qualified candidate for the I-15 Design Review Board. He supports Montgomery's candidacy and her exceptional qualification. Jackson asks if it is required to advertise position if it is not a vacancy. Smith asks if anyone else had an opportunity for candidacy [Quinley says, no]. He thinks it should go through the Nominations SC after publication for the sake of propriety. Bret Davis asks about the role of the DRB and Smith recites the broad outlines of responsibility for the DRB. He then adds clarification of how County regulations are imposed. Norwood-Johnson wants to abstain. Smith asks for reason Norwood-Johnson should abstain, saying there should be a reason [such as a

conflict of interest] for abstention. Otherwise, VCCPG members should give their opinions on items being considered. Norwood-Johnson says she is confident Montgomery would do an excellent job, but she agrees with Smith that the process should have been opened up to other applicants to be consistent with how we handle other vacancies.

Motion: Move to approve re-nomination of Lael Montgomery to Valley Center Design Review Board and forward nomination to the Board of Supervisors.

Maker/Second: Quinley/Norwood-Johnson

Carries/Fails: 9-3-0 [Y-N-A]

L A V E N T U R E	H U T C H I S O N	E V A N S	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		N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	B O B D A V I S	B R E T D A V I S
Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	R		Y	N	Y	A	Y	N

Notes: Vick recused because of personal relationship; Rudolf absent

E4

Discussion and Possible vote on PDS2013,MUP13-003, PDS-PLN346. Verizon Aquacate is a new cell tower project. Applicant is Verizon Wireless, Contact is Karen Adler at 760-715-3416 or Karen.Adler@plancominc.com. Project is located at 15202 Aquacate Lane at Fox Run Lane in Valley Center. Owners are Brad Deskin and Alex Urbano. Verizon is planning to install 12 panel antennas, 6 remote radio units and 1 four foot diameter microwave antenna on a 35 foot tall monopine. All equipment will be located within a new 14'8" x 42'8" x 8' high CMU enclosure with a decorative stone veneer to address compliance with noise. (Bret Davis)

Discussion: Bret Davis presents. He describes Verizon's cell tower location on Aguacate Lane at Fox Run Lane near Fruitvale Rd. The County sent out 20 letters to neighbors with notice of the plan. Verizon is proposing a mono-pine disguise for the tower. PlanCom's Ted Marioncelli, subcontracted to Verizon, adds that the site is just past Fox Run. The parcel is 4-acres with one residence. The proposed tower site has a high elevation. The mono-pine tower will be 35-feet tall. The equipment compound will be below the tower and is fairly large comparatively. There will be a river rock facia on the compound. The equipment are to be housed in outdoor cabinets, so no air conditioning is required. Bret Davis says the potential issues with the project are health, noise, property value, biological or archeological. Property owner has green houses on-site. Smith notes that health issues are under federal jurisdiction. Ted Marioncelli says noise will be contained within the compound. He notes that the County standard is 45 Db at the property line, and since the compound is at center of the property, the noise level will be well below that level and will meet the County noise standard. He says many neighbors are existing Verizon customers. He adds that non-customers seemed to support tower as well. Paul Rowe, a neighbor to the west of site says he bought his property as part of six-lot subdivision. He says there are covenants, codes and restrictions [CC&Rs] prohibiting antennas such as the one proposed. Marioncelli says the County is not aware of those CC&Rs. Bob Davis asks if the tower site is part of that subdivision and is recorded with CC&Rs. Rowe is uncertain if restrictions are recorded on the deed for the tower site. Rowe cites 21 CC&Rs in his deed. Vick asks which CC&R is violated? Rowe says CC&R item 13 prohibits other than citizenband radio transmissions within the subdivision. Rowe raises potential health issues re the tower antennas and asks if such a tower would appeal to members of the VCCPG? Smith says health issues may not be considered by VCCPG. Vick suggests that Rowe review the cell reception improvement map likely to occur with this tower. Smith suggests more research on CC&Rs by County is appropriate. He thinks VCCPG should put off a decision until more information is available on CC&R issue. Britsch asks if Verizon queried neighbors as part of their routine. Marioncelli says often they contact neighbors. He says the County doesn't enforce CC&Rs. Verizon generally researches for CC&Rs. Britsch suggests Verizon contact neighbors. Marioncelli says he will. Franck asks about feedback from the 20 letters sent out by the County with notification. Marioncelli says feedback, if any, is not known. Rowe says it was not clear how to respond based on the content of letter sent to neighbors by the County. Smith recounts the process for decisions on such projects. Bret Davis asks what is generally considered about such projects in terms of the community plan. Smith says traffic, aesthetics, and neighbor reaction. Vick says Bret Davis might organize a meeting of neighbors to discuss the tower. Glavinic asks if directional antennas are proposed [Marioncelli – yes]. Glavinic asks about the location of the antenna on the property. Ted says it is adjacent to a grove of trees below the

residence, more or less near the center of the property. Glavinic suggests offering disguising options other than the monopine to neighbors. Glavinic says common complaint is noise. But, he adds that service level can be a safety issue for police and firefighters.

Motion: Continued for more research

E5

Report from Parks and Recreation [P&R] Sub-Committee on recent activities with discussion and possible vote. (Norwood-Johnson)

Discussion: Lavonne presents. SC looking for different ways to raise money for P&R. Suggests to P&R to have an open meeting of residents for ideas on how to achieve greater funding. She says P&R is taking over rental of Western Days booths, which is a step in that direction. Vick asks if the property on the southwest corner of Lilac and Valley Center Roads is in escrow. Tom Bumgardner, audience and member of P&R board, says he didn't think property could be in escrow without a vote of the board, and none has been taken. He thinks Marcia Townsend, President of the P&R board, may have signed some contingency document for escrow. The item will be on the agenda at the next P& R meeting, Wednesday, 15 May 2013.

Motion: None

E6

Introduction of candidates for vacant Seat # 9 on the VCCPG which expires December 31, 2016.

Discussion: Britsch introduces Kennedy. Kennedy describes her background. Her interest in community involvement began when she noticed a small hole in Villa Sierra Lane. She says the road was starting to cave in. She formed a group to address the road issue and is inspired to extend that service to VCCPG and its Mobility SC. She has ideas for funding roads at a time that little money is available for such work. She has grant writing experience and experience in construction finance. Glavinic asks about vision for Valley Center. Kennedy says she wants to improve mobility. She cites the recent Amgen bicycle race congestion and relates an anecdote of her son's difficulty in moving about Valley Center. She suggests there is a great need for completing a road network for more general access. She wants more continuity for Valley Center with greater access in and out of Valley Center. She says the community is very spread out. She says Valley Center is likely not to become more developed, but it will become more congested. Norwood-Johnson asks if she has an interest in the Mobility SC [Kennedy responds, yes]. Smith says VCCPG has no formal power. VCCPG makes recommendations to the County. Any power comes from the quality of comments made to the County. He says VCCPG does its best when it presents cool, calculated facts. To do otherwise is to be rejected or ignored out of hand. VCCPG has had success with the thorough presentation of facts and its positions on issues before it. He says mobility has always been an important area. He describes a situation at Cool Valley and Villa Sierra Lane involving a failure to communicate responsibility for paving maintenance. He suggests that Kennedy review the General Plan's circulation sections for a better understanding of the on-going issues. Smith encourages Valley Center residents to be engaged in mobility issues and share new ideas with the Mobility SC. Glavinic asks if there are any other candidates. Britsch says none others. Smith says VCCPG will vote next month.

Motion: None

F

Group Business

Announcements

Correspondence Received

F1

1. DPDS to VCCPG. Replacement STP08-005W18SW VC Industrial LLC Site Plan Modification. Owner: VC Industrial LLC at 858-404- 9314; Project Contact Person: Gary Piro at 760-744-3700 or piroengr@cs.com; Project location: Cole Grade Road at Yuba Road. Project Description: When complete, project will contain RV storage; U-Haul or Moving Vehicles; storage of construction and farming vehicles and materials. There will be three buildings: a 30x 50 steel building used as a Weld shop; a 60x20 steel building attached to the Warehouse which has been on site for 12 years. And a 30 x 120 wood framed construction that will be used as an indoor sports training facility. (Laventure)
2. San Diego County Planning Commission, Meeting, May 17, 2013, rescheduled to June 7, 2013

	<p>at 9:00 at 5520 Overland Avenue, San Diego. Agenda includes Butterfield Trails Ranch Tentative Map PDS2008-3100-5551 located at Sunday Drive in Valley Center. The project proposes to subdivide 59.5 acres into 71 residential lots with 28.6 acres dedicated for open space.</p> <p>3. Department of Public Works to Oliver Smith, chair of VCCPG. The Department of Public Works has identified locations for replacement of guardrail end sections and installation of new guardrail segments on Mirar de Valle Road. Construction will begin in July/August 2013 and finish by January 2014.</p> <p>4. DPDS to VCCPG, Skyline Ranch Country Club, LLC, Major Use Permit Modification; Project number PDS2013-MPA-13-005; Project Address 1818 Paradise Mountain Road in Valley Center. A special use permit was granted in 1973 for a mobile home park and it has been modified twice since that time. The mobile home park encompasses 88 acres and has 222 mobile home spaces. Skyline Ranch Country Club proposes to submit a MUP modification to update and modernize the community buildings.(Bret Davis, Bob Franck)</p>
Discussion:	
F2	South Village development discussion [Vick]
<p>Discussion: Vick says he was told that the Valley Center Design Review Board [DRB] meeting last week was chaotic. Several projects including the Charles Hatfield Plaza, Liberty Bell Plaza, and the Konyon Dairy Project are active. He spoke the situation as being typical of the South Village [SV]. Developers are not coordinating their projects with each other. He thinks it would be useful to engage the County, PDS, to provide a planner to coordinate these three commercial developments. Glavinic asks about the consistency of these project with the General Plan. Vick describes the three projects and notes that the mobility element road 19 that presently is planned to run through the Charles Hatfield Plaza property would likely be abandoned because of the steep slope it would have to traverse. Smith relates Jerry Gaughan's plan for development of Charles Hatfield Plaza on the steep slope. Vick reiterates a request for VCCPG support for County to provide a planner to coordinate these projects. Smith asks the South Village SC to start looking at these projects. He says Lael Montgomery, Chair of the DRB, has sent strongly worded emails asking for Mark Wardlaw to provide planning coordination, especially as it relates to traffic. Jackson asks what Vick is specifically asking. Does he want one planner for all three projects? Or an overall planner that could coordinate the efforts of the planners for each project? Vick says one planner to oversee all 3 projects would be helpful. Smith says Mark Wardlaw, Director of PDS, claims to be assembling a team at PDS to address this issue. Glavinic says mobility element roads are planned for west of VC Rd. and the County must resolve those issues. Kerry Watts, Wynn Engineering representative in the audience, adds that a commercial property east of Valley Center Rd. at Woods Valley Rd. may be getting close to moving in the market, which would be another commercial project to compound the issues being discussed. He suggests the Banbury Rd./Valley Center Rd. intersection may be a good location for a formal Valley Center entrance.</p>	
Motion: None	
F6	Subcommittee Reports & Business:
a)	Mobility – Robert Davis, 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)	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)	Lilac Hills Ranch [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair
l)	Equine Ordinance - Oliver Smith, Chair
F7	Next regular meeting scheduled for 10 June 2013

G	Motion to Adjourn:	9.00 pm
	Maker/Second: Quinley/Bob Davis	Carries/Fails: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]

Appended Material from item E2:

Valley Center Community Planning Group

A Resolution Concerning the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District's Public Review Process of the Disposition of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Camp Roe Buildings and Site

The Valley Center Community Planning Group,

Acting on its responsibility to advise the County on all public and private land uses within Valley Center,

Having Considered notice, in the form of signed petitions from over 400 community members to acknowledge the historical significance of and consider the prospects for preserving the former Camp Roe site, presently owned by the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District [VCPUSD], as a matter of land use and public interest at its February 13, 2013 meeting,

Having Heard the information then available from local historians and the presenting community interest group about the historically important CCC Camp buildings on public land, acquired with public funds, and having significant historical interest,

Expecting that the VCPUSD could and should provide additional educational and administrative perspective that would be helpful to the community discourse on this issue, given that *prior to acquiring the property* the VCPUSD Board and Superintendent were aware of the historic importance of these buildings and the community's desire to preserve them,

Fully Aware that the disposition of the Camp Roe site is at the discretion of the VCPUSD as a publicly elected board, the Valley Center Community Planning Group did vote 10-4-0 to recommend support for a historical marker and to recommend the community and the VCPUSD work together to explore opportunities to preserve the former Camp Roe site,

Noting With Deep Concern that VCPUSD, at their subsequent March meeting, failed to address the agenda item of the historic site in an open and transparent process, and breached their ethical obligations to deal with the public fairly and openly,

1. Disapproves of the VCPUSD for deciding in advance of public discussion to contract for and then give weight to, a structural engineering report prepared by persons and corporations not qualified to make judgments regarding historic facilities;
2. Deplores the action of VCPUSD to decide on and prepare for a contract for the demolition and cleanup of the site three weeks before their March public meeting consideration and vote on disposition of the site, despite an offer to rehabilitate the buildings for the school, or in some other way, such as relocating them, to preserve the heritage of the CCC Camp at no expense to the VCPUSD;
3. Draws Attention to the health and safety concerns presented by the site to the children in their care that were ignored for the two years the VCPUSD owned the site until the present issue arose, belying the need for haste;
4. Finds Unseemly and disingenuous the VCPUSD media response to the community outcry regarding their apparent deception two weeks after their March meeting;
5. Recommends that the VCPUSD review and evaluate the procedural issues that have been encountered in this action with the goal of implementing policies and procedures that protect the public's interests in the conduct of public business.