

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the 10 June, 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 N=Nay P=Present R=Recuse
SC=Subcommittee VC= Valley Center VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 5 July 2013

Approved: 8 July 2013

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
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
A	P	A	P	P	P	P	A		P	P	P	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 11 present

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

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

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 13 MAY 2013 as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley **Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 (Y-N-A):** Voice

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

Casey Grenier, neighboring resident, speaks about the Verizon cell phone tower proposed for construction on Aguacate [presented at previous meeting] and his opposition to it based on traffic that will be generated during installation and for maintenance. He said that a 250-gallon fuel source proposed on-site was a significant fire danger. He cites covenants, codes and restrictions on the subject property that prohibit such communication facilities.

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

E1	Presentation by Valley Center Parks and Recreation District [P&R] on future Parkland Opportunities for Valley Center. (Glavinic)
-----------	---

Discussion: Glavinic narrates a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation is in reaction to public concern about opportunities for public input on P&R issues. He Introduces Marcia Townsend, P&R chair, and Doug Johnsen, general manager, both in the audience. He shows map of 94 sq. mi. P&R district. He presents the history of the district formed in 1966. It has a 5-member board and General Manager. The district is funded by user fees [about 2/3] and property taxes [about 1/3]. It provides ball fields, special events, etc. It has about 32-acres in eastern VC. The County goal for parks in rural areas is 3 acre/1000 population. If the population of VC is 15,000 then there is a need for 45 acres of parks. 15 acres/1000 is the goal for urban areas. Rudolf clarifies item on future park designation in general plan and community plan. The County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element established goals of 10 acres of local parkland and 15 acres of regional parkland per 1,000 persons. To meet these goals at "build-out", an additional 300 acres of local parkland are needed [Local parks include: Mini parks or tot lots, neighborhood parks, community parks, school parks, and specialty parks, containing both active and passive park uses]. Valley Center currently has 27 acres of local parkland and 1900 acres of regional parkland. Glavinic says seniors want meals on wheels, meeting places, youth want sports fields, equestrians want a place for events, and others want a fitness center, or gym, and multiuse fields. He cites some solutions for obtaining such facilities that have strings attached. He acknowledges that grant money is available for large multiuse fields. He cites developer requirements to develop parks as part of each development that is between 15 to 45 acres. He cites local agency sharing of sites, e.g Adams

Park owned by school district and VC fire department located on park land, etc. Rudolf clarifies trails use [land sold to county which made it part of the road so it could put in trails]. Glavinic says there will be two additional public meetings June 13 and June 27. He notes that an offer was made on park property located on the corner of Lilac and VC road. Presently, the property is in escrow. He says that limitations on the property such as no sewer, access problems, rock outcrops, and oak trees will make for high future development costs. The sale price for the property is \$400K while the appraised value was estimated at \$328K. He says P&R can buy and sell land. When land is sold, it must be replaced with an equivalent acreage. In this case, P&R must replace the 7-acres with more usable acres within 120 days. He says the lack of transparency with the public was done to facilitate obtaining replacement property. He cites criteria for replacement property – P&R wants 10-20 acres or more, it should be flat, close to a public road, with utilities ready, well water available, septic system capable, with access to trails system, and close to population centers. Glavinic says P&R wants help identifying prospective properties. He presents scenarios to show property might be acquired. He cites four possible properties along with some details of size and cost. He then asks to have audience fill out a survey.

Motion: None

E2

Discussion and vote on approving the Valley Center portion of the Draft 2013 General Plan Bi-Annual Clean-Up GPA. The county has asked for a formal VCCPG vote on the two items related to Valley Center. (Smith/Rudolf)

- a) VC101 Change the Abe Buolos property zoning from RR to C32
- b) VC102 Change the former Lilac Ranch property zoning from SPA to open space (purchased by CalTrans as Mitigation Land for SR76 construction).

Specifics on the proposed changes may be found at:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/2013GPBiAnnualClnUp.html>

Discussion: Smith introduces need to formally clean-up changes to General Plan adopted in August 2011. The County has requested VCCPG to revisit two cited items. a) April 9, 2010 vote by VCCPG on Boulos property [VC101] resulted in a change from RR to C-32 recommendation for convenience commercial. b) 902 acres purchased by Caltrans for mitigation of widening of Hwy. 76 is proposed to change from SPA to open space.

On item a], Smith explains there is usually no revote on a voted item unless there are specific changes to the property. Rudolf clarifies reconsideration of earlier vote is directed by the County. He says the original recommendation on Lilac Ranch was to create a SPA, which was consistent with the desire of the applicant. County has asked to change it now to open space. . Glavinic asks to amend Rudolf's motion to include designation of Road 3B proposed to cross Lilac Ranch. Rudolf refuses to accept amendment and says land use designation doesn't affect the prospective road. Glavinic wants to be clear that an east/west road is needed. Rudolf considers it a line on a map that is subject to change. Bret questions distinction between SPA and open space. Smith and Rudolf clarify. Patsy Fritz, audience, says it is incongruent to set aside sensitive space as mitigation for other sensitive space that was developed. She adds that the land-owner can do what it wants. Glavinic says that land has been farmed for 100 years. He cites the need for a road through the property and the need to notify Caltrans of that need. Smith suggests reminding County about evacuation designation for road 3B in Lilac Ranch. He reminds VCCPG of history of evacuation routes. He says 3b is in the Mobility Element of the County. Road 3B was part of the original solution for fire evacuation. He says this change would not eliminate 3B. He suggests amendment that would remind county about 3B as evacuation route. Rudolf declines to accept it, and it is not on the agenda. He says this is a staff recommendation. It is unnecessary to remind the County of this road issue. He says he wants to secure public access to the property. Smith reminds VCCPG of duty to decide issues. Smith/Glavinic call for question. Bret asks why County wants to change designation. Rudolf explains County's desire to make the change. Patsy Fritz asks if land use designation will be public. She wants to remind the County that it should seek an alternate route for Road 3B.

On item b], Rudolf states the VCCPG position to separate the North and South Villages with rural residential zoning. There was a goal to have no strip commercial on Valley Center Road. The Boulos property was left on the map accidentally. Boulos went to Supervisor Horn's office for reconsideration. The property is very

constrained by size and proximity to a stream. The vote to approve zoning of something less than C-34 was 10-3-2. Glavinic asks what is new now. Rudolf replies that the cleanup request is from the County. Jackson asks what C-32 is. Smith defines it as convenience commercial. Rudolf says lot is too small to use. Smith clarifies C-34 and C-32 zoning. Bob Davis says he understands C-32 is more limited than C-34. Rudolf urges to vote no saying it was a single parcel that was earlier changed with pressure from a large group of supporters attending the meeting. He continues that It was an erroneous artifact of an earlier review. Bret Davis asks about the surrounding zoning [Rudolf replies RR]. Norwood-Johnson asks about other changes that may be coming. Glavinic describes this revote as a bait and switch proposition for Boulos. He bought it as commercial and it was changed to RR. Patsy Fritz asks for clarification of property's circumstances.

Patsy Fritz asks if a discretionary permit is needed for Boulos property. Jackson says it depends on proposed use.

Motion: Move to approve the County's change for Lilac Ranch from SPA to open space

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Jackson **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 10-1-0 Voice; Glavinic dissents

Motion: Move to approve change of Boulos property from RR to C32

Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic **Carries/Fails:** 4-7-0 [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 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
	N		Y	N	N	N			Y	Y	N	N	N	Y

Motion: Move to reject change of Boulos property from RR to C32

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley **Carries/Fails:** 7-4-0 [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 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		N	Y	Y	Y			N	N	Y	Y	Y	N

E3

Discussion, Presentation and possible vote on 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)

Discussion: Gary Wynn, Wynn Engineering, presents. He reintroduces Skyline Ranch and its history. He says the County requires that if there is more than 10% change to a permit, it must be revisited. He describes the property as having a golf course and other features. He says applicants want to improve entry and public amenities as well as a maintenance building. Applicants are seeking modification of their major use permit. No change in density is planned. John Cataldo, architect, addresses VCCPG. He says there are three areas to be upgraded. Part of the project is updating 1970's buildings to meet current codes. He describes entry wall with associated directory display. The plan is to remove an administration building and maintenance structure and replace them with offices, a gym and storage. They will use similar architecture to that of park. The clubhouse will be updated: kitchen, restrooms, higher ceilings as well as features to make it compliant with Americans With Disabilities Act. A small maintenance shop will be added at far end of park. Project will go to the Design Review Board for review. Bret Davis asks about size of administration building [Cataldo says 4000 sq ft] and asks about road access. It will be similar to the existing administration building. Bret Davis asks about access to maintenance building. Cataldo says access is through the park. Glavinic asks about fire protection measures [Wynn says they are consulting with fire marshal]. Wynn says construction will be phased to accommodate continuing operations. Administration will be moved to clubhouse temporarily. Glavinic asks about pool lift, and

if it will have a different set of requirements. Franck notes that all improvements will be within the park. Patsy Fritz, audience, asks if footprint for clubhouse is the same? [Cataldo says they are adding 815 sq. ft.] Patsy Fritz asks about asbestos removal [Wynn says it will be done according to requirements]. She then asks about adding solar panels to the roof. Wynn notes that the clubhouse will continue to have solar. Rudolf asks about findings required by County. Wynn says he will address findings and provide them to VCCPG.

Motion: None

E4

Discussion and possible vote on recommendations for modifications of road standards for the Lilac Hills Ranch project, GPS 12-001: SPA 12-001. The applicant has proposed modified road standards for ten different road segments related to the project. The County has asked for recommendation from the VCCPG on the proposed modifications. (Hutchison).

Discussion: Hutchison presents proposed response to county on requested road standard modifications for the Lilac Hills Ranch project [see addendum below]. Glavinic observes that roads are stressed including 3B and the outcome of the motion will support the case that 3A will be back on the books as needed by the community. He wants roads to support the general plan build-out ~~whatever development happens~~. Rudolf asks if applicants are requesting 3A [Hutchison replies no]. Bret Davis asks about frequency of such requests. Glavinic suggests Mountain Ridge Road is a secondary emergency exit. Hutchison/Franck contest, saying it is intended as a primary and secondary access. Chris Brown, representing applicants, defends road standard modification requests to accommodate project uses, saying slower design speeds would accommodate village uses. Bret Davis asks for clarification of application of changes [Brown says they are for the entire project]. Patsy Fritz, audience, cites the same reasoning that caused BOS to remove Road 3A. She says registered voters within VC number 11,479. VC represents .75% of total of unincorporated County voters. The General Plan cost each voter over \$12 and over \$19.6 million in gross. She suggests that adding 5000 people in Lilac Hills Ranch will diminish chances of evacuation. She says Accretive needs to buy more land to get proper access. She suggests supporting County General Plan for roads. Loni Christiansen, resident, says proposal, in general, will exacerbate traffic load substantially.

Motion: Move to approve recommendation of joint Mobility and Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittees to reject 10 requests for road standards modifications by Lilac Hills Ranch applicants

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Rudolf

Carries/Fails [Y-N-A]: 9-0-2

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	R	Y	Y			Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y

Notes: Britsch and Jackson recuse because of proximity of their properties to the project

E5

Possible discussion and vote on recommendations for newly completed technical studies on the Lilac Hills Ranch project, GPS 12-001: SPA 12-001. The technical studies may be accessed at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/regulatory/docs/LILAC_HILLS_RANCH/LILAC-HILLS-RANCH.html

The County has asked for groups to begin reviewing the material so they can start deciding how to divide this material into assignments for review comments. (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison presents after Smith introduces the item. Hutchison notes that the County's website is hosting the Lilac Hills Ranch technical studies that will be part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the project. Rudolf asks about prognosis for project. He says that progress in releasing documents is uncertain. Hutchison clarifies what is presently available. Chris Brown, representing the applicant, suggests Accretive isn't holding back documents until a more opportune time for review presents itself.

Motion: None

E6	Discussion and authorization by the VCCPG for re-opening the application period to candidates for Seat #9 which expires December 31, 2016. (Britsch)	
Discussion: Smith explains the withdrawal of a previously submitted application. Britsch says he will advertise again in the newspaper and ask for applications by July 1 at 7pm. VCCPG has the option of reopening the period of application after that date if no qualified applications are received.		
Motion: Move to reopen application period for seat #9 for one month closing at 7pm on August 7, 2013.		
Maker/Second: Quinley/Norwood Johnson		Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
F	Group Business	
F1	Announcements	
<p>1) Request for new Chair of Mobility Subcommittee – Bob Davis has asked to step down as Chair of the Mobility Subcommittee.(Smith)</p> <p>Davis explains alternatives. It may work to have a vice chair that can assist Bob Davis or if that cannot be worked out, appoint a new chair. Glavinic suggests Laventure [who is absent] as a new member. Jackson volunteers to join SC. Rudolf suggests also adding Laventure and Bret Davis to subcommittee.</p> <p>Motion to add Jackson to mobility by Smith lacks second. Rudolf objects to vote on SC membership tonight, saying it needs to be on the agenda. Smith counters that a chair of SC can nominate new members. After discussion, it is decided that VCCPG will vote on new members at next meeting. Hutchison says Mobility SC will make some recommendations for additional members and officers.</p>		
Motion: Move to add Jackson to Mobility SC		
Maker/Second: Smith/no second		
F2	Correspondence	
<p>1) San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG; Final Agenda for the San Diego County Planning Commission regular meeting, June 14, 2013 at 9:00 AM; 5520 Overland Avenue, San Diego. An item on the agenda of special interest to Valley Center includes the Tiered Equine Ordinance; POD 11-001; Countywide. For additional documentation on this item visit http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/Equine.html</p> <p>2) San Diego chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects to VCCPG; Announcement that community groups are invited to apply for \$5,000 grants to make landscape improvements in their neighborhoods. The application deadline is August 1, 2013. For more information, contact Nate Magnusson at 619-236-1462 or nmagnusson@schmidt-design.com.</p> <p>3) Sarah Beers to VCCPG member Bret Davis; Letter in opposition to the installation of a cell tower on Aquacate Lane.</p>		
F3	Meeting Updates	
Next VCCPG Meeting: July 8, 2013		
G	Adjournment	
G1	Subcommittees of the VCCPG	
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	

I)	Equine Ordinance - Oliver Smith, Chair	
G2	Motion to Adjourn:	9.45pm
	Maker/Second: Quinley/Norwood Johnson	Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] 11-0-0

Addendum for item E4:

10 June 2013

To: Mark Slovick, Department of Planning & Development Services
County of San Diego
Project Manager, Lilac Hills Ranch Project
From: Valley Center Community Planning Group
Re: 10 Road Standards Modification Requests, Lilac Hills Ranch

Mr. Slovick:

This is a response to your request for comment on the road standard modifications requested by the project applicant. This response is interim since the information provided is not complete. The Traffic Impact Study and comments from the Deer Springs Fire District and the County Fire Authority, and Department of Public Works (DPW) are needed for evaluation concurrently with these modification requests. Given that, rather than dissect each request individually, we will address them collectively to avoid tedious repetition of our comments. And, you should interpret these comments as applying to all 10 requests rather than the half dozen directed specifically to us, since all apply to the project.

In general, these requests for modifications of the county road standards make the claims that the standards to be modified are too difficult, are too costly, require rights-of-way that may be unobtainable, will be time consuming to construct, will be disruptive to off-site property owners, will face opposition from existing neighbors, may require condemnation of right-of-way, and will impact biological open space. But, they do not acknowledge that by reducing road widths, reducing road design speeds and ignoring other standards established for safe, efficient transportation, they would compromise the safety of prospective residents in their project as well as all other residents of Valley Center who will be using these roads at full build out of the General Plan.

These claims do not justify the need to abandon the standards that were developed to safeguard the public in daily transit, to provide speedy and efficient evacuation corridors during emergencies [see VC Community Evacuation Route Study], and to address the traffic volumes spelled out in the recently adopted San Diego County General Plan. Two illustrative examples of where this is critical:

Exception Request # 2 - The West Lilac [Maxwell] Bridge over I-15 has the approximate dimensions of a 2.2E Circulation Element road, which enters Level of Service (LOS) F at 16,200 Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADVT). Critical missing data are what traffic load will the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch development place on this bridge? The existing 6-foot (north) and 4-foot (south) shoulders need evaluation for safety, Emergency Response Time, fire code conformance, and evacuation safety by the DPW and Fire Authority having jurisdiction.

Exception Requests # 7 and # 8 - Mountain Ridge Private Road, built in the 1990's currently serves 23 rural estate residences and experiences approximately 250 ADT. The developer is proposing performing the most minimal upgrades to the existing road to bring it in compliance with current County Private Road Standards for a private road with 750 ADT or less. What will be the additional traffic load placed on this road by the developer? The existing grade, vertical curve, and proposed intersection taper at Circle R Public Road

(exception request # 8) need critical design review for safety by the Department of Public Works and the Fire Authority having Jurisdiction.

These requests ignore the General Plan's objectives for road development [General Plan Goal M-3], ignore the Valley Center Community Right of Way Design Standards [VCCRDS] where they apply [See VCCRDS Section 3.0 et seq.; these standards supersede the County Public Road Standards within Valley Center], ignore the requirement for developers to improve mobility element roads to a minimum LOS "D" or higher [General Plan Policy M-3.1 & Policy M-3.2], waive safety standards [General Plan Policy M-2.1; and, projected additional 32,000 ADVT from the project], ignore the impact of these modifications on fire evacuation requirements for Valley Center [General Plan Policy M-3.3], attempt to exploit private roads for which no right to develop has been established, and set a dangerous precedent for modifying road safety standards that are deemed to be inconvenient or costly. The applicant is proposing a General Plan Amendment that would change the present rural residential use to a village designation. Incongruently, the applicant proposes not village capacity roads to accommodate the traffic generated by the village development they are proposing. Instead the applicant proposes modifications to the County Road Standards that will reduce capacities of roads that were planned, in the first place, to accommodate Rural and Semi-Rural residential land uses.

The project should be redesigned and downsized to meet the parameters of the road standards established in the San Diego County General Plan [adopted in August 2011] which took over 12 years in development and consumed over 19 million taxpayer dollars. If approved, these road standard modifications would become a seriously destructive precedent within the County.

The applicant's complaint of economic burden or inconvenience by being required to design and construct adequate roads and bridges for their project that meet County road and bridge standards is unacceptable considering their plan to increase ADVTs by an estimated 32,000, levels that will cause these roads to fail.

These requests must be rejected in the interests of public safety, of emergency preparedness and of traffic functionality in this project that has no adequate secondary access and relies on use of private roads for which the developer does not have rights to use for the scope and purposes of this project.