

Steering Committee Minutes
January 10, 2009

Steering Committee Members

Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Larry Johnson	Campo/Lake Morena
Jack Vandover	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Mary Manning	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Woody Barnes	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Joe Chislom	Pala-Pauma
Bob Smith	Pine Valley
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Bud Swanson	Rainbow
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Liz Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

Staff

Jeff Murphy, DPLU, Deputy Director
Bob Citrano, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Christine Wang, DPLU Staff

Public

Charlene Ayers
Hank Palmer
Sachiko Kohatsu
Mike Strong
Liz Higgins

I. Introductions

Welcome

Mr. Murphy called the meeting to order and thanked the group for attending and explained that Mr. Muto was unable to be present at the meeting. Mr. Murphy proceeded with introductions of Steering Committee members and DPLU staff.

Announcements

Mr. Citrano stated that staff was currently reviewing Community Plan inputs and will be coordinating with community planning and sponsor groups once the reviews are completed to solicit their comments — by the end of February or early March.

II. Action Item: Approve 10/25/08 Steering Committee Minutes

Mr. Phillips commented that the minutes were well done and motioned to approve. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. Mr. O. Smith and Mr. Barnes abstained. The Steering Committee voted to approve the 10/25/08 minutes (12-0-2)

III. Discussion of the Draft General Plan

Copies of the Draft General Plan

Mr. Citrano stated that loaner copies of the Draft General Plan were available for use during the meeting, or were available for purchase at a cost of \$23.70 per copy.

Mr. Denham commented that hard copies of the Draft General Plan should be made free to community planning group members as well as sponsor group members.

Mr. Phillips stated that the document contained a large number of colored photos. He further stated that none of the photos are referenced in the text, and that the document stands alone without the color photos which would dramatically reduce print costs.

Mr. Citrano stated that staff will look into ways to reduce printing costs, such as printing them in black and white for initial reviews.

Mr. Denham asked how the County was going to address community plans that had goals and policies that conflicted with the General Plan Update.

Mr. Citrano explained that the consistency review involved identifying policies that were in direct conflict with the GP update. He further explained that community plans could be more restrictive than the GP update, but not less restrictive.

Comments on the Draft General Plan

Mr. Murphy explained that the purpose of the meeting was to facilitate a discussion regarding comments on the GP update document, and that the meeting on 1/31/2009 would be the time to submit formal comments.

Mr. Russell provided the following comments:

- Policy LU-3.2 — more language is needed regarding large projects.
- Policy M-9.1 — the County needs to change friction intersections.
- Policy M-9.4 — there should be language in the policy that addresses transit nodes.

- Policy COS 6.2, 3rd bullet — remove “appropriate lots (e.g., residential lots one acres or larger and/or located near surrounding agricultural uses)”.

Mr. Murphy commented that Policy COS 6.2 was intended to protect existing agricultural lands.

Ms. Tisdale stated that subdivisions next to existing agricultural lands are not always compatible and could potentially harm agriculture. She further commented that smaller parcel sizes attract residents who would prefer not to live next to an agricultural operation.

Mr. Meyer stated that he believed the Draft GP did not have strong enough language that would protect agriculture in the future when compared to policies in the existing GP.

Mr. O. Smith provided the following comments:

- The draft GP does not address equity mechanisms
- There is a need for rural land standards
- The draft GP needs to address SB 375 regarding Global Climate Change
- There is a need for the GP to state a stronger connection with Community Plans, where the individual Community Plans are the determining factor and applicants must adhere to the communities guiding goals and policies.

Mr. Swanson commented that the Draft GP was a great start, and complimented staff. He provided the following additional comments:

- Policy LU-12.1 and that the word “concurrency” should be changed to “prior”, because infrastructure should be in place before the development occurs
- Policy LU-13.2 needs to be more restrictive requiring water availability needs to be proven accordingly

Mr. Barnes thought that the definition of agriculture should be reworded in the Glossary, by removing the word “prime” and “improved” because not many areas are defined as “prime” agricultural lands.

Ms. Tisdale stated that she believe the word “prime” actually protects agricultural land and it should remain in the document.

Mr. Johnson expressed his concerns regarding long term water sustainability.

Mr. Denham commented that Old Highway 80 is not listed as a scenic highway and should be added to the list.

Mr. Denham asked how Policy H-3.6 regarding farm worker housing would be implemented. Mr. Murphy answered by stating that State legislation mandates housing for farm workers.

Ms. Jones had the following comments:

- Pg. 1-14, bullet 3 — Consider revising to narrow scope of goal
- Pg. 2-7, last paragraph — Village Limit Line needs to be addressed

- Pg. 2-12, last paragraph — Grey water is mentioned but no policies on requiring the reuse of wastewater.
- Pg 3-12, footnote A — The word maximum should be removed from this footnote because this will not apply in every case.
- Policy COS-4.2 — Needs to be more specific (i.e. new development, commercial)

Mr. Phillips provided the following comments:

- His main concern was whether the document was going to allow future clustering by-right, and directed the group to page 2-8. Mr. Phillips stated that in the second paragraph on page 2-8 there is language that establishes the disassociation of parcel size from density which would lead to clustering development.
- He thought that the draft document was an excellent representation of the Steering Committee's work over the past ten years, and that members of the Valle De Oro planning group thought it was a good lesson in community planning.
- Policy LU-14.4 — The draft GP needs to ensure that the purpose of this policy is for things like failing septic systems or for public health and safety and not for the developers.
- Clustering only appears in a few places in the document, but urged Steering Committee members to be cautious of disassociating parcel sizes from density. He explained that defining minimum lot sizes in communities is extremely important because when parcels are one acre and smaller they require sewer which will in turn change the character of a community.

Mr. B. Smith agreed with Mr. Phillips, and stated that clustering does not always work and that the County should look at each individual community on a case to case basis.

Mr. Barnes commented on table M-1B in the Mobility Element, in that he recommends that the Minor Collector right of way width of 68' be changed to 52'. He further stated that there should be a provision allowing for a wider right of way width if necessary. Mr. Citrano explained that the reason for the 68' minimum was to provide a larger parkway in the village area where you have pedestrian amenities, or in constrained areas where there is slope to account for.

Mr. Swanson commented on page 6-10, second paragraph — He expressed his concern regarding water availability and where the supply would come to support these additional units. Mr. Swanson referred to pg 3-34 last paragraph and recommended that the portion referring to adequate water supply for demand thru 2030 be removed, because developers will point to this statement and claim there is adequate supply water for their project.

Ms. Tisdale recommended that policies should be added to noise, safety, and fire to address wind towers. She further commented that currently there are several proposals for wind farms in the Boulevard community and other communities should be aware of not just the positive effects but also the negative impacts of wind farms.

Mr. Barnes commented that there is a lack of emphasis on energy, and that nuclear power should be identified as a viable source of energy. He further stated that the draft GP should also include policies on desalination for future water resources.

Mr. Denham commented on policy M-10.5 along with M-10.6 and asked what the County's philosophy is with on-street parking. Mr. Citrano responded by stating that the County would like to make the villages more walkable by minimizing on-site parking requirements so that building could be sited closer together.

Mr. Phillips stated that if policies like M-10.6 remain, the County will have places similar to North Park where there is no parking for businesses. Mr. Phillips recognized the fact that the County is trying to reduce dependence on the personal automobile, but stated that people are going to use their vehicles regardless. Mr. Phillips also referenced a news article about the Municipal Transit System reducing service in the County.

Mr. Phillips recommended that Policy M-10.3 be removed.

Ms. Tisdale commented on Policy COS-14.13 and recommended removal because the State requires this thru SB375, and AB32.

Mr. Meyer recommended revising 2nd bullet on page 5-2 as follows — The protection and preservation of natural and cultivated open space.

Ms. Stonehouse recommended that in the glossary, the definition of "open space" be revised by removing the word "natural" in the beginning of the definition.

Mr. Denham commented on Policy COS-14.1 and asked how the County will implement this policy. Mr. Citrano responded by stating that the County will look at the size of each development project and will make a determination if there are jobs and services in the area or if residents will need to travel to jobs and services outside of the community.

Mr. Meyer asked if General Plan Amendments (GPAs) will still be applicable when the GP update is adopted. Mr. Murphy explained that GPAs will continue to be processed and are allowed 4 times a year according to state law.

Mr. O. Smith asked why the Conservation and Open Space Element were combined as one, when state guidelines mandate 7 elements. Mr. Murphy stated that State guidelines allow for local agencies to combine elements, and he further explained that staff felt that the Conservation and Open Space topics were closely related and opted to combine the elements.

Ms. Manning wanted to thank the County for listening to all the community input during the planning process.

Mr. Barnes wanted to also thank staff for putting together a draft document, and reminded staff that the criticisms at today's meeting were meant to be positive.

Mr. Swanson asked if the meeting on January 31st should be scheduled for the entire day. Mr. Citrano asked if the group needed to meet on the 31st. Mr. Phillips answered yes, because the Steering Committee will need to establish a formal position on the General Plan Update. Mr. Russell recommended that we postpone the meeting two weeks, because there will not be enough time for Staff to respond to comments.

Ms. Tisdale asked if the Interest Group was granted the same extension for the review period, and questioned whether they should make a Steering Committee position today.

Ms. Higgins stated that she felt that the Interest Group should be granted the same extension for comments on the draft General Plan. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Russell opposed the idea of granting an extension to the Interest Group.

Ms. Lowes asked if the land use maps were set in stone when the EIR comes out in the future. Mr. Murphy stated that the maps being evaluated under the EIR cannot be changed, because it would require restarting the analysis of the maps but after the EIR is complete the map could potentially change.

Mr. Barnes stated that he felt it was important to receive the updated community plans before providing comments on January 31st. Mr. Citrano stated that providing the updated community plans before January 31st was not feasible because of the limited staff resources and timeline. Mr. Murphy clarified that the current draft GP is a preliminary draft and there will be more time for comments during another period of review.

Mr. Swanson asked that Staff mail out clarification as to what is to be discussed and achieved at the January 31st meeting.

Ms. Tisdale stated that she formally rejects the idea of the Interest Group having equal footing with the Steering Committee, because members of the Steering Committee are elected by their communities and also have to submit financial disclosure forms.

Mr. Denham commented on page 7-17 regarding future developments in floodplains, and asked for clarification on the term “future” and if it meant new development that has not occurred or if it meant development without an approved tentative map . Mr. Murphy explained that the term “future” refers to new development that has not been approved, and that this policy is similar to what is in the existing General Plan.

Mr. Meyer asked if the Interest Group would be reviewing the individual community plans. Mr. Citrano answered by stating that the documents will be made public during the EIR phase and they will be allowed to provide comments.

Mr. O Smith stated that he would like the group to vote on not allowing the Interest Group the same review extension beyond what is allowed to the public because the Interest Group are not elected officials, and do not have to meet in public under the Brown Act. Mr. Phillips stated that he believed that it was not necessary to vote, and that he has been to numerous Board Hearings where they have re-established the Interest group.

IV. Public Comment

Mr. Palmer introduced himself as a member of the Twin Oaks sponsor group. He stated that the Sponsor group was experiencing difficulties with preparing a community plan that would prohibit agricultural activities such as the Golden Gourmet operation, which he explained was allowed by-right. Mr. Palmer asked for staff assistance with preparing the Twin Oaks community plan to ensure that an operation such as the Golden Gourmet could not occur again. Mr. Citrano stated that he will discuss with Mr. Muto and will be in contact with the Sponsor Group at a later time.

Ms Higgins introduced herself as a member of the Interest Group and a native San Diego resident. Ms. Higgins referred to the regional housing need allocation mandated by the State HCD, and asked how conflicts in regards to density between the Draft General Plan

and the Community Plans would be resolved. Mr. Citrano explained that the density of the communities is set by the land use map, and that the community plans do not take precedent.

V. Next Steps

Mr. Murphy informed the Steering Committee that staff would be contacting them early next week whether or not there would be a meeting on January 31st or it would be postponed to allow sufficient time for staff responses to Draft GP review comments received from planning and sponsor groups.

Mr. Murphy thanked members for their participation in the GP update process and adjourned the meeting.