

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the January 9, 2012 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 AI=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use 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: 12 January 2012

Approved:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: 7:07 PM

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	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	L E W I S	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	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A

Notes: Quinley, Bachman excused; Britsch arrives at 7.15 pm

Quorum Established: 12 present

Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes: December 12, 2011

Motion: Move to approve Minutes of December 12, 2011, as corrected

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Lewis

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12-0-0 Voice

3. Open Forum:

Linda Ogilvie, audience, asks about VCCPG awareness that The Oaks Indian Hill Ranch adjacent to Bates Nut Farm is sold to San Pasqual Indian Band. Smith responds that San Pasqual Indians may buy land like any other entity or individual. Such parcels are treated like all others in the County until and unless they are converted from fee to trust [1934 Indian Reorganization Act].

4. Discussion Items

4.a. Bates Traffic Forum. Change in leadership for consideration of traffic management issues surrounding Bates Nut Farm and their high traffic periods. (Smith)

Smith announces that responsibility for the Bates Nut Farm traffic issue [discussed at December Meeting] is being transferred to Bob Davis from Jon Vick. Vick, who withdrew, explains his reason for stepping aside. He notes that a survey conducted by the Roadrunner newspaper and an email from David Ross, editor, to Oliver Smith made Vick the focus rather than the traffic issue. Vick wants to redirect attention to the traffic problem by removing himself from responsibility for overseeing that issue.

5. Action Items:

5.a. Nominations, discussion and election of Valley Center Community Planning Group Chair for 2012 (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison, in Quinley's absence, calls for nominations for the position of Chair. Jackson nominates Oliver Smith, seconded by Hofler. Glavinic nominates Hutchison, but Hutchison declines. No further nominations made.

Motion: Nominate Oliver Smith for the position of Chair of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

Maker/Second: Jackson/Hofler

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice

5.b. Nomination, discussion and election of VCCPG Vice-Chair for 2012 (Smith)

Discussion: Smith calls for nominations for position of Vice Chair. Hofler nominates Ann Quinley, Jackson seconds. No further nominations made.

Motion: Nominate Ann Quinley for the position of Vice Chair of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

Maker/Second: Hofler/Jackson

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice

5.c. Nomination, discussion and election of VCCPG Secretary of 2012 (Smith)

Discussion: Smith calls for nominations for position of Secretary. Rudolf nominates Hutchison, Glavinic seconds. No further nominations made.	
Motion: Nominate Steve Hutchison for the position of Secretary of the Valley Center Community Planning Group	
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Glavinic	
Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice	
5.d.	Discussion, nominations and vote on sub-committee chairs and members for 2012 (Smith)
<p>Discussion: Smith polls respective subcommittee chairs regarding their desire to continue to serve their SC as chair and the proposed composition of the SC memberships. The poll results are:</p> <p>Mobility – (Bob Davis, Chair). Davis is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>GP Update -- (Richard Rudolf, Chair). Rudolf is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Nominations – (Hans Britsch, Chair). Britsch is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Northern Village – (Ann Quinley, Chair). Quinley is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Parks & Rec. – (Brian Bachman, Chair). Bachman is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Southern Village - (Jon Vick, Chair). Vick is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Spanish Valley Ranch [Segal Ranch] (Mark Jackson, Chair). Terminated</p> <p>Tribal Liaison – (Larry Glavinic, Chair). Glavinic is willing to chair. Rich Rudolf resigned earlier, all others willing to continue</p> <p>Website – (Bob Davis, Chair). Davis is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Pauma Ranch (Christine Lewis and LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chairs). Terminated</p> <p>Equine Ordinance (Oliver Smith, Chair). Smith is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>I-15/395 Master Planned Community (Accretive) (Steve Hutchison, Chair). Hutchison is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Red Tape Reduction Task Force – (Oliver Smith, Chair). Smith is willing to chair. All members willing to continue</p> <p>Discussion of efficacy of Tribal Liaison SC begun by Rudolf and Glavinic. Davis asks about tribal participation. Glavinic responds that tribes choose not to participate with a designated representative from tribal council. They do participate in some ways but have an issue concerning sovereignty and attending VCCPG meetings. Britsch asks about Jim Quisquis and his participation. Rudolf responds that Quisquis said he would seek authorization from San Pasqual tribe to be their tribal representative, but never followed through. Vick wants to continue the SC and our effort to work together. Smith sees value in retaining SC to handle issues that arise concerning the tribes. Hutchison says there is value in SC to present opportunity for communication even if communication currently doesn't occur. Lewis concurs. Glavinic continues to support SC. Rudolf disputes the value of SC if tribes are unwilling to participate.</p>	
Motion: Move to approve chairs and members as presented excluding Tribal Liaison	
Maker/Second: Rudolf/ Hoffer	
Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice	
Motion: Move to continue current Tribal Liaison SC, chair and membership	
Maker/Second: Smith/Norwood-Johnson	
Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12-1-0 Voice; Rudolf dissents	
Motion: Move to extend the meeting until 10.15 pm [made at 9.55 pm]	
Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic	
Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice	
5.e.	Discussion and possible vote on recommendations, letter from VCCPG to DPLU and special meeting (consider January 23) about the Red Tape Task Force (Smith)
<p>Discussion: Smith presents. Suggests an organized straightforward presentation of facts to BOS, rather than a succession of individual testimonials on why planning groups are necessary. Rudolf suggests 'noticing' of planning group meetings is a red herring issue from Red Tape Task Force. The Task Force used the same noticing procedure that VCCPG uses. Smith suggests development of a reasoned list of ways we can improve</p>	

VCCPG processes and response times and what we oppose [see list of issues from SC] Wants to organize Chairs of all planning groups to coalesce on a uniform statement of support for planning groups. Wants to create a response that is reasonable and representative of VCCPG Requests an additional regular single subject meeting to discuss . Glavinic says County approval process is too protracted and this notion should be included in the VCCPG response to the task force. Glavinic cites the County's 'medieval' approach to planning regarding oak trees that can be planted and mature in twenty years. Rudolf asks for clarification on goal of additional meeting. Smith says he will present a draft letter for review and encourage all VCCPG members to comment and suggest changes. Sandy Smith asks about importance of individual comments to BOS re importance of planning groups. O. Smith says task force was biased toward developers and there is a great need for public comment. Sandy Smith asks if a letter to Devin Muto will help. O. Smith affirms the usefulness of such letters saying all such comments will be rolled up in the staff report. Rudolf says it is important to send copy to BOS to ensure inclusion. Cal Townsend cites support for role of planning group. He says although there is too much government in general, planning groups are an important first filter for local land use issues. O. Smith summarizes proposed task force alternatives to planning group. Rudolf asks if other suggestions for the response letter should be made now. Smith says the present list is just initial and further suggestions can be made at the next regular meeting. Anderson notes that the solar issue points out the importance of planning groups to the community.

Motion: Move to call an additional regular meeting to create a letter response to Red Tape Reduction Task Force on Monday, 23 January 2012, venue TBD.

Maker/Second: Smith/Vick

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice

5.f.

Discussion and possible vote on the Mobility Sub-Committee report on their work on and recommendations for the Valley Center Local Public Road Network. Map and Matrix will be available at the meeting on January 9, 2012. (Davis)

Discussion: Davis introduces Sandy Smith to present. She passes recommended map for local public roads. Summarizes distinction between mobility element roads and local public roads. LPD to increase connectivity within and among neighborhoods. LPD are not as wide as mobility element roads. If they are on trails map they will have enlarged margin to allow construction of trails. One road missing from matrix. Mesa Verde was added after matrix formulated but was recommended by mobility SC. Some LPD overlap CERS corridors which would enhance chances for funding. Says wants DPW to remain flexible on exact routes of proposed roads but understand that connectivity from various points is the important point. Norwood asks about eminent domain taking of property issues. S. Smith says taking of private roadways long way off. Most LPD would be 28 ft wide. Rudolf asks about road kk.. S. Smith clarifies location. Hofler questions some of the roads

Motion: Move to approve recommended approximate Local Public Roads map and matrix with the addition of roads mm and kk to the map; and, for the County staff to remain flexible on alignments and subject to future planning group review.

Maker/Second: Davis/Hutchison

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A) 10-3 -0 Anderson recuses from vote on roads z and v; Hofler, Norwood-Johnson, Anderson dissent

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

5.g.

Discussion and possible vote regarding the \$425,000 grant for safety improvements on Valley Center Road (Davis)

Discussion: Continued until February

5.h.

Wooten, AD Permit for Solar, 300-11-032, project is located on the North side of Cool Valley Road between Cole Grade and Wilhite Lane; Owner: Kenneth and Violetta Wooten; development and operation of a concentrated photo voltaic solar farm on 9.83 acres; Contact: Steve Wragg , RBF Consulting at 858-614-5059 (Hofler)

Discussion: Smith presents a summary of previous activity on this issue. He recounts the process of postponement for an agenda item. He points out that he received a request from the applicant for postponement of this agenda item at 11.30 am today [also notes that the applicant waited until less than 2 hours before the December meeting to request a similar postponement, which was granted]. He said that he told the applicant that given the large expected and actual turnout of the public on this item, that postponement at such a late time was not acceptable. He notes that 40 members of the public are present. Hofler follows with a summary of the project. She gives the location of the project, which consists of 22 acres. The proposal is to install solar panels on 10 acres, which will generate 2 megawatts of electricity to be sent over existing transmission lines. Hofler explains that this project needs a discretionary administrative permit from the County, and she outlines the requirements that the project must meet. She mentions the need to remove existing large oaks along Cool Valley Road to prevent shading of the panels. The applicants would provide fencing and some screening around the project. Jackson adds that the panels are circular and about 23 ft in diameter. Glavinic has questions about the discretionary permit. Rudolf/Hofler clarify that it is a discretionary administrative permit. Smith adds that he specifically asked for VCCPG review of this project given that the group is reviewing other similar projects. Davis reminds the audience that agenda item 5.e. could affect how projects like this are handled in the future. Hutchison asks about screening and if there is any new information on the intentions of the applicants. Lewis compares this project to another larger solar project proposed on Vesper Road and asks why the Cool Valley Road project is proposed given its distance from the substation. Rudolf says this one is moving forward because the land is cheap. Glavinic asks about storing surplus energy in batteries and if county has said anything about battery storage. Hofler says if any storage occurs it will be at the substation, but none has been mentioned. Vick warns about applicant's ability to develop the full 22 acres in solar in the future. Rudolf says the remaining 12 acres is to be dedicated to the existing wildlife corridor. Smith explains SDG&E use of various generation options to balance electrical generation. Rudolf reminds audience that they cannot be accused of NIMBYism for being concerned about the character of their neighborhood. Rudolf says he voted for Vesper project because he approves of the technology, but is pleased that project was rejected. Anderson asks if proposed project will be obsolete in 5 years, given the advances in technology. Hofler says technology is sufficiently mature to make the proposed project profitable. Vick suggests setting up a committee to advise developers where in VC solar facilities might be better situated. David Smith, audience, agrees with motion and how it relates to County Ordinance 6952. He lives at the corner of Terrace View Lane and would lament loss of trees. Says it would look like an industrial area and would affect his uphill neighbors even more. He says it will adversely affect property values. Don Martin, audience, asks about how much influence VCCPG recommendations will have with BOS. Smith responds that VCCPG makes thorough, reasoned recommendations to the Director of DPLU, but has no authority to influence BOS directly. Smith asks to amend motion to request further review if applicants return with changes to proposal. Rudolf declines and suggests that Smith make his concern in an additional motion. Hofler suggests public should send letters to Director of DPLU if they want to further influence decision process. She wants a decommissioning plan and she wants the loss of oaks to be mitigated within VC. Rudolf/Smith discuss structure of motions. Vick suggests we should have a way to contact those in the public interested in being noticed about events on this issue. A list is circulated for email addresses.

Lynn Watts, audience, opposes the project saying she thinks it will destroy the rural character. She cites the ordinance requirements and says her views will be affected. Bob Fox, audience, asks about property boundary location re oak trees on the edge of Cool Valley Road. He questions the County action on widening Cool Valley road if oaks are present [oaks likely would be lost to road widening if Cool Valley Road reaches its full width as a mobility element road]. Easement is about 5 ft into property [84 ft ROW]. Rudolf/Hofler say applicant would cut oaks to prevent shading. Fox says view would be adversely affected. Concurs with VCCPG position of rejecting proposal. Patrick Simpson, audience, concurs with issues presented in motion, and asks about efficacy of individual letters. He wants the name of the appropriate County planner. Smith says that he will email planner information. Simpson decries notification of this project, especially since he is next door to project. He says he is speaking also for Dr. Van Wyck, his neighbor, who could not attend. Hofler provides email address of planner. Dorothy Kennedy, audience, opposes project. She says one can't encourage a green project by cutting down large, old trees. She worries that in several years this project may not be viable economically. She says one cannot mitigate 150-year old trees. Susan Rodriguez, audience,

opposes project and concurs with other opponents. She says this project dramatically contrasts with her neighborhood. Vanessa Norris, 30-year resident, doesn't want to lose oaks for her children's sake. She asks how to avoid this development? Cal Townsend, audience, wants to compliment Hofler/Rudolf for their efforts. He says applicant underestimates residents' interest in this project. He wants more information sooner so a more reasoned decision **may** be made. He questions the maintenance program. He wants to know about impacts on riparian area resulting from project. How will requirements be enforced? Pat Simpson is wondering about possibility of using parcel as mitigation land by county or state. Vickie Lund, audience, speaks to large oaks and their existing protection at the state level. Jerry Gaughan speaks to how project can be stopped. He says you can't stop it but you can steer it in a different direction. Suggests forming the committee mentioned by Vick to identify where in VC such projects can be located. He suggests telling applicants where projects should or could go without adverse impacts. He says to find a way to regulate it. Dave Ross, Valley Roadrunner, asks about inclusion of the old airstrip in project area. Hofler says project includes the airstrip. Hofler recounts how to address this issue to County. Jennifer Weiss, audience, suggests locating project next to casino.

Rudolf says that Sol Orchard should – *on their own property* – provide setbacks, fencing, and landscaping buffers which more than adequately protects adjacent private residential properties and travelers on Cool Valley and Cole Grade Roads from the noise generated by the installation construction, ongoing operations and maintenance, and more than adequately screens the solar installation from view. Rudolf adds that Sol Orchard should preserve and protect existing oaks during and after construction, to ensure their survival. He says further that Sol Orchard should be required to submit a decommissioning plan for this project. And lastly, he says Sol Orchard should be required to perform all mitigations in Valley Center.

Motion: Move to recommended denial of permit as the project is out of harmony in scale, bulk and density with surrounding uses; will adversely affect views of neighbors; is not close to SDG&E electrical substation; will inject an industrial feel to the site while destroying old, iconic oak trees; is incompatible with the existing, functioning wildlife corridor; and, will destroy an historic air field landmark.

Maker/Second: Hofler/Rudolf **Carries/Fails (Y-N-A) 13-0-0 Voice**

Motion: Move to require additional review of the project by VCCPG should any aspect of the project be changed by the proponent or the Department of Planning and Land Use [DPLU].

Maker/Second: Smith/Hofler **Carries/ Fails (Y-N-A) 13-0-0 Voice**

Motion: VCCPG agrees that solar power is a great idea, but that it needs to be compatible with the surrounding area; therefore, move to approve an appeal, in advance, if the director of DPLU approves project so such an appeal is timely and VCCPG and the community can present their concerns to the Planning Commission.

Maker/Second: Hofler/Rudolf **Carries/Fails (Y-N-A) 13-0-0 Voice**

5.i.

Discussion and possible vote on Community Evacuation Route that consists of one lane portion of Valley Center Road leading into Escondido. Consider strategies for widening that segment or using traffic cones to allow egress. (Davis)

Discussion: Continued until February

5.j.

Johnson Site Plan “B” Designator; 3500-11-013- (STP11-013); Project is located at 28357 Cole Grade Road; the project is 3.25 acres in size and zoned M54. There is a single family dwelling on site (non-conforming use) which will remain. There have been alternations to the home without benefit of a building permit. There are 6 other buildings on site which will be for storage. All were originally constructed as residential accessory buildings so it will be necessary to alter them to meet industrial occupancies. The project will bring the residence up to code for residential occupancy and the other buildings up to code for industrial occupancy. Contact person is James Chagala 760-751-2691 (DPLU planner: Kevin Johnston 858-694-3084) (Norwood-Johnson)

Discussion: Jim Chagala presents location of project. He summarizes the plan for the property, which includes re-designating and reconditioning existing buildings for industrial use. He returns tonight to provide the results from the Design Review Board [DRB]: approval. Has not yet gotten a scoping letter from the County. The County won't send scoping letter until additional money is paid for planning process. The property owner wants an accounting of monies already paid to the County for planning, which have been

exhausted by planning efforts to date.

Motion: Move to support the project pending the receipt of the scoping letter from the county and subject to all the conditions contained the scoping letter.

Maker/Second: Norwood/Rudolf **Carries/Fails (Y-N-A)** 13-0-0 Voice

5.k.

28404 Cole Grade Rd. (south of Valley Center Rd., just east of Grangettos), 4.3 acres owned by Jerry Gaughan (Phone 619-269-7451). Possible vote after discussion by owner of the issues regarding use of property as M54, RV Storage, property rezoned RR2 rural residential with "B: designator (site plan required for changes) as part of the GP Update. DPLU has requested owner get an opinion from the planning group in the form of a letter (Smith)

Discussion: Smith presents project and introduces Jerry Gaughan. Gaughan asks VCCPG to provide an opinion [not a vote] on converting property to M-54. There are still many issues with the property. Gaughan presents location on Cole Grade, says it is in a flood plain. He describes neighboring businesses, all of which have been in use for the past 30 years. County rezoned several parcels to flood plain from M-54. Since then, those properties are much less valuable. He has cleaned up the property, that used to be an aggregate yard, and repaired the fence. He has been to the DRB to get recommendations. Code enforcement cited several items. The issue of the code enforcement activities went to Eric Gibson at DPLU. Those code issues are now in litigation. County says Gaughan has no grandfather rights [grandfather rights refer to uses of the property before 1978 that can continue, but no new uses]. Gaughan continues to meet with County entities. Gaughan has invested about \$500K so far. Says VC is growing and he wants to create outdoor storage facility. He says VC has eliminated much of the M-54 zoned areas in the face of growth needs. Gaughan asks for some kind of support from VCCPG.

Jackson asks if there is a property specific request in progress. No, says Gaughan, the County sent information for that process to the wrong person. Glavinic asks about the flood plain designation for property. Yes, it is in the flood plain identified by the County, says Gaughan. Hofler asks about how long property was vacant. It has been 2-years since it was an aggregate yard. Rudolf summarizes why VCCPG stayed out of this issue during the General Plan Update process. He asks what Gaughan wants. Gaughan asks for support for use of property as heavy equipment storage as it is currently being used. Smith says there has been some talk of using the property for a tow lot that would accommodate vehicles towed and impounded by the California Highway Patrol [CHP]. If this option is granted, it could encourage other property owners to set up competing tow yards in Valley Center. Gaughan apparently got permission from CHP to set up tow lot. Smith indicates that the issue of a tow lot is different from the request Gaughan is making.

Motion: Move to authorize a letter from Oliver Smith to Eric Gibson [DPLU] in support of the current use as a heavy equipment storage yard as well as the fencing and landscaping that is currently installed

Maker/Second: Davis/Glavinic **Carries/Fails (Y-N-A)** 13-0-0 Voice

6. Subcommittee Reports & Business:

- a) Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
- b) GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
- e) Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, 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) Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
- l) I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- m) Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair

7. Correspondence Received for September 12, 2011 Agenda:

- a) Senator Joel Anderson to VCCPG; invitation to a holiday party on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 from 6:00-8:00 PM at the Ronald Reagan Community Center, 195 East Douglas Avenue, El Cajon, CA 92020.

b)	DPLU to VCCPG, Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration, 3803 11-004, Log ER 11-00-001, Zoning Ordinance No 29 and County Code Amendments. The project proposes amendments to the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, Administrative Code and County Code to make additions and minor revisions, corrections and clarifications to various sections. The project covers the unincorporated portions of the County over which the County has land use jurisdiction. Comments on this proposed Negative Declaration must be received no later than January 17, 2012 at 4 PM.	
8.	Motion to Adjourn:	10.15 pm
	Maker/Second: Smith/Hutchison	Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice
Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 23 January 2012		