

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Minutes for the February 13, 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 A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use EIR=Environmental Impact Report  
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: 26 February 2012; 2 March 2012 corrected

Approved: 12 March 2012

1.		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
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
P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

**Quorum Established:** 14 present

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2. Approval of Minutes: January 23, 2012**

**Motion:** Move to approve Minutes of January 23, 2012

**Maker/Second:** Rudolf/Quinley

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):** **12-0-2** Voice; Glavinic & Norwood-Johnson abstain

**3. Open Forum:**

None

**4. Discussion Items**

**4.a. Review of Property Specific Requests from the Board of Supervisors Hearings January 9-12. (Rudolf)**

General Plan Update [GPU] SC will meet on 23 February, possibly, to discuss these requests in advance of next VCCPG meeting.

**4.b. Announcements about Form 700 and deadlines for VCCPG members to submit them to County of San Diego, Registrar of Voters (Smith)**

Smith advises VCCPG members to submit form 700 to Registrar of Voters. Deadline is in March. Must also complete Ethics training.

**4.c. Status update for Bates Traffic Forum (Davis/Smith)**

Davis reports that Bates' Nut Farm management suggests this issue is not part of the portfolio of the Mobility SC. They expressed no interest in participating in a community forum on this issue. They did say they would work with a small group of experts, if that is arranged. Davis expresses frustration with the situation. Smith voices interest in considering the importance of commercial interests in such issues. Davis then presents action of Mobility SC to request traffic light at Woods Valley Rd. and Lake Wolhford Rd. Glavinic suggests that there are other possible alternatives for dispersing traffic during large events at Bates' Nut Farm. Anderson points out the difficulty presented by the possible development of The Oaks Indian Hills Ranch by San Pasqual Indian Band. Vick suggests that implementing the emergency evacuation plan during large events would solve the south-bound traffic issue on Valley Center Rd. Davis points out that while it addresses south-bound traffic, it is not a solution for the north-bound traffic problem on Valley Center Road that continues onto Woods Valley Rd. Rudolf suggests that a traffic light is premature, and we should ask the County for help to solve the problem. Davis suggests that as the County studies the warrants for a traffic light, it will visit many issues associated with this problem. Rudolf says that major use permits are in place to address these kinds of issues. Vick notes that the San Diego County Fair puts traffic control people on the road to regulate traffic,

	<p>avoiding most problems. Tom Baumgardner, audience, says VCCPG does not do code enforcement for the County. Rudolf says there is no code to enforce in this instance. Baumgardner replies that County must be the enforcement agency. Glavinic suggests we seek support from County to find a solution. Smith says there have been other large events in Valley Center that have had to provide traffic control. Control may have to come from County safety agencies. A discussion about the extent of the problem at Bates' ensues. Smith suggests reviewing the MUP, talking to DPW traffic to see if there is anything that will induce DPW to review this issue.</p>
<b>4.d.</b>	<p><b>Report and discussion on meeting with District 5 Planning and Sponsor Group Chairs. (Smith)</b>  Smith reports that a group of private citizens met in VC to form a list of bullet points that was used at the meeting of all chairs of all planning and sponsor groups in the county. Smith expected more controversy, but reports that all but one bullet point was accepted. The final bullet caused confusion in defining which agencies were being referenced so it was dropped.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Action Items:</b>
<b>5.a.</b>	<p><b>Report, discussion and possible vote on draft bullet points developed at a meeting with Planning and Sponsor Group chairs County-wide on February 2, 2012. (Smith)</b></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Smith reports that this group came up with eleven points. 22 of 26 chairs ratified it. About half of the planning groups are expected to ratify it. Adoption of this list of bullet points doesn't preclude saying more in the future. There were several alternative suggestions relating to the issue of term limits for planning/sponsor group members cited in the Red Tape Reduction Task Force [RTRTF] report. But, because planning groups are elected, this issue was determined to be of less consequence, and no changes were made. On the issue of planning group size, the consensus was to leave that determination to each of the planning groups. Smith says for some planning groups, regular group participation is the basis for remaining on a planning group. Some other groups have less community interest leading to difficulty filling vacancies. Glavinic asks about adding bullet points to the original list. Smith says he is reluctant to veer from the presented list. He says he may want to polish some of the language, but had no interest in making substantive changes or additions. Glavinic addresses the issue of the County, State and Federal decision-making bureaucracy, supporting some of the concerns in the RTRTF report. Smith says there are only three levels of decision-making: DPLU, Planning Commission, and BOS. Hutchison responds saying that some of the same folks who authored the RTRTF report had caused the problems that various government agencies were now in place to address as part of the project review process. Davis supports that point, but wonders why we are discussing. He thinks that discussion should be had by BOS. Quinley agrees this discussion is not on topic. Vick says a certain amount of red tape is useful. It gives the public the opportunity to review projects more thoroughly. Smith asks about VCCPG meeting schedule going to twice monthly as a constructive suggestion to address the speed with which projects are reviewed. He rhetorically asks why developers don't like planning groups, suggesting it is because planning groups ask questions and review projects thoroughly. Smith is uncertain about the hearing date due to a planned absence of Supervisor Roberts on 29 Oct 2012. There is some confusion about the desire of Roberts to hear this item. Jackson thinks it may be 28 March 2012.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Move to accept the points presented by CPG/SSG Chair RTRTF Report [appended below]</p> <p><b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Quinley      <b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):</b> 14-0-0 Voice</p>
<b>5.b.</b>	<p><b>Discussion and possible vote regarding the \$425,000 grant for safety improvements on Valley Center Road (Davis)</b></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Davis presents an email sent to the County asking the status of the submitted project priority list for this grant, with no response. He says we are caught in a change-of-the-guard situation with the leaving of Bob Goralka from DPW and no designated replacement. He says that the recommendation is languishing at DPW. Davis wants to have Michael Long attend the Mobility SC to discuss the Valley Center Road improvement list and the Cole Grade Road upgrade.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> none</p>
<b>5.c.</b>	<p><b>Discussion and possible vote on equine ordinance and new potential environmental impacts arising from changes in the existing ordinance and the introduction of new tiered permitting of horse stables. (Smith)</b></p>

**Discussion:** Smith says there was no meeting of the Equine SC [lack of quorum]. Smith commented that an administrative permit starts at 10 horses and 10 acres. Rudolf asks about 1-acre limits if any. Smith responds there are none and that the limit applies to the number of horses not who owns them. Davis thinks expansive limits are unacceptable and will induce commercial uses in residential areas where none existed before. Jackson says Orange County's benchmark is two horses per acre. Davis agrees that potential densities allowed by San Diego Co. are very high. Smith says rules governing farm workers do not apply to horse stables by state law. Smith adds that Hofler has suggested to him that equine caretakers be recognized as necessary for equine facilities. Smith mentions that beyond County permit costs, there can be substantial other costs for forms and reports. Some discussion ensues about limiting horses based on a submitted plot plan. Smith asks about best management practices confusion and says he regards practices used by University of California, Davis as the guide. Davis says there is no requirement or limitation for personal horses. Smith says an EIR is now underway for various equine uses. He is not sure when to expect progress. Smith will plan another meeting of SC. Discussion of horse density ensues.

**Motion:** none

**5.d.**

**Review of and Recommendations on "Countywide Single Family Residential Design Guidelines" (POD11-008) draft (Rudolf)**

**Discussion:** Rudolf advises that the General Plan Update [GPU] SC will be meeting jointly with the Design Review Board [DRB] to discuss the subject guidelines. He is looking to have a recommendation for next month's meeting of VCCPG, but will forward the recommendations of the joint meeting to County staff **subject to Ratification by VCCPG at the 12 March 2012 meeting.** Rudolf says there is a need to discuss additional specific recommendations beyond those already present in the GPU. Rudolf suggests that the outcome of meeting will be about implementation of GPU.

**Motion:** none

**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. : There is some activity planning a sewer by developers but nothing to report
- h) Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive
- i) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair: Presently no plans for The Oaks Indian Hills Ranch to be reported
- j) Website – Robert Davis, Chair: Addresses issue of cost of site hosting. Rudolf suggests submitting formal request to County to recover costs to date.
- k) Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
- l) I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair : PAA response deadline passed with no definitive outcome. County expects Accretive to submit a response to scoping letter in about 2 months
- m) Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair

**7.**

**Correspondence Received:**

- a) none

**8.**

**Motion to Adjourn:**

**8.35 pm**

**Maker/Second:** Quinley/Bachman

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):** 14-0-0 Voice

**Note:** Next regular meeting scheduled for 12 March 2012

Appendix – item 5.a.

**Draft Bullet Points: CPG/CSG Chair RTRTF Report Responses**

- 1) Eliminating planning and sponsor groups does nothing to reduce red tape as the county process is not dependent upon a response from them as well as does away with organized public information dissemination and much of any organized community input.
- 2) Each planning group can effectively determine the number of members it needs to be reflective of its local community perspectives.
- 3) PPP single public meeting is problematic in that scheduling and notification may not be aligned with community needs for effective attendance and needs to be in addition to and not replace the need for planning/sponsor group input.
- 4) Self-certification of documents: Not acceptable as DPLU provides independent review for their primary customer: the Public.
- 5) Elimination of the RPO is not really possible as it is an ordinance while CEQA is a process for disclosure. (*waiting on Planning Commissioner Beck's wording*)
- 6) Term limits are not appropriate as members are all volunteers who are not paid and have detailed community knowledge gained over their years of service.
- 7) Planning and Sponsor Group costs and legal liability to the county are not red tape issues. That being said, any information used as the basis for a recommendation needs to be factual, accurate, and complete.
- 8) Reducing EIR requirements may not be possible. Is it legal for the county to delegate its lead agency status with regards to CEQA?
- 9) Single bite at the apple: Concept needs to be modified to allow additional review focusing on changes made or new information received since planning or sponsor group review and prior to completion of the EIR and approvals by the Planning Commission and BOS.
- 10) Loss of free appeal rights significantly affects CSG/CPG ability to effectively represent our community position.
- 11) Planning and sponsor group chairs enthusiastically support timely creation of a new task force having representation from all stakeholders. It would focus on reducing delays and other true red tape in project processing by clearly and accurately defining issues and then recommending appropriate changes based on that information.