

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the December 9, 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 DPW=Department of Public Works DRB=Valley Center Design Review Board N=Nay P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group VC= Valley Center Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 6 January 2014; Corrected 11 January 2014

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									7:01 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		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		
P	P		P	P	P	P	P		P	A	P	P	P		

Notes: Vice Chair Ann Quinley presides in the absence of Oliver Smith; Britsch arrives 7.09

Quorum Established: 10 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of November 18, 2013 as corrected

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Jackson

Carries/Fails: 10-0-0 (Y-N-A) Voice

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

Bob Davis speaks about Lilac Market at the Harvest Farms complex and says that the owners presented their development as family friendly. However, one of the stores next to the market and the yogurt store is a store selling drug paraphernalia. Also, a 'Lung Doctor' next to Reveles Restaurant, in the same complex, is selling drug paraphernalia, although more discreetly. He suggests more caution when these business owners approach the VCCPG for approval of their development plans.

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

E1

Discussion and possible vote on Weston Town Center; PDS2010-3992-10-014; Project Address is Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road; APN is 188-230-01; contact person is James Chagala 10324 Meadow Glen Way East; Escondido, CA. The project description is based on the 2010 project and may change depending on the applicant's needs. If it changes, a new project description will be prepared by PDS. The project is a potential GPA, Specific Plan area for a mixed-use town center. Approximately 83 acres of the Weston Town Center would be used for residential development at an average density of 7.10 dwelling units per acre. 529 residential units are planned and 10 are proposed as duplex residences while 476 would be single-family units. About 17-acres of open space, park and/or trail areas are proposed. Main access to the commercial portion would be from Indian Creek Road off Valley Center Road. The project may be served by a sewage recycling plant proposed by Valley View Properties and operated by VCMWD. (Quinley)

Discussion: Jim Chagala presents. He says this presentation is more informational. He is breaking the project into two parts, the commercial component and the residential component. He notes that the commercial component requires a site plan that will be ready in a couple of weeks. He is hoping to file the site plan 19 December 2013. He will then go to the DRB and eventually to VCCPG for further review. The residential portion will require a specific plan. He says there are many players working to set up the commercial portion. There are two major tenants, Stater Brothers and CVS Pharmacy. These two tenants are very important anchors for the center. These two businesses are among very few who are expanding presently. Therefore, they have leverage and are making specific demands upon the developer. He suggests that VC and the County have differing ideas for development. And, in addition, the water district has specific requirements regarding sewer service, among other factors. However, he is pleased with the DRB and North Village SC process and their willingness to be flexible.

No feasibility studies have yet been completed for the site plan as presented. The major tenants have not seen the site plan, however, it is believed to be acceptable. He notes that Stater Brothers is headquartered in Los Angeles and CVS Pharmacy is headquartered in Providence, RI, and both have corporate development policies and architectural requirements as part of their brands, as a way of explaining their disinterest in agreeing to the previous consensus plan for the North Village. He displays site plan.

David Ko, project architect, reviews the site plan. Vick notes the handout is from 2009 [attached below] and not the current proposal. Ko says he was involved in the project's master plan and is providing oversight. Ko says the main street entrance would not work because of its proximity to Indian Creek Road. He says the County can only authorize an entrance at the midpoint between Cole Grade Rd. and Indian Creek Rd. Jackson notes that a proposed new traffic signal at the realigned 'Main Street' entrance is not in the General Plan, and it would be in addition to those already included in that plan. The major tenants require the entrance at the proposed position in the new site plan along with the new traffic signal. He says that Main Street, as drawn in the original plan [lined with smaller shops], is not acceptable to the major tenants because it hides their stores. Ko suggests that Main Street in the new site plan tries to use trees, rather than buildings, to define the street. He says he wants to maintain the importance of the village green feature. He notes the two "mom and pop shop" buildings, plus three pads along VC Rd. He cites CVS Pharmacy's adamantness regarding their unique building template architecture and their absolute reluctance to deviate from it to accommodate the community's desire for the look of repurposed agricultural buildings. He notes that the major tenants are also particular about 'owning' their parking spaces and not sharing with other businesses.

There will be one office building. Chagala suggests the need for road/parking lot linkage from the post office and bank facilities that border the developer's property. Residential development in between, still undetailed, will determine that linkage. Ko says Stater Brothers doesn't like trees in their parking lot. But, the site plan will continue to show trees. He says the road structure will lead also to adjacent properties in the North Village area. He notes that the loading area for the market will be off of School Bus Lane as it extends into the North Village north of the commercial component. The loading area will provide adequate maneuvering area and will allow trucks to enter/exit on the larger roads. He says the look of the commercial component will be patterned after a Clairemont development in San Diego with seating and vegetation.

Norwood-Johnson asks if Indian Creek Rd. will continue to the south. Chagala says he is not sure. Norwood-Johnson questions the location of the loading area off of School Bus Lane. Ko says it's a requirement of the market and provides the best access for large trucks there. Norwood-Johnson questions the need for the additional signal at the proposed new entrance off VC Rd. Jackson adds that the proposed light is not in the General Plan presently. Hutchison asks whether there are some other configurations that could use planned/existing roads without the addition of the new entrance. Ko cites the requirement of Stater Brothers for an entrance as proposed. Vick asks about the possibility of a roundabout intersection at Indian Creek Rd. Ko says that traffic moves too fast for a roundabout at that location. Davis asks about the need for a traffic signal at the proposed new entrance given the short distance between lights proposed at Indian Creek Rd. and existing at Cole Grade Rd. He cites a similar problem in El Cajon where traffic signals are in close proximity. He says such a short distance between signals would require coordination. He cites space for only 20 car lengths between signalized intersections. Chagala and Ko cite the County's requirements and anticipated traffic warrants. Glavinic cites the friction a new signal would cause for traffic, particularly at rush hours. He says the developer has additional property for the residential component adjacent to the commercial component that could be reconfigured as an alternative to accommodate Stater Brothers without the new entrance. Chagala says that the residential area is a separate issue and is not yet planned. Rudolf asks about the residential segment and the plan for roads within it. Ko says the specific plan is several months away, but it will address those roads. Rudolf asks about the trees in the commercial area and possibly augmenting trees with covered parking with solar panels atop. Ko says that such structures would likely not appeal to the tenants. Rudolf notes the 'captive' parking of CVS and asks if having shared parking would be more appealing to County. Ko says some reciprocal parking is designed on the side of the building, but acknowledges the tenant requirements to 'own' the parking near their buildings. Rudolf suggests that Indian Creek may not go south of VC Rd as a result of the redesign of the sewer facility. Chagala says the southern extension of the road still exists in the General

Plan. Rudolf asks about the extension of the Heritage Trail along Cole Grade Rd adjacent to the project and if that is part of the plan? Ko says if it is mandated, it will be part of the plan. However, connectivity beyond the bounds of their property will depend on other property owners. Rudolf asks if a traffic signal is still planned for Miller Rd at VC Rd? Chagala says, yes.

Steve MacPartland, engineer for a number of developers, speaks to roundabouts, saying development costs are three times that for a traffic signal, especially in consideration of the additional right of way required. Another problem for roundabouts is pedestrian traffic. Traffic in a roundabout does not stop. Horses are even more problematic.

MacPartland says the realigned proposed entrance originally was left turn in only. But, the County wanted to move the proposed entrance closer to the midpoint between Indian Creek and Cole Grade Roads to accommodate future development to the south. He says some adjustments may allow Indian Creek Rd. to be narrower. Jackson asks if there is an analysis of traffic for this area? MacPartland says, no, not yet. Jackson asks what options exist to mitigate the entrance and Indian Creek and Cole Grade. None are offered. Britsch asks if the County or if Stater Brothers is requiring the entrance. Ko says the market wants the signal and the County has specific requirements as to how to do it. Britsch suggests markets other than Stater Brothers as a possible fit. Davis comments on the speed of bus traffic and trucks along the adjacent stretch of VC Rd. He asks that the developer to consider truck, bus [school and casino], and other long vehicles carefully in the eventual study. Glavinic cites his concerns about traffic in VC, and notes his interest in the traffic study. He says he could be influenced if the Village Green [a segment within the commercial component of the site plan] were dedicated to the Valley Center Parks & Recreation District.

Deb Hofler, audience, introduces herself, and comments that the original plan gave her optimism with Ko as the architect. She says that over the years the plan has morphed into something more reminiscent of Irvine, Ranch Bernardo, etc. She is disappointed in present plan. She understands the need for return on investment. But, she says this plan deviates wildly from the Community Plan and is not what the community envisioned in the earlier iteration. She says the General Plan allows two times more commercial development than the community can sustain. She says Herb Schaffer [applicant/developer] is not developing all commercial to potential, but it is still too much. She adds that the traffic signal proposal will cause excessive traffic on Miller Rd. She says that Stater Brothers or anyone else shouldn't extort us. Davis suggests wording of a proposed motion may allow for roundabouts and he can't support roundabouts. Glavinic says the proposal is a mess, and he will not support it.

Rudolf recounts the history of proposals and his opposition to the initial proposal that looked stereotypical for a strip mall. He says he doesn't need a market. He objects to the rigidity of commercial entities regarding development requirements that don't fit with community desires. He is torn between supporting the proposed motion and rejecting it since it does not comport with community sensibility. Rudolf asks if the community, the County and the developer can talk to the market/pharmacy to reassess the site plan? Herb Schaffer says there have been 17 iterations of the plan and Stater Brothers and CVS Pharmacy have said take it or leave it. He says the plan has been studied to death. He says the sewer issue has held up development. He says sewer access is very expensive [\$25K per dwelling]. If he drops out, the neighboring developer will likely not be able to continue either. He says this plan is the best he could do. He says the location for the supermarket requires in-front parking to accomplish their business model. He adds that CVS is always on a hard corner with a signal and must have a supermarket adjacent. He says everyone has a requirement. He adds that if this plan doesn't work, Valley Center would have to be satisfied with the commercial center proposed for Lilac Hills Ranch. Steve Herckt, audience, says Stater Brothers is present in Ramona, and thinks it is a good corporate citizen. Rudolf comments on Lilac Hills Ranch as an alternative commercial development, saying that project is likely dead.

Davis asks Vick if amending his motion to indicate that the community does not want a string of uncoordinated traffic signals, but would want to have such closely spaced traffic signals coordinated, is acceptable. Vick will not consent to the amendment. Rudolf tries to convince Davis of an alternative approach by suggesting the County be directed to explore alternatives to a signal. Rudolf suggests alternative wording by deleting a sentence regarding alternatives. Napoleon Zervas, adjacent developer, supports the proposed shopping center

and says he is not changing anything in his project. Zervas noted that the Miller Road extension south of VC Road, heading easterly as shown in the new General Plan, is still included in his project; the road will extend to Cole Grade Rd., a part of his project. But, he adds, without Herb Schaffer's project, he doesn't have a project either. He cites the money spent on community meetings. Glavinic says this project, even with coordinated signals, will create a bottleneck and he needs assurance that some other options will be explored. Vick concurs with Glavinic. Davis says the County has required the traffic signal at the proposed entrance. If the County can mitigate with coordinated signals we should approve it. Rudolf says we will have another chance for review after the traffic study is completed and we can look at alternatives then. Schaffer says he did a traffic study [\$60K] and Darnell [traffic engineering consultant] says the proposal works and the signals can be synchronized. He says roundabouts were suggested years ago. Schaffer hired a consultant to review roundabouts. The costs for a roundabout were about three times that for a traffic signal and would take more land. He then cites the high cost of sewer service. He says he has done what he can to adhere to the plan previously endorsed by the community. Rudolf says he still wants to see alternatives. A discussion of amendments to the motion by Quinley and Vick ensues.

Motion: The Weston Town Center Project [PDS2010-3992-10-014] has been many years in development. We are now looking at a revised set of site plans for the commercial area that are substantially changed from what the Planning Group previously endorsed. The changes reflect, in some part, the economic realities of getting the project built. While there are significant issues still to be resolved, the Valley Center Community Planning Group endorses the concept that the site plan embodies.

Significant issues still to be resolved include:

- The project proposes a traffic light at the corner of Indian Creek and Valley Center Roads, then 600-feet farther along at the entrance to the commercial area that serves Stater Brothers Market and then at the corner of Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road as well as at Miller and Valley Center Roads. Valley Center is a rural community where a string of uncoordinated traffic lights along a short stretch of road could create unwanted traffic congestion.
- The size of the Village Green within the commercial area needs to be large enough to accommodate community gatherings. The area allotted on this site plan appears too small.
- The project should be more pedestrian friendly. A "pedestrian-friendly village" has long been the vision for this project. More pedestrian-centered outdoor space should be allotted to accommodate "sidewalk" and patio-style restaurants that are protected from automobile traffic, noise and fumes.

Maker/Second: Quinley/Vick

Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A]

L A V E N T U R E	H U T C H I S O N		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	
Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	A	Y	Y	Y	

Motion: Move to amend the motion by striking the final sentence of the first bullet.

Maker/Second: Davis/Laventure

Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

E2

Presentation from Chuck Tucker on the long-term business plan for the San Diego County Parks and Recreation. Discussion follows presentation. (Norwood)

Discussion: Chuck Tucker, County Department of Parks and Recreation, Park Project Manager, presents the long term business plan and naming rights policy for certain County Parks and Recreation [P&R] facilities. Mark Massen says P&R has seen a significant financial gain for new policies. Massen updates the fee-ranges. Presently, the County has a fee for some facilities. The new use policy will expand fee ranges for such items as sports fields, fishing, parking and others. Another proposed policy change is naming rights for limited time periods. This policy would apply to sports fields, parks, playgrounds etc. The department director would administer fees up to \$15K. Above that amount would be approved by the BOS. The duration for a facility name will vary from 5 years and up depending on the fee payment. Quinley asks about the usefulness of renaming a facility every 5 years. Tucker cited the potential for revenues. Glavinic notes that P&R is a County organization and is distinct from the Valley Center Parks & Recreation District. Hutchison asks why the County doesn't have plans to build parks in VC. Massen explains Park Land Dedication Ordinance

[PLDO] funding is collected for Valley Center and points out that Valley Center has its own parks and recreation district responsible for park creation. Hutchison asks if the County extracts an administrative fee from those PLDO funds before they are transferred to Valley Center. Massen says, yes. Rudolf clarifies that the point Hutchison is getting at concerns the question of why, as County taxpayers, Valley Center is not the beneficiary of County developed parks, in addition to any locally funded parks, as are other parts of the unincorporated County. Rudolf notes that given the current population of Valley Center, the area is underserved by parkland according to the County's current policy.

Motion: None

E3

Discussion and possible vote on MUP 173-248 W2 Modification of a Major Use Permit, Preliminary Grading Plan and Plot Plan map for Skyline Ranch Country Club LLC located at 18218 Paradise Mountain Road at Latigo Road. Applicant is Fred Gritzen for Skyline Ranch Country Club, LLC; Contact person is Sharon Thornton for Wynn Engineering at 760-749-8722. Skyline Ranch Country Club proposes a Major Use Permit Modification to update and modernize community buildings within the mobile home park located on Paradise Mountain Road. Improvements involve rehabilitation of the existing office/restroom/storage/laundry /maintenance building to accommodate a proposed 2843 SF building with offices, gym, rest rooms and storage area. (Franck)

Discussion: Franck presents and reminds VCCPG of earlier presentation. He says modification to some buildings inside park and a new maintenance building is being proposed. Franck reviews the proposed new entrance and says he is in favor of entrance exemptions. Gary Wynn, civil engineer, reviews the history of Skyline and notes they are not asking for more density. He says they are making Americans With Disabilities Act [ADA] improvements. He says the entry is not expanding substantially, and the proposed exception is permit an alternate entry design that will allow a turnaround possibility. The second entry exception is to allow a left turn lane into and out of the park to help with the proposed 325' sight line rather than the usually required 400' sight line to the northwest. The applicant is asking not to have to widen Paradise Mountain Rd. But, they are improving property. Steve Herck, Skyline resident, addresses the fire protection fee and says the original maintenance buildings did not have an impact on homes. However, the new building will impact several homes visually. He suggests moving all maintenance buildings to the northwest area of the property. Wynn says the maintenance building is being moved for greater fire protection. The building will be located at the base of a 20-foot cut bank. The residential coaches are at the higher level. Glavinic asks about the parking area. Wynn clarifies. Herck says the driving range is to be converted to two dog parks [location of present maintenance building]. A discussion of the maintenance building location ensues between Herck and Wynn. Jackson asks if there is an Home-Owners Association [HOA]? Herck says yes, a voluntary association. Jackson asks if HOA has taken action on this issue. Herck says, no review or vote to date. Phil Johnson, General Manager of Skyline, says the maintenance activities will not have an adverse affect on residents.

Motion: Move to approve the project with the exemptions they are asking for.

Maker/Second: Franck/Glavinic

Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

E4

Discussion and possible vote on letter to Oliver Smith from the Mobility Subcommittee requesting that DPW provide VCCPG with a copy of the 75% design drawings for the work Escondido is planning at the Valley Center Road/Valley Parkway project. (Davis)

Discussion: Davis Is providing information. He says Jackson has obtained a road alignment drawing from the City of Escondido. From Bevin Lane to Lake Wohlford Rd. there will be two travel lanes in each direction. Glavinic says Escondido has already allocated part of the money for this project and more will be allocated in the coming fiscal year [July 2014]. Davis describes the deal between Escondido and the County to make Bear Valley Parkway and Valley Parkway four lanes to Valley Center Rd. Jackson says construction will start a year from now. There are three property owner holdouts along the proposed route that need to be resolved.

Motion: None

E5

Discussion and possible vote on a VCCPG request to DPW that they conduct a traffic survey on Valley Center Road just east of Sunset to determine volume and speed of traffic. There appears to be excessive speeding in this area and more enforcement may be needed. (Davis)

Discussion: Davis cites the traffic count performed by the County on Lilac Road recently. He says we need to have another evaluation of traffic along Valley Center Road east of Sunset to get a better understanding of the volumes and speeds in that area that result from the VC Middle School and casinos.		
Motion: Move to have Chair write a letter to DPW to conduct a traffic study of volume and speed along Valley Center Road just east of Sunset Road.		
Maker/Second: Davis/Rudolf		Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
F	Group Business	
F1	1) Announcements and Correspondence Received	
<p>a. Department of Public Works to VCCPG. The County of San Diego will construct improvements on Valley Center Road south of Mirar De. Valle Road including replacing the existing channelizers with a narrow raised median along the existing left turn pocket. Construction will begin in November and be complete by January 2014.</p> <p>b. From DPDS to VCCPG; Michael LeBlanc. LeBlanc Garage Administrative Permit, PDS2013-AD-13-024, located at 14637 Tyler Road. The AD for a detached oversized accessory structure of 2,431 square feet, as built, two story oversized garage with workshop and recreation room has been approved.</p>		
Quinley announces that we will elect new officers and committee chairs. Asks commttee chairs to poll members for continued interest and new appointments if any. Quinley suggests that Orrin Miller consider interest in a committee assignment.		
F2	Discussion and vote on recommending the appointment of Orrin Miller by the Board of Supervisors to the Valley Center Community Planning Group (Britsch)	
Discussion: Britsch cites Orrin Miller's presentation last month and asks for questions. Vick asks to review the application.		
Motion: Move to approve recommendation of Orrin Miller for seat #15 vacancy.		
Maker/Second: Britsch/Rudolf		Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
F3	Introduction of candidates for open seats on the VCCPGP (Brisch)	
Discussion: No new candidates to introduce.		
F4	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 January 13, 2014	
G	Motion to Adjourn:	
		9.35pm
Maker/Second: Quinley/Rudolf		Carries/Fails: 11-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

Attachment for item E1:

NORTH VILLAGE as endorsed by VC Community – circa 2009

The Master Plan for the North Village shows a pedestrian-oriented "Main Street" with a Town Green, abundant recreational greens and open spaces. Feathered from the commercial core are a mix of residential neighborhoods, each with a variety of housing types, lot sizes, and architectural styles. Through the use of site designs and architectural treatments that emulate historically authentic patterns and structures, the built environment will appear to have been built across time, beginning in the 1860s and continuing to the present.

