Valley Center Community Planning Group
Minutes of the March 10, 2014 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 DPD=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 Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 17 March 2014; 10 April 2014 corrected
Approved: 14 April 2014

A [1] Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:  7:08 PM
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Notes: * numbers in brackets indicate actual order of consideration

Quorum Established: 10 present


C [3] Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of February 10, 2014

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Jackson  Carries/Fails: 10-0-0 (Y-N-A) Voice

D [4] Public Communication/Open Forum:

Jon Vick distributes copies of Parks & Recreation District Survey to all VCCPG Members and all members of audience, urging participation.

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

E1 [6] Informational item on the proposed construction, operation and maintenance of a photovoltaic (PV) solar facility on land owned by SDG&E next to the existing substation at 29560 Valley Center Road. Facilities will allow for the long-term generation of energy from solar power connected to the local electrical distribution grid. Overall production capacity is expected to be enough to serve 500 households. (Smith)

Discussion: Ian Stewart, SDG&E Regional Public Affairs presents information sheet, trails map and photo of area for proposed 1-megawatt solar facility adjacent to SDG&E Substation on VC Road. He explains the line around the parcels shows the area to which they must give legal notice of the project. It will be constructed on approximately 4 ¾ acres of the 6-acre parcel, the balance vacant to avoid the 100-year floodplain through the parcel. The panel will be fixed at a 20-degree tilt, and staggered in height to ensure all panels will be 12 inches above the potential high water level. He introduces the IES design/construction contractor members, who explain their expertise and indicate construction would probably begin in about 1 year. Members Johnson and Glavinic express concern that VC will become target for even more sites. Mr. Stewart says their plans are for a 2-megawatt site in Pala and 5 megawatt in Ramona, and explains the potential is unlikely but exists. The capacity of the substation is the limit, but there has to be a need for the electricity, and someone has to pay the cost. He states there will be no chemicals to affect adjacent wells using groundwater, all lines are insulated so no possibility of arcing to cause fire, connection to substation will be underground 12K pole on-site. Chairperson Smith says aesthetics will be a major issue. Landscape consultant Amanda Gonzalez says the on-site oaks will have to be removed, and mitigated for. Member Rudolf expresses frustration at lack of specificity in proposal, process requiring submittal to VCCPG before definitive project can be presented for comment. As Chairperson of VC Trails Association, he requests trail through project site connecting VC Road to Vesper Road, and potential future pathways along those roads to make circle with new trails on Sol Orchard solar project farther.
east on Vesper. He suggests project go to DRB before returning to VCCPG. Neighbor Michael Curley relieved with answers regarding fire and groundwater impacts, but says would rather have it be somewhere else. Mr. Stewart says they will be discussing the trail potential with VCTA, hope to file their application in April, and be back in May.

**Motion:** None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E3 [11]</th>
<th>Wright Second Dwelling Unit at 12471 Mirar de Valle Rd. PDS2014-AD-14-005. Owners are Craig and Julie Wright at 253-431-1237; Project Engineer is Pat Taylor as <a href="mailto:asuram1@yahoo.com">asuram1@yahoo.com</a> or 619-532-3159. The project is to convert the existing main house garage into a home entertainment room and to construct a new, detached second dwelling unit with a 2-car garage. The proposed new second dwelling unit will be used to house elderly parents who have become ill. The new dwelling unit living area is 888 sq.ft. which is 35% of the main house living area. The project included only finish grading with far less than 200 cubic yards of cut and fill. Existing drainage patterns remain unchanged. The project is on septic. (LaVenture).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Chairperson Smith presents item due to surgery absence of member Laventure. He states fire department is satisfied with 15-foot west side setback, and only neighbor concern was whether second dwelling was going to be directly underneath adjacent house. Renter says probably OK with owner, since it is not. He states architecture will match main house so permit finding can be satisfied. Owners say unit will be for aging parents needing assistance.

**Motion:** To recommend approval, subject to any fire and scoping letter conditions.

**Maker/Second:** Smith/Franck  
**Carries/Fails:** 8-1-0 [Y-N-A] Voice; Jackson dissents

**Notes:** Quinley departs at 9.43 pm after vote on previous item [E10]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E4 [5]</th>
<th>Administrative permit for an oversized structure for the McGuire Game/Hobby Room at 31121 Stardust Lane PDS2014-AD-14-006. The project involves the construction of a 2 story, 2014 square foot structure on a 2.5 acre property. The structure will honor all building setback limits and comply with all zoning regulations and building codes. Owner is Dave McGuire at <a href="mailto:dave@mcguireconsulting.com">dave@mcguireconsulting.com</a>; Contact person is Dough Pedersen at <a href="mailto:doug@idads.com">doug@idads.com</a>. (Britsch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Member Britsch distributes 15-page handout explaining project setting and requirements. He explains county planner advises 15-foot setback (same as main house) is sufficient, not 18-feet otherwise required, but owner negotiating with Fire Department about 30-foot “request.” Planner also requiring shower for full bath, and outdoor stairs, for living quarters separate entrance. Permit needed for excess square footage: By right 2,000 square feet are allowed: Asking for a total of 3,122 sq. ft. (1,970 sq. ft. current garage plus 1,152 sq. ft. hobby room of new structure) for detached garage/hobby room; and for guest living quarters, by right 600 square feet are allowed: Asking for a total of 1,125 sq. ft. Additional area, up to 50% of the square footage of the primary dwelling (in this case 4,720 sq. ft.). Member Glavinic objects that proposed structure is too large, out of place with the neighborhood, and not consistent with the main house architecture because the roof is not tile. He suggests adding a condition requiring IODs to make Stardust Lane potential future public road for emergency egress. Member Jackson expresses concern that the zoning is SR-2, allowing only 1 dwelling, but approval could lead to rental use, adding to burden on roads. Britsch clarifies that planner says use can only be intermittent, not permanent, in response to Rudolf query. Neighbors Larry Eskildsen, Steve Laguisse, and Michael Day make clear that neighbors do not have existing IODs, and do not want project conditioned to require applicant and/or neighbors to give them; do not want public road.

**Motion:** To recommend approval of the additional area requested by the applicant, as the proposed project meets the SD County Administrative Permit Findings, subject to the fire and septic conditions in the SD County Planning and Development Services (PDS) Scoping letter yet to be developed, adding “Guest quarters” to the “Description of Proposed Use”, and trees for screening between the new structure and the adjacent property to the north.
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|

**E5 [12]**

Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District Environmental Impact Report for a District Sports Field Project. Comments must be received by March 17, 2014 and should be directed to Julie Macy Kimball, Chief Business Officer VCPUSD at 28751 Cole Grade Road, Valley Center 92082 or email comments to Kimball.ju@vcpusd.org. The project proposes a multi-use turn sports field in the southeastern quadrant of Cole Grade Road and VC School Road on a 1.9 acre site. (Rudolf)

**Discussion:** Member Vick recuses himself because of his participation in litigation about district’s alleged illegal destruction of the historic buildings on the site. Rudolf presents proposed EIR Comments letter (Attachment #1 hereto) addressed to district with copy to county. Chairperson Smith and member Jackson point out letter must be addressed to county, with copy to school district, per new Board Policy I-1. Member Glavinic says second paragraph is incorrect because county parks goal is only 3 acres per 1000 population for active parkland. Rudolf advises General Plan goal for local parks is 10 acres per thousand (different goal for Regional Parks). Glavinic has goal confused with county Parkland Dedication Ordinance, which is limited by state law to extracting only 3 acres via the PLDO ordinance.

**Motion:** To approve the letter as written and direct Chairperson to send, reversing the addressee and copy recipients.

**Maker/Second: Rudolf/ Jackson**

**Carries/Fails: 5-3-1 [Y-N-A] Voice; Smith, Glavinic, & Johnson dissent, Vick recused/abstained**

**Motion:** To approve the letter with second paragraph deleted, and direct Chairperson to send, reversing the addressee and copy recipients.

**Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic**

**Carries/Fails: 8-0-1 [Y-N-A] Voice; Vick recused/abstains**

**E5A [13]**

Meeting time extension

**Motion:** To Extend the Meeting to 10:15 pm.

**Maker/Second: Smith/Britsch**

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

**E6 [8]**

Presentation (and discussion following) from Gladys Gonzalez, San Diego Land Use Environmental Planner on ground water projects to improve water quality for the Unincorporated County. (Smith)

**Discussion:** County Environmental Planner Gladys Gonzales distributes flyer describing the county Watershed Protection Program, and asks for suggestions for projects the county could apply for. The purpose is to mitigate storm water pollution impacts. She explains the county’s “Green Streets” provisions, requiring redesign of streets to capture pollutants before they enter groundwater or runoff. She states purchase of a 147-acre parcel at the bottom of keys Creek Canyon could be an excellent project meeting requirements for both land purchase to preserve floodplain functions and stream or riparian area rehabilitation. Suggestions are due March 28, 2014 to project consultant Rick Engineering.

**Motion:** None

**E7 [9]**

Rancho Guejito Farm Road Restoration; Notice of Intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration; PDS2013-LDGRMJ-0039; PDS2013-LPR-13-006. This project is a restoration, grading and re-vegetation plan to restore 10.7 acres of unpermitted grading that occurred in 2011. The project is located within the SE portion of the 22,544-acre Rancho Guejito property. The project impacts include fill removal, remedial grading and slope restoration for the site. It will restore a total of 4.3 acres of habitat that were illegally graded. (Quinley)

**Discussion:** Vice Chairperson Quinley distributes a 1-page handout (Attachment #2 hereto) regarding the
The county’s notice of intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration regarding the restoration grading and revegetation plan to cure the Rancho Guejito owner’s illegal road creation on the rancho.

**Motion:** To endorse the Mitigated Negative Declaration that the county intends to adopt with regard to the Rancho Guejito Farm Road Restoration. Removal of the unpermitted road grading and restoration of the land with great care for riparian habitat, and the species that inhabit the land is applauded.

**Maker/Second:** Quinley/Glavinic  
**Carries/Fails:** 10-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E8 [14]</th>
<th>Report on review and recommendations for the Rincon Reservation Environmental Assessment. (Glavinic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Member Glavinic distributed an undated page of draft minutes of the Tribal Liaison Committee with four recommendations from the four members of the committee then present, and a 2-page draft letter dated March 6, 2014, apparently drafted by the Mobility Committee for presentation to the VCCPG, but without a quorum of the committee present. Glavinic reports comments on the Draft EA are due tomorrow.

**Motion:** To direct the Chairperson to send the 4 recommendations to the county, copy to Rincon, over the Chairperson’s signature (copy of Chairperson’s letter sent Attachment #? hereto).

**Maker/Second:** Glavinic/Johnson  
**Carries/Fails:** 9-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E9 [15]</th>
<th>Discussion and possible vote on a response to the Feb 20, 2014 Land Development Performance (LDP) Committee request for Board of Supervisors Clarification on LPD “purpose, operation and/or function”. (Jackson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Item continued to April meeting due to lack of time to consider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E10 [10]</th>
<th>Discussion and possible vote on a Planning Group letter or action in response to the decision by DPW to allow Wayne Hilbig’s Butterfield Ranch project (at Sunday Drive and Valley Center Road) to make cuts in the median on Valley Center Road. (Quinley)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Vice Chairperson Quinley distributes a draft letter to PDS Department Director Wardlaw, excerpts from the VC Design Guidelines, and member Vick distribute a photo of the existing median at Sunday Drive. She explains the very recent discovery that DPW added a condition to the Alti Corporation Butterfield Ranch project (which the VCCPG enthusiastically supported) at the last minute before the Planning Commission, without prior VCCPG knowledge or discussion; and the current north village proposals for additional removal of existing medians. The proposed letter request a meeting with PDS staff to explore alternatives to their removal, since they are at the heart of the vision or Valley Center Road development.

Member Vick points out the “gap analysis in the traffic study points out there is no need for the left turn lane existing the project and removal of 650 feet of median, but it is shown as strikeout text. Member Glavinic wants the letter to also address the need for an alternative route through town. Member Rudolf suggests that was resolved as part of the general Plan Update process (no viable alternatives found) and would sidetrack discussion of destruction of the median. He suggests letter strikes the appropriate positive tone, to try to get assistance to find alternative solutions.

**Motion:** To Approve the draft and direct the Chairperson to send the letter to Director Wardlaw.

**Maker/Second:** Quinley/Glavinic  
**Carries/Fails:** 10-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E11 [7]</th>
<th>Presentation by San Diego County Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Weights and Measures on proposed revision to the County Bee-Keeping ordinance. Entomologist Dr. Tracy Ellis will talk to the Planning Group and can respond to questions. (Smith)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Dr. Tracy Ellis explains difference between European honeybees and African “killer bees.” The proposed ordinance changes are in response to San Diego city changes and the reduced numbers of honeybees. The purpose is to increase opportunities for pollination by honeybees by reducing the distances.
for beekeepers boxes and adjacent roadways, structures and sensitive sites. Options would include increased certification/education requirements and BMPs for beekeepers. Member Glavinic requests ordinance also include county extermination of the 80% hybridized bees. Dr. Ellis explains the ordinance only controls beekeepers of honeybees, and the county has no role regarding extermination of killer bees. She distributes chart showing ordinance change options, requests feedback to the department.

**Motion:** None

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Group Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Welcome to new any new member following BOS approval. (Smith)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Not addressed for lack of time

| F2 [15] | Introduction of candidates for open seats on the VCCPG (Britsch) |

**Discussion:** Nominations Committee Chairperson Britsch distributed the Application and introduced Mr. Macias. Mr. Macias recounted his work history and interest in becoming a member. He responded to Member Rudolf’s question that he has not read the Community Plan. Member Glavinic stated Mr. Macias would be a valuable addition because he would bring the perspective of a resident of the Valley View gated community.

**Motion:** To extend the application period for the remaining vacant seat to 7.00 pm, April 9, and introduction of applicants for seat #14, term expiring January 2015, to the April 14 meeting.

**Maker/Second:** Rudolf/Britsch | Carries/Fails: 9-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

| F3 | Next regular meeting scheduled for April 14, 2014 |

| G [16] | Motion to Adjourn: By expiration of extended time 10.15 pm |

**Maker/Second:** | Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A]

**Correspondence Received for the March meeting:**

1. Department of Public Works to VCCPG; Prioritization request for Roadway Pavement Maintenance and Capital Improvement Projects in the Valley Center Community Planning Group Area and Road Condition Index categories. (Jackson)

**Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group**

- a) Mobility – Mark Jackson
- 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) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair
- g) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair
- h) Website – Oliver Smith, Chair
- i) Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- j) Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair
March 11, 2014

Todd Snyder
Chief of Advanced Planning
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
todd.snyder@sdcounty.ca.gov

Re: Comments on VCPUSD Draft EIR for Sports fields at School Lane

Todd,

Following are the comments of the Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) on the District’s Draft EIR for Sports fields at School Lane. Initially we point out that the VCCPG sent the District a letter on March 13, 2013, urging the District to work with the community to support some type of historic recognition at the site, regardless of what the ultimate use for the site became. We note, regretfully, that District Board and Superintendent have refused to do so.

1. Project objectives, baseline, background, description, areas of controversy, and alternatives

These portions of the EIR are all fundamentally flawed, and skew all the analysis that follows. They neglect to deal with the CEQA-required “Whole of the Project,” which includes the prior destruction of the historic buildings on the site, without any environmental analysis. It is easy to conclude there are no environmental impacts, when you don’t include destruction of the most important part of the Project as part of the Project.

The Notice of Preparation of EIR dated September 18, 2013 includes (in Figure 2) an aerial photo correctly showing the buildings intact. Since the DEIR Notice includes the site prior to demolition, the baseline data of the DEIR should be prior to demolition, not 6 months afterwards.

There is no sketch, diagram, or verbal definition of the proposed sports fields, preventing the reader from determining whether any of the analysis is accurate. There is no description of the location of the rejected alternative sites, preventing the reader from determining if a 1.9-acre portion of some other District-owned parcel could equally well serve the asserted project objectives. As the analysis shows, the project objectives are duplicative, overlapping, and so narrowly written that they can only be satisfied by the proposed Project (not the required “reasonable range” of alternatives). Those objectives, of course, lead to a self-serving and biased environmental analysis.
Although the previous destruction of the historic buildings is listed as an “area of controversy,” it is never responded to in any meaningful way except to say that they were destroyed. There should be discussion and analysis of CEQA’s whole of the project/no project splitting fundamental basis, and how or why destruction is not part of the Project, but there is none.

2. County is a “Responsible Agency” regarding Zoning/Land Use
The Land Use discussion is inaccurate and misleading. The General Plan and Community Plan Land Use designations are appropriate for the proposed sports fields, but the RR Zoning only allows them under “Special Circumstances.” The County determines whether such “Special Circumstances” exist and whether the ordinance requirements are met, not the District, unilaterally. This need for discretionary approval from the county makes San Diego County a “Responsible Agency” whose status the EIR totally ignores.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. These comments were discussed and voted on at our regular VCCPG meeting on March 10, 2014 with a vote of 10 ayes, 0 nays, and 0 abstentions.

Regards,
Oliver Smith [by smh]
Chair, VCCPG
Cc: Julie Macy Kimball, Chief Business Officer, VCPUSD kimball.iu(vcpusd.orq
March 11, 2014

Dixie Switzer
Planner
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
Dixie.Switzer@sdcounty.ca.gov

Re: Rincon Casino Expansion Environment Assessment (EA) Review

Dixie,

The Valley Center Community Planning Group has reviewed the “FINAL” Rincon Casino Expansion Environment Assessment (EA) as it relates to traffic impacts to VC and our neighbors to the north & east.

1) The Planning Group appreciated Rincon volunteering fair share financial contributions to the many traffic impacts the SR 76 and VC Road, but in particular to the VC Rd segment, North Escondido City Limits to Beven Drive and widening to a 4-Lane Major Road Standard, with the help of TransNet funds.

2) It was noted that there needs to be a process to identify funds which are retained & targeted to address only the DIRECT TRAFFIC IMPACTS to the segment of Valley Center Rd between No. Lake Wohlford & west to Cole Grade Rd and the intersection of SR 76 & Valley Center Rd. These improvements must be part of any mitigation.

3) The traffic impacts to the Lilac/Old Castle corridor need to be considered and part of any comprehensive solution developed before a “less than significant” determination is made.

4) To allow for the maximum amount of funding to address the direct traffic impacts listed above, we strongly encourage and request that County Staff negotiate mitigation funding that will cover the complete costs of design and construction of those direct impact mitigations, in addition to whatever overhead charges are expected.

These recommendations were approved by the VCCPG at our regular meeting on March 10, 2014 with a vote of 9 ayes, 0 nays, and 0 abstentions

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, VCCPG

Cc: Nikki Symington  Nikki Symington nsymington42@gmail.com