

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

FALLBROOK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 16 April 2012, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

NOTE: There will be 8 seats on the Fallbrook Planning Group up for election in the November General Elections. Application can be made at the San Diego County Registrar of Voters between 16 July and 10 August.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Jim Russell.

Twelve (13) members were present: Anne Burdick, Eileen Delaney, Donna Gebhart, Jackie Heyneman, Ron Miller, Roy Moosa, Jim Russell, Jean Dooley, Tom Harrington, Steve Smith, Jack Wood, Ike Perez and Michele Bain. Harry Christiansen was excused. Paul Schaden was not present. (He has been approved by the Planning Group to replace Chuck Sanacore, but is awaiting formal appointment from the Board of Supervisors.)

Mr. Russell read the following actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on March 28, 2012 in regard to Planning and Sponsor Groups.

**5.1 ACTION: A1 and A2 Community Planning and Sponsor Groups
ON MOTION of Supervisor Jacob, seconded by Supervisor Slater-Price,
the Board received the staff analysis of the Red Tape Reduction Task
Force (RTRTF) Recommendations and took the following actions:**

- **Rejected the RTRTF Recommendations noted in Attachment A, under A1 and A2, and retained Community Planning and Sponsor Groups (CPG/CSGs) as they currently exist.**
- **Directed the Chief Administrative Officer to return to the Board with revisions to Board Policies I-1 and I-1A to reflect the following staff recommended changes:**
 - **require training before being seated;**
 - **require annual training (in person or online);**
 - **provide a meeting agenda template;**
 - **make legal defense and indemnification dependent upon Community Planning and Sponsor Group members completing training and being in good standing;**
 - **modernize Board Policy I-1 requirements for Community Planning and Sponsor Group management;**
 - **identify that when Community Planning and Sponsor Groups make specific requests of an applicant that such requests be made through the County Project Manager.**
- **Directed the Chief Administrative Officer to return to the Board with a chairperson rotation process.**
- **Refer to the Chief Administrative Officer for funding for these recommendations to come out of the General Fund - \$40,000.**

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Groups jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item.

Ms. Shirley Fender introduced a request to have Rocky Crest (from Mission to Hill) given priority for a Capital Improvement Project. She stated that the public utilized the road heavily and the condition of the road is becoming dangerous to drive. She stated that public road easements have already been accepted by the County on both ends of the segment of roadway with Irrevocable Offers of Dedication held by the County for the remainder of the right of way. With public use growing, public dedications in place and the segment of road already on the CIP list, Ms. Fender asked for the Group's assistance elevating the priority of Rocky Crest.

Mr. Russell asked Ms. Burdick to discuss the issue with the Traffic Advisory Committee to see what can be done. He also stated that the item would be placed on a future agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 19 March 2012. Voting item.

Ms. Bain motioned to approve the minutes as presented and the motion passed with 12 in favor and Ms. Delaney abstaining.

3. Presentation by Ron, Steve, Department of Public Works on the proposed Fallbrook Street Extension and alignment. 858-694-2567, Steve.Ron@sdcountry.ca.gov. **Circulation Committee**. Community input. Non-voting item.

As you know, residents and Circulation Committee members at the February 14, 2012 Field Review and Circulation Committee meeting had several questions about the need for Fallbrook Street Extension.

Since that time we confirmed that Fallbrook Street Extension was shown on the previous General Plan and on the General Plan Update recently adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

We also confirmed that the General Plan Update did not study alternatives to Fallbrook Street Extension. This was not an error or omission, rather, alternatives are not studied during the planning phase if the issue was never raised during public review.

Therefore, in order to provide a more complete picture to the Planning Group and residents, DPW will analyze and present a comparison of Alternative 3A, 4, and widening Stage Coach Lane and Reche Road (Alternative 5). Upon completion of this analysis and presenting it to the Planning Group this summer, DPW will recommend a preferred alignment based on the new information for EIR purposes. The EIR will take 9-12 months, during which additional public comment will be accepted.

Mr. Steve Ron presented the item. He stated that since there were so many concerns with the current alternatives to the Fallbrook Street extension project, the County had decided to study a fifth alternative. This would be to improve Reche Road (from Fallbrook Street to Stagecoach) and Stage Coach Lane (from Reche to Fallbrook Street) in lieu of the extension project. A traffic study as well as environmental and right-of-way impact studies would be done as a part of the comparison. He stated that the study would evaluate improvement of the intersections (Fallbrook Street –Stagecoach and Stagecoach-Reche) as a separate project, as well as improving the intersections in conjunction with widening the entire stretches of roads. Mr. Ron stated that the study of Alternative 5 would take 5 to 7 months. Then the EIR of the identified project would take another 9 to 12 months. During that time frame DPW would be searching for funding to acquire right-of-way and construct.

Members of the public requested that pushing Reche Road through to Mission Road would provide a great deal more east-west connectivity than the Fallbrook Street extension. They asked if Mr. Ron would study that alternative as well. Mr. Ron stated that the immediate issue was

traffic between the start and end of the extension project. The only alternate would be to improve all or portions of the existing alignment of Reche and Stage Coach between the intersections in question.

Members of the public asked why a 30-year-old design did not have an updated traffic study to determine if it was still viable. Mr. Ron stated that the study he was proposing to do would answer the question of viability. Mr. Ron also stated that, while the EIR process would allow for public comment, his study would be presented to the Community and he encouraged public comment at that time.

Members of the public once again asked for a special meeting of the Planning Group to further discuss the community concerns with the project. Mr. Russell stated that a meeting would be held once the County's study was complete and ready for review.

After lengthy discussion Mr. Russell thanked Mr. Ron for the presentation and said the Planning Group would be looking forward to the results of the study.

4. DPW has created a website to host the **draft** technical information for the TIF Update. It is located at the top of the main TIF webpage: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/tif.html> And here is the direct link: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/tifupdate2012.html> . There you will find many detailed documents and an outline of our expected process just as we have described during our public engagement sessions. We will look at the roads now included and prepare comments for the Board of Supervisors' meeting on **June 27**. The direct link to these materials has a summary of the process and a list of all related documents.
<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/tifupdate2012.html>.

The summary page would be important for members to read, as well as to look through the "Transportation Needs Assessment Report" (a 127-page document, but the first 35 pages provide a summary, and of those only 6 describe roads/costs in Fallbrook).

It would also be important to look at the TIF Facilities map shown at:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/Docs/FacilitiesMapNorth.pdf> (This is the map that they posted on the wall at their meeting last month, but they did not have copies available to distribute.)

Also included at this link are the documents related to the GP Update. The Mobility Element map is an 84 page document that has been available for some time and I think most members already have a copy of it. County Planner **Everett Hauser**, PTP, Transportation Specialist, DPW Land Development, 858-694-2412. Circulation committee. Community input. Voting item.

Ms. Burdick introduced the discussion and distributed related materials. She stated that she had attended a County presentation on the re-structuring being proposed to the Traffic Impact Fee program. Several exhibits were presented that showed how the fees were scheduled to be reduced and the new limited application of the funds in the Fallbrook area. The proposed segments of roads scheduled for TIF funding, as shown on the map and list distributed to members, are primarily located adjacent to future development at the junction of I-15 and Highway 76, plus a segment on Stage Coach, one on Reche, and two small segments on Fallbrook Street. Ms. Burdick stated that the Transportation Planning Section of DPW has offered to re-check the TIF table and map information, and double check their assessment, for any road improvements that the Planning Group felt should not have been removed from the TIF list.

She further reported that the Circulation Committee had passed a motion to request three things of the County.

- 1) Ask DPLU to incorporate the Planning Group in the decisions on how to apply TIF funds derived from projects in the Fallbrook area.
- 2) Request that DPLU provide a report on the funds acquired by the County on Fallbrook projects to date and the plans for allocating these funds.
- 3) Work with the Planning Group early in the project development phase.

Mr. Russell offered a brief history of the TIF program and suggested that the Planning Group further study the materials and identify any previously-listed TIF road improvements that should have been included on the current TIF list. After limited discussion on Mr. Russell's recommendation, Ms. Burdick motioned to return the item to the Circulation Committee in order to identify those road projects for submission to DPW. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Presentation by Carl Stiehl, Land Use Environmental Planner II, Advance Planning, County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, 858.694.2216, carl.stiehl@sdcounty.ca.gov, on the following. " as part of the General Plan Update adoption in August 2011, thousands of parcels were rezoned with new and revised use regulations, building types, lot sizes, special area regulations, etc. in property specific zoning. There were some minor errors, omissions and oversights that can now be corrected comprehensively with a countywide cleanup rezone to help with implementation of the new General Plan. There are a few changes in Fallbrook.

We'll be sending out some maps next week for your group to consider. Additionally, property owners affected will be noticed next week. I just wanted to give you a heads up, since we're headed to the Planning Commission in May and your next meeting will be your first opportunity to provide comments. At your request, I am available to attend your next meeting and clarify and recommended changes in zoning. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Stiehl presented the request. His assignment was to update zoning to match the new General Plan modifications. The list of changes had 36 instances where Use Regulations, Animal Regulations, Density, Lot Size, Building Type, Height regulations, Set Back, Open Space or Special Area Regulations needed to be modified to match surrounding zoning. Mr. Stiehl went over each change. The members of the Group had several questions about the proposed changes but were satisfied with Mr. Stiehl's explanations with the exception of the parcels that were earmarked for a Height change (FA-HT-1). Mr. Stiehl explained that the surrounding parcels had P height designation allowing 4 stories with a maximum height of 65 feet. The Planning Group was confused since the Community Plan clearly has a maximum height of 35 feet. Mr. Stiehl stated that the Community Plan would trump the zoning. However the Planning Group was hesitant to approve such a conflictive zoning designation. After limited discussion Ms. Delaney motioned to approve all for the suggested zoning designation changes with the exception of FA-HT-1. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6 Response to the county on several requests for changes in Fallbrook properties designations made by the General Plan Update. County planner: Kevin Johnson, 858-694-3084, Kevin.johnson@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee.** Community input. Voting item.

Video recordings of the January 9, 10 and 11 workshops with the Board of Supervisors are available for public viewing on the Board's webpage at:

<http://sdcounty.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view id=2>

FB2, Owner: FRITZ FAMILY TRUST, Pala Mesa Dr and Rice Canyon Road. Former General Plan Designation (17) 1du/2, 4 ac. Current GP: RL20, **Request: SR2. Level of change MAJOR**

FB18, Owner: FRITZ FAMILY TRUST, South of Pala Mesa Heights Drive on Rice Canyon Road, Former General Plan: (20) Gen Ag 1du/10ac, Current GP: RL40, **Request: SR10. Level of change MAJOR**

FB 17, The county and the property owner have a compromise (graphic attached) for the General Plan Update Property Specific Request (PSR) FB17 (PSR requested by Diane Garrett; property

near Reche Road and I-15). I was hoping you could place this on your April agenda for a vote on the compromise graphic detailing a split designation of SR-2 and SR-1.

Mr. Wood presented the items. As for FB 17 the property owner and the County had reached an agreement on splitting the zoning on his property along Reche Road to blend better with the surrounding property designations. The steeper portion (westerly) of the property would be designated SR-2 with the flatter easterly portion designated as SR-1. The only remaining issue was the line of demarcation between the two designations. The County had originally proposed splitting the designation on Assessor Parcel lines but the property owner requested splitting the designations on an MWD aqueduct easement that bisected his property and also represented a major development constraint. County staff had agreed to move the demarcation line if the Planning Group had no objections.

After limited discussion Mr. Wood motioned to approve of moving the demarcation line to the aqueduct easement on FB 17. The motion passed unanimously.

Next Mr. Wood introduced FB-2 and FB-18. On these two parcels the Planning Group had approved changing them to RL-10. However, there is no RL-10 designation. The correct designation should have been SR-10.

After limited discussion Mr. Wood motioned to request approval of the SR-10 designation on both FB-2 and FB-18. The motion passed unanimously.

- 7 AD12-008 Request for an Administrative Permit for an existing second dwelling unit on the 3.03 acres located at 1976 Willow Glen Road, APN 102-711-37. Owner Lynne Auret 760-723-2159. County planner Beth Ehsan, Beth.Ehsan@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use Committee. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Auret presented the request to approve an administrative permit, stating that his property had been red tagged by the County for not having a permitted second unit. The unit was existing at the time of his purchase. The administrative permit had been negotiated with the County once an upgraded septic system was installed and a permit to expand the primary residence was acquired. Mr. Auret informed the Group that an updated Septic System has been installed and the primary residence expansion permit applied for.

Mr. Wood reported that the Land Use Committee had reviewed the request and approved it.

Mr. Auret further requested relief from the fees that he was being asked to pay to the County since he was expending a large amount of funds on updating records that he felt the County should have retained on file.

Mr. Russell advised that he should take that request to Supervisor Horn's staff. Mr. Wood stated he would provide the appropriate contact information.

At this point Mr. Wood motioned to approve the Administrative Permit and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
Tom Harrington, secretary.