Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Ten (10) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Roy Moosa, Tom Harrington, Paul Schaden, Jim Russell, Jerry Farrell, Jack Wood, Lee J. De Meo, and Donna Gebhart. Ron Miller, Jean Dooley, Eileen Delaney, Jackie Heyneman and Michele Bain were not present.


NONE.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 16 September 2013. Voting Item.

Mr. Wood motioned to approve the minutes and it passed unanimously.

3. GPA05-003, SPA -001, REZ 05-005, TM5424. Campus Park West located in the north east corner of I-15 and SR-76. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego is circulating for public review a draft Environmental Impact Report in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act along with a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan for the following project. The draft Environmental Impact Report, General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan can be reviewed on the World Wide Web at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/ceqa_public_review.html and at Planning & Development Services (PDS), Project Processing Counter, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, California 92123 and at the public libraries listed below. Comments on these draft documents must be sent to the PDS address listed above and should reference the project numbers and name. PDS2005-3800-05-003 (GPA). PDS2005-3813-05-001 (SP). PDS2005-3600-05-005 (REZ). PDS2005-3100-5424 (TM), HLP XX-XXX, LOG NO. 3910 05-02-009 (ER). SCH NO. 2009061043, CAMPUS PARK WEST PROJECT. The Campus Park West project is a proposed amendment to the Hewlett-Packard Campus Park Specific Plan; and is the result of changes in land ownership and regional planning goals, generally consistent with the 2011 County General Plan. The Project proposes two design scenarios. One (Scenario 1) is sited within the original Project boundaries and covers approximately 116.5 acres. The other (Scenario 2) would incorporate approximately 2.1 additional acres into the Project that are currently held as State Route 76 (SR-76) right-of-way by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Because SR-76 is now built to its final anticipated configuration and the excess right-of-way is not anticipated to be required for state route operations, this area would be decertified and could be sold to the Project Applicant. Should this occur, the Project would encompass a total of 118.6 acres. Under both Scenarios 1 and 2, the Project includes review and proposed approval of four discretionary actions. These include:
- A Tentative Map (TM 5424) to subdivide the property into 23 lots;
- A Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 05-001) to amend the 1983-approved Specific Plan to the currently proposed mix of uses;
- A Rezone (REZ 05-005) from S90 to S88; and,
- A General Plan Amendment (GPA 05-003) to revise or reconfigure land use designations as well as amend the Mobility Element (ME)
Specifically, the GPA would: (1) change the Regional Category on two parcels south of SR-76 from Rural to Village; (2) change the land use designation of three parcels south of SR-76 from Specific Plan to General Commercial and Rural Land 40; (3) expand Limited Impact Industrial uses north of SR-76 south to Pala Mesa Drive; (4) reconfigure land use designations north of SR-76 to reflect the Project SPA; and (5) amend the ME to reclassify Pankey Road from a Collector to a Boulevard with Class II bike facilities from Pala Mesa Drive to Shearer Crossing, apply Class II bike facilities to the portion of Pala Mesa Drive within Project boundaries, and designate Pala Mesa Drive between the western Project boundary and Old Highway 395 as a Class III bike route.

The draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) identifies significant and unavoidable environmental impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Transportation and Traffic. The DEIR also identifies significant and mitigated environmental impacts to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, and Paleontological Resources.

In accordance with Section 86.104 of County of San Diego Ordinance No. 8365 (N.S.) and Section 4.2.g of the Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Communities Conservation Plan Process Guidelines (November 1993), a Habitat Loss Permit is required because the project would impact Diegan coastal sage scrub.

Section 2762 of the Public Resources Code requires the County as lead agency under CEQA to prepare in conjunction with preparation of an EIR, and prior to approving the project, a statement specifying the County's reasons for permitting a proposed use in an area that contains mineral resource deposits of regional or statewide significance. The County of San Diego is considering the approval of the proposed Campus Park West project which would allow residential use on the project site which currently contains lands classified by the Mineral Resource Zone- (MRZ system. In addition to public circulation, this statement must be provided to the State Geologist and the State Mining and Geology Board for review and comment.

Comments on this DEIR, General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan and Draft HLP must be received no later than September 23, 2013 at 4:00 p.m. (a 45 day public review period). These draft documents can also be reviewed at the Fallbrook Library, located at 124 S. Mission Rd., Fallbrook, CA 92028. For additional information, please contact Dennis Campbell at (858) 505-6380 or bye-mail at Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov.

Comments on the project related to mineral resource issues should also be directed to Dennis Campbell at Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov or at the above address. Comments related to mineral resource issues must be received no later than October 8, 2013 at 4:00 p.m. (a 60 day public review period). County planners Kristin Blackson, Kristin.Blackson@sdcounty.ca.gov and Dennis Campbell, Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov.

Mr. Dennis Campbell was in attendance to answer any questions that came up on the topic. Mr. Moosa reported that the Design Review Committee had reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report and had the following concerns with the proposed design.

Mr. Dennis Campbell was in attendance to answer any questions that came up on the topic. Mr. Moosa reported that the Design Review Committee had reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report and had the following concerns with the proposed design.

"Acceptable architectural styles would include “rustic rural ranch” characteristics, “urban Victorian,” Mediterranean, ....."

While design styles are not specifically listed in the Community Character section of the Fallbrook Community Plan, styles & materials are addressed in Commercial, Industrial & Multi-Family sections. They exclude Mediterranean. DEIR should be revised to reflect this in the architecture & landscaping.

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLAN
Commercial. Page 17
Policy LU 2.2.4 Encourage “Village Style” architecture, described as Craftsman, Victorian, Ranch, Colonial, Cottage Mission and Spanish architectural styles and utilization of building materials such as wood (simulated, non-combustible) rock, brick, stone or similar materials which are in harmony with the natural environment. These requirements aim to maintain and promote the
intimate personal scale of the Village, its character, and warmth.

Policy LU 2.3.4 Require the use of “Village Style“ architecture, described as Craftsman, Victorian, Ranch, Colonial, Cottage Mission and Spanish architectural styles and utilization of building materials such as wood (simulated, non-combustible) rock, brick, stone or similar materials which are in harmony with the natural environment. These requirements aim to maintain and promote the intimate personal scale of the Village, its character, and warmth.


The project does not propose the following tree species:
• All Eucalyptus
• Palms that exceed 20 feet at maturity such as:
  o Archontophoenix (All) o Brahea ()
  o Standard Cocos (Coconut Palm) o Julaea (Chilean Wine Palm)
  o Livistona (All)
  o Phoenix (All)
  o Pritchardia (All)
  o Rhapalostylis (All)
  o Roystonea (All)
  o Sabal (All)
  o Syagrus romanzoffianum aka Arecastrum romanzffinum (Queen Palm) o Washingtonia (All)
  o Caryota (All)

Pages 1.27-28
1.2.2.4

”Where there is a conflict between the Fallbrook Design Guidelines & San Diego County ZO sign regulations, the Project Specific Plan would control. Where the Specific Plan is silent, the County ZO (sections 6200 & 6250 would prevail.”

Many Design Guidelines for signage in Fallbrook conflict with County Ordinance. The most restrictive is what controls, so this should also apply to this project as well.

Chapter 6 II- 103

"WALL SIGN AREA"

General Commercial Signs
Signs should be no more than 50% of the architectural building element on which it is placed.

Industrial
Signs should be less than 50% of the architectural building element on which it is placed.

Page 1-58, Table 1-3.

Building heights should not exceed 35 feet for consistency throughout the region and comply with the Fallbrook Design Guidelines; With the exception of unoccupied architectural features which may not exceed 45 ft.

2.1.2.4

"Green Roofs"

While green roofs/rooftops are said to improve building energy efficiency, they should not be used to replace or calculate open space configurations in residential areas. They can be very costly to maintain (example -Fallbrook Library) and may also cause safety or liability issues.

Clarify- Children’s play areas will not be satisfied by roof tops

Figure 1-9, Appendix B

“The trees and landscaped street edges and open spaces would reduce and soften the strong geometric forms and lines, the bright or neutral colors, and hard textures that the

Proposed Project would introduce in to the viewshed when seen from areas within the viewshed that are at higher elevation, such as within Engel Family Preserve, Monserate Mountain Trail, and I-15 at the southern edge of the viewshed. The difference from the Fallbrook Design Guidelines, therefore, would not create a visual impact.”

More trees & shrubs should be used along the I-15 to reduce the visual impacts of the Project.
After limited discussion Mr. Moosa motioned to forward the concerns to the County for consideration. The motion passed unanimously.

4. TPM21209 Dawson TPM. Request to subdivide the parcel located at 131 East Elder Street, APN 104-055-23, into 2 parcels for two existing single family dwelling units Owner Carroll R. Dawson 760-728-3850. Contact person Patrick Harrosin 858-679-8868, harrisonrc@aol.com. County planner Kristina Jeffers, 858-694-2604, Kristina.jeffers@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use Committee.

Mr. Carroll Dawson was in attendance to answer questions.
Mr. Wood reported the Land Use Committee had inspected the site and had been informed that the two structures had been built in the 1940's. The divided lots would exceed the minimum lot size for the zoning and the Committee had no concerns with the request. After limited discussion Mr. Wood motioned to approve the request as presented and the motion passed unanimously.

5. AD12-023W1 Request for an Administrative Permit Modification to construct a 468 SqFt shade roof for a work area for olive processing beside the shanahan barn on the 2.46 acres at 5078 San Jacinto Circle East. Owner and contact person Mary Shanahan, 917-318-4842, mary.shanahan@icloud.com. County planner Donald Kraft, 858-694-3856, Donald.kraft@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use and Design Review Committees.

Ms. Mary Shanahan was in attendance to answer questions.
Mr. Wood reported the Land Use Committee had inspected the site and had no concerns with the request.
Mr. Moosa reported that the Design Review Committee had also reviewed the request and the members in attendance also had no concerns.
After limited discussion Mr. Wood motioned to approve the request as presented and the motion passed unanimously.


Mr. Larry Gabele introduced the request. Stating that he managed the building and that the operator of the Self Storage facility had matched the Straub signs on the building when Straub moved into the building 3.5 years ago. At that time Straub had acquired a variance for the larger letter size. The building recently sold to Straub and as a part of the deal the seller took responsibility for getting the existing signage approved or modify the signs.
The request was to leave the existing signage in place.
Mr. Moosa reported the Design Review Committee had reviewed the request and did have a concern with the size of the letters along Beech Street, but after discussion had recommended approval.
After limited Group discussion Mr. Moosa motioned to approve the request as presented and the motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting was adjourned at 7:25 pm
Tom Harrington, Secretary