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

Twelve (12) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Roy Moosa, Tom Harrington, Jean Dooley, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Lee J. De Meo, Ron Miller, Donna Gebhart, Jackie Heyneman and Jerry Farrell. Paul Schaden, Bill McCarthy and Eileen Delaney were excused.

A large audience was also in attendance.

Mr. Russell announced that there were seven openings on the Group and only five candidates had applied. He encouraged any additionally interested individuals to apply.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Group’s jurisdiction but not on today’s agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion, & Non-voting item. NONE.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 18 August 2014. Voting Item.

Ms. Gebhart motioned to approve the minutes as presented and the motion passed unanimously.


Mr. Murali Pasumarthi, Manager of Traffic Engineering, San Diego County Department of Public Works, outlined the County Regulations with this type of event. He detailed the individual county regulations for the issuance of Special Event Permit like this, which declared that events such as this needed to benefit the community and meet the traffic requirements of this type of permit. He stated that setting the date was key and then having an approved Traffic Safety and Emergency Services plans approved and in place prior to the issuance of the permit.

Ms. Knox and her event organizer and Mr. Jeff Stoner of Seasick Marketing, the promoter, updated the Group on their progress. They stated that the date of the event had been changed to May 23 to avoid conflict with other Fallbrook events. They illustrated the course, which was planned to follows last year’s alignment. Ms. Knox stated that the organizers were committed to addressing the County requirements and were working hard on clearing each requirement. Several members of the public spoke in support of the event.

After limited comments by the Group Mr. Moosa motioned to support the event as long as all County Requirements were met. The Motion passed unanimously.
4. Request for a waiver of the B Designator Design Review requirement for a Site Plan for a used car lot that will allow no more than three used cars at a time to be on the lot, located at 416 N. Pico Ave, APNs 103-131-02, 03 & 04. Owner David Paulsen, 760-532-7712, knightflight747@gmail.com. County planner Debra frischer, 858-495-5201, debra.froischer@sdcounty.ca.gov. Continued at the 18 August meeting. Design Review Committee. Community input. Voting item. (7/11)

Ms. Heyneman informed the Group that the Design Review Committee had meet with Mr. Paulson and apparently there had been a complication with his project and the County approval. The problem was going to require some rework of the proposed signage for the project and Mr. Paulson had requested a continuance.

Ms. Heyneman motioned to continue the item until next month. The motion passed unanimously.


Mr. Ted Marioncelli introduced the request and stated that after meeting with County staff and neighbors to the project, Verizon had decided to modify the proposed telecommunication facility appearance and location on the property. All access would be off Stage Coach eliminating the need to improve Reche Road. He noted that the design was intended to be 40 feet tall but could be cut down to 35 feet.

Mr. Moosa reported that the facilities Committee had met on the request. Mr. Marioncelli had presented the proposed changes. Also several members of the public had objected to the project. There were objections to the height of the tower and how that height was determined, the deed restriction on the vesting deed, lack of construction details on the plans and concerns with traffic congestion on Stage Coach. After in depth discussion the Committee had voted to continue the item until the Monday evening meeting. To allow an opportunity to further research the concerns brought up during the meeting. After the meeting Mr. Harrington reported back to the Committee chair that Ms. Smith at Planning and Development Services reported that both North County Fire and the County Fire Authority had reviewed the access to the existing buildings and had approved the plan. Also Ms. Smith had informed Mr. Harrington that County Counsel had reviewed the vesting deeds for the project and had no objection to the project.

Several members of the audience had concerns with the proposed development.

One member of the audience took exception to the proposed separation between the existing buildings and the proposed structures. He stated that his review of County regulations indicated that the required setbacks were not being met. Furthermore that if the doors in the existing building and the new facilities were opened at the same time the walkways would be blocked. He further stated that the existing retaining wall at the foot of the existing slope would need to be completely rebuilt to accommodate the new structures. The gentleman also stated that if the height of the new structure (as designed) was measured from the lower buildings walkway the height would be 46 feet.

Another member of the audience pointed out what he perceived as errors in the project site plans that he felt re-represented the grading issues the development posed. He further stated that in his view there is no way the existing retaining wall would be adequate to support the surcharge the new structures would apply.

Ms. Sandy Forrest presented a deed restriction (for church use only) she found on the vesting document for the church property. She felt that the Telecommunications facilities would be a commercial enterprise and thereby a violation of the deed restriction. She stated that the application to the County for the project, declaring that there was no trust interests in the
property. Ms. Forrest felt the deed indicated otherwise and the omission amounted to some level of deception or at least a serious error in the application.

Further concerns were voiced over possible emergency access to the church facilities would be compromised by the construction of the telecommunications in their present location. Ms. Burdick and Mr. Russell both voiced concerns with the location and appearance of the tower.

Mr. Harrington stated that he had made the motion to continue the item until Monday evening at the Committee meeting due to concern over the issues that had been raised. He further stated that the Group does not represent experts in law or engineering, but they rely on County experts to answer technical questions. After researching the issues brought up at the committee, he was confident that the appropriate County Staff had reviewed the issues and were prepared to approve the project. Another key point was that this was a Use Permit application. The plans that were being reviewed were not structural building plans. They were site plan and elevation drawings to illustrate how the building would blend with the existing structures.

After further discussion Mr. Harrington motioned to approve the request contingent on the County considering all of the concerns brought to light. After limited discussion a vote was taken and the motion did not pass with only 6 members voting in favor.

At this point Ms. Gebhart motioned to continue the item. This motion did not pass either with only seven members voting in favor. Mr. Russell stated that the Group would report no opinion on the matter.

6. TM·4713-7: Request from Meritage Homes of California, Chris Courtnery, 951-314-8301, chris.courtney@merritagehomes.com to make changes to the below listed three conditions on our approved map. County planner Michael D. Johnson, 858-694-3429, Michael.Johnson1@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use Committee. Community input. Voting item. (8/7)

1. Condition C.4.d: As discussed in our last meeting that Meritage would not be required to Stabilize the dam we would like to remove all conditions regarding the dam. If this condition needs to stay then we would request deferring to Units 9 or 10; however, we don't feel it is necessary since new hydromodification requirements require on lot retention and any overflow is nominal.

2. Condition C.15.b: Meritage is dedicating the open space within its control on the Unit 7 final map; however, we cannot control the dedication of the open space on the remainder of the open space that is controlled by North County Investments. We request to defer this condition or split this condition by ownership.

3. Condition C.15.c: As discussed with Ken Brazell, it makes more sense to dedicate the limited building zones on each final map for which it applies to ensure their accuracy. We would like to have this condition re-written to allow the IBZ to be dedicated on each final map for Units 7-10.

Mr. Chris Courtnery introduced the request. He stated that Meritage had three separate requests in regard to the development of Units 7 and 8 of Pepper Tree Park. The first was a request to remove the condition to stabilize the dam to the west of unit seven. However if the condition needs to stay then Matitage requested to deferring the stabilization effort to the development of units 9 and ten who control the west side of the dam and detention basins. This request was due to the new storm water regulations requiring modifications to the grading plan that minimized storm water runoff into the detention ponds on the west side of the units. The second request was to defer the open space dedication requirement or to split the condition by ownership. Due to trouble working with the adjoining property owner the off site dedication portion of the
requirement was proving difficult. Third Meritage requested the condition to dedicate the limited-building zone easements on the final map instead of by separate document. Mr. Duane Urquhart presented the original grading plan and conceptual drawings of the completed open space. He was concerned that the grading plan was being changed and would affect the finish improvements in the open space easement.

After lengthily discussion Mr. Moosa made the following motions on each item:

1) Condition C.4.d: defer the condition until the development of units 9 and 10, but request that County staff put in place some agreement to assure Meritage will be financially responsible for it’s portion of the dam stabilization effort.

2) Condition C.15.b: Approve splitting the condition by ownership.

3) Condition C.15.c: Approve modifying the condition to allow the limited-building zone easements to be dedicated on the final maps.

This motion passed unanimously.


   Design review Committee. Community input. Voting item. (8/11)

Mr. Reese introduced the request and exhibits of the proposed panel placement.
Ms. Heyneman stated the Design Review Committee had reviewed the request and had no objections.
After limited discussion Ms. Heyneman motioned to approve the request as submitted and the motion passed unanimously.


   GOAL
To establish a web of safe, interconnecting pathways that will take people on a walkabout to any location in town or beyond to a 30-mile loop trail around Fallbrook.

Plan of Action
- Identify safe and practical locations for the pathways, using a subset of the Community Trails Master Plan
- Create maps showing potential pathways
- Develop a team of volunteers to “ground-test” each proposed trail
- Use only pathways on FLC preserves, or in public right-of-way in initial phase.
- Ensure public access to additional pathways through agreements, and purchase of easements, if necessary
- Collaborate with neighboring communities of Bonsall, Valley Center, Pala/Pauma, Oceanside, and Temecula to expand the web into their areas.

Phase 1:
An 7-mile loop going north from Fallbrook Union High School (FUHS) along Stage Coach Lane to the Dinwiddie Preserve, and to Fallbrook Street to Potter, to Alvarado, to Main Street to S. Mission to the Los Jilgueros Preserve, and back to FUHS. An additional loop would go down Reche Rd. past Potter Jr. High and Live Oak Elementary School.

Phase 2:
Continue down Reche Rd. to Highway 395, and over to Stewart Canyon Rd. to connect to Monserate Mountain and the pathways developed by DR Horton along Pankey Rd.

Phase 3: Connect to the FPUD Santa Margarita Trail.
Future Phases: Add links to the interior web of pathways, and expand the exterior loop trail.

Mr. Tucker presented the request and an exhibit showing the primary circuit and then the overall concept. He stated that at this time he was seeking community support for the concept. Mr. Burdick reported that the Circulation Committee had heard this item and had concerns with the absence of details for the proposed improvements and the source of financial support for the extensive improvements involved. She suggested that the Land Conservancy develop a specific plan, segment by segment, and bring it back to the Planning Group for consideration. At that time the Planning Group could incorporate portions into their priority lists for Community Improvement Projects. She also mentioned that Ms. Gebhart had reminded the Circulation Committee that the Planning Group has already gone on record to formally request that DPW consider accommodating trails and pathways in all projects whenever possible.

Mr. Tucker stated that he was not seeking county funding. He was hoping to work with community members and property owners to improve the existing right-of-way. Mr. Harrington stated that an approval of the plan in concept would probably assist DPW in providing encroachment permits for work in the right-of-way if they were needed. After limited discussion Ms. Dooley motioned to approve the project in concept and the motion passed unanimously.


Ms. MacDonald presented the request and stated that the light pole were already being utilized to hang banners. This request was to approve that use and set some guild lines up for that use. After limited discussion Ms. Heyneman motioned to approve the request and the motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:25 pm
Tom Harrington, Secretary