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

Fifteen (15) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Roy Moosa, Tom Harrington, Jean Dooley, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Ron Miller, Jackie Heyneman, Jerry Kalman, Lee J. De Meo. Bill McCarthy, Eileen Delaney, Donna Gebhart and Margaret Singleton-O'Leary. Also a large audience was also present.


Several property owners around the Fallbrook Golf Course spoke about their concerns with the Golf Course’s current management and the prospect of a portion of the course being acquired for mitigation land. From several different perspectives, they stated how important the Golf Course is to Fallbrook and how tragic it would be to lose it to a mitigation bank. The group of property owners had created an organization (savefallbrookgolfcourse.com) to try and block any attempt to convert any of the current golf course into mitigation land. The recent conversion of the San Luis Ray Golf Course to a mitigation bank provided an example of how a great recreational facility could be lost. One of the most compelling arguments was how conversion to a mitigation bank would turn an excellent fire buffer (as an irrigated golf course) into a major fire hazard.

Mr. Russell thanked all the interested parties for attending the meeting but informed them that until such time as the property owner applies to the county for a modification of zoning or use, the planning Group has no authority to advise the county of the community’s concerns. He advised that they closely monitor developments on the site through the county. As soon as the Planning Group gets a request to review and comment on any development on the site, it would be published in the Village News and posted at Fire Station number 1 and the library.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 18 January 2016. Voting Item.

Ms. Dooley motioned to approve the minutes as presented and the motion passed unanimously.
Mr. Jim Chagala introduced the project briefly going over the history of the development. He stated that the Planning Group, due to excessive grading and traffic safety concerns, had originally denied the project. Since that time the grading plan had been re-designed to minimize slope heights and slope rates. Also landscaping on the perimeter slopes had been added to provide privacy for the surrounding developments. The Planning Group had reviewed the preliminary plans and approved the grading in concept. Those changes had been made to the project's grading plans. Therefore the traffic flow for the site was the last issue from his view. At this point he went through the six alternatives the developer and engineering staff had studied.

1) The first was to create a left turn pocket on Mission Road southbound for the entrance to the subdivision. This alternative would eliminate southbound traffic from utilizing the Stagecoach Mission intersection to make a U-turn to enter the site but would have no impact on traffic exiting the project and wanting to go south on Mission. This alternative also would require an extensive part of the median to be removed. The developer had rejected this alternative due to its limited improvement to traffic flow and negative impact to the landscaped median.

2) Second was to install a traffic signal at the Mission Road entrance to the project. Mr. Chagala stated that the traffic counts for the project would not reach the County signalization requirement. The cost would also be prohibitive for a development of this size. Also County regulations would not allow signalization due to the proximity to Sterling Road and Stage Coach traffic signals on Mission. The developer had decided to abandon this alternative.

3) Third was primary access at Sterling Bridge. Mr. Chagala stated that in 2008 the developer had researched with the Pepper Tree Homeowners Association what would be required to utilize the Sterling Bridge access to Mission road. At that time the developer was advised that utilization of the Sterling Road bridge would require approval of at minimum 67% of the membership as well as Eligible Mortgage Holders. Mr. Chagala stated that the Pepper Tree Homeowners Association had advised him again in January of this year that the same approval requirement still held true. An additional issue with this alternative is that the entrance road would be extended to a 1,700 foot distance from the 1,200 foot distance with the Mission entrance in the center of the project. County regulations require a secondary access with primary roads exceeding 800 feet. The County and North County Fire had approved the project with only an emergency access on Morro Road with the 1,200 primary road. Mr. Chagala felt that the Sterling Bridge access would trigger a secondary access requirement and Morro Road easement rights would need to be acquired and additional improvements would be needed to open it as a secondary access road. The
The developer had decided in light of the difficulty in acquiring approval of the Pepper Tree Homeowners/lenders and the possibility of having to acquire additional easement rights from the Morro Road residence to abandon this alternative.

4) The fourth alternative was to make Morro Road the primary entrance to the project. Mr. Chagala informed the Committee that while solving the Mission Road problems this alternative presented several other complex problems. Additional easement rights would need to be acquired from the residents along Morro Road. Also easements would be needed on several properties on Stage Coach to the east of the Morro Road Stage Coach intersection to provide proper site distance. Additionally road improvements and signalization would be needed. The developer's engineers estimate that this could cost 1.5 million dollars. In the developer's view the project could not carry this type of development cost. Additionally an emergency access would still be required. This would require connecting to Mission or accessing through Pepper Tree. The developer had rejected this alternative.

5) The fifth alternative was to make the entrance on Mission a right in, right out and install a U-turn lane at the Sterling Bridge intersection. Southbound traffic wanting to enter the project would utilize the Sage Coach Mission intersection to U-turn on Mission Road. This alternative had met County staff approval and been presented to the Planning Group in December of last year. The planning Group and several members of the audience had objected to the demolition of several hundred feet of landscaped median to construct this turn lane. Concern was also presented with the need for traffic exiting the project and then needing to cross two lanes of traffic to reach the turn lane in a very short distance. In the light of public concern, the developer had decided to abandon this alternative.

6) Finally the main entrance on Mission would be a right in right out and utilize the existing Airpark turn lane for southbound U-turns on Mission. Southbound traffic wanting to enter the project would still utilize the Sage Coach Mission intersection to U-turn on Mission Road. This alternative also met with County Staff approval. This was the developer's current proposal.

Mr. Chagala felt the sixth alternative was the best solution. Next, Mr. David Green spoke and presented a detailed power point presentation detailing the history of the project’s reviews to this point, his review of the aesthetics of the project, biological resources he felt were missed by the projects EIR, a detailed soil and geological study he made of the site, grading impact studies he also made and land use impacts of the project. Several residence of Summer Hill Lane, to the south of the project, commented on the current difficulty they have controlling traffic and addressing maintenance on Summer Hill. These property owners felt the new project would make the situation worse.
Residents of Morro Road stated that they had drainage, traffic control and maintenance problems as well and agreed that the project would make the situation worse.

Residents of the Pepper Tree subdivision stated that the Mission Road entrance would cause problems at the Sterling Bridge intersection and they felt that the Airpark intersection was an unsafe alternative.

Mr. Duane Urquhart informed the Group that his development, Pepper Tree Park, had made some improvements to Morro Road, which brought it close to private road standards. He presented a letter he thought should be sent out to the Pepper Tree homeowners to gauge their interest in working with the project’s new homeowners.

Ms. Burdick stated that the Circulation Committee had reviewed the traffic proposals and had decided to compile the concerns and present them to the Group for their consideration. One of the main concerns she had was that a question was raised at the committee meeting about the opinion of the Airpark and the Fallbrook Tennis Club in their intersection being considered for the project’s traffic flow. Ms. Burdick did contact the Tennis Club management and was informed that Pepper Tree Park Residents were currently using the intersection instead of waiting for the light at Sterling Bridge and it was not a problem. The airpark is a County facility and was contacted in the County’s internal review process.

Mr. Moosa stated that he felt the Sterling Bridge entrance was the best alternative and thought further effort should be applied to that alternative.

A representative of the Pepper Tree Home owners association stated that the process of getting the homeowners approval to utilize Sterling Bridge was more involved than Mr. Urquhart had implied. He stated that a formal proposal would need to be made. At that point the homeowners board would consider the request and if it chose to do so forward it to legal counsel. Counsel would then return their analysis and recommendations. At that time the board would decide to send out a letter or not. He felt the major question was would the Fire District or the County allow only an emergency access (not a secondary access) if the primary access was 1700 feet long. A secondary access would require development of Morro Road.

Mr. David Sibbet, County Planning Manager, commented that he had just, that day, received notification from North County Fire that a secondary access would be required if the primary access was 1700 feet long.

Mr. Russell stated that in his opinion the Pepper Tree access was impossible. Getting 67% of the homeowners to agree was challenging but 67% of lienholders was impossible. He felt Mission Road was the only reasonable access for this project. He suggested that requiring acceleration and deceleration lanes be constructed by the project might be suggested to the County.

Ms. Singleton-O’Leary felt the project was reasonable and might raise land values for some of the surrounding properties. But she thought the speed limit on Mission Road was too high for the congestion in the area. She suggested lowering it to 40 miles per hour or lower.

Several members still had reservations with the project. Others felt the property owner had rights to develop his property.

After lengthy discussion Mr. Harrington motioned to approve the project as presented and recommended that County staff consider requiring acceleration and deceleration
lanes be constructed at the Mission Road entrance. Also that the County should consider requiring an additional road dedication at the Stage Coach and Mission Road intersection to allow for future improvement of the intersection. The motion passed with eight members in favor.


4. Proposed update to the Parkland Dedication Ordinance
The Board of Supervisors directed county staff to perform a comprehensive update of the ordinance. In addition to the Board directed actions, the Board Letter also asked staff to:

- Provide a new toolbox for developing parks associated with discretionary projects while balancing the needs of the community and park users
- Incorporate working with neighboring jurisdictions
- Provide more flexibility for developers to meet requirements
- Look into revising park planning areas to be consistent with planning group areas
- Align with the General Plan, Live Well San Diego, and the County’s Strategic Plan
- Include information on the level of service standards and community needs

Staff is asking for input from Community Planning/Sponsor Groups on how to improve the ordinance. Marcus Lubich, (858) 966-1348 office | (858) 378-3878 cell. Marcus.lubich@sdcounty.ca.gov. Parks & Recreation Committee. Community input.

Voting item. (1/27)

Mr. Marcus Lubich introduced the item and described some of the changes the County was trying to make to the Parkland Dedication Ordinance. The changes ranged from how fees were charged to project priorities.

Ms. Heyneman informed the Group that the Parks Committee had reviewed the request but had concerns with several details of the proposed changes. Members of CSA-81 stated that they too had problems with the proposed changes and wanted to be included in the discussion of how these ordinances would be changed. A representative of FPUB said his utility district, being one of the largest open space property owners in the community, wanted to be involved in the discussions of ordinance changes.

Mr. Lubich informed the Group that a meeting was already scheduled with CSA-81 later in the week.

Ms. Heyneman suggested that a meeting of several community groups needed to take place prior to the Planning Group supporting any changes.

After further discussion, Ms. Heyneman motioned to continue the item until a greater consensus could be reached. The motion passed unanimously.
5. TPM 21233 Request to subdivide the 6.37 acres located at 4342 Ramona drive into three lots for three single-family dwelling units. The existing residence on lot#1 to remain.

Owner and contact person Mike Amos, 760-801-1603, mikeampos@miacontractor.com.

County planner Vincent Kattoula, (858)-694-3959, Vincent.Kattoula@sdcounty.ca.gov.

The applicant had requested that the item be continued due to his inability to attend the meeting.

Mr. Wood motioned to continue the item and the motion passed unanimously.

6. The changes to the Fallbrook Community Plan to add two new parcels to the Grand Tradition is tentatively planning for the Grand Tradition General Plan Amendment and Rezone to be considered by the County Planning Commission on March 11th. In addition to the proposed land use and zoning changes, changes to the Fallbrook Community Plan Policy LU2.2a1 are necessary to incorporate the two new Commercial parcels. The draft changes to the policy are provided below. County planner Robert Citrano, 858-694-3229, Robert.Citrano@sdcounty.ca.gov.

Policy LU2.2a1 APNs 104-250-34, 104-250-35, 104-350-14, and 106-410-36, 106-410-59 and 106-410-61 contain The Grand Tradition. In this iteration of the Fallbrook Community Plan a category of Commercial was placed on those parcels to facilitate that business (The Grand Tradition) and only that business. It is primarily a wedding venue for reserved group activities with an outdoor/indoor commercial area with three separate facilities: the Beverly Mansion (15,000 SF), Arbor Terrace (5,000 SF) and a third site yet to be constructed, Tuscany/Vineyard (5,000 SF), plus the possibility of a future hotel to support those group activities. In this case, the total square footage permitted for the entire 22 30-acre venue shall be 80,000 SF. If the current business usage of The Grand Tradition ceases to exist on these parcels, the Land Use Designation will revert to a Village Residential 2 designation residential with 0.5 acre zoning.

Mr. Don McDougal introduced the request stating that the effort was to modify the Fallbrook Community Plan to match the County General Plan modifications that the Planning Group had previously approved.

Mr. Wood reported that the Land Use Committee had reviewed the request and supported it with one modification. The Committee felt that in the last sentence the statement “If the business of The Grand Tradition ceases” should read “If the current business usage ceases”.

After limited discussion Mr. Wood motioned to approve the request with the one change in wording and the motion passed unanimously.

7. Request from James Brennan, Brenson Realty Group, Inc., 951-695-9555, james@brensonrealty.com, to hear a proposed use for the 1.94 acres located on west Alvarado Ave west of Summit Avenue to build multifamily dwelling units consisting of 2
8. Presentation by Robert Faudoa and Ted Walters of Gary Engineering, 858-483-0620, garyengca@aol.com on a proposed project 'Mission Canyon Center Project' located on the 6.4 acres on the south side of east Mission Road west of Ranger Road. Proposed project would require a zone change from agriculture to commercial, Tentative Map to subdivide property into 3 lots, a Major Use Permit and a General Plan Amendment. The proposal is for a 3,000 SqFt Arco am/pm Food Mart, Car Wash, Electric Charging Station, 2,500 SqFt drive-thru restaurant, 8,000 SqFt commercial strip, facilities to have 4, 2,000 SqFt tenants. Community input. Non-voting item. (2/5)

Mr. Robert Faudoa of Gary Engineering introduced the project. He requested input from the community and the Group of developing a gas station and commercial strip on a 6.4 acre site at the north east corner of Mission Road and Old 395 intersection. Mr. Wood stated that he felt that kind of development had no chance of success at that location.

Mr. Russell informed Mr. Faudoa that commercial zoning of that project would be in direct conflict with the Fallbrook Community Plan. Section LU2.2.2, which limited the extent of commercial development from the village center.

Other members of the group felt that given an appropriate type of development might be acceptable. A member of the audience felt leaving the property as is would better reflect the community’s agricultural background.

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:28 pm
Tom Harrington, Secretary