

SAN DIEGUITO PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 2789, Rancho Santa Fe, CA, 92067

Minutes of Meeting

March 8th, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 P.M. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Present: D. Dill, T. Parillo, S. Biszantz, M. Hoppenrath, J. Zagara, P. Fisch, N. Christenfeld, S. Williams, J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, S. Thomas, L. Lemarie
Absent: D. Willis
2. AGENDA REVIEW
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [Circulated to members during meeting for initials/comments]
4. OPEN FORUM:
5. GENERAL PLANNING ITEMS:
6. MAJOR PROJECTS AND LAND USE ITEMS:
 - A. **Hacienda Santa Fe Senior Facility.** Proposed project is located in the City of San Diego on the southeastern corner of Via de la Valle at El Camino Real. The developer will present an overview of the project with Q&A in preparation for the release of a draft EIR sometime in the first quarter of 2018. Project Developer: Milan Capital Management - Bret Bernard, AICP, Director of Planning & Development, [714-687-0000](tel:714-687-0000), ext119; SDPG member: Don Willis [\(858\) 481-6922](tel:(858)481-6922). **Continued to April 5th**
 - B. **Property Specific Request (SD15) to General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006)** PDS Planner Kevin Johnston to answer questions concerning the proposed change from SR-1 to a combination of General Commercial (C-1), VR-10.9, and SR-0.5 bringing an estimated total potential dwelling unit increase of 301 units. The parcel(s) are located adjacent to a City of San Marcos suburban area, and the property owner is exploring annexation. The group revisited their original decision because new information had become public through the release of a new EIR and to accommodate community feedback. Project web page at - <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/prelim-analysis-sd15.pdf>
Applicant/Owner *Steve Bieri* gave a brief overview of his request; they have not submitted specific project plans. Property is within the San Marcos SOI and he prefers to develop in that city. He said any project developed in the County would follow the Guiding Principles of the General Plan and conform to the Community Development Model.

Kevin Johnston explained why the proposed rezone would not be inconsistent with LU-1.2 and would have a "D" designator requiring development according to LEED guidelines.

The group first addressed the issue of whether they would change the last motion, agenda item 5A made at the December 8, 2016 SDPG meeting supporting the PSR-Owner Request Map. Members discussed that given additional County Staff provided information, such as the SD15 'Alternative' map, strong public concern, and the fact that this motion specifies land use changes, such as a 5x increase in density of residential dwelling units and adding commercial uses that would significantly increase development potential, they would like to reconsider the motion. The property is in a designated Very High Fire Severity Zone.

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

Motion: By J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, **second** by L. Lemarie, to rescind first SDPG motion of December 2016 and make a new motion.

Vote: ayes = 9 nos = 1 abstain = 1 absent/vacant = 2
P. Fisch D. Dill

J. Arsivaud-Benjamin reported that the property originally had a lower density, just 30 units, and then was increased to the current 61 in the GP update. She noted it is adjacent to conservation areas and has a high fire risk and felt that the 80 units (EIR alternative) and 362 units (PSR- Owner request), both with commercial areas, might be unwise planning. *M. Hoppenrath* commented that the General Plan Guiding Principles require areas of high fire risk to have reduced density.

Markus Spiegelberg of the Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM) said the CNLM owns the surrounding open space, called the Rancho La Costa Habitat Conservation Area. He said they plan for the current density, and that higher density will increase vandalism and adversely impact the Preserve.

Kevin Barnard of The Escondido Creek Conservancy (TECC) said that because funding is calculated on the amount of land, the loss of this potential open space would reduce the ability of conservation groups to manage these lands. He pointed out that the property was adjacent to an old landfill and that the liner membranes meant to retain leachates would eventually fail. He also was concerned about increased traffic congestion during wildfire evacuations.

Richard Murphy (TECC) felt that the owner should increase the number of acres being purchased for mitigation because the edge effects of increased density would degrade the adjacent conservation areas.

Kathe Kline lives nearby in San Marcos and noted that it took 2 hours for residents to evacuate during the Cocos fire. She felt the area roads were already inadequate, especially during times when schools let out. She was afraid of becoming trapped in the event of another fire and felt that there should be no high-density development.

Matt Simmons, Land Use Consultant to the owner, said the County has learned from each fire season and now manages fire risk better. He suggested that a staggered release of evacuation notices would help to avoid overcrowding on area roads. *J. Arsivaud-Benjamin* cautioned that the benefit of such policies was dependent on assumptions about how fast the fire was moving, the direction and strength of the wind, the amount of combustible fuel, and the availability of County resources. In the recent Santa Rosa tragedy, she noted, the residents had no time to evacuate. *J. Arsivaud-Benjamin* pointed out that the Harmony Grove Village South Fire Protection Plan called for over 100 officers to direct evacuation traffic, a number that exceeds the standard daily allocation of officers for the entire City of San Diego. She stressed the importance of having a calculation of the evacuation capacity of the local area road network before adding density to the General Plan. *Richard Murphy* said there were 5 fires on the same day as the Cocos fire and anticipating an officer at every intersection was unrealistic. *S. Williams* said that the Fire Chief stressed in a meeting with Harmony Grove Village residents that people often ignore evacuation notices and choose not to leave in the predicted traffic patterns. *Kathe Kline* remarked that during the Cocos fire, about half of the residents of Old Creek Ranch in San Marcos never evacuated, according to their FaceBook page.

Ginger Perkins said her family has had a ranch in the area since 1951. She said that runoff water from nearby irrigated developments and the landfill scours the land and causes Copper Creek, once seasonal, to now flow year-round. The degraded condition of the land prevents regrowth of vegetation needed to absorb runoff. She said her family filled in the old Copper Creek Mine in 1965, but that area trails give the public 24-hour access and people have attempted to dig up some of the dangerous mine shafts. She was opposed to higher density that would encourage more trespassing activity on restricted open space and undeveloped private property in proximity to SD15.

JP Theberge of the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council was very concerned about the fire risk and traffic congestion. He cautioned about changing the zoning before there was a specific project to evaluate impacts, noting that the land could be sold to a different owner.

A further eight attendees submitted slips in opposition to the project, but either did not wish to speak or felt their issues had already been mentioned: Les Briney, Dee Folsa, Leeann Fiolka, Dave Aylmer, Robert Petitmermet, Jon Dummer, Sheri Powers, and Scott Sutherland.

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

L. Lemarie said an upzone now would mean the owner could get higher density “by right”. *Kevin Johnston* clarified that higher density would not be “by right” but rather subject to discretionary approval, but that the maximum density allowed would be determined by the zoning.

T. Parillo felt that if the group disapproved of the upzone, it would be easier to stop a bad plan in the future from going forward.

N. Christenfeld believed that the zoning should determine the density appropriate for the property. A Specific Plan Amendment and Subdivision Map would be more appropriate in evaluating a 5x increase in density.

S. Biszantz thought the main focus should be the commercial area along the street. She asked the owner for his preferences, and *Steve Bieri* answered that he felt mixed use with residential and commercial would be best.

P. Fisch thought that it would be better to keep the ‘Existing’ zoning rather than speculate on the merits of possible future development.

Motion: By J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, **second** by S. Williams, to retain existing County zoning.

Vote: ayes = 9 nos = 0 abstain = 2 absent/vacant = 2
S. Biszantz
D. Dill

- C. **PDS2018-AD-18-002 Kahatibi Open Space Encroachment Administrative Permit.** [16268 Via Cazadero, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067](#), APN 269-201-52-00. The project deviation is the installation of a boundary wall along the property lines. Applicant Representative: Kenneth Discenza, [619-540-7462](#); PDS Planner: Sean Oberbauer, [858-495-5747](#); SDPG Member: Steve Thomas, [858-232-8580](#).

Motion: By S. Thomas, **second** by J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, to approve as presented.

Vote: ayes = 11 nos = 0 abstain = 0 absent/vacant = 2

- D. **PDS2018-AD-18-004 Fortuna Farms Administrative Permit.** Waiver for an additional 5,564 sq ft service building. Private residence and equestrian facility on an eight-acre parcel located at the corner of Via De Fortuna and El Camino Del Norte, Rancho Santa Fe; APN 265-160-2500. Property Owners: Caroline LaBarre and Tim Porthouse, [520-390-4470](#); Applicant’s Contact: Allard Jansen Architects, [619-450-6550](#); PDS Planner: John Leavitt, [858-495-5448](#); SDPG Member: Laurel Lemarie, [858-756-2835](#). **Continued to May 10th**

7. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- A. Community Reports
- B. Consideration and comments on circulation mail
- C. Future agenda items and planning
- D. Prospective & returning Planning Group members
- E. Supply orders and reimbursement of expenses – printing of 400 new speaker slips @ cost of \$34.05

Motion: By D. Dill, **second** by J. Zagara, to approve County reimbursement to secretary for printing fees.

Vote: ayes = 11 nos = 0 abstain = 0 absent/vacant = 2

Adjourned 9:40 pm.

NOTE: The San Dieguito Planning Group currently has one vacancy. If you wish to become a member of the SDPG, please provide the chair with your current resume and plan to attend 2 or 3 meetings in advance of processing your application for membership.

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

Future Meeting Dates:	4/5/18	5/10/18	6/14/18	7/12/18	8/9/18	9/13/18
Doug Dill, Chair		760-736-4333		FAX 760-736-4333	e-mail:	theddills@att.net
Tim Parillo, Vice-Chair		415-238-6961			e-mail:	tparillo@gmail.com
Mid Hoppenrath, Secretary		760-747-1145			e-mail:	midhop@gmail.com

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.