

## Valley Center Community Planning Group

**Approved Minutes** for a regular meeting held on **June 11, 2018** at 7:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.

Oliver Smith, **Chair**; Ashly Mellor, **Vice-Chair**; James Garritson, **Secretary**

A=Absent; **Ab**=Abstention; **BOS**=Board of Supervisors; **PDS**=Department of Planning & Development Services; **DPW**=Department of Public Works; **DRB**=Valley Center Design Review Board; **GP**= County General Plan; **N**=Nay; **P**=Present; **PC**=County Planning Commission; **R**=Recused; **SC**=Subcommittee; **TBD**=To Be Determined; **VCCPG**=Valley Center Community Planning Group; **VC**= Valley Center; **VCPRD**=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District; **Y**=Yea

### A. Roll Call

- Meeting was called to order at **7:00 p.m.** and a Quorum was established with **13 members present**. Mr. Hutchison and\* Ms. Boulos\* both arrived at 7:15 p.m.
- Jeana Boulos - **P\***
- William Del Pilar - **P**
- Susan Fajardo - **P**
- James Garritson - **P**
- Dina Gharmalkar - **P**
- Steve Hutchison - **P\***
- Susan Janisch - **P**
- Jennifer Lindley - **P**
- Kathy MacKenzie - **P**
- Ashly Mellor - **P**
- LaVonne Norwood - **P**
- Claire Plotner - **P**
- Ann Quinley - **P**
- Oliver Smith - **P**
- Jon Vick - **P**

### B. Pledge of Allegiance - Mr. Gharmalkar

### C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of April 9, 2018

- **Motion: Approve Minutes from Regular Meeting of April 9, 2018.**
- **Maker/Second: Janisch/Gharmalkar**
- **Motion Carries 13-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

### D. Public Communication/Open Forum

- The Chair had a discussion about the current openings on the VCCPG, Design and Review Board, and the I-15 Corridor Board.
- Larry Glavinic (audience) shared information about decisions made about the County. He said the County, State, and the Federal governments are not doing anything about the developing new roads.
- Laura Gordon (audience) shares a SOS Initiative that will require the general public to vote on any changes to the general plan within unincorporated regions in San Diego County.

### E. Action items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items).

#### 1. Update with Presentation on Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) by Marcus Lubish, Senior Park Manager for Project San Diego County Parks and Receptions. (Norwood)

- Mr. Lubish shares information about the San Diego County park land dedication ordinances. He says that the San Diego County website at <http://www.sdparks.org> was recently updated and it has a copy of the Strategic Plan. The Valley Center park region will remain the same. State law prohibits allowing fees to go towards park maintenance. Off-site land dedication must be within three miles of the development.
- On **June 27, 2018**, the Department of Parks and Recreation will be presenting staff recommended changes to the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance program along with three options for the Board's consideration.

- Please find the link below to the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance Update webpage, which provides a summary of recommended changes and options for the Board of Supervisors to consider along with links to the draft Park Lands Dedication Ordinance, Board Policies (F-26, I-44, and G-19), and Park Design Manual. PLDO Webpage: <http://www.sdparks.org/content/sdparks/en/AboutUs/Plans/pldo.html>
- Mr. Hutchison asked about some of the County Planning Group Members who served on the committee. He also wanted to know about reimbursements. He also asked about the thoughts behind giving developments 50% credit for private parkland dedication. With board approval, private parks can receive up to 75% credit. Mr. Del Pilar and Ms. Norwood also asked for further clarification about parkland credits for private parks.
- Ms. Plotner asked about who is responsible for building trails. He said that the Department of Public Works (DPW) is responsible for trails built outside of a park. Mr. Vick asked if PLDO fees can be spent on trails. He also asked about the new park that will be built within the Park Circle development. Mr. Lubish said that Park Circle is a public park and will be open to the public.
- Mr. Rudolph (audience) shared some of his thoughts about the community trails master plan. Mr. Rogers (audience) asked about service spaces.
- Mr. Smith wanted to know more about the amount of land required for developments. The County requires 3 acres of parkland for every 1000 residents, but their goal is 10 acres for every 1000 people.
- Park fees will increase by 50% because of additional construction costs.
- Mr. Rodriguez (audience) lives near the Park Circle development and is concerned about potential park lighting and traffic light timings. Mr. Lubish said that people can park on public roads in the Park Circle development. He said that since there will be no ballpark at the new park, lighting will not be a problem.
- Mr. Garritson wanted to know more about why Valley Center doesn't have a Regional Park in this region. Mr. Vick said that the Park District hopes to eventually build a regional park, but the park fees collected from local property taxes do not provide enough funds to make this a present possibility. A property assessment increase will most likely be necessary to provide funding.

**2. Discussion and possible vote on PDS2018-TM-5478TE Discretionary Permit for Tentative Map –Time Extension for Project Duffywood a 7-home subdivision on 17.7-acre parcel located at Fruitvale and Duffwood Rd. (Lindley, Norwood)**

- The VCCPG needs to gather more information about this project before a vote can be taken.

**3. Discussion and possible vote on PDS2018-ZAP-99-015W2 Crown Castle Minor Use Permit Modification. Crown Castle is proposing the following primary components: Redesign one (1) existing 39' high antenna support structure (leaf covers over antennas and bark colored paint on the pole) Maintain existing equipment compound. This project is located at 28407 Gordon Hill Rd. (MacKenzie, Fajardo)**

- Ms. MacKenzie asked the Chair to explain some of the details about the permit. The Chair asked Ms. MacKenzie to speak with the County about one of the permit fields that might be incorrectly checked off. There also is another mistake that needs correction on the application. A vote was postponed on this project in order for the applicants to correct the application.

**4. Discussion and possible vote on PDS2018-ZAP-03-011W2 Crown Castle Minor Use Permit Modification. The project proposes to modify the two existing monopoles to better disguise the facility and help integrate it into the aesthetics of the surrounding area. One monopole will be converted into a faux utility pole, by painting the pole and equipment brown, and by adding cross arms to the top of the pole. The other pole will be a faux tree. This project is located at Paradise Reservoir, 27225 Kiavo Dr. (MacKenzie, Fajardo)**

- Ms. Fajardo introduces Mr. Dale Richard, a representative of Crown Castle. He shares information about the County's current requirements to disguise all existing wireless telecommunication facilities. One of the poles will be painted to look like a faux utility pole, while the other one will look more like a faux tree. Mr. Hutchison wanted to know if Crown Castle will provide long term maintenance of these faux poles.
- Mr. Vick asked about why both poles were not made to look like faux trees. Mr. Richard explained that one pole did not have enough clearance to be made into a faux tree.
- Ms. Plotner has concerns about allowing one of the poles to look like a faux utility pole because it might establish precedent for future faux poles.
- Mr. Garritson wanted to know about the costs of converting a pole into a faux tree. Mr. Richard did not know this amount.
- **Motion: Approve the Crown Castle Minor Use Permit Modification for PDS2018-ZAP-03-011W2 with the recommendation that the permit conditions include aesthetic maintenance in a timely manner (30 days).**
- **Maker/Second:** Fajardo/Garritson
- **Motion Carries 13-2-0 (Y-N-Ab). Hutchison and Smith voted nay.**

**5. Discussion and possible vote on PDS2018-ZAP-019W2 Crown Castle Minor Use Permit Modification. The project proposes the continued use of a communications facility that includes a 45 foot (top of pole) high antenna support structure and therefore requests the pole be repainted the color brown. The site is located in the general agricultural (A70) zone and the applicant is requesting the approval of a Minor Use Permit (Tier 3 Modification) pursuant to the request of the County of San Diego. (Janisch)**

- Ms. Janisch introduces Tom Hannah and he shares information about how Crown Castle only manages these poles.
- Ms. Plotner asked if the faux utility poles are only proposed in rural areas. Mr. Hannah said Crown Castle analyzes the best type of faux pole design on a case by case basis.
- **Motion: Approve the Crown Castle Minor Use Permit Modification for PDS2018-ZAP-019W2 with the recommendation that the permit conditions include aesthetic maintenance in a timely manner (30 days).**
- **Maker/Second:** Janisch/Norwood
- **Motion Carries 15-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

**6. Discussion and Possible vote for ratification of appeal letter for Rite Aid Pharmacy county approval. See attached county approval letter. (Quinley)**

- Chair Smith explains background about the letter he has written to the County that appeals the recent decision of approving the Rite Aid Pharmacy.
- Mr. Del Pilar asked if this appeal would result in any changes. The Chair stated that the Planning Group only makes recommendations to the County.
- **Motion: The Chair will send a letter to the County appealing the approval of Rite Aid Pharmacy.**
- **Maker/Second:** Smith/Vick

- **Motion Carries 14-1-0 (Y-N-Ab). Garritson votes nay.**

### **7. Discussion and possible vote on adding traffic controls for VC Road on our CIP list, including studies of traffic control options. (Vick)**

- Ms. Plotner reads a short summary about traffic control options for Valley Center Road. There is an increase in traffic volume from the current 25,000 per day to 36,000 ADTs at build-out. This increase in traffic volume combined with the planned residential and commercial development in VC's 2 villages will require significant additional traffic control to maximize safety, traffic flow, and to facilitate access to businesses, and emergency response and evacuation. The Valley Center community has had multiple discussions about future traffic control options, including roundabouts, over the past two years.
- Mr. Vick shares a presentation on the past, present, and future developments along Valley Center Road. There is a plan to add an additional five traffic lights within the distance of 2.6 miles. Mirar de Valle and Miller Road are the areas that Mr. Vick would like to have roundabouts installed instead of traffic lights. He says that it is likely that DPW will install traffic lights without the Planning Group making these roundabout recommendations.
- Jaquin Aganza (audience) is in favor of roundabouts. He shares that along his drive to Vista he uses one roundabout and really likes it. He says that quality of life is his major reason for supporting roundabouts.
- Fred Wollman (audience) favors roundabouts. He thinks that the new residential developments will also appreciate having roundabouts to improve the safety and efficiency of our roads.
- Kevin Smith (audience) favors roundabouts because they are more efficient.
- Al Maioriello (audience) has concerns about roundabouts. He has spoken to CHP about traffic speed along Valley Center Road and the officers say that the County has not established clear speed limits. Mr. Maioriello does not think roundabouts will solve traffic problems.
- Lawrence Gartner (audience) supports the development of roundabouts because of his experience driving in the Birdrock area of La Jolla. He says they are quieter because the traffic flow moves more slowly, creating less noise; plus they are safer than signalized intersections.
- Rich Rudolph (audience) says that he has lived in Valley Center for 25 years. He describes Bend, Oregon and how the city has 26 roundabouts. He said roundabouts improved his driving experiences throughout Bend. Rich also believes that roundabouts are much safer and provide a better quality of life. Rich described the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) process, which provides a detailed study and Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) on each CIP item. The only way for Valley Center to obtain a 'Study' is to put roundabouts on the CIP List.
- Edward Ball (audience) supports roundabouts because there are no signals. The timing always works.
- Fire Marshall Chief, Mike Shore, said that the fire department has concerns about evacuation and emergency speed response times if roundabouts are installed.
- Ms. Norwood favors roundabouts because the audience supports them.
- Ms. Plotner supports them and has spent a lot of time researching roundabouts. She says they are safer.
- Ms. Janisch is pro-roundabouts.
- Ms. MacKenzie is in favor of getting a study done.
- Ms. Lindley favors adding roundabouts to the CIP List to obtain a study.

- Ms. Boulos says that roundabouts do work, but they also do have traffic jams. She supports a roundabout study.
- Ms. Quinley supports roundabouts and a study.
- Ms. Mellor supports roundabouts and a further study.
- Mr. Del Pilar supports a roundabout study.
- Mr. Gharmalkar says that this is a great time to have a study done on roundabouts.
- Mr. Garritson does not support roundabouts because of concerns about numerous semis, fire trucks, and other large vehicles use VC Road. He says there are also numerous people who do not favor roundabouts in the community.
- Mr. Hutchison shared background about his conversation with Chief Napier about getting fire trucks through a roundabout. He said that most modern roundabouts accommodate about 40,000 daily vehicles. He is in favor of a roundabout study.
- Mr. Vick is in favor of roundabouts.
- Ms. Fajardo favors a roundabout study.
- Chair Smith recommended a traffic control study at all intersections. The Chair says that 40% of the traffic driving through Valley Center is heading to another destination and is probably not planning on stopping to shop. This is not an urban region. Traffic light timing does work. He has experience seeing how traffic light timing works when driving to work along San Marcos Blvd.
- **Motion: “Moved to recommend the design and construction of modern roundabouts at VC Road and (1) Mirar de Valle and (2) Miller Roads” as CIP Priority 1 & 2.**
- **Maker/Second: Plotner/Gharmalkar**
- **Roll Call Vote** was requested by Chair Smith at **9:55 p.m.**

|                         |                        |                      |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| ● Jeana Boulos - N      | ● Steve Hutchison - Y  | ● LaVonne Norwood-Y  |
| ● William Del Pilar - Y | ● Susan Janisch - Y    | ● Claire Plotner - Y |
| ● Susan Fajardo - Y     | ● Jennifer Lindley - Y | ● Ann Quinley - Y    |
| ● James Garritson - N   | ● Kathy MacKenzie - Y  | ● Oliver Smith - N   |
| ● Dina Gharmalkar - Y   | ● Ashly Mellor - Y     | ● Jon Vick - Y       |

- **Motion Carries 12-3-0 (Y-N-Ab). Boulos, Garritson, and Smith vote nay.**

**8. Discussion and possible vote on drafting a letter to the County Planning Department against bundling General Plan Amendments. (Hutchinson, Vick)**

- A motion was made by the Chair to extend the meeting until 10:15 p.m. Motion was unanimously approved.
- Mr. Hutchison shared background about how the County bundles amendments together.
- Stephanie Saathoff, representing the Twin Oaks Valley Community Sponsor Group, shared that her group voted 5-0-0 in opposition to the bundling of large General Plan Amendment projects when each has a separate EIR.
- The Chair will write a letter to the County.
- **Motion: To send a letter to the County Planning Department that the Planning Group takes the position of not bundling General Plan Amendments.**
- **Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley**
- **Motion Carries 14-1-0 (Y-N-Ab). Garritson votes nay.**

**9. Discussion only regarding June 8th Planning Commission consideration of Lilac Hills Ranch as to whether the changes to the proposed project, which have occurred since the**

**Planning Commission's recommendation on September 11, 2015, are considered "substantial modifications" requiring additional review and recommendation by the Planning Commission, as outlined by California Government Code Section 65356. Note that the hearing on this item will be limited to the changes that have occurred since the Planning Commission's recommendation on September 11, 2015. (Hutchison)**

- There will be another public meeting about this proposed project on October 31.

#### **F. Group Business**

**1. Meeting Updates: Next Regular Monthly VCCPG meeting: July 9, 2018**

**2. Required completion of member training and annual submittals. (Smith)**

- The Chair said that all members missing trainings need to submit or resubmit the missing documentation to the County.

**3. Mellor resignation from the Valley Center Planning Group creating seat #5 vacancy. (Smith)**

- The Chair says that Ms. Mellor is moving to Pauma and therefore seat #5 is now vacant.

#### **I. Adjournment**

- **The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.**
- **Minutes were approved on July 9, 2018.**

**James Garritson, Secretary**