

**Valley Center Community Planning Group**

**Minutes for a regular meeting held on May 13, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.**

**CHAIR: Oliver Smith**  
**VICE-CHAIR: Jeana Boulos**  
**SECRETARY: Kathy MacKenzie**

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; PSR=Property Specific Requests; 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 7:07 p.m. and a Quorum was established with 14 members present and 1 seat vacancy.

Jeana Boulos - P	Steve Hutchison - P	Jon Vick - P
William Del Pilar - P	Susan Janisch - P	Kevin Smith - P
Susan Fajardo - P	Kathy MacKenzie - P	Dina Gharmalkar - P
James Garritson - P	LaVonne Norwood - P	Renee Wolf - P
Delores Chavez Harmes-P	Oliver Smith - P	

**B. Pledge of Allegiance - Mr. Steve Hutchison**

**C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of April 8, 2019**

- Motion: To approve the April 8, 2019 Minutes.
- Maker/Second: Boulos/Garritson
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

**D. Public Communication/Open Forum - Members of the public may address the Planning Group on any topic not on the agenda.**

- LaVonne Norwood inquired about the work being done behind Tractor Supply. Chairman Smith informed the group work had begun on the condos of The Shady Oak Project which was previously approved.
- Kevin Smith notified the group the nursery and produce market on Valley Center had closed. The nursery is moving to a new location, however, the produce market is permanently closed. Jeana Boulos confirmed this by adding the developer is changing

leaseholders. Ms. Harmes asked if it is being consolidated. Ms. Boulos only knew the leasehold was being changed.

- Erik Jockinsen, an audience member and also a member of the South Village Subcommittee, said it is his understanding that the Valley Center Design Review Board (DRB) reviews projects first, and then they go to the subcommittees. He feels everything is stonewalled at the VCCPG level and that the VCCPG is becoming like the county by stalling projects. Mr. Jockinsen said when a subcommittee makes approval, the project should then go to the VCCPG for final approval before going to county. Unfortunately, the VCCPG is stonewalling. He suggested the VCCPG members read the subcommittee minutes and move things forward. Jon Vick responded saying the approval on the Liberty Bell Plaza to which Mr. Jockinsen was referring, had conditions, and until conditions are met, it will not be moved forward.
- Ms. Harmes asked if the traffic study for the project had been completed and submitted. Mr. Ross Burnett (Developer Representative) said a traffic study had been completed and submitted, but it was not specifically for the Liberty Bell Plaza project. He said recommendations received were for the elevation and architecture. Ms. Harmes went on to point out to Mr. Vick that the year is being omitted on the subcommittee reports, and that must be included for clarification.
- William Del Pilar suggested the group table the discussion until we reach it on the agenda - it is #1.
- Mr. Del Pilar said Rite Aid, which is #8 on the agenda under group business tonight, might be combined with this discussion. Chairman Smith said the Rite Aid item was for the board to reflect on to ensure we don't make the same mistakes moving forward.

## **E. Action items**

### **1. *Presentation and discussion on Liberty Bell Plaza site plan, concept and size.***

***Presentation by Ross Burnett, PDS2017-STP-17-037. Project Manager: Benjamin Mills, 858-495-5234 (Vick).***

- The project is 8.2 acres in the South Village. Ross Burnett is the lead. They met with the Valley Center Design Review Board (VCDRB) in August of 2018 and received approval. The vote did not include size or scale. They presented an update on April 3, 2019 to the South Village Subcommittee (SVSC) for approval of the project. The project was approved with a vote of 5-1-0 with three conditions (utility location determination, change sidewalk material, change tree species).
- Steve Flynn, with Bell Properties, and John Ziebarth, the architect for the project, were both present.
- The project was originally submitted to the County in July of 2017. An informational presentation was given to the VCCPG at the August 2017 meeting. The project includes a grocery market (either Von's or Albertson's), inline retail, a gas station and bank. In August of 2017 a formal presentation was made to the DRB. Over the following twelve months, they met five more times with the DRB to work out details. The DRB dove deep into details,

more than any other group they have ever worked with, yet they were good comments and the project leads took the DRB's comments and revised the plan. The project was presented informally to the South Village subcommittee in February of 2019 and again formally in April of 2019. The project was approved with the following conditions:

- a. **Utilities.** Determine where they are located and if the location will affect the landscaping. This was completed. The utilities are located under Valley Center Road and will **not** affect the landscaping plans.
  - b. **Sidewalk.** Determine if the sidewalk can be constructed with DG in place of concrete. DG does require more maintenance. This is a county decision, not the developers. The request has been submitted to the county.
  - c. **Landscaping screening** on Valley Center Road. Request to change the trees from deciduous to evergreen so there is foliage year-round. There is a bio filter with a double row of trees planned with a requirement of a 14-foot right of way. The developer has gone over and beyond the requirement of 30 feet distance from road, by planning it to be 35 feet back from the road. The developers have sent the request to meet with the DRB for approval of the change of tree species. At this time, they have not heard back.
  - d. **Traffic Study.** A final traffic study is not done, but the mobility element report was completed when the property was zoned commercial. At that time it already took into consideration the potential traffic. This project will not receive final approval from the county unless it meets both the general plan and mobility guidelines.
- Mr. Del Pilar asked if a presentation had been made to the community. Mr. Burnett said there have been multiple presentations to the DRB, which the public was invited to, as well as to the Homeowners at Woods Valley (325 homes). At that meeting, there was overwhelming approval. Only one person was neutral. The project has also been presented twice to the Valley Center Chamber of Commerce. Again, majority approval, with one two neutrals. Further, the project has been presented to the Valley Center homeowners group behind Tractor Supply. They gave lots of input and support. Finally, the presentation has also been given to the Valley Center Realtor group which gave majority approval. The only questions asked from this group were "when will the project start?" and "when will it be completed?" There have been a total of 7 meetings with public notice, plus the presentations at the Chamber.
  - Mr. Hutchison mentioned that when the project was first proposed, there was a concern about the size of the market. He has not heard anything addressed about making the market smaller. Mr. Ziebarth explained that typical Von stores are between 50,000 and 58,000 square feet. Boutique markets like Trader Joe's or Sprouts are typically between 14,000 and 30,000 square feet. The retailer has studied this area and knows what is needed. The larger store is what's indicated for this area.
    - a. Mr. Hutchison asked about scale, pointing out the planning group's purpose is to review and make sure projects are consistent with the general plan. Scale can have a dramatic effect taking rural to suburban area. Part of the community plan is to

- preserve the rural feel. The VCCPG is a review group, not a planning group. We're trying to tell the tenant what we want. We don't want the scale/size that will change the feel of Valley Center. Mr. Hutchison hasn't seen these items addressed. What effort has been made to be consistent with the plan in regard to scale and size? The group has gotten different responses back.
- b. Mr. Ziebarth responded the developer is working to maintain the rural character of the community by increasing the number of trees to hide the development from the road, actually more than what's necessary. It's not the size that's important, but rather how well it blends into the community. It is not our job to determine size, but rather to ensure it blends into the community, to make the project feel appropriate.
  - c. Mr. Hutchison responds he still hasn't heard how size is consistent with the general plan here in Valley Center. Mr. Burnett said the county has no right to override general plan. They make sure everything meets the plan. DRB said they would not disapprove the project because of size. Mr. Burnett further said, community character is going to change because of the housing development, not this project. And, this is not a big box project.
  - d. Mr. Burnett stated the size of the market is proposed to be 52,000 square feet. Mr. Vick corrected him stating in his notes he had 50,900 square feet. Mr. Burnett apologized for his error. Mr. Vick is correct. He went on to explain the inline retail building will be 50 feet deep, the length is about the same as the market. The developer and retailer have worked to deal with the size. To be a full service market, which is wanted, this is the size needed. To make it feel smaller, they will be breaking it up visually into 5 units, so it appears to be 5 adjoining buildings - the same as building 2 (inline retail). The DRB is thrilled they were listened to. The builder and developer want to respond and come to a mutual agreement.
- The DRB voted unanimously for the project. The South Village Subcommittee voted 5-1-0 to approve the project. The only nay vote was Mr. Vick.
    - a. Mr. Vick said he voted no because he has concerns with the size. Also, he wondered how many gas pumps will there be. Mr. Burnett advised him 6 stations, 12 pumps in all. There will also be a total of 400 parking spaces. The project also includes an entry for the gas station on a side road, not directly from Valley Center Road to alleviate traffic congestion. Further the project will have a drive-thru bank and an outdoor plaza with outdoor seating and a coffee shop. The building is pushed back 15 feet to allow for gatherings. In all, the project is 82,000 square feet and includes 6 buildings.
  - Ms. Harmes asked to confirm conditions on the approval. Specifically, (1) the utilities - Mr. Burnett responded they were to clarify the location of the utilities in relation to the proposed plants and trees, which has been done and confirmed planting can proceed as planned; (2) changing tree type - Mr. Burnett confirmed they are waiting on DRB approval; (3) changing sidewalk to DG - Mr. Burnett explained that is in county's hands, the developer does not have any say on the matter; (4) architectural articulation - Mr. Burnett described

the “stepping in and out” both vertically and horizontally to give the appearance of several buildings. Architecture is the component the developer could address, and it has been done.

- Mr. Vick wants a traffic study before any vote on recommendation is taken.
  - a. Mr. Burnett explained the traffic study was submitted, but nothing has been received. It is a requirement by the County and general plan, meaning it *has* to comply.
- Ms. Fajardo is concerned about the traffic from the gas station and points out the Von’s in Escondido on Felicita at Centre City Parkway as an example. Felicita is always jammed with cars waiting in line to enter and wants to ensure this is addressed in the traffic study.
  - a. Mr. Burnett explained the entrance to the gas pumps will not be from Valley Center Road, it will be a side road.
  - b. He also informed the group the traffic study does not consider entrances / exits to shopping center. Rather it focuses on existing overall flow.
- Mr. Garritson is concerned about property rights. The store owners are taking the risk. The VCCPG is to only give input. Why isn’t the group voting on approval of this project tonight?
- Will Rogers, landscape architect, audience member, and member of the South Village subcommittee states he had asked for a floorplan from the developer. He had not received one. He wants to see all 4 sides of the building, not just the front and front angles. He doesn’t feel the renderings articulate the building as 5 separate buildings. Also, the silo is not a true silo. He wants a 3-dimensional rendering showing authentic architecture that appears historical in nature: a new building that looks like it’s been here a long time. He wants to see where the AC units are located, what the side walls look like, etc.
  - a. Mr. Burnett described the project, explaining the back side is facing the sewer plant, the north side is blocked by the bluff between the golf course and the project.
  - b. Ms. Harmes wants a full silo. She also thinks when storage is considered in the size of the market, it is not too big and further states anyone investing money is not going to overbuild. New communities are being built, it’s in the general plan. Let’s do what we have planned. We need to put personal opinions aside and serve the people we represent.
  - c. Ms. Fajardo shares her opinion that the community is being blown apart with new housing developments and there will be traffic jams around the gas pumps. She then inquired about the purpose of biofiltration. Mr. Burnett explains it’s how regional water from storms is treated and it’s mandated by law. As for the gas station, it was moved further away from the street and a different entrance (not using Valley Center Road) was created to avoid potential accidents.
- Ms. Norwood asked if the project development will be phased. Mr. Burnett confirmed

it would be built in sections, with the market being completed first.

- Ms. Norwood said this area had a high water table, and inquired how the gas tanks would affect it. Mr. Burnett responded he had not seen or heard anything about any issues or prohibiting installation of the gas tanks. Mr. Burnett also mentioned about off-site mitigation. The developers need to mitigate for direct impacts by contributing money to the county as traffic impact fees.
- Mr. Gharmalker inquired about the different elements in the project. Mr. Ziebarth described the different areas of the market and also said there will be a drop-in area. Mr. Gharmalker said he thinks because of all the offerings, it will make the market feel smaller.
- Ms. Boulos had wanted to hear what Mr. Will Rogers shared earlier about the plans. With that said, there is nothing the VCCPG can change, since approval has been granted by the DRB and feels it should have been voted on tonight.
- Chairman Smith explained it is not on the agenda as a voting item because he had checked with Mr. Vick, the chairman of the South Village Subcommittee, who informed Chairman Smith that the matter was not ready to vote on and that's why there is no vote on the matter tonight. Mr. Vick spoke up saying "we'll get screwed" if we don't have all the facts before a vote is taken.
- Ms. Boulos questioned why Mr. Vick said no vote until traffic study is in, yet in other projects that hasn't prevented a vote.
  - a. Mr. Burnett said it's very complex and in the past it has not been the practice of the VCCPG to postpone a vote based on a traffic study, why now? What's different? Mr. Vick is postponing the South Village S/C approval. Why wouldn't the matter go to the VCCPG for a vote?
- Mr. Rogers inquired about a scoping letter. Mr. Vick says he doesn't know about a scoping letter. He had not received an update to the Scoping Letter, but will request one. Mr. Rogers informs the group that until an updated scoping letter is received, we don't have all the details necessary.
- Mr. Vick wants the group to understand why he was the sole person to vote NO to the project and passed out his prepared notes (see Attachment A-Big Box Stores in Valley Center?) and quickly summarized due to the time limit of 2 minutes..
- Chairman Smith explained in moving this forward the options were to either (a) put it on the next month's agenda for a vote or, (b) schedule a special meeting or, (c) have South Village S/C meet again and give their recommendations to the VCCPG.
  - a. Mr. Jockinsen spoke up reminding the Chairman the South Village S/C already voted on the matter and provided recommendations. There is no reason to push it back to the Subcommittee.
  - b. Ms. Harmes motioned to put the matter on the agenda for a vote in June.
  - c. The Chairman informed everyone the item will be on the June's Agenda.

**2. Discuss and Possible Recommendation Vote - San Diego County Dept. of Public Works Annual Guardrail Maintenance project in Valley Center: Additional areas needing attention**

**discussion.**

- Mr. Vick informs the group a new guardrail measuring 2000 feet in length is planned to be installed on Old Castle Road east of Pamoosa Lane at the hairpin curve.
- There is no further input from the group.

**3. Discussion and Possible Recommendations Vote - San Diego County Dept. of Public Works: 5-year road resurfacing list alternatives as identified by the community (Vick).**

- Mr. Vick summarized the road resurfacing projects. 150 miles of roads are resurfaced per year. This year 4 roads are slated to be resurfaced. Mr. Vick had asked for input on what other roads need resurfacing and received many recommendations. A list is provided with those recommendations (Attachment B-Valley Center Roads That Need Resurfacing). Chief Napier and the fire department recommended the roads listed on the second page of Attachment B. Mr. Vick makes the motion to send this list to the county with corrections.
- Chairman Smith asked what would the group like to see done and what can we eliminate?
- Mr. Vick mentions that other communities are getting more resurfacing.
- Ms. Harmes asks why should we not negotiate if other communities are getting more?
- Mr. Hutchison says Betsworth Road is not an evacuation road, but Ms. Harmes informs him it actually is.
- Audience member, Dorothy Kennedy, brought up Valley Center Road.
- Chairman Smith said some roads don't need to be on the list because they are being addressed like Valley Center Road which is being brought back to its previous condition before the sewer line work started.
- Ms. Kennedy suggests Bear Valley, as it served as a mini evacuation route in 2011.
- **Motion: To move for Chairman Smith to provide the DPW a revised list identifying roads needing resurfacing.**
- **Maker/Second: Vick/Harmes**
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

**4. Discussion of the Rite Aid Project and its Progress. Reflection on what was done right or wrong. (Smith)**

- Due to time constraints, the Chairman postponed this topic until the June 10th meeting.

## **F. Group Business**

**1. Candidate application acceptance for the VCCPG vacant seat #13, term expiring in January 2021 (Janisch)** (Listed in Agenda as: Applicant review and possible vote for VCCPG vacancy caused by resignation of Seat 13, Jennifer Lindley (Janisch))

- Sue Janisch introduced candidate for seat 13, Lisa Adams and invited her to share why she wants to be on the VCCPG. Ms. Adams explained her background working for the City of San Diego for 35 years before retiring and now finds herself bored and wanting to get involved. She brings a lot of experience that would benefit the group as far as processes of working with developers and the

county are concerned.

- Mr. Del Pilar asked Ms. Adams her thoughts on the presentation given about the Liberty Bell Plaza. Ms. Adams says (1) it's important to give feedback in a positive way and to be kind to developers and treat them with respect. They don't have to come before the VCCPG. (2) Traffic study won't change anything, only turn lanes. (3) Excited to be here at the time of the general plan update.
- Mr. K. Smith thanked Ms. Adams for coming back (she'd previously ran for a seat, which Mr. Smith won), and said he thinks she'll be a valuable addition to the group.
- Ms. Janisch thanked Ms. Adams for her time and a vote was taken.
- **Motion: To nominate Ms. Lisa Adams for seat #13 on the VCCPG expiring January 2021.**
- **Maker/Second: Janisch/K. Smith**
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- Chairman Smith advises the nomination papers will go to the Board of Supervisors, then that Board will vote in 4-6 weeks, before she can be seated.

**2. Candidate application acceptance for vacancy on the Valley Center Design Review Board, Seat #2 with a term of 5 years (Janisch).** *(Listed as item #2 on Agenda: Candidate application acceptance for the VCCPG vacancy seat #13 and VCDRB vacancy, term expiring in January 2012 and item #4)*

- Sue Janisch introduced candidate for VCDRB vacancy, Kevin Smith, and invited him to share why he wants to be on the VCDRB. Mr. Smith said he doesn't have a background in architecture or landscaping, but believes the DRB should have VCCPG members on it. He has attended multiple meetings and has learned a lot. He wants to be the people's viewpoint.
- Ms. Janisch thanked Mr. Smith for his time and a vote was taken.
- **Motion: To nominate Mr. Kevin Smith for a seat on the Valley Center Design Review Board for a 5-year term.**
- **Maker/Second: Janisch/Del Pilar**
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- Ms. Janisch advised the nomination papers will go to the Board of Supervisors, then that Board will vote in 4-6 weeks, before he can be seated.

**3. VCCPG Standing Rules reviewed and recommendation vote taken on changes, if needed, or kept the same (Smith) [See Attachment A].**

- Decision was made to postpone the item until the June 2019 meeting due to lack of time.

**4. Discussion on San Diego County's Official response about planning group Email Signature Blocks (Boulos).**

- Ms. Boulos had been notified that her email footer was advertising because it contained her photograph and company contact information. In response Ms. Boulos contacted the county. Their official response said it's okay to have

signature blocks in emails. Shortly afterwards, a response was received from the County Counsel which said, the use of a work signature isn't a conflict issue, however, if this is a problem (even in appearance), a gmail account should be used. There shouldn't be any advertising in emails.

- Chairman Smith asked the group if anyone had any issues with other members using their work emails. Nobody did.

**5. Discussion and possible recommendation vote for VCCPG member to take up Mobility Subcommittee Chair (Vick/O. Smith)**

- Dina Gharmalker's seat as the Subcommittee Chair of the Mobility Subcommittee must be filled. Due to work obligations, Mr. Gharmalker is not available. This seat must be filled by a VCCPG member. Mr. Vick said it should be someone who is not already a chair on another subcommittee group.
- Ms. Harmes suggested newly nominated member Lisa Adams, when she gets seated on the group.
- Ms. Harmes asked Mr. Vick if he could maintain until Ms. Adams gets seated, or as a public citizen can she be voted in?
- Ms. Adams said she knows nothing about the subcommittee and is not ready.
- No further action was taken at this time.

**6. Report of the VC Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee. (Harmes)**

*With the loss of Jennifer Lindley and a CHP member, the Emergency Evacuation needs two more individuals on the group. Ms. Harmes recommends William Del Pilar and Rick Johnson to serve on the subcommittee and requests a vote.*

**Motion: To elect William Del Pilar and Rick Johnson to serve on the VC Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee**

**Maker/Second: Harmes/Garritson**

**Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

**7. Vote to extend meeting length**

- Motion: Motion to extend meeting 5 minutes
- Maker/Second: Chair Smith / Janisch
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

**8. Discussion on the chair's role in determining public communication by subcommittee chairs, board members and how this is communicated (Del Pilar)**

- Mr. Del Pilar gave an interview to the town's newspaper, the Valley Center Roadrunner, and his comments were published, appearing to be as a representative of the VCCPG.
- In response, Mr. Del Pilar received an email from the Chair informing him any future articles need to go through the Chair first, since what was published reflected badly on the VCCPG.
- Mr. Del Pilar said he spoke as an individual. However, he did send a copy of what he was submitting to the newspaper to the North Village Subcommittee for their comments prior to submission.

- Ms. Boulos sent him feedback in an effort to help Mr. Del Pilar understand he needs to clarify he's speaking as a private citizen, and to also choose his words to be more diplomatic.
- Chairman Smith pointed out any quotes must say upfront they are coming from you as a private citizen. He has no problem if you are speaking as an individual.
- Mr. Del Pilar took the email he received from Chairman Smith after the article was published as "bullying tactics." The email directed Mr. Del Pilar to get approval from the Chairman before publishing anything moving forward.
- Ms. Harmes asked the Chair about speaking as the chair of a subcommittee if it was necessary to get approval first. The Chairman said it had been his practice to give permission to all subcommittee chairpeople to speak for their groups without prior approval, however, to keep it professional and not filled with rhetoric.
- Mr. Del Pilar said the Chairman acts as boss, but he should be guide, and not dictate or bully.
- Chairman Smith pointed out the importance of ensuring our PDS relationship. Everything should be on a professional level at all times.
- Mr. Del Pilar further inquired why Mr. Vick and Mr. Hutchison were included in the email exchange, since they had nothing to do with the matter. No response was given.
- Mr. Del Pilar said this has been a learning and growing experience and will ask the Roadrunner not to print the follow-up article he had already submitted.

#### **9. Meeting Updates:**

- Next Regular Monthly VCCPG meeting: June 10, 2019.

#### **G. Reports of VCCPG Subcommittees**

##### **a. Community Plan Update - (Steve Hutchison, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **b. Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee – (Delores Chavez-Harmes, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **c. Member Training - (Oliver Smith, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **d. Mobility – (Jon Vick, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **e. Nominations – (Susan Fajardo, Chair)**

- Previously discussed in Group Business Action Items 1, 2.

##### **f. North Village – (William Del Pilar, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **g. Parks & Rec. – (LaVonne Norwood, Chair)**

- No updates.

##### **h. South Village – (Jon Vick, Chair)**

- See item 1 of these minutes.

**i. Tribal Liaison – (Jeana Boulos, Chair)**

- No updates.

**j. Website – (Kathy MacKenzie, Chair)**

- No updates

**H. Correspondence Received for the April 8, 2019 Meeting**

1. Frank Arebalo to VCCPG - County of San Diego's Annual Road Resurfacing Program Update. [Frank.Arebalo@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Frank.Arebalo@sdcounty.ca.gov).
2. Subject: *Advertise and Award a Construction Contract for Guardrail Maintenance in Valley Center, Fallbrook, Pine Valley and San Dieguito (Districts: 2, 3 & 5)* - Meil Att
3. Email to VCCPG. Subject: *General Plan Amendment (GPA) to be heard by the Board of Supervisors (Planning & Development Services)*. Planning & Development Services (Advanced Planning Division) is currently finalizing the items to include in the 2019 General Plan Clean-Up. The General Plan (GP) Clean-Up is a board-directed process that is conducted every two years. The GP Clean-Up is intended to provide a regular mechanism for making refinements and minor changes to the General Plan. The last GP Clean-Up was completed in 2017 and the next will be completed in 2021. Find more information, including map and examples, on the 2017 GP Clean-Up project website: <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/2017gpclean-up.html>
4. Email to Oliver Smith, VCCPG. Subject: *General Plan Amendment (GPA) to be heard by Board of Supervisors (Planning & Development Services)*. Planning & Development Services (PDS) is currently processing its first General Plan Amendment (GPA) of the Land Use Element and Mobility Elements for 2019, to be considered by the Board of Supervisors (Board) on May 22, 2019. The GPA is comprised of the privately-initiated Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19. [sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com](mailto:sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com)
5. Email to Oliver Smith, VCCPG. Subject: *County of San Diego Public Hearings on the County Budget*. [sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com](mailto:sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com). All hearings listing above will take place at the County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Board Chamber, Room 310, San Diego CA 92101. The County of San Diego invites you to view and submit your comments regarding the Chief Administrative Officer's Recommended Operational Plan (budget) online. Please visit <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/cob/op-plan-comments.html> to view the Recommended Operational Plan and submit comments online.
6. Notice of Public Hearing from Historic Site Board (HSB) of the County of San Diego. Location: Public Hearing Chambers. 5520 Overland Ave., San Diego, CA 92123
7. Letter from Jim Desmond, Board of Supervisors to Oliver Smith, Chair of VCCPG. Thank you for the discussion on the enhancement of the Community of Valley Center. 619-531-5555. [jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov).

**I. Adjournment**

- Motion: Motion to adjourn.

- Maker/Second: Vick/Chair Smith
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.
- Minutes were approved on June 10, 2019

**Kathy MacKenzie, Secretary**

---

**Attachments A, B**

## Attachment A

May 13, 2019

### Big-box stores in Valley Center?

Most everyone in Valley Center wants a grocery store so we don't have to go down the grade into Escondido for our everyday needs. And most everyone came to live in VC because they wanted to live in a rural community. How do we balance these goals?

The VC Community Planning Group (VCCPG or PG) has an obligation to the residents of VC to facilitate the development of one or more grocery stores **and** to protect our rural community character. The owners of Liberty Bell Plaza have proposed building a 50,900 square foot (sf) Von's on the east side of VC Road in the South Village. This store would be a full-service Von's that would provide beer & wine, a bakery, coffee-bar, deli, and other services, plus a multi-pump gas station. Compare this 50,900 sf store with the 38,437 sf Von's on E. Valley Parkway. Or the 19,000 sf Tractor Supply across the street (built by the same proponents). The proposed Von's would be over 2.5 times the size of Tractor Supply.

A 50,900 sf store would be larger than any Von's in Escondido and is incompatible with VC's rural character. Yes, we want a grocery store but we also want to protect our community character. How do we balance these competing goals? By developing a store that meets the community's requirements, not a store that is intended to create a monopoly for Von's and enrich the proponents.

The proponents are great salesmen. They will tell you that Von's knows what they are doing and would only build a store that they know will be successful and that they determined that they needed a 50,900 square foot store plus 16 or so gas pumps to supply the needs of Valley Center. They will also tell you that they designed the facades to look like a number of smaller stores and that the design and site plan were approved by the VC Design Review Board.

The DRB did approve the site plan that includes this "Big Box" store, and they approved the landscaping schematic. But they did not vote on the size or the scale of the store. The DRB also approved the site plan and landscaping plan for Tractor Supply because the same proponents represented in schematics that the store would be hidden from VC Road by trees between the store and the road. But then they installed 35 feet of cement they called "water wise landscaping" and according to our local arborist the trees will never grow to maturity and the store will never be masked from the street. The proponents are convincing salesmen and they will tell you what you want to hear, but judge for yourself if they are telling you the truth. When the store is built and you can see it, it will be too late.

The 50,900 sf Vons will transform VC's Community character and will discourage any other market, such as a Sprouts, Barons, or another more "country" or "farmers market" store from coming to VC thus limiting our choices to one large, urban grocery store. This is their goal. Is it ours?

The VC Von's does not need to be, nor should it be, larger than the Von's on E. Valley Parkway.

## Community Character

The VCCPG (PG) is tasked with making recommendations to the County on projects proposed for Valley Center. The PG Members should be guided by Valley Center's Design Guidelines, VC's Community Plan, and the SD County General Plan.

Here are excerpts from each of these documents:

**The VC Design Guidelines:** "Valley Center citizens feel strongly about the quality of the community's rural setting and its rural residential character. The community intends to avoid the haphazard urban development common to other growing communities and to preserve the feeling of the valley's spacious, largely unspoiled environment. The design review process is intended to protect this special environment while accommodating the substantial growth expected".

**VC Community Plan, Chapter 1: Community Character Goals (p.4):** "Preserve and enhance the rural character of VC by maintaining a pattern of land use...consistent with enhancing the rural village character of VC's North and South Villages".

### San Diego General Plan

#### Excerpts from the Land Use Element

The Land Use Element provides a framework to accommodate future development in an efficient and sustainable manner that is compatible with the character of unincorporated communities.

#### Goals and Policies for Land Use Element

##### LU-2

Maintenance of the County's Rural Character. Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.

**LU-2.2 Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan.** Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area.

**Villages and Town Centers:** It is important that new development in Villages be compatible with its surrounding area. Under the General Plan land use designations, many of the County's Villages may realize a sizable amount of growth in the future years. Unchecked, growth and new development can easily transform a community. However, when planned and implemented wisely, growth can be beneficial to a community's identity, economy, and character.

**LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character.** Requires that commercial... development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.

**LU-11.5 Large-Format Retail Stores.** Allow large-format retail uses only where the scale of the use and design is compatible with the surrounding areas.

**Conclusions:**

- People move to VC because of our rural community character
- Our license plates say “Valley Center, Country Living”
- When it comes to community character, size and scale matter
- “Large format” stores will destroy our rural community character
- The proposed Von’s is incompatible with VC’s rural character
- Large stores like the proposed Von’s will transform our community.
- Large-format retail stores are allowed only where the scale of the use and design is compatible with the surrounding areas.

The VCCPG, the PG subcommittees, and the DRB have a responsibility to the community to protect VC’s Community Character.

The proposed Von’s does not comply with the VC Design Guidelines, the VC Community Plan nor the SD General Plan in its proposed configuration – it is not scaled and designed to be compatible with the unique character of our community. Other than to create a monopoly for Von’s and enrich the proponents, why should VC have a Von’s larger than any in Escondido?

**Motion:** The proposed Von’s should be no larger than the Von’s on E. Valley Parkway and should be shielded from the road view by landscaping that will be allowed to grow to maturity.

**Attachment B**

**Valley Center Roads that need resurfacing\***  
 May 13, 2019

Road	From...	To...	Est. distance	Reported by
VC Road*	Woods Valley Road	Cole Grade Road	2.5 miles	Multiple people
Betsworth Road	Lilac Road	Wilkes Rd.	3 miles	D. Chavez
VC Road	Ridge Ranch Rd.	southbound	1 mile	Kevin Smith
Miller Road	Cole Grade Road	VC Road	Entire	Doug Smith (USPS)
Cool Valley Road	Cole Grade Road	Little Quail Run	Entire	D. Kennedy, S. White
McNally Road	Cole Grade Road	Oak Glen Road	1 mile	J. Vick
Vesper Road	VC Road	Mactan Road	2 miles	Multiple people
Hilldale Road	Cole Grade Road	Star Dust Rd.	1 mile	Larry Glavinic
Old Highway 395	Circle R Drive	Palos Verdes	Entire	Jack Fox
Anthony Road	Lilac Rd.	end	1 mile	James Campbell, DPW
Aerie Rd.	Betsworth Rd.	end	2 miles	"
Lilac Rd.	W. Lilac	Couser Cyn.	2 miles	"

**Notes:**

1. Resurfacing priority should be given to A) Evacuation Route roads, and B) to the highest volume roads
2. All roads, and especially evacuation and high volume roads, should have **petro-mat** installed when resurfaced to extend the life of the pavement

\*It is reported that VC Road is to be returned to condition it was in prior to installation of new sewer lines.

