

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for a regular meeting held on June 10, 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 - Ms. Renee Wolf

C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of May 13, 2019

- Motion: To approve the May 13, 2019 Minutes.
- Maker/Second: Garritson /Janisch
- **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.

- Due to the “standing room only” audience, the Chairman announces a one-minute time limit throughout meeting for all audience members who wish to speak.
- Mike O’Connor, an audience member: He is concerned about the roads and fire safety in Valley Center and points out no progress on either road 14 or 19, yet ground is breaking soon for the housing developments. And acknowledged thanks to the planning group members donating their time.

- Erick Jockinsen, an audience member and also a member of the South Village Subcommittee: Makes two points (a) doesn't like or appreciate the scare tactics that have been used lately about how any development will destroy the quality of life in Valley Center, it is simply creating a shopping district in our town, and (b) the VCCPG denying property rights is wrong.

E. Action items

1. Discussion and Vote on formal assignment of VCCPG Parliamentarian (Norwood)

- Ms. Norwood states 2017 was the last time the VCCPG had a Parliamentarian. Having one helps smooth meeting, helps secretary and the person chosen has to be on the board.
- Chairman Smith elaborates the person selected must be qualified, have a working knowledge of the rules, how long, etc.
- Ms. Boulos suggested the person should also need to do research.
- Chairman Smith says research is not a requirement.
- Mr. Del Pilar feels Robert's Rules are more efficient, more positive, and gives people the ability to speak their mind.
- Audience member, Rich Rudolph says this discussion should go under "Group Business" after the public has a chance to speak.
- Chairman Smith explains the question has been raised can we get through this without one. Because of the topics, the full house tonight, and time limits, this is critical to make the selection now.
- Ms. Norwood suggests Dee Chavez Harmes as the Parliamentarian.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes shares her experience that includes serving on many boards and having knowledge and experience using Robert's Rules, has in-depth knowledge and where to look up information, but is not certified.
- Chairman Smith asks if there are any other nominations. There are none.
 - **Motion:** To move for formal establishment of VCCPG Parliamentarian and appoint Delores Chavez Harmes to serve as Parliamentarian
 - **Maker/Second:** Norwood/Garritson
 - **Motion Carries** 13-0-1 (Y-N-Ab). {Ms. Chavez Harmes abstains}

2. Discuss and Vote to determine YES or NO whether the updated Scoping Letter for Liberty Bell Plaza Project is to be considered as new information per Board of Supervisors Policy I1 Article VI Section VI (Chairman Smith)

- Chairman Smith explains to the VCCPG this vote is to determine whether the updated Scoping Letter for Liberty Bell Plaza project is to be considered new information per Board of Supervisors Policy I1, Article VI, Section VI
- Mr. Hutchison passes out a list of 6 items entitled "Liberty Bell Plaza: New Information" ([See Attachment 1](#)) while Mr. Vick informs members of the VCCPG that new information came to light after the South Village Subcommittee (SVSC) vote on the Liberty Bell Plaza

project.

- Mr. Del Pilar invites the San Diego County representative to explain the process and define what a scoping letter is and if this information is new.
- Ashley Smith, with the San Diego County Planning Department, says the Scoping Letter was issued in November of 2017 with an attachment of an outline of comments. There has been no new scoping letter issued. The applicant has gotten all the information requested to the County, and the County is currently in the review process. At this time, no major issues have been identified and she thinks it is appropriate to take a vote on moving this project forward. Ms. Smith further explains there will be a 30-day public disclosure period for review and feedback.
- Keith Roberston, Chairman of the Valley Center Design Review Board (VCDRB) says all of the supposed “missing items” have been addressed by the VCDRB.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes asks Ms. Smith if any new items or material has been identified since the scoping letter of 2017. Ms. Smith reiterates the County is in the process of reviewing and has not identified any new major issues that will result in changes to the site plan. They will continue working through with applicant.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes addresses the Chair about the Scoping Letter. She has confirmed, through the county, the scoping letter is only sent to 3 parties - the Planning Group Chair, the DRB Chair and the County Planning Department. She asks the Chair if he received a new “scoping letter” from the County. Chairman Smith said he did not receive anything directly from the county. However, other members of the board did. Ms. Chavez Harmes points out that the scoping letter would not be going out to members of the board, only to the chairs. of VCCPG and DRB. She asked if the county would address it?
- Ms. Smith from the County explains the “new attachment” is actually a working draft from the applicant--and not a new scoping letter.
- Chairman Smith asks Ms. Smith why the May attachment is longer. She explains the working draft attachment is longer because it includes items added by the developer not on the formal scoping letter that include: PDS Land Development Comments, Department of Public Works Comments, and Planning & Development Services CEQA Comments.
- Mr. Vick shares that Ms. MacKenzie pointed out the titles of “Scoping Letter” on the reports are misleading, because they are both actually attachments to the scoping letter from November 29, 2017. Mr. Vick clarified these two documents are attachments to the scoping letter. One is the original Attachment A ([See Attachment 2](#)), while the second, dated May 22, 2019 ([See Attachment 3](#)) is the applicant’s working copy. Mr. Vick said he’d asked Project Manager, Brad Sonnenberg for an updated scoping letter so they could review it before this meeting. What was received is [Attachment 3](#). And therefore item #1 on the handout ([See Attachment 1](#)) is not correct. Mr. Vick confirmed no updated scoping letter has been received. However the SVSC had not seen the original scoping letter or the updated attachment prior to voting on the project and therefore took a vote in April before having the information they should have had.
- Mr. Del Pilar states since the county did not issue a new scoping letter, no new information

has been issued from the County.

- John Ziebarth, the project's architect, said under Section 13, they needed the signed DRB approval, which they have received after working with the group between 1.5 and 2 years to meet their requirements. Before the traffic study can be finalized, the approval to move this project forward must be given.
- Mr. Hutchison asks County Representative Ms. Smith about the first several items on the attachment. Why are they identified as "informational only?" The job of the VCCPG is to look for consistency with the General Plan and Community Plan. Only thing settled on is the DRB. The County hasn't really looked at consistency. It sounds like we don't get that information until the EIR. He thinks we are putting the cart before the horse.
- Ms. Smith explains before the project gets final approval, it also goes to the Planning Director for final review to ensure consistency and that it meets the general plan. We're here to get your feedback and overall recommendations tonight.
- Mr. Hutchison points out the Public Disclosure Plan only relates to environmental compliance.
- Ms. Boulos inquires if any modifications that happen after approval will have a 30-day period for public review and feedback. Does it include the site plan, or is it strictly environmental?
- Ms. Smith says it's about the Environmental review, and the site plan is part of the package.
- Audience Member, Ann Quinley, doesn't see any problem.
- Audience Member, Michael O'Connor is concerned with the size and site plan considerations when looking at the community plan. He points out the VCCPG needs to look at zoning, floor plan, whole comprehensive package.
- Ms. Norwood thinks if the VCCPG gets too picky, the county and developer will go over our heads, like Rite Aid, and then Valley Center will have no say in development. Plus this developer has gone well above what was required.
- Audience member, Tracy Smith, asks the County Representation, Ms. Ashley Smith, if this a final vote or just a go-ahead to move forward and have another vote for approval? The County representative says this vote is about making a formal recommendation to approve or deny with conditions or requests to the county.
- Chairman Smith says the future public 30-day period review is on environmental issues only. Map, design, size, or architectural will not be allowed to be part of the next review. Environmental review only. We need to do our decision on the rest of the project now.
- Ashley Smith confirms this review is for the environmental impact.
- Tracy Smith asks if that means only issues brought up affect environmental. Ms. Ashley Smith confirms that is correct.
- Mr. Vick says the SVSC did not review the scoping letter. He thinks the subcommittee should look at it along with the new information obtained from the developer to ensure compliance.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes said (1) the VCCPG can't go back and vote to have a vote that was completed. It is an obstruction of a separate committee to review and revote on a matter

that has already been voted on and cleared by another committee per Roberts Rules of Order. Chairman Smith disagrees.

- Audience Member and SVSC member, Eric Jockinsen, explains he's the one who made the motion for the SVSC to approve the project after the VCDRB approved. Project approval was brought for a vote before the SVSC. It passed with a 5-1 vote. Mr. Jockinsen said, "Only Mr. Vick voted no and is a bad loser."
- Chairman asks for an end to the discussion and put it to a vote. Is it new information, yes or no? Needs 2/3rds vote. Mr. Garritson said the County already explained it is NOT new information, but Chairman Smith explains the VCCPG has the right to make that decision for itself. Mr. Hutchison points out that a 2/3rds vote is not required, only a majority.
- Rick Rudolph presents a letter and shares his background. The one minute time limit is used up giving his bio, he is asked to sit down, Mr. Greg Johnson, who was to speak next, gives his time to Mr. Rudolph to read his letter. Time elapses again, and then audience member, Lael Montgomery continues reading ([See Attachment 4](#)).
- Mike O'Connor, audience member, is disappointed with the time limit - people take time to come and then don't have time to speak their opinion. He says this project is being sideswiped. It is going to drive out small businesses and economic viability. New information has come up and needs to be considered.
 - **Motion:** Is the Scoping Letter new information per Board of Supervisors Policy I1, Article VI, Section VI? Yes or No.
 - **Maker/Second:** O. Smith/Hutchison

Jeana Boulos - N	Kathy MacKenzie - N
William Del Pilar - N	LaVonne Norwood - N
Susan Fajardo - Y	Oliver Smith - Y
James Garritson - N	Jon Vick - Y
Delores Chavez Harmes-N	Kevin Smith - N
Steve Hutchison - Y	Dina Gharmalkar - N
Susan Janisch - N	Renee Wolf - Y
 - **Motion Defeated** 5-9-0 (Y-N-Ab). Scoping Letter [{Attachment 3}](#) is NOT considered new information by County rules.

3. Presentation, Discussion and Recommendation Vote on Liberty Bell Plaza site plan, concept and size. Presentation by Ross Burnett. PDS2017-STP-17-037, Project Manager Brad Sonnenberg (858-694-3640) (Vick)

- Mr. Vick summarized saying the SVSC voted on April 3rd on a motion proposed by Eric Jockinsen on the Liberty Bell size and scope that had been reviewed by the VCDRB without reviewing the scoping letter. The SVSC moved to approve the size and scope of the Liberty Bell Plaza project with the following conditions (Mr Jockinsen interrupted to say the word is "recommendations", not "conditions"): to replace the concrete sidewalks with DG pathways along Valley Center Road, replace the trees in the second row with evergreens to provide screening and also to request the floor plans and details for articulation to be

reviewed by the subcommittee. It was seconded by Jeana Boulos and the final vote of the SVSC was 5-1. Mr. Vick was the nay vote because of size. Mr. Vick says he wants a market, however, wants to keep it rural. His wife had been on the VCDRB and she was instrumental in developing the Heritage Trail and Mr. Vick worked to get the landscaping. He just wants to ensure we all know what the plans say (community and general plans) to maintain rural community. Mr. Vick then passed out a statement of his reasons why the VCCPG should not vote at this time to approve or deny approval of the Liberty Bell Plaza site plan, concept and design ([See Attachment 5](#)).

- Chairman Smith asks what specifically the motion is. He asks Mr. Jockinsen, who made the motion, what specifically did it say? Is there a conflict? What was the motion?
- Mr. Jockinsen said the motion was an attempt to soften the project because the SVSC got a lot of flack from the Tractor Supply with the hardscape vs softscape. In answer to Chairman Smith's question, the motion was to "[Approve the project with *recommendations* of replacing the concrete sidewalk with DG, replace 2nd row of deciduous trees with evergreen trees to provide better screening of building from road and to request floor plans and articulation.](#)"
- Ms. Boulos states the replacement of deciduous trees is up to the VCDRB. Further, the VCCPG can't decide on DG, that's a county issue, as they will also be maintaining it. Also the minutes need to be changed from using the word "conditions" to "recommendations".
- Chairman Smith inquires if there is a clear motion?
- Ms. Chavez Harmes announces she was at the SVSC meeting and asks Mr. Vick if the group has a secretary. Mr. Vick informs her that Susan Fajardo normally takes minutes, but she wasn't there, so he took the minutes.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes says she and Ms. Janish were not recorded as being present in the minutes and that she did write down the motion as made by Mr. Jockinson; "Move to approve the project with recommendations of replacing concrete sidewalks with DG pathways, use of evergreen trees in the second row of trees from the road to provide better screening and provide details of the articulation." Mr. Vick said the final minutes haven't been distributed yet. Chairman Smith said, he is trying to find out exactly what the SVSC motion was so that the VCCPG could vote on it. He's seeing Mr. Jockinsen, Ms. Boulos, and Ms. Chavez Harmes on one position and Mr. Vick on another. Ms. Chavez Harmes interjects that it is unacceptable to change the wording of the motion and Chairman Smith explains that is why he is attempting to get the language of the motion because the draft minutes were not accurate and that bothers him. Mr. Del Pilar reminds Chairman Smith that Ms. Chavez Harmes had written down the motion from the meeting and Chairman Smith asks her to read: "[Move to approve the project with the following recommendations: Remove concrete sidewalks along Valley Center Road and replace with DG pathways; use evergreen trees in the second row of trees to provide better screening; and provide floor plan and articulation.](#)"
- Mr. Vick interrupts to say they were looking at Site Plan, they were not looking at everything. Ms. Chavez Harmes said if Mr. Vicks strikes some of the beginning language of

his version it will be accurate.

- Chairman asks Ms. Boulos if what Ms. Chavez Harmes read is accurate. Ms. Boulos asks the motion to be read one more time.
- The motion is read again.
- Claire Collins, also a member of the SVSC talked about the trees, DG and size of building might not have enough parking spaces.
- Will Rogers, also a member of the SVSC, said he asked for the floorplan because he only saw ½ of the facade. The third request was to provide a detailed floor plan for articulation by the subcommittee.
- Chairman says that's the motion. Dina seconds. Now discussion.
- Ms. Janisch shares she was at the DRB meeting and heard Susan Moore say that they'd like 6 trees in each section, 3 evergreens and 3 deciduous trees in the second row.
- Chairman Smith asks to go around group to ask questions. Ms. Norwood asks to refrain from asking questions until the audience has had a chance to speak their opinions.
- Mr. Vick wants to clarify that this vote is to approve the *project*, not the *site plan*. Chairman Smith says the motion is as spoken. Mr. Vick responds saying "I was chair of the meeting, I took the minutes, the motion was to approve the *site plan*, not the project. You're way off base." The Chairman responded saying three or four people on the subcommittee are here and they disagree. Therefore, other members of the subcommittee disagree on what they voted on.
- Audience Member, Lee Schwarz wants to know why the store is so big? Why rolling over so fast?
- Chairman Smith points out that it is outside the parameters of the Planning Group to decide or make recommendations on the use of a property. That is the choice of the owner and county. The VCCPG doesn't have a say.
- Mr. Vick interrupts to correct Chairman Smith. "The plan, section LU2-7 requires new commercial properties to maintain or enhance the viability of the existing commercial businesses. We have a reasonable responsibility to protect existing businesses. In the San Diego General Plan under 11-9 states new projects must be scaled and compatible."
- Mr. Will Rogers wants to ensure awareness of what we're voting on, please base vote on criteria - consistent with the general and community plans.
- Ann Quinley is concerned about the size of store. She feels it's better to have 2, 3, or 4 smaller stores than 1 mammoth store.
- Michael O'Connor - Feels the store is too big. We don't need 50,000 (*NOTE: correct size is 50,900*) square feet.
- Johnson Dualsvey - wants Vons.
- Leroy Goering - wants Vons.
- Craig Johnson - wants Vons. Concerned about safety issues at the intersection of Mirar de Valle and VC Roads.
- Camille Hayes - welcomes Vons. Bigger concern is the traffic measures. What is planned?
- Alysha Stehly - proponent of approving project and allowing it to start. Keep the money in

Valley Center. The developer has gone above and beyond responding to requests from community.

- Nathan Hilbig, son of Wayne Hilbig. He has worked this last decade on this project. The Bells have worked tirelessly. This project will bring in jobs, save residents time and reduce traffic by not having to drive up and down the grade.
- Aaron Anaya - wants Vons. The store is not too large, and offers more options. Also caution note to VCCPG about relations with developers - do not antagonize as they don't have to go through the VCCPG. Lastly a grocery store, no matter the size, is not going to change our small town values! "The behavior of some of the people in attendance tonight, if you were my kids, you'd be on time out."
- Douglas Moriarity - board president of Woods Valley. Shares the developer came to the community to give a presentation and the residents of Woods Valley do want the Vons project to come.
- Bruce Salerno - He thinks VC would benefit from full service market. VC is going to get developed but doesn't want big box stores. Size is too big and offers such a breadth of service, it makes it impossible for a small market to compete.
- Rand Lowe - Wants the store to look like it belongs here. LD9-8, and LD-11 are vague statements. Needs to have teeth in these statements to make it look like it belongs here.
- Lael Montgomery - Bad idea to approve something prematurely. Make recommendations, see what the developer does, wait until the end and then give approval.
- Larry Glavenic - 2 things: In 5 years there will be gridlock going down the grade with no plans for new roads. If this town is planning for 40,000 residents, we need to provide right type of retail.
- Richard Rudolph - Send decision back to subcommittee. Why is county asking for decision? Very strange. Need more information. What's the rush?
- Daniel Scepurek - Bring a custom, full service butcher shop to Valley Center.
- Mike Moyna - Don't make this area into Escondido. Make it like Rancho Bernardo. He wants his property value to stay up. Make the retail the right size, serve the community, meet the guidelines, and it will keep the property values up.
- John Ziebarth - Size of small grocery store. 50,900. The DRB approved. Mr. Vick is trying to stop.
- Craig Johnson - No reason to rush to give people chance to adjust their feelings to what is going to happen. We should be in charge, not the developer or county.
- Mr. Ross Burnet gives presentation of project to audience and explains he's given this presentation throughout the community multiple times to ensure everyone has had the chance to give input. As far as the size, with the cost of construction, the last thing they want to do is overbuild! There is no new information from County. The intention has always been to work closely with the community and they intend to continue to do so.
- Mr. Ziebarth explains further on the community character issues - the landscaping is 12-13 feet deeper from road than called for. As far as competition, markets like Trader Joe's or Sprouts like to be in shopping outlets with Vons or Ralphs or Albertsons because Trader

Joe is a niche market and benefit from the customers generated by the bigger markets.. Further, the project has been designed NOT to increase traffic. There will be a side road entry, less people will be driving down the grade, which reduces carbon emissions, improves the air quality and reduces the traffic. In conclusion, the project has worked closely with both the VCDRB and SVSC and have met guidelines.

- Chairman Smith asks each VCCPG member to make a statement.
- Ms. Norwood - Clearly heard 11 yes's, 9 no's and 4 concerns about the size of building, competition with existing businesses and traffic issues. Since it's her job to represent the majority of the people, she'll vote yes on this project.
- Ms. Wolf - She wants store, but the issues are traffic and the store size. She thinks it is too large.
- Ms. Janisch - Likes the project. Pleased with cooperation, they listen to ideas, make corrections and answer questions. No problems with size or trees.
- Ms. MacKenzie - Heard more yeses than nos. This developer has gone over and above what they needed to do. As far as community, we need a grocery store. It's the size that concerns some people. The developer has thoroughly analyzed what is needed based on projected population and surrounding area residents who will come to shop. They're not going to build more than they need. The traffic is a concern, a side entrance will alleviate that. A traffic study will also be done, which is a whole other topic.
- Mr. K. Smith - He's going to *&#\$ some people off, since it's nearly a 50/50 split no matter what way he votes. He doesn't like the size of the store and he's gone to many meetings. No criticism. The VCCPG needs to pursue with county directly. We can't say businesses can't come in. This developer has tried and made significant changes to meet our demands. Remember, the county ultimately approves the project, not the VCCPG.
- Ms. Boulos - She's heard a lot about the size of the grocery store, but not about the rest of the project. The size determination is not up to VCCPG and there's a lot more to the project and points out the County does ultimately decide. VCCPG can't restrict what owners do with the land/property they bought to develop. We are restricted to giving our opinions/recommendations to county Planning Commission, but we can still provide some input on this project.
- Chairman Smith - He heard "No big box stores." County has definition of big box: 60,500 sq ft or larger. People say don't want big box, but want supermarket. 35,000 sq ft has been suggested. Big concern is traffic. Recommends the gas pump and traffic is not part of this project approval. It is an additional and separate item. Recommend to add to motion on the floor that we recommend a traffic study for that site.
- Mr. Del Pilar - He's done lots of research. Amazon started destroying mom and pops stores. The average Von's is 50,000 - 60,000 sq ft and includes a coffee bistro, floral section, bakery section and deli section. They are one-stop shops. Consumers want convenience. Developer got the VCDRB's stamp of approval, which it had to do before

it could go to the SVSC who votes 5-1 vote in favor of moving forward to the VCCPG. End of story. This project brings 150 jobs to the area. And has programs to help workers get further education. Further, after studying the Vons in Carlsbad learned that Vons uses local produce and florals - another income generator for the local community. There are some ugly buildings in VC, but these developers are going overboard to comply and they have been honest with us throughout and are working hard to provide what we want. Keep good relationships with developers - "remember Rite Aid."

- Ms. Chavez Harmes - This Vons is being built for what is coming, not what is here. For 1400 homes that's a minimum of 2800+ people. We don't want to have to redo in another 5, 10 or 20 years to accommodate the growth. Valley Center Road is not pretty. This project can be the catalyst for a new, higher standard. What concerns her the most is not the developer, or the size of the grocery store, but the behaviour and actions taken by some of the board members: causing alarm, fear, and misrepresenting facts to the public, attempting to undermine a legitimate vote, to cause unnecessary drama in trying, to obstruct a legitimate vote, to compromise trust; these actions are un-excusable and have only served to increase financial hardship for all, as costs are passed from developer on to the consumer.
- Mr. Gharmalkar - When looking around the entire area of Valley Center, the best place to locate a grocery store is Valley Center Road. The topography elsewhere won't allow. He wants less trips to keep money local and to serve the community.
- Mr. Garritson - Thanked developer for coming again to a meeting. He thinks the matter should have been voted on last month. With a 5-1 vote from the SVSC, he doesn't see why it had to be postponed, it should have immediately been forwarded to the VCCPG for a vote. He takes offense when the VCCPG doesn't support property owners. Valley Center is no longer agricultural, residents need to get into the present time.
- Mr. Hutchison - (1) Traffic. Study is vitally important. Butterfield Ranch was approved without traffic study which resulted in potentially 650 feet of *planned* median removal, but after negotiations, only 190 feet were removed from plan. What we don't know is vital. Not just driveways, it's the traffic. (2) Further he's concerned with the compatibility with the Plan. The plan calls for forward-facing buildings to create that "downtown" feel - but this is side-facing. Parking is to be to the side or behind developments. (3) He thinks most VCCGP members haven't given the General Plan its due. The County says it has no issues, the developer says it meets the requirements, yet the plan is vague. Big Box county specs is more of a suggestion, not specification. This Vons will be 2.5 times larger than the Tractor Supply store. (4) We are Elected Officials of County - VCCPG members - are to recommend to County. What we say matters. We are here to protect VC from overdevelopment. Therefore, he's opposed - for the size.
- Mr. Vick - Against the store. Size is a transformational issue. Look at the scoping letter. All sizing is marked "informational / NA" If approved now, don't know what you're

voting for. It won't include traffic impact analysis. This project shows 9800 car trips daily is estimated. If approved now, don't know what we're voting for. What's the rush? Recommendation is to wait for further information on updated scoping letter and traffic report.

- Ms. Fajardo - Increased traffic, doesn't see traffic increasing in our community from the project, since all traffic goes downhill anyway. She believes the three upcoming housing projects will affect the traffic more.. The outcropping rocks, according to our general plan are to be protected, yet they were destroyed by the developer at the corner of Valley Center and Miller Road to make way for another gas station. As far as mom and pop stores, most don't offer the selection or the reasonable prices Von offers. She is for the project.
 - Chairman Smith distributes a petition ([See Attachment 6](#)) from 31 VC residents saying the Vons and its size does a disservice as well as bringing too many gas stations to our town that take business away from small businesses. Mr. Del Pilar announced this petition is a result of a college student and he applauds her getting involved and making a difference. He urges people to get involved.
 - Steve Wynn - His father-in-law, Mr. Bell, bought the land in 1981. Since that time he has dealt with just about every obstacle imaginable. What people really want is a nice looking store. When they walk in, they don't know what the square footage is. He ensures the developer will continue to work with the community to ensure people get what they want.
 - Chairman Smith - Makes motion to modify "[Recommendation for County to pay particular attention to traffic issues regarding the gas station and do a site specific study.](#)" Boulos seconds. Chairman Smith asks the maker of the motion (Mr. Vick) if he agrees to the modification.
 - Mr. Vick says yes...if it also includes that the County look at all the General Plan and Community Plan items and has an issue resolution created.
 - Ms. Chavez Harmes points out Mr. Vick's request is a separate motion. And so we should vote on the (original) motion as it is.
 - Chairman Smith requests the original motion be read again:
 - [Motion to approve the project with the following recommendations: Remove concrete sidewalks along Valley Center Road and replace with DG pathways; use evergreen trees in place of deciduous trees in the second row of trees along the road to provide better screening; and request the floor plan in details of the articulation be provided for review.](#)
 - **Maker/Second:** Vick /Gharmalkar
- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Jeana Boulos - Y | Steve Hutchison - N |
| William Del Pilar - Y | Susan Janisch - N |
| Susan Fajardo - Y | Kathy MacKenzie - N |
| James Garritson - Y | LaVonne Norwood - Y |
| Delores Chavez Harmes- Y | Oliver Smith - N |

Jon Vick - N
Kevin Smith - N

Dina Gharmalkar - Y
Renee Wolf - N

○ **Motion Defeated: 7-7-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

- Chairman Smith informs that the motion needs a minimum of 8 to achieve quorum and asks if anyone else has a motion.
- Mr. Hutchison makes a motion to refer the issue back to the subcommittee for further consideration. Ms. Wolf seconds.
- Mr. K. Smith questions why Mr. Hutchison wants to refer the matter back to subcommittee. Mr. Hutchison says the subcommittee needs to take this more seriously and review everything.
- Mr. Vick says the SVSC never looked at the scoping letter so they didn't know what they were voting on.
- Ms. Boulos comments that Mr. Vick keeps referring to the scoping letter. Yet, doesn't clarify as to the 2017 attachment or the 2019 attachment. Mr. Vick says the only one available at the time was the 2017. He doesn't think the subcommittee ever looked at that. Ms. Boulos asks if he knew that for a fact. Mr. Vick does not. Ms. Boulos shares that she did review the scoping letter and the attachment.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes asks the chair of the SVSC, "did you not prepare and present that to your subcommittee?" Mr. Vick explains when it came out, he was not the chair. Ms. Chavez Harmes asked wasn't the vote taken in April of 2019 and wasn't he the chair at that time? Mr Vick said yes and explained he had assumed it had previously been done. Chairman Smith said every member of the VCCPG received a copy of the updated draft attachment secured by Mr. Vick as soon as Chairman Smith received it. It was pointed out the topic was about the subcommittee members receiving it, not the VCCPG members receiving the information.
- Ms. Janisch shares that she was at the meeting and knew the DRB went over the conditions, and so did the SVSC.
- Oliver wants to have a vote to determine if further discussion is needed or is it time to vote on the motion on the table.

○ **Motion Yes to immediately vote on the motion on the table or No votes means we continue discussion**

○ **Maker/Second: Chairman Smith/Janisch**

Jeana Boulos - Y
William Del Pilar - N
Susan Fajardo - Y
James Garritson - N
Delores Chavez Harmes- Y
Steve Hutchison - Y
Susan Janisch - Y

Kathy MacKenzie - Y
LaVonne Norwood - Y
Oliver Smith - Y
Jon Vick - Y
Kevin Smith - Y
Dina Gharmalkar - Y
Renee Wolf - Y

○ **Motion Carries: 12-2-0 (Y-N-Ab) to vote on motion on table**

- Chairman Smith instructs the group to immediately vote on the motion.

- **Motion** to refer the issue back to the SVSC for further consideration.

- **Maker/Second:** Hutchison/Wolf

Jeana Boulos - N

Kathy MacKenzie - N

William Del Pilar - N

LaVonne Norwood - N

Susan Fajardo - N

Oliver Smith - N

James Garritson - N

Jon Vick - Y

Delores Chavez Harmes- N

Kevin Smith - Y

Steve Hutchison - Y

Dina Gharmalkar - N

Susan Janisch - N

Renee Wolf - Y

- **Motion Defeated:** 4-10-0 (Y-N-Ab)

- Chairman Smith says the group needs to vote to extend the meeting to 10:30.
 - **Motion** to extend meeting to 10:30 pm.
 - **Maker/Second:** Chairman Smith/Garritson
 - **Motion Passes:** 12-2-0 (Y-N-Ab)
- Ms. Chavez Harmes motions [approval of the Liberty Bell Plaza project](#) and Mr. Garritson seconds. Ms. Chavez Harmes says the majority of the public wants it, there has only been one scoping letter. We do need information on traffic, but believes we'll be in a position to be able to ask for that as the developer has worked in good faith and demonstrated their willingness to meet our requests, Therefore the motion is presented with no recommendations.
- Mr. Hutchison is surprised by the Parliamentarian and challenges the motion. It's the same thing with no new information.
- Mr. Garritson mentions that votes have been taken several times on the same thing to break a tie in the past.
- Mr. Ziebarth shares that once approval is given they can actually move forward to complete the traffic study and we can come back once that's done. That's why the vote is being asked for now, so they can move forward and start finalizing all the loose ends. Without the go ahead, these things can't be done.
- Mr. Hutchison challenges the motion again, saying it's the same issue without change or new information.
- Mr. Vick does not believe the Traffic Impact Analysis is part of the study. Ms. Anna Smith from the County clarifies again that the Traffic Study IS part of the assessment and there will be a 30-day review period to give feedback.
- Aaron Anaya interjects to advise group members to consider the young families and large demographic missing in the audience and not represented at this meeting that need the convenience.
- Mr. Del Pilar supports Mr. Garritson by reminding group of voting repeatedly in the past over filling a spot on the board until we had a majority.
- Lael Montgomery from the audience says if approval is given without consideration for traffic or review of sidewalks by the county, you're wrong. Ms. Chavez Harmes says maybe she is, and asks either Mr. Burnett or Mr. Ziebarth to address those issues. Ms.

Montgomery refused to let them speak and says we can't just approve it with no conditions or recommendations or requirements.

- Mr. Ross and Mr. Ziebarth explain traffic, need for approval so they can order the traffic study.
- Audience member, Dorothy Kennedy, questions if this vote is to approve straight out?
- Mr. Vick said traffic analysis is not part of environmental study.
- Ms. Ashley Smith of the County corrects Mr. Vick stating that the traffic study WILL be included and comments can be made during the public hearing.
- Ms. Chavez Harmes explains to Mr. Hutchison that the last vote was different in that it was presented with recommendations. This one is reworded.
- Chairman Smith says he voted no because he didn't like the wording on the first motion to approve the project. Rewording it may change his vote.
- Ms. MacKenzie says it's ridiculous to send the project back to the subcommittee to revote on something that was already approved.
- Mr. Rogers is not okay with this. He said the approval included 3 recommendations.
- Mr. Burnett said the project was brought to the DRB and over the past several years they have responded to all requests.
- Ms. Lael Montgomery suggests the VCCPG vote on the recommendations to the county and take out "approval of project". Ms. Charvez Harmes doesn't understand how that suggestion would help the project move forward. Ms. Montgomery says you move forward with little steps. Once you have all the information, then you can make an intelligent decision.
- An audience member asks group to stop milling around all night long. Let Mr. Hutchison challenge, but take the vote and move on. Make a decision.
- Mr. Burnett explained the back of the project faces the water treatment plant, that their experience with the DRB shows their willingness to work with us.
- Ms. Carmen Sifuentes says the traffic isn't going to increase because people aren't going to drive here to go shopping at Von's. They are heading through to go to the casinos. VC needs a beautiful and clean place to go shopping.
 - **Motion:** Yes to vote on the proposed motion immediately or No to continue discussion
 - **Maker/Second:** Chairman Smith/???
 - **Motion Carries:** 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab) to vote on motion on table
- Chairman Smith calls for the vote.
 - **Motion** To approve the Liberty Bell Plaza project
 - **Maker/Second:** Chavez Harmes/Garritson

Jeana Boulos - Y	Steve Hutchison - N
William Del Pilar - Y	Susan Janisch - Y
Susan Fajardo - Y	Kathy MacKenzie - Y
James Garritson - Y	LaVonne Norwood - Y
Delores Chavez Harmes- Y	Oliver Smith - N

Jon Vick - N

Dina Gharmalkar - Y

Kevin Smith - N

Renee Wolf - N

- **Motion Carries:** 9-5-0 (Y-N-Ab)

- After vote, Jon Vick, without a word, gets up and walks out of the meeting.

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

- Due to time constraints, this topic was not discussed.

5. Information Only: Chair subpoena for records and deposition regarding the Granger Solar Project on Mesa Crest Rd (PDS2015-MUP-15-019). This project was reviewed by VCCPG Solar Projects Subcommittee and full VCCPG starting in 2015. (Chairman Smith)

- Chairman Smith explains neighbor is suing because of drainage issue caused by cell tower. However, VCCPG didn't recommend or vote, so County is who they need to contact. Chairman Smith was subpoenaed. Moral: Save documents. The only documents that are NOT public are drafts. All else are public documents including emails and texts. This is the second time records have been subpoenaed.

6. Discussion and possible vote on county proposal to repair 9 locations with damaged curb, gutter or sidewalk identified for repair or replacement in the Valley Center Community (Gharmalkar)

- The county has allocated and budgeted for repair of damaged curbs, gutters and sidewalks and provided a list of which to repair. Mr. Gharmalkar makes a motion to accept.
 - **Motion:** Recommend repair of concrete sidewalks identified on county's list.
 - **Maker/Second:** Gharmalkar / Garritson
 - **Motion Carries:** 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab)

F. Group Business

1. CVCCPG Standing Rules reviewed and recommendation vote taken on changes if needed, or keep the same (Smith).

Due to time limit, this item was not discussed.

2. Report of the VC Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee (Harmes).

Ms. Chavez Harmes explains the need for approval of Cal Fire Replacement on the subcommittee. Cal Fire Chief Rick Johnson can not fulfill the requirements and a replacement is needed and makes a motion.

- **Motion:** Recommend Battalion Chief Cal Hendrie as representative to Valley Center Emergency Evacuation subcommittee.
- **Maker/Second:** Chavez Harmes / Garritson
- **Motion Carries:** 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab)

3. Meeting Updates: Next Regular Monthly VCCPG meeting: July 8, 2019.

G. Reports of VCCPG Subcommittees

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

- No updates.
- b. Emergency Evacuation Subcommittee – (Delores Chavez-Harmes, Chair)**
 - See item 2 under Group Business.
- c. Member Training - (Oliver Smith, Chair)**
 - No updates.
- d. Mobility – (Jon Vick, Chair)**
 - No updates.
- e. Nominations – (Susan Fajardo, Chair)**
 - No updates.
- f. North Village – (William Del Pilar, Chair)**
 - No updates.
- g. Parks & Rec. – (LaVonne Norwood, Chair)**
 - No updates.
- h. South Village – (Jon Vick, Chair)**
 - No updates..
- 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. Upcoming project to repair and replace concrete sidewalks, curbs and gutters in San Diego County. To VCCPG Chair, Oliver Smith, from Eric M. Ng, Senior Civil Engineer with County of San Diego - DPW. eric.ng@sdcounty.ca.gov. 858-694-2517. Design Engineering & Capital Projects, 5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 320, San Diego, CA 92123.
2. Zoning ordinance update for Small Cell Wireless Facilities. As follow up to the CPG/CSG Chairs meeting that was held on May 18, 2019, we would like to inform you that the draft Zoning Ordinance Update for Small Cell Wireless Facilities will be distributed for public review on May 31, 2019. On February 28, 2019, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to return to the Board in 180 days with additional requirements for small cell wireless facilities for reducing cluttering, avoidance of sensitive sites, co-location, distance between poles, placement of utility boxes residential preferred locations, undergrounding or equipment, and additional public noticing. This project proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance to address the Board direction and to comply with the September 2018 FCC Order. For any questions, please contact Tara Lieberman, PDS. AdvancePlanning@sdcounty.ca.gov (project email address). 858-495-5466 (project phone line).
3. Site Plan Waiver for 127-370-47-00 Nelson Wya regarding as-built addition to existing garage. To Keith Robertson, DRB from Jenny Tran, Land Use Aid with San Diego County, Planning & Development Services, 5510 Overland Avenue, San Diego. Phone: 858-694-3042. Email: Jenny.tran@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Notice regarding nominations for a Parks and Recreation Champion. Submissions will be reviewed by a panel of judges, and recognition will be given in several categories - in addition to the grand prize: 2019 Parks and Recreation Champion. Winners will be announced at a ceremony and banquet in July, in celebration of National Parks and Recreation Month. County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation, % Marketing Department, 5500 Overland Ave., #310, San Diego, CA 92123.
jessiva.geiszler@sdcounty.ca.gov

I. Adjournment

- Motion: Motion to adjourn.
- Maker/Second: Chair Smith/Garritson
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Minutes were approved on August 12, 2019.

Kathy MacKenzie, Secretary

Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Attachment 1

Liberty Bell Plaza: New information

The case for considering the May 22nd update to the LBP Scoping Letter as new information includes the following

1. The original Scoping letter, issued in November 2017 was not updated until May 22, 2019. Thus, the SVSC did not have access to an update at the April 3, 2019 S/C meeting at which they approved the LBP project.
2. The SVSC was not aware that there are many items on the Scoping Letter Attachment A that are critical to VC Planning that remain unresolved and need to be resolved prior to project approval.
3. The unresolved issues ("unchecked boxes") are important VC Community Plan issues, SD County General Plan issues, and VC Road traffic issues that are critically important to the future of VC.
4. The May 22nd Scoping Letter included many VC Community Plan and SD County General Plan items that were categorized as "Informational" and "N/A" when these items are of critical importance to Valley Center's future. Several important land use items were found to have been omitted. According to the attached May 30th note from Project Manager Brad Sonnenberg, these items are to be reviewed for applicability and conformance with the proposed site plan, but this has not yet been accomplished.
5. The Scoping Letter Attachment A received on May 22nd included 9 pages of items that had not been submitted with the November 2017 Scoping letter so have not been reviewed by the SVSC.
6. Neither the SVSC nor the Mobility S/C were aware that the LBP project projected 9,800 total trips per day on VC Road. These S/Cs have not had an opportunity to review the impact this will have on VC Road.

In addition, On June 5th DS County PDS Project Manager Brad Sonnenberg wrote to Kathy MacKenzie.: "the plans were recently resubmitted and they are still currently under review, and a new Project Issue Checklist/letter has not yet been issued showing what items are remaining".

Liberty Bell Plaza Scoping Letter from November 29, 2017
 ATTACHMENT A
 PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST
 Page 1

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1-1	General Plan Conformance	The proposed project is within the General Plan Regional Category "Village" and Land Use Designation "General Commercial". Please review the below goals and policies of the County of San Diego General Plan to ensure the proposed project complies.	Informational	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
1-2	General Plan Conformance	Commercial Designation. This designation provides for commercial areas where a wide range of retail activities and services are permitted. The maximum intensity of General Commercial development varies according to the compatible regional category as follows: Village—0.70 FAR 82,300 sf / 369,693.72 sf = 0.22 FAR The project complies with the General Commercial Village FAR maximum intensity of 0.70.	Informational. Staff has reviewed and no further justification is required.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
1-3	General Plan Conformance	LU-9.5. Village Uses. Encourage development of distinct areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1-4	General Plan Conformance	LU-9.8 Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity, and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1-5	General Plan Conformance	Commercial, Office and Industrial Development. LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity. Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1-6	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, sited, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1-7	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.6 Office Development. Locate new office development complexes within Village areas where services are available, in proximity to housing, and along primary vehicular arterials (ideally with transit access) with internal vehicular and pedestrian linkages that integrate the new development into the multi-modal transportation network, where feasible.	Informational	11/17/2017	N/A

Plus → LU-2 LU-2.2 LU-11.5

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1-8	General Plan Conformance	<p>LU-1.7 Office Development Compatibility with Adjoring Uses. Require new office development, including office parks, to be compatible to the scale, design, site layout, and circulation patterns of adjacent existing or planned commercial and residential development.</p> <p>LU-1.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers. Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.</p>	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1-9	General Plan Conformance	<p>Please show conformance with the General Plan goal of pedestrian-oriented commercial centers within Villages. Consider designing Shops to create frontage and pedestrian access on Valley Center Road and minimize the automobile-orientation of the development, or provide additional justification.</p>	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
2-1	Community Plan Conformance	<p>Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, land forms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and watershed shall be incorporated in the design of the future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area.</p> <p>Please ensure conformance with Valley Center Design Guidelines.</p>	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
2-2	Community Plan Conformance	<p>Commercial/ civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.</p>	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
3-1	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<p>Design Objectives. Commercial Development on Valley Center Road. Parking Lots and service areas are to be fully screened from road view.</p> <p>Please provide visual simulations from Valley Center Road, to depict how the proposed parking area will be screened.</p>		11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3-2	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	5. Architectural Character Please provide dimensioned elevations on all sides of proposed buildings, including the <u>Clocktower</u> , <u>Liberty Bell</u> , <u>Famous Flag</u> and <u>Heroes Flag</u> .		11/17/2017	
3-3	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	11. Site Lighting . <i>Site lighting shall be limited to that necessary for security, safety and identification.</i> Please provide location of lights on the Site Plan.		11/17/2017	
3-4	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	12. Site Planning Principles - Commercial Development . Development Regulations: 1. Setbacks : <i>The minimum front and street side setbacks shall be 30 feet as measured from the ultimate street right-of-way line. The minimum rear and interior side yard setbacks shall be 10 feet.</i> Please delineate all setbacks on Site Plan to show conformance with setback requirements. 2. Minimum lot size . <i>The minimum commercial parcel size shall be one acre.</i>		11/17/2017	
3-5	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	Please provide a lot encumbrance map to show conformance with lot sizes. A lot merger via certificate of compliance, tentative map, or tentative parcel map may be required			
3-6	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	15. Signage . Please include and dimension all proposed signage on the elevations on the revised Site Plan.		11/17/2017	
4-1	Zoning Ordinance - Use Type	Please identify/clarify all proposed uses onsite to determine conformance with C36 General Commercial use regulations, parking regulations and others. Please include a description of all commercial use types, hours of operation, and any other relevant information.		11/17/2017	
4-2	Zoning Ordinance - Building Type	Building Type regulations: <i>W: Nonresidential Detached, Nonresidential Attached L: Nonresidential Detached, Nonresidential Attached</i>	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4-3	Zoning Ordinance - Building Height	Building Height: G: Maximum: 35 feet, 2 stories. Please provide dimensions on all elevations to show conformance with building height requirements, including the all proposed buildings, <u>Clocktower</u> and <u>Liberty Bell</u> . Please clarify use of <u>Heroes Flag</u> and <u>Famous Flag</u> .		11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4-4	Zoning Ordinance - Setbacks	<p>Setbacks:</p> <p>O.</p> <p>Front: 50' (from centerline) Side Interior: 0' (from lot line, 5' if lot abuts residential zone) Side Exterior: 35' (from centerline) Rear: 25' (from lot line, 15' if lot or building site is used exclusively for buildings with commercial principal uses or buildings with commercial principal uses with one or more dwellings on the second story.)</p> <p>B.</p> <p>Front: 60' (from centerline) Side Interior: 15' (from lot line) Side Exterior: 35' (from centerline) Rear: 50' (from lot line)</p> <p>Please show all lot lines to show conformance with setback regulations. Should the applicant choose to merge the parcels, please submit for a Boundary Adjustment/Certificate of Compliance.</p>		11/17/2017	
4-5	Zoning Ordinance - Special Area Regulations B	<p>Special Area Regulations: B The project is subject to the Community Design Review Board. Please see Valley Center Design Guidelines for more information.</p> <p>Please contact the Chair of the Valley Center Community Group to present the project and receive a recommendation.</p>		11/17/2017	
4-6	Zoning Ordinance - Special Area Regulations F	<p>Special Area Regulations: F No building or structure shall be placed, erected, constructed, altered or enlarged within the area subject to the Flood Plain Area Regulations.</p> <p>Please show Flood Plain line on Site Plan. Please see DPW-Flood comments for more detail.</p>		11/17/2017	
4-7	Zoning Ordinance	<p>Signage: Section 6250-6299 specifies the size, location, number and type of onsite signs permitted. Please identify and dimension all proposed signage. Any proposed signage must be shown on the plot plan and subsequent attached plans or it won't be permitted.</p>		11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4-8	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Proposed Parking Total Offstreet Parking spaces provided: 373 Reserved Accessible Parking: 14 Bike Parking: (Please provide)</p> <p>Please confirm all proposed parking. There are discrepancies on the Plot Plan and in the submitted Project Description and Application for Initial Study.</p> <p>Off Street Parking Requirements: Commercial Office: 4 parking spaces per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3 Shop 3/Office: 140,000 SF x .004 = 56 parking spaces</p> <p>Bank: 4 parking spaces per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike spaces per car space but not less than 3. Drive-Through Vehicle Stacking Provision: 3 vehicles (50 feet) minimum per teller/ATM lane. 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3. 3,500 SF x .004 = 14.4 parking spaces</p>		11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4-9	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Retail Services and Sales: 4.5 Parking spaces per KSF GFA. (Total eating, drinking and entertainment uses cannot exceed 15% of projects GFA. Otherwise the floor area that exceeds 15% shall be calculated according to stand-alone eating and drinking establishment use parking requirements) 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3. Market 50,800 SF + Shop 19,700 SF + Shop 2 3,200 SF = 63,700 SF x .0045 = 286.65 parking spaces</p> <p>Gasoline Station (with accessory retail sales): 4 parking space per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike Space per car space but not less than 3. Gas Station: 1,000 SF x .004 = 4 parking spaces</p> <p>Total Offstreet Parking required: 361.05 parking spaces. Total Offstreet Bicycle required: 35,105 bicycle spaces.</p>	<p>Informational. Please see Parking Comment 4-10.</p>		
4-10	Zoning Ordinance - Parking			11/17/2017	

Please clarify all uses proposed with associated gross floor area (GFA) in order to calculate offstreet parking requirements. For instance, are eating and drinking establishments proposed as part of the shops? How much GFA is devoted to office in Shop 3? Please identify number of bike parking spaces on site and include with calculations.

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4-11	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Accessible Parking Required: 301-400 spaces: 8 required minimum accessible spaces. Minimum 2 of 8 must be van-accessible (1 for every 6 provided).</p> <p>Please show compliance with ADA parking requirements. Please label all ADA spaces on Plot Plan including van accessible spaces. Please provide a typical.</p>		11/17/2017	
4-12	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Parking Design: Please show conformance with minimum dimensions for Common Parking Lot Layouts, Sections 6790-6792: 90 deg: 18' x 9', 16' aisle.</p> <p>Some spaces are identified as less than 18' long. Please show conformance with minimum parking lot dimensions. Please provide a typical.</p>		11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4-13	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Note: Compact vehicle spaces are only allowed to be used as surplus parking and cannot be used to satisfy the minimum parking requirement per the Zoning Ordinance. Compact spaces should be no less than 8' wide and 16' long. Compact spaces should be restricted for use by compact vehicles and identified with pavement, stenciling and/or signage. Compact spaces should be located furthest from the building entrances to discourage use by non-compact vehicles.</p>	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4-14	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Clean Air Vehicle Parking: Constructed non-residential uses shall provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles, per Section 6792 of the Zoning Ordinance: 20% and over: at least 8% of total.</p> <p>The designated parking spaces shall be identified with the words "CLEAN AIR VEHICLE". The words should be painted in white paint and the lower edge of the word "VEHICLE" should be aligned with the end of the stall, stiching to be visible beneath a parked vehicle. Parking spaces provided for clean air vehicle will be credited towards the minimum parking requirement per the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Please identify Clean Air Vehicle parking spaces on the Plot Plan.</p>		11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4 - 15	Zoning Ordinance - Lighting	The proposed project falls within the Dark Skies Zone A. A Lighting Plan for the parking lot site shall be provided for all parking lots with 5 or more spaces, per Section 6792 of the Zoning Ordinance. Lighting should clearly identify the parking lot, entrances and exits to adjacent streets, and enhance the pedestrian environment. Lighting Plans should be appropriate to the location, context and scale of the areas being lit. Lighting must also conform to Zoning Ordinance Section 6300 and the Light Pollution Code.		11/17/2017	
		Please identify proposed lighting on Plot Plan, or on another sheet.			
4 - 16	Zoning Ordinance - Gasoline sales	Gasoline sales: There shall be no open storage of goods or materials, and all repair and lubrication services shall take place in an enclosed building.	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
5 - 1	Plot Plan - Project Description	Please identify grading quantities, i.e. amount and depth of cut/fill. Please identify length of sewer and water connections.		11/17/2017	
5 - 2	Plot Plan - Project Description	Please clarify the square footage and usage of the "Shops 3" commercial and office. What is the square footage of each building in that cluster? What is the proposed use in each building?		11/17/2017	
5 - 3	Plot Plan	Please include a Lot Encumbrance Map to show all parcels within the project site, to ensure if buildings are encroaching over lot lines. If so, a redesign, lot merger via certificate of compliance, Tentative Parcel Map or Tentative Map will be required.		11/17/2017	
5 - 4	Plot Plan	Is access to the loading area/service dock for the Market being proposed from offsite, as well as other improvements such as a proposed rail fence and proposed landscaping? Please provide access agreement, owner permission, and/or any other documents with neighboring property and easement owners if improvements are proposed offsite.		11/17/2017	
5 - 5	Plot Plan	Please include Zoning for all APNs on Cover Sheet/Plot Plan. Information for APN 189-091-35 is missing. Please note that this parcel is split zoned with C36/RR use and development regulations.		11/17/2017	
5 - 6	Plot Plan	Please identify as existing or proposed all buildings and uses on site. Are any existing buildings, landscaping or other improvements to be removed?		11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5-7	Plot Plan	Please include all easements on the Site Plan. Note that an Easement for Water Access and Use Agreement, Doc# 2017-0953122 has been identified on the property.		11/17/2017	
6-1	Elevations	Please provide dimensioned elevations and label each side (North, South, East, West) of every proposed structure. Please include proposed materials and a Key Map for all structures, including the Market building, Clocktower, Liberty Bell, Heroes Flag and Famous Flag.		11/17/2017	
7-1	Traffic & Transportation	The 82,300 SF neighborhood shopping center will generate about 9,800 total trips with about 4,400 being primary trips. The rest are pass by or diverted. A Traffic Impact Analysis is required.		11/17/2017	11/16/2017
8-1	Legal Lot Status	The assessor's parcels listed below have legal lot status per County Policy G-3. (i.e. Deed [recorded prior to Feb. 1, 1972]; Certificate of Compliance) 189-012-17 189-012-49 189-091-08 189-091-22 189-091-30 189-091-35	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/16/2017
8-2	Legal Lot Status	The assessor's parcels listed below do not have legal lot status per County Policy G-3. (i.e. Deed [recorded prior to Feb. 1, 1972]; Certificate of Compliance) 189-012-20 189-012-21		11/17/2017	
9-1	Service Availability Forms	Please submit Deeds or conveyance documents recorded prior to Feb. 1, 1972 as evidence of legal lot status per County of San Diego Policy G-3. A lot merger through a certificate of compliance, Tentative Parcel Map or Tentative Map may be required. Please complete and submit Sewer, Water and Fire Service Availability Forms (PDS-399S, PDS-399W, PDS-399F).		11/17/2017	
10-1	Groundwater	Please identify any existing wells on the property and identify the use. If the property contains wells that will no longer be used or are not a part of the project, a Well Destruction Permit may be required as a condition of approval.		11/17/2017	
10-2	Groundwater	Please clarify if groundwater will be used to serve the project.			

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11 - 1	Fire Protection	A letter dated June 19, 2017 from Valley Center Fire Protection District stated that "VCCPD approves 20' drive aisle widths within the parking area where stalls are at a 60 degree angle". Please have plans fully reviewed by Valley Center Fire Protection District in order to determine if a Fire Protection Plan is necessary.		11/17/2017	
12 - 1	Ownership Verification	Ownership is shown as Liberty Bell Plaza LLC for all submitted APNs. Please submit verification of ownership through an updated Title Report and vesting grant deed(s). Documents submitted were for Bell Holdings LLC and Bell Development LLC.		11/17/2017	
13 - 1	Community Planning/Design Review Board	The project was heard at the Valley Center Design Review Board on 11/6/2017, although no formal recommendation was made. Please contact the Chair of the Valley Center Design Review Board to present the project and receive a formal recommendation.		11/17/2017	
14 - 1	Hazardous Material Use/Storage Onsite	A review of your project indicates that there is a possibility for onsite storage, use or transport of hazardous materials as a part of normal operations associated with a gas station, grocery market, and a mini mart. Please provide additional detail regarding the types of uses and operations that will require hazardous materials storage, use and/or transport. Detail the types of hazardous materials (i.e., gasoline, petroleum, oils, chlorine gas, solvents, pesticides etc.) that would be stored onsite and estimate the quantities that would be stored onsite at any given time. Note that a detailed Hazardous Materials Business Plan may be required as a condition of approval.		11/17/2017	

Attachment 3

Liberty Bell Plaza Scoping Letter from May 22, 2019
 ATTACHMENT A
 PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
Planning & Development Services (PDS) Project Planning Comments					
1 - 1	General Plan Conformance	The proposed project is within the General Plan Regional Category "Village" and Land Use Designation "General Commercial". Please review the below goals and policies of the County of San Diego General Plan to ensure the proposed project complies.	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
	General Plan Conformance	Commercial Designation. This designation provides for commercial areas where a wide range of retail activities and services are permitted. The maximum intensity of General Commercial development varies according to the compatible regional category as follows: Village—0.70 FAR 82,300 sf / 369,693.72 sf = 0.22 FAR	Informational. Staff has reviewed and no further justification is required.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
1 - 2	General Plan Conformance	The project complies with the General Commercial Village FAR maximum intensity of 0.70.			
1 - 3	General Plan Conformance	LU-9.5. Village Uses. Encourage development of distinct areas within communities offering residents places to live, work, and shop, and neighborhoods that integrate a mix of uses and housing types.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1 - 4	General Plan Conformance	LU-9.8 Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity, and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1 - 5	General Plan Conformance	Commercial, Office and Industrial Development. LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity. Locate commercial, office, and industrial development in Village areas with high connectivity and accessibility from surrounding residential neighborhoods, whenever feasible.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1 - 6	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.2 Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1 - 7	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.6 Office Development. Locate new office development complexes within Village areas where services are available, in proximity to housing, and along primary vehicular arterials (ideally with transit access), with internal vehicular and pedestrian linkages that integrate the new development into the multi-modal transportation network where feasible.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1 - 8	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.7 Office Development Compatibility with Adjoining Uses: Require new office development, including office parks, to be compatible to the scale, design, site layout, and circulation patterns of adjacent existing or planned commercial and residential development.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
1 - 9	General Plan Conformance	LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers. Encourage the development of commercial centers in compact, walkable configurations in Village centers that locate parking in the rear or on the side of the parcel, use transparent storefronts with active retail street-fronting uses, minimize setbacks, and discourage "strip" commercial development. "Strip" commercial development consists of automobile-oriented commercial development with the buildings set back from the street to accommodate parking between the building and street.	See revised site plan.	11/17/2017	N/A
2 - 1	Community Plan Conformance	Please show conformance with the General Plan goal of pedestrian-oriented commercial centers within Villages. Consider designing Shops to create frontage and pedestrian access on Valley Center Road and minimize the automobile-orientation of the development, or provide additional justification. Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, land forms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and viewshed shall be incorporated in the design of the future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area. Please ensure conformance with Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A
2 - 2	Community Plan Conformance	Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.	Informational.	11/17/2017	N/A

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3 - 1	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>Design Objectives. Commercial Development on Valley Center Road, Parking Lots and service areas are to be fully screened from road view.</i> Please provide visual simulations from Valley Center Road, to depict how the proposed parking area will be screened.	Visual simulations included in resubmittal.	11/17/2017	
3 - 2	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>5. Architectural Character.</i> Please provide dimensioned elevations on all sides of proposed buildings, including the Clocktower, Liberty Bell, Famous Flag and Heroes Flag.	See revised plans under separate cover.	11/17/2017	
3 - 3	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>11. Site Lighting. Site lighting shall be limited to that necessary for security, safety and identification.</i> Please provide location of lights on the Site Plan.	Lighting plan included in resubmittal.	11/17/2017	
3 - 4	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>12. Site Planting Principles - Commercial Development. Development Regulations:</i> <i>1. Setbacks: The minimum front and street side setbacks shall be 30 feet as measured from the ultimate street right-of-way line. The minimum rear and interior side yard setbacks shall be 10 feet.</i> Please delineate all setbacks on Site Plan to show conformance with setback requirements.	Setbacks shown on revised site plan.	11/17/2017	
3 - 5	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>2. Minimum lot size. The minimum commercial parcel size shall be one acre.</i> Please provide a lot encumbrance map to show conformance with lot sizes. A lot merger via certificate of compliance, tentative map, or tentative parcel map may be required	Tentative Parcel Map included in resubmittal	11/17/2017	
3 - 6	Valley Center Design Guidelines Conformance	<i>15. Signage. Please include and dimension all proposed signage on the elevations on the revised Site Plan.</i>	Revised signage plans in resubmittal set under separate cover.	11/17/2017	
4 - 1	Zoning Ordinance - Use Type	Please identify/clarity all proposed uses onsite to determine conformance with C36 General Commercial use regulations, parking regulations and others. Please include a description of all commercial use types, hours of operation, and any other relevant information.	Uses not yet determined.	11/17/2017	

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4-2	Zoning Ordinance - Building Type	<i>Building Type regulations: W: Nonresidential Detached, Nonresidential Attached L: Nonresidential Detached, Nonresidential Attached</i>	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4-3	Zoning Ordinance - Building Height	<i>Building Height: G: Maximum: 35 feet; 2 stories. Please provide dimensions on all elevations to show conformance with building height requirements, including the all proposed buildings. Clocktower and Liberty Bell. Please clarify use of Heroes Flag and Famous Flag.</i>	See revised plans under separate cover.	11/17/2017	
4-4	Zoning Ordinance - Setbacks	<i>Setbacks: O: Front: 50' (from centerline) Side Interior: 0' (from lot line, 5' if lot abuts residential zone) Side Exterior: 35' (from centerline) Rear: 25' (from lot line, 15' if lot or building site is used exclusively for buildings with commercial principal uses or buildings with commercial principal uses with one or more dwellings on the second story.) B: Front: 60' (from centerline) Side Interior: 15' (from lot line) Side Exterior: 35' (from centerline) Rear: 50' (from lot line)</i>	Tentative Parcel Map included in resubmittal and siteplan updated	11/17/2017	
4-5	Zoning Ordinance - Special Area Regulations B	<i>Special Area Regulations: B The project is subject to the Community Design Review Board. Please see Valley Center Design Guidelines for more information. Please contact the Chair of the Valley Center Community Group to present the project and receive a recommendation.</i>	D.R.B. has approved. Stamped drawings already submitted.	11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4 - 6	Zoning Ordinance - Special Area Regulations F	Special Area Regulations: F No building or structure shall be placed, erected, constructed, altered or enlarged within the area subject to the Flood Plain Area Regulations. Please show Flood Plain line on Site Plan. Please see DPW-Flood comments for more detail.	Flood Plain limits shown on revised plans.	11/17/2017	
4 - 7	Zoning Ordinance	Signage: Section 6250-6299 specifies the size, location, number and type of onsite signs permitted. Please identify and dimension all proposed signage. Any proposed signage must be shown on the plot plan and subsequent attached plans or it won't be permitted.	See revised signage plans under separate cover.	11/17/2017	
4 - 8	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	Proposed Parking: Total Offstreet Parking spaces provided: 373 Reserved Accessible Parking: 14 Bike Parking: (Please provide) Please confirm all proposed parking. There are discrepancies on the Plot Plan and in the submitted Project Description and Application for Initial Study.	Site plan revised. Revised Project Description submitted separately.	11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4 - 9	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Off Street Parking Requirements: Commercial Office: 4 parking spaces per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3 Shop 3: Office: 140,000 SF x .004 = 56 parking spaces</p> <p>Bank: 4 parking spaces per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike spaces per car space but not less than 3. Drive-Through Vehicle Stacking Provision: 3 vehicles (60 feet) minimum per teller/ATM lane. 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3. 3,600 SF x .004 = 14.4 parking spaces</p> <p>Retail Services and Sales: 4.5 Parking spaces per KSF GFA. (Total eating, drinking and entertainment uses cannot exceed 15% of project's GFA. Otherwise the floor area that exceeds 15% shall be calculated according to stand-alone eating and drinking establishment use parking requirements). 0.1 Bike space per car space but not less than 3 Market 50,800 SF + Shop 1 9,700 SF + Shop 2 3,200 SF = 63,700 SF x .0045 = 286.65 parking spaces</p> <p>Gasoline Station (with accessory retail sales): 4 parking space per KSF GFA 0.1 Bike Space per car space but not less than 3. Gas Station: 1,000 SF x .004 = 4 parking spaces</p> <p>Total Offstreet Parking required: 361.05 parking spaces. Total Offstreet Bicycle required: 36.105 bicycle spaces.</p>	<p>Informational. Please see Parking Comment 4-10.</p>	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4 - 10	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Please clarify all uses proposed with associated gross floor area (GFA) in order to calculate offstreet parking requirements. For instance, are eating and drinking establishments proposed as part of the shops? How much GFA is devoted to office in Shop 3? Please identify number of bike parking spaces on site and include with calculations.</p>	<p>Uses not known at this time.</p>	11/17/2017	

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4 - 11	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Accessible Parking Required: 301-400 spaces: 8 required minimum accessible spaces. Minimum 2 of 8 must be van-accessible (1 for every 6 provided).</p> <p>Please show compliance with ADA parking requirements. Please label all ADA spaces on Plot Plan including van accessible spaces. Please provide a typical.</p>	All ADA spaces and routes shown on revised site plan.	11/17/2017	
4 - 12	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Parking Design: Please show conformance with minimum dimensions for Common Parking Lot Layouts, Sections 6790-6792: 90 deg: 18' x 9', 16' aisle.</p> <p>Some spaces are identified as less than 18' long. Please show conformance with minimum parking lot dimensions. Please provide a typical.</p>	Dimensions shown on revised site plan.	11/17/2017	
4 - 13	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Note: Compact vehicle spaces are only allowed to be used as surplus parking and cannot be used to satisfy the minimum parking requirement per the Zoning Ordinance. Compact spaces should be no less than 8' wide and 16' long. Compact spaces should be restricted for use by compact vehicles and identified with pavement stenciling and/or signage. Compact spaces should be located furthest from the building entrances to discourage use by non-compact vehicles.</p>	No compact spaces proposed on site plan.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
4 - 14	Zoning Ordinance - Parking	<p>Clean Air Vehicle Parking: Constructed non-residential uses shall provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles, per Section 6792 of the Zoning Ordinance: 201 and over: at least 8% of total.</p> <p>The designated parking spaces shall be identified with the words "CLEAN AIR VEHICLE". The words should be painted in white paint and the lower edge of the word "VEHICLE" should be aligned with the end of the stall striping to be visible beneath a parked vehicle. Parking spaces provided for clean air vehicle will be credited towards the minimum parking requirement per the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	Clean Air stalls depicted on revised site plan.	11/17/2017	
		Please identify Clean Air Vehicle parking spaces on the Plot Plan.			

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4 - 15	Zoning Ordinance - Lighting	The proposed project falls within the Dark Skies Zone A. A Lighting Plan for the parking lot site shall be provided for all parking lots with 5 or more spaces, per Section 6792 of the Zoning Ordinance. Lighting should clearly identify the parking lot, entrances and exits to adjacent streets, and enhance the pedestrian environment. Lighting Plans should be appropriate to the location, context and scale of the areas being lit. Lighting must also conform to Zoning Ordinance Section 6300 and the Light Pollution Code.	Lighting plan included in resubmittal.	11/17/2017	
4 - 16	Zoning Ordinance - Gasoline sales	Please identify proposed lighting on Plot Plan, or on another sheet. Gasoline sales: There shall be no open storage of goods or materials, and all repair and lubrication services shall take place in an enclosed building.	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
5 - 1	Plot Plan - Project Description	Please identify grading quantities, i.e. amount and depth of cut/fill. Please identify length of sewer and water connections.	Earthwork quantities revised. See revised CGP	11/17/2017	
5 - 2	Plot Plan - Project Description	Please clarify the square footage and usage of the "Shops 3" commercial and office. What is the square footage of each building in that cluster? What is the proposed use in each building?	Uses of building not yet known.	11/17/2017	
5 - 3	Plot Plan	Please include a Lot Encumbrance Map to show all parcels within the project site, to ensure if buildings are encroaching over lot lines. If so, a redesign, lot merger via certificate of compliance, Tentative Parcel Map or Tentative Map will be required.	Tentative Parcel Map included in resubmittal	11/17/2017	
5 - 4	Plot Plan	Is access to the loading area/service dock for the Market being proposed from offsite, as well as other improvements such as a proposed rail fence and proposed landscaping? Please provide access agreement, owner permission, and/or any other documents with neighboring property and easement owners if improvements are proposed offsite.	Access agreement with tribe included resubmittal	11/17/2017	
5 - 5	Plot Plan	Please include Zoning for all APNs on Cover Sheet/Plot Plan. Information for APN 189-091-35 is missing. Please note that this parcel is split zoned with C36/RR use and development regulations.	APN 189-091-35 is not a part of this STP.	11/17/2017	
5 - 6	Plot Plan	Please identify as existing or proposed all buildings and uses on site. Are any existing buildings, landscaping or other improvements to be removed?	No existing buildings on site.	11/17/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5 - 7	Plot Plan	Please include all easements on the Site Plan. Note that an Easement for Water Access and Use Agreement, Doc# 2017-0353122 has been identified on the property.	All existing easements shown on revised plans		
6 - 1	Elevations	Please provide dimensioned elevations and label each side (North, South, East, West) of every proposed structure. Please include proposed materials and a Key Map for all structures, including the Market building, Clocktower, Liberty Bell, Heroes Flag and Famous Flag.	Resubmitted separately.	11/17/2017	
7 - 1	Traffic & Transportation	The 82,300 SF neighborhood shopping center will generate about 9,800 total trips with about 4,400 being primary trips. The rest are pass by or diverted. A Traffic Impact Analysis is required.	LLG	11/17/2017	
8 - 1	Legal Lot Status	The assessor's parcels listed below have legal lot status per County Policy G-3. (i.e. Deed [recorded prior to Feb. 1, 1972], Certificate of Compliance) 189-012-17 189-012-49 189-091-08 189-091-22 189-091-30 189-091-35	Informational	11/16/2017	11/16/2017
8 - 2	Legal Lot Status	The assessor's parcels listed below do not have legal lot status per County Policy G-3. (i.e. Deed [recorded prior to Feb. 1, 1972], Certificate of Compliance) 189-012-20 189-012-21	Tentative Parcel Map included in resubmittal	11/17/2017	
9 - 1	Service Availability Forms	Please complete and submit Sewer, Water and Fire Service Availability Forms (PDS-399S, PDS-399W, PDS-399F).	Included in resubmittal package	11/17/2017	
10 - 1	Groundwater	Please identify any existing wells on the property and identify the use. If the property contains wells that will no longer be used or are not a part of the project, a Well Destruction Permit may be required as a condition of approval.	Well location noted on site and to be removed.	11/17/2017	
10 - 2	Groundwater	Please clarify if groundwater will be used to serve the project.	No use on site.		

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11 - 1	Fire Protection	A letter dated June 19, 2017 from Valley Center Fire Protection District stated that "VCFPD approves 20' drive aisle widths within the parking area where stalls are at a 60 degree angle". Please have plans fully reviewed by Valley Center Fire Protection District in order to determine if a Fire Protection Plan is necessary.	Plan revised to depict typical drive aisle widths. VCFPD has reviewed plan.	11/17/2017	
12 - 1	Ownership Verification	Ownership is shown as Liberty Bell Plaza LLC for all submitted APNs. Please submit verification of ownership through an updated Title Report and vesting grant deed(s). Documents submitted were for Bell Holdings LLC and Bell Development LLC.	Current grant deeds included in resubmittal.	11/17/2017	
13 - 1	Community Planning/Design Review Board	The project was heard at the Valley Center Design Review Board on 11/6/2017, although no formal recommendation was made. Please contact the Chair of the Valley Center Design Review Board to present the project and receive a formal recommendation.	D.R.B. approved.	11/17/2017	
14 - 1	Hazardous Material Use/Storage Onsite	A review of your project indicates that there is a possibility for onsite storage, use or transport of hazardous materials as a part of normal operations associated with a gas station, grocery market, and a mini mart. Please provide additional detail regarding the types of uses and operations that will require hazardous materials storage, use and/or transport. Detail the types of hazardous materials (i.e. gasoline, petroleum, oils, chlorine gas, solvents, pesticides etc.) that would be stored onsite and estimate the quantities that would be stored onsite at any given time. Note that a detailed Hazardous Materials Business Plan may be required as a condition of approval.	Will be submitted later under separate cover.	11/17/2017	

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
Planning & Development Services (PDS) Land Development Comments					
0 - 1	Wetlands	<p>NOTICE: The subject property contains wetlands, a lake, a stream, and/or waters of the U.S. which may be subject to regulation by State and/or federal agencies, including, but not limited to, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. It is the applicant's responsibility to consult with each agency to determine if a permit, agreement or other approval is required and to obtain all necessary permits, agreements or approvals before commencing any activity which could impact the wetlands, lake, stream, and/or waters of the U.S. on the subject property. The agency contact information is provided below.</p> <p>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: 915 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1101, Los Angeles, CA 90017, (213) 452-3333; http://www.usace.army.mil/</p> <p>Regional Water Quality Control Board: 2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92108; RB9_DredgerFill@waterboards.ca.gov ;http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/</p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife: 3883 Ruffin Rd., San Diego, CA 92123; (858) 636-3160; AskRF5@wildlife.ca.gov; http://www.dfg.ca.gov/</p>	Existing man made channel to be converted to underground facility. Submittal to ACOE, RWQCB and CDFG to be coordinated with team members	10/4/17	
1 - 1	General	Have your project reviewed and commented on by the Valley Center Fire Protection District. Project's conditions may be revised upon further review and input from the agency.	Will resubmit to VCFPD for review.	10/4/2017	
2 - 1	Site Plan	Show the direction of lot & road drainage and percent of slopes on roads & driveways.	Slopes and drainage shown on CGP	10/4/2017	
2 - 2	Site Plan	Provide document numbers for any onsite and offsite easements.	Complete	10/4/2017	10/4/2017
2 - 3	Site Plan	Include any walkways and/or pathways. State whether proposed and/or existing walkways and pathways are paved (i.e. asphalt concrete, portland cement, etc.).	See revised site plan.	10/4/2017	
2 - 4	Site Plan	Show proposed and existing Landscaped areas. Provide a summary of the landscaped areas.	Bernie	10/4/2017	
2 - 6	Site Plan	What is proposed for Sewer to serve the project?	See revised Conceptual Grading Plan.	10/4/2017	

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2-7	Site Plan	Provide a legend for all the proposed and existing facilities of the project. Include lines and symbols. Please define all symbols including existing/proposed Fire hydrants, sewer laterals and mains, Fire Service, manholes, fencing, etc.; Delete symbols from the Legend which are not used on the plans.	Legend included on Conceptual Grading Plan	10/4/2017	
2-8	Site Plan	Provide the dimensions of the proposed driveway.	Dimensions shown on revised site plan.	10/4/2017	
2-9	Site Plan	Show a minimum fire turnaround radii of 28 feet (28').	See revised site plan.	10/4/2017	
2-10	Site Plan	The private driveway connecting on the private access road should have a minimum turnout radius of 28 feet (28'). Show fire turnout radii of 28 feet (28') minimum for the private driveway connection to the private access road.	See revised site plan.	10/4/2017	
2-11	Site Plan	Please use consistent font size. Please ensure symbols on plan match symbols in legend and Easement Notes. There are many conflicting notes making the plans difficult to read. Please clean up the plans.	See revised site plan.	10/4/2017	
2-12	Site Plan	Per Public Road Standards 6.1.C minimum driveway separation on a Mobility Element Road is 300'. If the proposed driveways do not meet this minimum separation distance then a Design Exception Request is required.	Understood. Exception included in resubmittal.	10/4/2017	
3-1	SWQMP (Stormwater Quality Management Plan)	The applicant shall submit a new intake form and PDP SWQMP in accordance with the 2016 BMP Design Manual requirements and to be in conformance with the Watershed Protection Ordinance and the new Municipal Permit, 2013 MS4, that was implemented by the County on February 26, 2016. The BMP Design Manual and SWQMP forms are available at: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/watersheds/DevelopmentsandConstruction.html	SWQMP included in resubmittal.	10/4/2017	
4-1	Prelim. Grading Plan (PGP)	The SWQMP is a living document to be updated to reflect any changes during the project's final plan review and construction throughout the life of the project in perpetuity. Submit a Preliminary Grading Plan. Additional information can be obtained in the following link: Preliminary Grading Guideline http://www.sdccounty.ca.gov/dpluldocs/ZC034.pdf Grading Ordinance http://www.sdccounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/gradingordinance.pdf	Submitted	10/4/2017	10/4/2017
4-2	PGP	Show the direction of lot & road drainage and percent of slopes on roads & driveways.	Drainage and slopes included in revised GGP	10/4/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4-3	PGP	Show the existing and proposed contour lines and elevations. Show proposed pad elevations and spot elevations for driveway(s).	Contours and Elevations shown on revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-4	PGP	Extend existing contour lines 100 feet offsite.	Shown on revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-5	PGP	A minimum setback, for grading is required, from top and toes of slopes, per the San Diego County Grading Ordinance Section 87.412. Also note that the setback is measured from the property line.	Comment for Informational Purposes Only	10/4/2017	10/4/2017
4-6	PGP	Clearly show discharge points, access for maintenance, and easements for proposed BMPs.	All BMPs shown on plan with access points from 3:1 slopes. No easements.	10/4/2017	
4-7	PGP	Provide a legend for all the proposed and existing facilities of the project. Include lines and symbols. Please define all symbols including existing/proposed Fire hydrants, sewer laterals and mains, Fire Service, manholes, fencing, etc.; Delete symbols from the Legend which are not used on the plans.	Legend included on Conceptual Grading Plan	10/4/2017	
4-8	PGP	Show Earthwork Quantities, import, export, cut, and fill quantities of grading operation.	Earthwork quantities revised. See revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-9	PGP	Add the note "This plan is provided to allow for full and adequate discretionary review of a proposed development project. The property owner acknowledges that acceptance or approval of this plan does not constitute an approval to perform any grading shown hereon, and agrees to obtain valid grading permissions before commencing such activity."	Note added to revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-10	PGP	Show lines of inundation of the 100-year floodway and floodplain.	Floodplain shown on revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-11	PGP	Parcel contains mapped County Floodway/Floodplains and requires review by DPW Flood Control	Floodplain shown on revised CGP. Floodplain does not actually (in reality) enter onto site.	10/4/2017	
4-12	PGP	Within Preliminary Grading Plan Sheet, show site design and source control BMPs selected within the PDP SWQMP.	All BMPs' shown on revised CGP	10/4/2017	
4-13	PGP	Clearly delineate the wetlands, jurisdictional features and Waters of the US and/or State on the PGP	Man made channel determine to be jurisdictional waters is being put into underground facility shown on revised CGP.	10/4/2017	
4-14	PGP	Please use consistent font size. Please ensure symbols on plan match symbols in legend and Easement Notes. There are many conflicting notes making the plans difficult to read. Please clean up the plans.	See revised CGP	10/4/2017	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5 - 1	CEQA Drainage Study	The project is required to submit a CEQA Drainage Study. The CEQA Drainage Study shall be prepared in compliance with the documents shown below. San Diego County Hydrology Manual: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/flood/hydrologymanual.html San Diego County Hydraulic Design Manual: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/FLOOD_CON_TROL/floodcontrolpdf/hydraulic_design_manual_2014.pdf	Drainage Study included in resubmittal.	10/4/2017	
6 - 1	Site Plan - Improvement Plans	Improvement Plans - Project is subject to County Board of Supervisors Policy I-18 and County Code Section 51.301 et al. Please submit improvement plans for Valley Center Road (SF 639) designated as a 4.2A Boulevard with a raised median. The plans shall include intersection improvements for Valley Center Road and Mirar De Valle Road.	CGP depicts our entry layout and design.	10/4/2017	
7 - 1	Sight Distance	Provide a sight distance certification to demonstrate that adequate sight distance along Valley Center Road from the project driveways is achievable per Section 6.1.E, Table 5 of the County Public Road Standards (approved March 2012). If the lines of sight fall within the existing public road right-of-way, the engineer or surveyor shall further certify that: "said lines of sight fall within the existing right-of-way and a clear space easement is not required."	Site distance letter included in resubmittal.	10/4/2017	

Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Sean.McLean@sdccounty.ca.gov.

KENNETH J. BRAZELL, LD Manager
PDS-Land Development

KJB: SM

cc: PDS2017-STP-17-037 file

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
Department of Public Works (DPW) Comments					
Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1 - 1	Flood	The plans should show the location of the floodplain lines of Moosa Canyon Creek, for both the pre and post development condition per Section 811.401(a) of the County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (FDPO).	Limits of flood plain shown on revised CGP. In reality, flood plain does not cross onto subject property to existing site wall.	11/14/17	
1 - 2	Flood	County Floodplain mapping in this area was revised by LOMR 04-09-1312P. Effective floodplain mapping for this area is shown on FEIMA FIRM Panels 06073C0810G and 06073C0809G.	Limits of flood plain shown on revised CGP. In reality, flood plain does not cross onto subject property to existing site wall.	11/14/17	
1 - 3	Flood	Any proposed work that will cause a change in the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), Base Flood Depth or Floodplain boundary will require a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) prior to grading activities and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy in accordance with Section 811.503(b) of the FDPO and CFR Sections 65.3 and 65.12.	Limits of flood plain shown on revised CGP. In reality, flood plain does not cross onto subject property to existing site wall.	11/14/17	
1 - 4	Flood	Any proposed structure within the mapped Floodplain is required to be raised one-foot above the base flood elevation or properly flood-proofed in accordance with Section 811.501(c) of the FDPO.	Limits of flood plain shown on revised CGP. In reality, flood plain does not cross onto subject property to existing site wall.	11/14/17	
1 - 5	Flood	Local drainage issues should be reviewed by the PDS Plans Reviewer.	Understood	11/14/17	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
Planning & Development Services (PDS) CEQA Comments					
1-0	CEQA Studies and additional information	See below for a list of studies and additional information required.	Informational.	11/17/2017	4/5/2019
2-1	Air Quality	An Air Quality Analysis is required. Please see Attachment E.	Emily, Ross	11/17/2017	4/5/2019
2-2	Air Quality	Updates to Air Quality Analysis are provided under separate attachment.	Emily, Ross	4/5/2019	
3-1	Biological Resources	A Biological Letter Report is required. Please see Attachment F.	Informational.	11/17/2017	4/5/2019
3-2	Biological Resources	Staff has reviewed the Biological Letter Report dated December 19, 2018 prepared by Kluitz Biological Consulting and submitted to the County on January 14, 2019. The report was found to be adequate with incorporation of the minor revisions detailed below.	N/A	4/5/2019	4/5/2019
3-3	Biological Resources	All changes to the document must be in strikeout/underline format.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-4	Biological Resources	Please correct the ER number.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-5	Biological Resources	Please provide additional discussion for previous grading of the project site, including the uses for grading and how this was established.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-6	Biological Resources	Please update summary, Table 1 and additional paragraph in the text from "Developed Lands" to "Disturbed/Developed Lands"	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-7	Biological Resources	Please ensure that the acreages of vegetation communities match the total acres of the site.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-8	Biological Resources	Please list the dominant plant species for the disturbed vegetation community. If none are present, please include a sentence describing that no species are present.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-9	Biological Resources	Please provide additional explanation of potential wildlife corridors to include existing development surrounding the site, etc.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-10	Biological Resources	Please provide additional discussion for potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	
3-11	Biological Resources	Appendix A - please include any species found in the disturbed vegetation community.	Korey Kluitz	4/5/2019	

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3-12	Biological Resources	Appendix A includes the vegetation community of Non-Native Grassland. If NNG occurs within the survey area, please include in the text of the document. If NNG does not occur within the survey area, please remove species found within the NNG community as it leads to confusion within the report.	Korey Klutz	4/5/2019	
4-1	Climate Change	A GHG Analysis Report is required. Please see Attachment M.	Informational.	11/17/2017	4/5/2019
4-2	Climate Change	Updates to the CAP Checklist have been provided under separate attachment.	Emily, Ross	4/5/2019	
5-1	Cultural Resources	A Cultural Study is required. Please see Attachment G.	Informational.	11/17/2017	4/5/2019
5-2	Cultural Resources	Updates to the Cultural Study have been provided under separate cover.	Emily, Ross	4/5/2019	
5-3	Cultural Resources	The project has been sent for AB-52 Tribal consultation. Any comments will be collected and forwarded.	Informational.	4/5/2019	4/5/2019
6-5	Drainage	A Drainage Study is required. Please see Attachment S.	Drainage study included in resubmittal	11/17/2017	
7-6	Fire	A Fire Protection Plan may be required. Please have the plans fully reviewed by Valley Center Fire Protection District.	Plans being resubmitted to VCCFPD for review.	11/17/2017	
8-1	Geologic Hazards	Based on the flat topography of the site, potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In-situ soil densities are expected to be sufficiently high to preclude liquefaction. Therefore, a Geologic Reconnaissance report is not required for the project. The project will still be required to comply with the County's Grading Ordinance.	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
9-1	Groundwater Resources	At this time, it is unclear if the project proposes utilizing groundwater resources. A Well Destruction Permit may be required. Please provide more information and see Attachment K. Also, please provide a Water Service Availability Form.	No groundwater use	11/17/2017	
10-1	Hazardous Materials	A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is required. Please see Attachment H.	Emily, Ross	11/17/2017	
10-2	Hazardous Materials	A Hazardous Materials Use/Storage Onsite Assessment may be required as a condition of approval. Please see Attachment I.	Resolved.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
10-3	Hazardous Materials				
11-1	Mineral Resources	Because of the proximity to nearby development, a Mineral Resources Report will not be required.	Informational.	11/17/2017	11/17/2017
12-1	Noise	An Accoustical (Noise) Study is required. Please see Attachment L.	Informational.	11/17/2017	4/5/2019

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12-2	Noise	Staff has reviewed the Noise analysis prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc. dated December 10, 2018 and plot plan associated with the Liberty Bell Plaza. Documentation is considered acceptable and staff has final recommendations to ensure the project is in conformance with County noise standards. The project is subject to the County Noise Element and Noise Ordinance that governs the noise levels generated by this project. The main source of operational noise from this project would be from the mechanical equipment and truck loading operation. The noise report analyzed the operational noise based on a conservative scenario.	LDN		
12-3	Noise	The analysis demonstrated that the noise levels from the mechanical units and truck deliveries would be in compliance with the Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. The most stringent allowable day time noise limit is 55 dBA and a night time of 50 dBA at the nearest property line, which is approximately 50 feet away. Based on the report, one truck delivery takes approximately 45 minutes and would produce a noise level of 54.5 dBA at the nearest property line. Deliveries would only be limited to the daytime hours of 7:00am to 10:00pm, no deliveries shall occur during the nighttime hours. The mechanical units will be located on the rooftop and will be installed behind the proposed parapet walls on each building. The parapet wall will vary in height, but will be roughly 1-foot higher than the HVAC units. With the combination of the distance separation and parapet wall, the noise levels from the mechanical units are anticipated to not exceed the Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. Therefore, noise levels from these sources will be in compliance with the noise standards.	LDN		
12-4	Noise	Additionally, the project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance that regulates the temporary noise limits. Temporary construction noise is subject to Section 36.408, 409, and 410. Noise from grading activities is one of the main noise producing sources from this project. The grading equipment would be spread out over the project site, the combined grading operation would be more than 300 feet way from the adjacent property lines. Construction work would be limited to Monday through Saturday between 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. There will also be no off-site construction or grading. Blasting and/or rock crushing is not proposed. Therefore, temporary noise from construction and grading is not expected to exceed the 75 dBA.	LDN	4/5/2019	4/5/2019

**ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12-5	Noise	The report also analyze the traffic impacts from this proposed project. Based on the report, the project does not create a direct or cumulative noise level increase of 3 dBA CNEL on any roadway segment. Therefore, traffic noise from this project will not cause any significant impacts to the existing or future noise sensitive land uses. Based on that information, the noise levels from the traffic would be in conformance with the Noise Elements.	LDN	4/5/2019	4/5/2019
	Noise	~Staff has the following noise conditions to STP: 1) On the site plan, place a note, indicating, "Noise Design Feature: Parapet Walls, at least 1-foot taller than HVAC units."	LDN	4/5/2019	4/5/2019
	Noise	~Staff has the following noise conditions to STP: (SEE ATTACHED DRAFT NOISE CONDITIONS)	LDN	4/5/2019	4/5/2019
1 - 13	Transportation & Traffic	A Traffic Impact Analysis is required. Please see Attachment N.	LLG	11/17/2017	
	Transportation & Traffic	Please find comments on TIA under separate cover.	LLG	4/5/2019	
1 - 14	SWQMP	An updated Stormwater Quality Management Plan and Stormwater Intake Form are required. Please see Attachment J.	SWQMP included in resubmittal	11/17/2017	
1 - 15	Visual Resources	Please provide visual simulations from multiple locations on Valley Center Road. Please see Attachment D.	Cathy	11/17/2017	

Attachment 4

To: Chairperson and Members of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

Date: 6/10/19

Re: Agenda Items E 2&3 Liberty Bell Plaza

1. I am Rich Rudolf, former VCCPG Member for about 15 years, member of one or more VCCPG Subcommittees since 1998, current member of Community Plan Update and North Village subcommittees.
2. I retired on Dec 31, 1999 after 27 years as a municipal attorney, practicing Planning and Land Use Law for the last 15 years of my career as Assistant City Attorney for Chula Vista and then Carlsbad.
3. I participated with you in the interminable fight against the Lilac Hills Ranch Project, Randy Goodson, John Rilling, and Accretive, Inc, the most uncooperative and recalcitrant Developer San Diego County, much less Valley Center, has ever seen. I worked with you to save the planning and sponsor groups when the Board of Supervisors attempted to do away with us.
4. I envision your board as the representatives and guardians of this Community, responsible for protection and enhancement of our unique qualities. Most, if not all, of us moved here because of its special rural beauty, character, and the friendliness of its residents.
5. In 2004, by a split vote, we approved Herb Schaffer's Town Center Shopping Center Project at the corner of VC and Cole Grade Roads at one of our most contentious meetings. It was a standard, close your eyes and you are in anywhere/everywhere USA shopping center. Those of us voting No filed a Dissenting Report, pointing out how it was not consistent with the Community Plan and Design Guidelines, and did not create the Country Village that enhanced our community as we envisioned it could be. That would have been built, but Herb was suddenly met with \$2M TIP fees not previously required! He went back to the drawing board, and was convinced to work with us to create a real Town Center Project. The VCCPG approved the new plan with his promise that the entire project (both the commercial and residential components) would come back to the VCCPG for approval via a "Specific Plan." The General Plan land use designations and zoning to allow it were included in the General Plan Update. Recession came, addition sewer costs, etc., and the Oat Field is still an Oat Field.

6. But the process was still another example of the VCCPG not giving up, fighting to use the meagre tools at our disposal to work with Developers and County staff to bring the promise of the General and Community Plans and our Design Guidelines to fruition, and not allow them to be treated as mere “guidelines” or ignored (as Mr. Goodson and Accretive would have had it).
7. You are reminded tonight that your subcommittee is supposed to review projects and present you with recommendations that demonstrate how they comply, or do not comply, with the General and Community Plan and Design Guidelines. It is clear that their Motion recommending 5-1 for approval of Liberty Bell Plaza Project does not address those requirements; it does not because the subcommittee did not have the 2017 Scoping Letter and Its Table A with all the preliminary matters the PDS staff required the Bell Applicants to address and satisfy. You have just been made aware of that, and that the Applicant’s PARTIAL responses have just been received and not yet analyzed by the PDS staff. Nor, of course, by your subcommittee, you, or the community. Also unknown are the contents of the required Traffic Study, to determine if appropriate measures will be required to prevent making the South Village traffic a nightmare.
8. So, I ask you continue our tradition of fighting for the community, standing up to staff and/or any Developer to insist on the information you need to make the best possible decision for US.
9. Please vote Yes, this is “New Information.” Make it clear that you want it (and the soon-to-be-revised Second Iteration Scoping Letter) to go back to your South Village Subcommittee for thorough review and analysis, resulting in a new recommendation for your consideration. If the Project satisfies all the General Plan, Community Plan, and Design Guidelines requirements, then you should approve the Project. But not until a full, complete, and fair process has been followed.
10. Please vigorously protect and represent us—your constituency, neighbors, and friends.

Thanks for all your hard work for all of us in your community!

Gratefully,
Rich Rudolf

Attachment 5

Reasons Why the VCCPG should not vote to approve or deny approval of the Liberty Bell Plaza (LBP) site plan, concept and design

According to the SD County PDS Scoping Letter the project has not been shown to be in conformance with the SD General Plan nor the VC Community Plan (and the VC Design Guidelines)*.

The LBP Scoping Letter Attachment A, received on May 22, 2019 from SD County indicates that the following issues are unresolved or are yet to be reviewed for applicability and conformance:

SD County General Plan:

Scoping Letter General Plan Conformance Items 1-3 through 1-9, all of which are marked “Informational” and “N/A”. Of particular important to VC is item 1-6: **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.

Missing from the Scoping Letter are the following General Plan items that should be shown to be in compliance prior to approval:

LU-2: Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County’s varied communities, rural setting, and character.

LU-2.7: Requires new commercial centers maintain or enhance the viability of existing commercial areas.

LU-11.5: Large format Retail Stores are allowed only where the scale of the use and design is compatible with the surrounding areas.

These items are yet to be reviewed for applicability and conformance.

Scoping Letter item 7-1: Traffic & Transportation: LBP will generate about 9,800 total trips per day on VC Road. A Traffic Impact Analysis is required and should be reviewed by the VC Mobility and S. Village S/Cs to understand the impact and mitigation recommended prior to VCCPG approval.

*The County has reported to the VC DRB that the 6 DRB items on the Scoping Letter have been complied with but no update to Attachment A reflecting this conformance has been received.

VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLAN
None of the following from the VC Community Plan have been
addressed in the LBP Scoping Letter:

1. COMMUNITY CHARACTER

GOALS

1. PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE **RURAL CHARACTER** OF VALLEY CENTER BY MAINTAINING A PATTERN OF LAND USE CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLLOWING REGIONAL CATEGORIES.

A. VILLAGE

ENHANCE THE **RURAL VILLAGE CHARACTER** OF VALLEY CENTER'S NORTH AND SOUTH VILLAGES

2. LAND USE

GENERAL GOALS

A PATTERN OF DEVELOPMENT THAT CONSERVES VALLEY CENTER'S RURAL CHARACTER.

3. COMMERCIAL

"RURAL VILLAGES" THAT ARE CONSISTENT IN SCALE AND DESIGN WITH A LOW DENSITY RURAL RESIDENTIAL AND AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY.

COMMERCIAL USES SHALL NOT INTERFERE EITHER FUNCTIONALLY OR VISUALLY WITH ADJACENT LAND USES OR THE **RURAL ATMOSPHERE OF THE COMMUNITY**

Attachment 6

We, the undersigned residents of Valley Center, urge the Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) to reconsider the franchise developments that are currently in consideration for our community.

WHEREAS, we believe in the “small town” atmosphere of Valley Center and large corporations do not contribute to the country living appeal of our town. The historical understanding of life in Valley Center has meant seclusion from large-scale commercial developments¹.

WHEREAS, within the stated Valley Center Community Plan², “the focus for Valley Center commercial development is on small businesses which serve a limited market and the daily needs of local residents.”

WHEREAS, a Vons of 51,000 square feet does a disservice to the community of Valley Center by drawing customers away from locally owned businesses. The addition of a Vons will not generate new sales and only “shift economic activity from one part of town to another.”³ A big-box store such as Vons increases the probability of locally-owned enterprises going out of business and “absorb[s] retail sales from nearby stores without significantly contributing to local economic development.”⁴

WHEREAS, a Vons of 51,000 square feet is too large for a community of about 11,600⁵ people, and there is no evidence to suggest that the new developments will be filled within a timely manner as the developments at the bottom of the Grade were not immediately bought.

¹ <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1990-10-24-me-2730-story.html>

² Page 12. <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/gpupdate/VALLEY%20CENTER-CP-11-18-15.pdf>

³ https://ilsr.org/impact-chain-stores-community/?fbclid=IwAR2DYKerMqT_w5j1fk33y3OeAoxlXmfAmT1bkM_Ow_KMYlrykNqKevQhiuCI

⁴ https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0891242412457985?fbclid=IwAR0jLhcfMrhKLPQhUsSbC-57mLvDA2v1aSaaQRs94WSTNyVEJHONY_TII

⁵ Current figure based on the 2010 population and growth percentage from 2000 to 2010.

<http://www.city-data.com/city/Valley-Center-California.html>

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/valleycenteredpcalifornia>

WHEREAS, the community does not need another gas station or grocery mart when there is already Valley Center Oil, Town Center Market, Pala Vista Gas, Inc., United Oil, Valley Center Market, and Lilac Foods in addition to pop-up fruit stands.⁶

WHEREAS, the community would be better served by the addition of family-oriented businesses.

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED, we, the undersigned residents of Valley Center, stand against the inclusion of more gas stations and a 51,000 square foot Vons in our community, and

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED, we support community growth, and we call on the VCCPG to encourage and promote small business ventures in the town centers.

⁶ <https://vcchamber.com/business-directory>

Isabel Orah
Sabrina Munaco
Brent Colvin
Roxana Contreras McInerny
Gay McNeil
Susan C. Shoup
Grace Lechnir
Adrienne Johnson
Victoria Holtz
Sofia Orah
Peter Orah
Armida Davis-Orah
Robin Treasure
Melanie Hughes
Holeen Sunderland
Janalee Sanders
Wayne Sanders
Sukmal Turner
Jordyn Birch
Margo Littrell
Mark Littrell
Remy Littrell
Mardee Littrell

Essence Park
Judith Segina
Dana Kerrigan
Jamie Lee
Dawn Hughes
Rosie Hughes
Leigh Pettit
Mia Becerra