

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the August 11, 2014 Meeting

Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice Chair: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain; BOS=Board of Supervisors; PDS=Department of Planning & Development Services; DPW=Department of Public Works; DRB=Valley Center Design Review Board; N=Nay; P=Present; R=Recuse; SC=Subcommittee; TBD=To Be Determined; VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group; Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 2 September 2014

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									7:04 APM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
M I L L E R	H U T C H I S O N		G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F		L A V E N T U R E	
P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		A	

Notes: Britsch arrives 7.20 pm

Quorum Established: 11 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 21 July, 2014

Maker/Second: Glavinic/Quinley

Carries/Fails 11-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

None

E Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:

E1

Report, discussion and possible vote on options to promote and protect beekeeping operations within San Diego County. An update on developing beekeeping ordinance presented by Tracy Ellis from the Agricultural Scientist, Entomologist, Plan Health and Best Prevention (PHPP) and San Diego Beekeeping Society (SDBS) (Smith)

Discussion: Smith explains the history of the beekeeping ordinance and the additional fourth option that significantly reduces setbacks from property lines for beehives. He explains the process for a rehearing of an ordinance based on new information. Tracy Ellis, San Diego County staff, presents and reviews the Italian bee defense zone of 25-feet and the Africanized bee defense zone of 150-feet. She says in October 2013 the BOS asked for a reevaluation of rules governing beekeeping within the county, and a new proposal. Frank Golbeck, San Diego Beekeeping Society, added that the goal is to protect beekeeping in SD County. He presents the required best management practices [BMPs]: County registration, the 6-foot barrier around hives to elevate the bees line of travel, the on-line beekeeping course, the need for a water supply, fire prevention relative to smoker use, the need to re-queen with known docile queens, regular hive inspection, and the requirement for identification information on each hive. He also notes that beekeepers must avoid sensitive receptors [parks, schools, hospitals etc] when locating their hives.

The fourth option, the Tiered ordinance, recognizes three categories of beekeeping: Tier A- urban beekeepers on city lots may have 2-5 hives with setbacks of 25-feet from a road, 25-feet from a neighboring property line, and 35-feet from a neighboring dwelling. Tier B- represented by larger lot sizes and permitting up to 20 hives with setbacks of 50-feet from a road, 50-feet from a property line, and 100-feet from a dwelling. Tier C- the commercial tier allows for 100 –300 hives with setbacks similar to Tier B.

Ellis shows aerial photos to illustrate setbacks for the three tiers.

Franck asks about foraging area. Ellis responds that bees can forage several miles from a hive. Smith asks

about pollination. Ellis says in most agricultural operations two hive boxes per 2 acres is normal. Franck asks about commercial operators and the need for providing a water source for their hives. Golbeck says that it is routine to provide barrel waters for commercial hives. Glavinic asks about BMPs and asks about the 6' hive barrier for commercial operations. Ellis clarifies that most BMPs apply to tiers A & B. Glavinic suggests a higher barrier may be appropriate – 8-feet. Golbeck says the 6-foot barrier redirects the approach of bees and is usually adequate, even for tall people. Ellis says the barrier applies to urban Tier A operations. Miller asks about a quality of life issue regarding how one finds a hive, if one is being harassed by bees in one's yard? Golbeck says defensive bee behavior occurs only immediately around the hive, not in foraging areas five miles out. Franck asks how many beekeepers there are in the county. Ellis estimates 700-800, but only about 70 are registered. 95% of registered hives are commercial hives. Glavinic asks about enforcement of hive rules. Ellis says the County uses the nuisance abatement procedure. Ellis says they proposed a \$250 apiary inspection fee, however the County will re-evaluate the costs before establishing an inspection fee. Smith cites the weakness of code enforcement and thus, likely, nuisance abatement, since both procedures require a neighbor to turn in a neighbor. He suggests that the County has only a weak response unless money is available for enforcement. He also suggests that enforcement is not usually timely. According to Ellis, an agricultural inspector will respond to complaints. She says they need to respond to complaints quickly because of the potential health risks.

Dennis Jobe, audience member and beekeeper, says the objective is to address colony collapse syndrome and this led to peoples' acceptance of bees where they didn't occur before. He notes that people are tolerating bees in odd places. He points out that many more people are keeping bees, and in many cases, just for pollination. In the past five years, there are many new beekeepers. He acknowledges that the County ordinance change is encouraging off-record beekeeping. He explains the danger of uneducated beekeepers. He describes the infatuation of new beekeepers with bees. He continues to explain bee habits. Ellis describes a grant proposal to the University of California for bee inspection. Jobe elaborates on the usefulness of the hive barrier. Rudolf asks if there is a requested action? Ellis says they are not asking for specific action. Rudolf asks what Ellis will recommend to BOS Ellis says the presented plan.

Motion: Move to forward to the BOS VCCPG's support for the hive setback distances, requirements for apiary best management practices and recognition of sensitive sites, with the proviso that the County acknowledge its code enforcement capability needs to be elevated to a higher standard with appropriate funding.

Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic

Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

E2

Update and possible vote on Valley Center Road planted median impact by Butterfield Trails Project (Vick and Jackson)

Discussion: Vick presents. He asserts that VC got swindled. He cites a well-attended meeting by County staff, the applicant [Wayne Hilbig attended by phone link], and VCCPG. He recounts the proposed alternatives that were considered by the County staff. All the alternatives were rejected. Bill Lewis, consultant to applicant, thought an additional alternative might be possible. However, Wayne Hilbig asked Lewis not to spend any more time or money on alternatives. Smith explains Lewis' idea to create a thin planted median rather than a more standard width planted median that would accommodate the acceleration lane now conditioned and approved by DPW. Vick says Hilbig offered a take-it-or-leave-it choice. DPW says the median is only 11-feet wide and cannot accommodate a planted median with the acceleration lane added. Vick says the developer did not disclose the impact of his project on the VC Road median although he had two formal opportunities to do so at the South Village Subcommittee meeting presentation and a subsequent presentation to the VCCPG. Jackson asks about the alternative to replace the removed planted median at some other location along VC Road. He says the planted median, a County public asset, will be destroyed and it must be restored. Smith says it is probably too late, a done deal, since Hilbig has secured approval of the project including the removal of the median. He cites Hutchison's concluding statement at the County meeting regarding the extreme sensitivity to changes in Valley Center Road between Woods Valley Road and Cole Grade Road. He observes that VCCPG needs to be more vigilant about questioning developers and the ramifications of their projects. Franck asks about the presentation model used at the community meetings showing the median unchanged. Smith clarifies

that about a month after the public presentations, the change was required by DPW. David Ross, audience and reporter, asks about how much public investment will be lost as a result of the removal of the community financed median? Smith responds that the costs of the median include \$50K a year for irrigating all median plantings plus construction costs. Quinley says the planted median will be a serious issue when North Village is being built. Vick says VCCPG should go on record to oppose such removals. Glavinic is concerned about the traffic capacity in the area of North Village. He says we need to be in the County's face with regard to the preservation of the median. Smith says the VCCPG seems to want a letter outlining our concern for the loss of median and the need to carefully review any future changes to the median. He notes that the median is a County asset and should be replaced in an appropriate place. Rudolf advises against making removal a deal breaker, since North Village would not be possible without some loss. Vick suggests it must be replaced somewhere along VC Road. Rudolf disagrees and says there may be other sites for replacement. Rudolf reminds members of the degree of difficulty of processing projects and the need to work hard on it. He acknowledges that VCCPG helps developers in most instances, and yet, after such support Hilbig rejected any suggestion of an alternative to removal of the median to benefit his project.

Motion: Move to have the Chair write a letter to the County regarding the planted median on Valley Center Road and the community's desire to retain and expand it.

Maker/Second: Smith/Norwood

Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

E3

Update on Valley Center Road speed reporting signage changes--a bigger display and relocation of signs. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presents the topic, saying sometimes VCCPG's letters work. He notes that DPW will replace the radar-based, lighted speed indication signs with larger, more visible versions of such signs and relocate the one south of Lilac Road on southbound VC Rd to near Sunday Drive and southbound VC Road. Smith explains DPW's logic for the replacement of the signs.

Motion: None

E4

Update on Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR response to the submission by Valley Center Community Planning Group and other organizations, (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison explains that the comments from August 2013 were resubmitted to the County to ensure that the issues not previously addressed would receive responses [because no public comments received responses before the DEIR was redistributed to the public for further comment]. In addition, new and revised comments totaling over 250 pages were submitted on behalf of the VCCPG by the deadline. He also noted that the level of public response seemed to be comparable to the level achieved in 2013 if not larger. He pointed out that several law firms had commented, that the level of individual comments was consistent with the effort the previous year, and that more than one environmental group commented as well. Asked when the responses to the comments could be expected, Hutchison responded that it was too difficult to predict based on the opinions of the County staff, but it could take between two and 6 months. He also noted that the revised DEIR could be re-circulated once more if deemed necessary by the County staff.

E5

Discussion and possible vote on recent updates proposed for "County of San Diego Traffic Guidelines". (Jackson)

Discussion: Postponed due to lack of opportunity to review by the Mobility SC.

E6

Vote to approve Lilac Hills Ranch subcommittee copying expenses for distribution of copies of their comments on Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR and associated analysis. (Hutchison)

<p>Discussion: Hutchison incurred photocopying expenses related to the Lilac Hills Ranch SC review of comments for that project as well as the review by the VCCPG. Receipts have been turned over to Smith.</p>	
<p>Motion: Move to approve the photocopying expenses.</p>	
<p>Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley</p>	<p>Carries/Fails 10-0-2 [Y-N-A]: Jackson/Britsch recused due the proximity of their properties to the project</p>
<p>E7</p>	<p>1) PDS2014-MUP-14-029 Major Use Permit; Valley Center Cemetery District; 28953 Miller Road Valley Center at Little Creek Lane; Contact person is Gary Wynn at 760-740-8722 or gary@wynnengineering.com. Valley Center Cemetery District (VCCD) proposes to expand an existing cemetery located on Miller Road. On June 25, 2013 the property owner to the north granted an additional one acre net area to provide for this expansion. The expansion area will be utilized as additional interment area along with a proposed 800 SF office build and septic system upgrade. The property has a General Plan Designation 17 and is zoned RR.5m two acre minimum lot size. This is an existing non-conforming use. (Laventure)</p>
<p>Discussion: Gary Wynn presents in the absence of Laventure. Wynn speaks to the project saying he has not heard from the County, so, he is not sure why he is presenting tonight except to introduce the project to the VCCPG. He points out that the district is running out of burial plots and needs to expand. He did meet with the County 3-years ago. The district does have condemnation authority, but it decided to negotiate a deal with Herb Schaefer, a principal developer of the North Village whose land adjoins the cemetery parcels. The district acquired 1-acre from Schaefer.</p> <p>The cemetery was founded in 1850. And probably because of that early start, Wynn discovered the County had no right-of-way for Miller Road in front of the cemetery. He says they are altering the entrance to the cemetery. He notes that some graves are along road and will not be disturbed. He explains the existing conditions within the cemetery. He notes that the new exit will provide better site distances along Miller Road. A new building is proposed that will have 800 square feet of space and will be on a septic system.</p> <p>He observes that this is not a complicated project. It's a simple expansion. He asks for questions. Quinley asks if burials are still occurring? Wynn says, yes, the rate is varied and there are not as many cremations as expected. Rudolf asks what is immediately adjacent to cemetery in North Village. Residences, says Wynn, but what type he is not yet certain. Rudolf asks if south of the new exit road will be gravesites. Wynn says, yes. Glavinic asks if parking will increase, and he suggests more parking in other areas to accommodate services. Wynn replies, yes, some new parking spaces along the internal road. Rudolf asks about County ownership of Miller Road. Wynn says the cemetery will dedicate asphalt in front of cemetery. He says the major widening of Miller Rd. will likely occur when Westin develops their portion of North Village. He says likely, an Irrevocable offer to Dedicate [IOD] will eventually be required. He notes that the district is still working on approval and will return in about a year. Smith asks about niches and how full they are. Wynn says there is still room.</p>	
<p>E8</p>	<p>PDS2013-MUP-81-098W1; Valley Center Church Modification, 14919 Fruitvale Road; owner is Southeastern CA. Conference of Seventh-day Adventist at 951-509-2200; Applicant and contact person is Doug Munson @ 760-390-7727 or drmunson@cox.net. The proposed project consists of the addition of a 40 x 90 Fellowship Hall, the addition of a steeple, the addition of a monument sign, the remodel of the existing fellowship Hall into classrooms, the removal of the existing kitchen in favor of a hallway and the removal of a portion of existing leach lines and replacement in a new location. (Bob Franck)</p>
<p>Discussion: Franck presents the Modification to Major Use Permit [MUP]. Franck cites an open house last Sunday with 45 neighbors invited to review the remodeling plans. The turn-out was not that great. Doug Munson, applicant representative, says the project has tiers. He explains the enlargement of the fellowship hall with a kitchen and restrooms with showers. He explains the remodeling of the sanctuary. The occupancy load for the buildings will not change. He notes that a leach field is in way of construction and it will be relocated with no increase in size. Remodeling will add a steeple to the church. The standard height limit is 35-feet, but he is asking for 50'. Research suggested the increased size would be in better proportion to the building. He describes a monument sign that will have 'down lighting' to minimize light pollution. Glavinic asks about the construction material for the steeple. Munson says it will be fiberglass. The design of the steeple tapered</p>	

portion is not finalized. Rudolf asks if the project has gone to the DRB? Munson says it is not required, however, he will go to the DRB. Rudolf asks about a steeple for another church that was exceptional in height and approved. Not known to those present. Franck says the property is 5-feet lower than the grade of the road. He notes that the property is surrounded by tall trees that will match the vertical reach of the steeple.

Munson says there is an oak in the road right-of-way that he is requesting to remove. He is asking for a site distance on approach and has talked to the neighbor to get agreement. The remodeling plan calls for three new air conditioner units. They will require a 6-foot masonry wall connecting buildings to mask the AC units. Hutchison asks about mitigation for loss of the oak. Munson will do what the County requires. He wants to work with his neighbor. Smith asks about the restriping of Fruitvale to the east of the church. Glavinic adds that the road is widened in front of church and that exacerbates the speed issue and site distance issue. Munson describes the mailed meeting [open house] notice and the effort to make sure neighbors are aware of the project. Smith asks about conditioning of oak tree mitigation, saying we usually condition mitigation to occur in VC.

Motion: Move to approve the plan with the condition that applicant presents project to the Design Review Board subject to completion of a scoping letter, that VCCPG have a final review if changes are made to the project subsequently, and that oak removal mitigation occur in VC.

Maker/Second: Franck/Rudolf

Carries/Fails 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]

F Group Business

F1 Report on the Community Plan Update progress. [Rudolf]

Discussion: Rudolf reports that the BOS has funded the update of the Valley Center Community Plan that was to have been done concurrently with the General Plan Update [which was approved by the BOS in August 2011]. The community plan update now has the highest priority. VCCPG should be expecting contacts from the County and/or its consultants.

Motion: None

F2 Tribal Liaison Update. [Glavinic]

Discussion: Smith asks if there is an update from the Tribal Liaison SC. Glavinic says the only issue is the intersection of VC Road and Highway 76. Smith relates a story from Pala Pauma Chair regarding roundabouts. The issue is still pending.

F4 Next regular meeting scheduled for September 8, 2014

G Motion to Adjourn:

9.21 pm

Maker/Second: Quinley/Smith

Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]

Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

- a) Mobility – Mark Jackson
- b) Community Plan Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair
- e) Parks & Recreation –LaVonne Norwood Johnson, Chair
- f) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair
- g) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair
- h) Website – Oliver Smith, Chair
- i) Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- j) Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair

Correspondence Received for the Meeting: none