

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the October 13, 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: 3 November 2014

Approved: 10 November 2014

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:04 PM				
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	J A N I S C H	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	F A J A R D O	L A V E N T U R E
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P

Notes: Norwood arrives 7.10 pm

Quorum Established: 13 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of September 8, 2014

Maker/Second: Glavinic/Quinley

Carries/Fails: 12-0-1 (Y-N-A): Voice; Franck abstains – absent in September.

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

None

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

E1

Hatfield Plaza located at, 27326 Valley Center Road; PDS2013-TPM 21202; PDS2013-STP-13-01. The project proposes five buildings with accompanying parking with mixed-use retail including a drive-through restaurant proposed in the center of the development. It will access Valley Center Road from a point in the center of the site. Owner is Woods Valley Plaza, a California LLC at 619-438-4980, Applicant and contact person is Jerry Gaughan at 619-204-8797 or Jerrygaughan@msn.com. (Vick)

Discussion: Vick presents. On Tuesday, October 7th, the South Village SC met with Jerry Gaughan and reviewed the plans and found them lacking in several respects. The traffic plan is missing and the project description is inaccurate. The plans did not include the extension of Heritage Trail in the plan. An approval by the DRB is missing. There is a lack of consistency in the plans. There is minimal detail on the landscape plan. Smith explains the reason for hearing this project tonight. Gaughan arrives during the discussion. Vick asks Gaughan if he wishes to speak. Glavinic questions the need for DRB approval at this time. Smith explains that the DRB review is not required for VCCPG consideration but it is desirable for a complete understanding of a project.

Gaughan explains the project and notes that revisions have been made since the inception of the project. He says the VC design guidelines don't accommodate building on a slope. Reconfiguration of the subject properties has happened several times. Presently, there are four simple lots with 4 to 6-foot retaining walls plus one wall at 12-feet behind the buildings. He tried to preserve as many trees as possible on site. He acknowledges that some will be lost. He presents some illustrations, worked on with the DRB, showing a drive-through business. The architecture shows heavy timber in facades. He is proposing Monterey and Rural Farm styles as well. The project will include a fire access road that will double as a pedestrian trail. Jackson asks about ingress and egress to the project. Gaughan says the entrance will be at the intersection of Woods Valley Road and Valley Center Road. There is an 8% grade at the entrance. Gaughan says he doesn't want to remove too much dirt from the site. Glavinic asks about sewer. Gaughan says he has purchased 11 EDUs [equivalent dwelling units] for these properties. Vick asks about the four-way stop mentioned in the plan and

Gaughan says that it is rather the signal at the intersection, and that he will have to move the traffic signal about 6-feet to accommodate the project entrance. He says excess dirt will be used at his Nelson property on Valley Center Road across from Miller Road. Norwood asks about the large signage that is usual for businesses and how that might affect the appearance of the entrance to VC. Gaughan says large signs will not fly in VC. Norwood asks about the 8-foot iron panels shown in the plans. Gaughan says wrought iron fencing will be used at the back of buildings to close them off. He says the largest building will be 7000 sq. ft.

Fajardo asks if there will be access from his project to the commercial property to the north [the quilt shop and fitness center]. Gaughan suggests that it could be done but it is not now decided. Glavinic asks about slope of the properties. Gaughan says there has been a lot of work done by VCMWD [Valley Center Municipal Water District] and the County along the western side of Valley Center Road fronting his project. Gaughan explains the history of the infrastructure work and slopes. Hutchison asks about the Heritage Trail and why it doesn't appear to be extended along the front of the project. Gaughan notes that the County right-of-way along VC Road includes a drainage ditch and says he cannot ask the County for use of the space to accommodate the trail. Hutchison asks why not? Gaughan says he has asked the County and they responded that the existing path should continue to be used. Vick clarifies by describing the current narrow footpath along VC Road adjacent to the drainage ditch. Fajardo asks about the nearest house to the project. She expresses concern about noise from the drive-through associated with building #3. Gaughan suggests the grade behind the buildings will deflect sound away from the neighbors. Glavinic asks about the entrance configuration. Gaughan says there will be one lane in and two out. Glavinic says he would prefer two in and two out. Gaughan says the traffic study doesn't require it. Gaughan is challenged with the fact that the traffic study is not available for VCCPG review. Gaughan says the traffic study is submitted, but it continues to be reviewed by the County.

Vick says Gaughan wants to sell a couple of the lots before any buildings are built. Franck asks if changes to the buildings' design can be made after the sale. Gaughan says only minor changes are possible after the sale. Smith clarifies that the BOS is the only entity that can stop excessive building alterations after a sale. Smith says the developer should give the County feedback not the other way around. He then suggests that a pipe underground to replace the drainage ditch would allow the extension of the Heritage Trail. Gaughan asserts that he cannot get the County to cooperate on that issue. Gaughan says the County's development of VC Road as a four-lane road instead of six-lane road has complicated his plans. He adds that the County may require a traffic signal on VC Road at Banbury Road to accommodate the commercial property across VC Road from Gaughan's project. Smith asks for questions. Jim Wold, audience, asks if the drainage ditch can be covered to accommodate a trail in order to have access by bike to the Heritage Trail and the South Village from Banbury. Gaughan says accommodation of the Heritage Trail may be possible if it can be reduced to 6-feet. Wold says there are equestrians on Banbury that would need a wider trail to be accommodated. Mike O'Conner, audience, observes that the architectural styles presented are more 'Santa Barbara-like' and not western as he thought was called for by the community plan. Gaughan says he has worked for 10 months with the DRB and they seem to be leaning toward the present designs. Glavinic asks about the schedule for the plot plan. Gaughan says he will have a plot plan after the DRB review in November.

Motion: The South Village Subcommittee moves to recommend continuing consideration of this project until the plans are complete, consistent, accurate, the traffic study is available and a prior review of it is done by the Mobility SC, and the Heritage Trail issue is more thoroughly addressed.

Maker/Second: Vick/ Norwood

Carries/Fails: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

E2

Report and discussion on the letter from Mary Gorsuch, VCPUSD to Mark Slovick of DPDS that sets out the view of the School District on the Draft Revised Environmental Report (DEIR) for Lilac Hills Ranch. The letter includes previous comments from the school district and email correspondence with Randy Goodson and Jon Rilling among others. (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison reports that the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District [VCPUSD] did submit comments on the Lilac Hills Ranch [LHR] project Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report [RDEIR] during the public comment period. He cites the comments submitted in response to the initial Draft Environmental Impact Report [DEIR] for LHR in 2013, and notes that there were several issues raised by those comments that went unaddressed in the latest RDEIR. The district listed them as: 1. School location approval – there was no

delineated school site specified. 2. The ambiguous shared approach to the proposed K-8 school – an unidentified school location for an unidentified entity [either Bonsall Unified School District, VCPUSD, or a private charter organization], offered for an unknown period of time. 3. School Fees as complete mitigation – inadequate statutory fees for school development. 4. Transportation impacts due to available school attendance locations – having to reassign students to other schools to accommodate the impact of new students, and thus generating additional traffic impacts as a result.

Hutchison noted that the comments to the RDEIR did not vary much from the 2013 comments submitted. He also noted that the comments included several emails between the district and the LHR principals that demonstrated that the issues mentioned were going unaddressed in spite of the dialog.

Motion: None

Notes: Britsch and Jackson recuse themselves because of the proximity of their properties to the project.

E3

Scoping Letter for Paradise Mountain NDC Wireless Facility Major Use Permit; PDS2014-MUP-14-031; Project address: 18218-18750 Paradise Mountain Road; APM: 189-192-01, 189-192-02. Project would authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility including 12 panel antennas and one microwave dish antenna mounted on a 50 foot high mono-pine tree; associated equipment and a 30kW emergency back-up generator located within a 12.8 X 34 concrete masonry block wall equipment enclosure. Project is located at the NE corner of Lookout Rim within Skyline Ranch Country Club off Paradise Mountain Road. (Miller)

Discussion: Miller introduces Tracy Thomas [Verizon] and she presents. She says that Verizon is planning a 60-foot mono-pine antenna array and an equipment building at the Paradise Mountain Road location. She notes that no negative comments have been received from neighbors. Miller says he asked neighbors about the project and they were unaware of project. He notes that these neighbors are tenants on same property proposed for the communications facility. He cites one lady who said the facility is needed for better cell phone reception. Miller says one house has a clear view of proposed tower, but he could not get access to the house to inquire. He says the County sent out numerous notices to include all appropriate neighbors. Miller says two equipments, an air conditioning unit and an electrical generator, are proposed for a location outside the equipment building. He anticipates some noise issues, but only minor ones. Thomas says the generator only runs during tests or in the event of emergencies for which it is intended. Jackson notes that the noise threshold is 35 DB at 50-feet. Thomas says the installation will comply with that requirement. Miller asks about tower height exceeding the 30-feet limit. Thomas says Verizon will ask for a waiver of the height restriction. Miller says the County may ask for consideration of an alternative site. Thomas says they did consider the site suggested by the County and found a dead spot there. Hutchison asks about the aesthetics of the pseudo-tree antenna array and whether it will be maintained beyond initial installation. Thomas says camouflage designs are better now and the installation will be maintained. Glavinic asks about collocation of competing networks antennas at this facility. Thomas says that sort of arrangement is not usual in California but sometimes happens, and is possible. Fajardo asks about the fire resistance of equipment. Thomas says this installation is not a fire issue and is intended to continue service during emergency events using the generator proposed. Glavinic asks about ingress. Thomas clarifies how the site is accessed from Paradise Mountain Road.

Motion: Move to approve the project as presented.

Maker/Second: Laventure/Glavinic

Carries/Fails: 13-0-1 [Y-N-A] **Voice;** Franck recuses himself because he is retired from Verizon

E4

Discussion and vote on a letter to Mark Slovick from the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee concerning the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR. The letter points out a major deficiency in Section S-3 of the DEIR which deals with areas of controversy concerning the project and is insufficiently covered and presented. (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison presents. He cites the draft letter [attached] proposed to be sent to Mark Slovick, Project Manager for the County on the Lilac Hills Ranch project. He says that review of the County's policy governing the preparation of Environmental Impact Reports [EIR], subsequent to the submission of comments,

revealed a disconnect in the way “Areas of Controversy” were addressed in the recent RDEIR for the project. He says that, rather than identifying and discussing the controversial issues of the project in section S3 of the RDEIR as required by the policy, the County merely generally described the scope of controversies in two short paragraphs and referred readers to the remainder of the RDEIR for elaboration. Hutchison says without identifying and thoroughly discussing the controversial issues in section S3, the RDEIR deprives the decision makers of a clear and concise discussion of the issues. Asking decision makers to ferret out the controversies from the entire RDEIR will likely result in several issues not being properly reviewed as the policy on section S3 intends. He also notes that, based on assurances from Mark Slovick, comments such as those contained in the draft letter will be added to the administrative record for the project and will be considered, although the County is not obliged to respond to comments received after the deadline for submission of public comments.

Glavinic states that the County did not respond to our comments submitted in response to the DEIR in 2013, and he wonders if this letter gets the job done. He suggests that the PDS staff doesn't have enough work to do and they are extending the work process to cover themselves. Smith says we worked hard to meet the deadline. And, anything sent out since the deadline will not have any influence with the County. He says we shouldn't muddy the water and detract from already submitted comments. Quinley says it's important to note all the deficiencies of the RDEIR regardless of when they are discovered.

James Gordon, audience, says the purpose of the letter is crucial and will cause the reissue of the EIR or will cause a response from the County. He says the letter's topic [areas of controversy] is required by CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act]. He suggests that it is important for the community to have a summary of controversial issues. Smith doesn't disagree with sending letter, but argues that the County will ignore it. Franck says the letter recognizes deficiencies of the EIR even if not within deadline. Glavinic asks if there is a need to put in a time limit for a County response. Hutchison responds saying a time limit is not necessary.

Motion: Move to send the draft letter to Mark Slovick, Project Manager, Lilac Hills Ranch Project.

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley

Carries/Fails: 12-0-2 [Y-N-A]:

MILLER	HUTCHISON	JANISCH	GLAVINIC	BRITTSCH	FRANCK	QUINLEY	VICK	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	JACKSON	RUDOLF	FAJARDO	LAVENTURE
Y	Y	Y	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	R	A	Y	Y

Notes: Jackson and Britsch recuse themselves because of the proximity of their properties to the project.

F Group Business

F1 Welcome to new VCCPG members Susan Janisch and Susan Fajardo recently approved by the Board of Supervisors. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith welcomes the two newly installed members of the VCCPG.

F2 1) The County Website has changed. PDS is now <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/>

Discussion: Smith notes the changes to the County's website. He says he has asked the County about two of the outstanding solar projects proposed for Valley Center. The County said that SDGE not ready to present. Regarding the project on Via Valencia, Chris Brown, consultant to the applicants, says they are making changes to the design and there are some internal issues in applicant organization. He says the project will go to the Solar SC first, then VCCPG. He suggests there may be a reduction to the footprint of the project when finally presented. Smith again notes the County mandated notices for planning group agendas and speaker slips. Smith queries the activities of the subcommittees.

F4	Next regular meeting scheduled for November 10, 2014	
G	Motion to Adjourn:	8.56pm
	Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley	Carries/Fails: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
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:

1. Preliminary Landscape Plan for Hatfield Plaza PDS2013-TPM 21202; PDS2013-STP-13-01. The project is located at Banbury Road and Valley Center Road. Owner is Woods Valley Plaza, LLC; contact person is Jerry Gaughan at 619-204-8797 (Vick)

Attached Materials for Item E4: see next page

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082

20 October 2014

Mr. Mark Slovick, Planning and Development Services, Project Manager
5510 Overland Ave, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Lilac Hills Ranch RDEIR, Areas of Controversy

Dear Mr. Slovick:

Since the close of the public comment period for the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report [RDEIR] for the Lilac Hills Ranch project [the Project], we have been able to continue our examination and study of San Diego County's EIR process policy. Furthermore, we have had the opportunity to meet with you and others at Planning and Development Services to discuss some specific aspects of the Project that we believe received only cursory or limited consideration in the RDEIR that must be reconsidered more thoroughly to provide decision-makers with a clearer analysis of the Project.

Our recent review of the County's policies regarding EIRs, led us to discover that there is a requirement to prepare a section of the EIR that addresses "controversial" aspects of the project under consideration so that decisions based on the findings of the RDEIR are made

with insight into both sides of the controversies [specifically, the need for a section S3 Areas of Controversy]. The section S3 included in the RDEIR gave short shrift to the several areas of dispute known to exist at the time of preparation of the RDEIR, based on our comments from August 2013. Our discussions with you on 11 September 2014 highlighted one such area of controversy, namely the Mountain Ridge Road issues. Of course, there are several others that were outlined in our comments on the RDEIR, especially those items discussed in the section of our comments of July 2014 titled Executive Summary.

Perhaps it is the intention of PDS to develop a more comprehensive section S3 for the final

EIR, but, in our view, that would not allow for public review and corroboration of the numerous areas of controversy. A more satisfactory approach would be to re-circulate the RDEIR in whole or part to address this oversight and provide adequate discussion specifically in section S3. The two paragraphs in the present RDEIR section S3 provide little or no analysis for decision-makers, and merely reference the remainder of the voluminous RDEIR for any discussion of those issues. That approach defeats the purpose of calling special attention to the areas of controversy.

We thank you for your continuing efforts to fairly portray this Project for the decision-makers whose review and action is yet to come.

Oliver Smith
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Ann Quinley
Vice Chair

Ann.quinley@pomona.edu

Steve Hutchison
Secretary

hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Jeana Boulos

jeana.h.boulos@gmail.com

Hans Britsch

thomas@westerncactus.com

Susan Fajardo

susanfarr@vcweb.org

Bob Franck

Franckfort@yahoo.com

Larry Glavinic

ljglavinic@yahoo.com

Mark Jackson

markjacksonvccpg@gmail.com

Susan Janisch

socaljj@cts.com

Eric Laventure

mxinmotion@gmail.com

Bill Miller

cdmiller@aol.com

LaVonne Norwood

lavonne@armorfabrication.com

Rich Rudolf

richrudolf@sbcglobal.net

Jon Vick

JonVick2@aol.com

Respectfully yours,

Steve Hutchison, Chair

Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee
Valley Center Community Planning Group

Attachment: Executive Summary from the Comments submitted by the VCCPG in response to the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report in July 2014 [also available at:

http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/regulatory/docs/LILAC_HILLS_RANCH/LILAC-HILLS-RANCH.html]