

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the December 8, 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: 4 December 2015

Approved: 12 January 2015

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:00 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	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 15 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
C	Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of November 10, 2014, as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Rudolf	Carries 12-0-3 (Y-N-A): Voice: Miller, Boulos, & Smith abstain because of absence in November.
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

D	Public Communication/Open Forum:
	<p>Glavinic speaks regarding Lilac Ranch and its status as a CalTrans [California Department of Transportation] conservation mitigation site. SANDAG [San Diego Association of Governments] will go to bid in January for a manager of the site. Glavinic is seeking interested parties who would be willing to partner with the Parks & Recreation District to manage the site. Vick asks about the partnership suggested. Glavinic responds with clarification. Quinley asks if that property was supposed to be wild land. Jackson confirms that is the case. Rudolf explains the state's creation of an endowment to manage the property. He says Caltrans doesn't want to manage the property, and wants to sell the property to a conservancy manager. He says he advised the historical society that funding of historical sites on the property should be done separately. He hasn't seen the RFP [request for proposal] yet but he is confident that the historical buildings/sites will be taken care of. He says it may be too late to create a partnership locally.</p>

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

E1	Discussion and possible vote on presentation by Jim Courter, Valley Center Fire Protection Coordinator and General Manager of Valley Center CERT on Valley Center Fire Safe Council Wildfire Protection Plan. (Glavinic)
-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discussion: Glavinic presents. He suggests that the County is learning from previous large wildfires. He cites that \$10M is available as grant funding. CERT [Community Emergency Response Team] is trying to put together a grant proposal to deal with major fire incidents. He cites the size of Valley Center and the possibility/need of establishing a community shelter. He notes that the high school was used in 2007, but was ineffective. He says Smith will meet with George Lucia, Fire Marshal and the sheriff's department to solicit ideas for the grant proposal. He is trying to write a meaningful grant proposal that will aid incidents first response. Smith adds that Jim Courter intended to present his ideas but was unable to attend the meeting this evening. Rudolf asks about the existing fire protection plan. Glavinic says the plan is changing. Rudolf asks if the grant is for the County or for the Valley Center Fire Protection District CERT program. Glavinic says it is for the local group. Michael O'Conner, audience, says roads need expanding and debrushing. Glavinic agrees. Says there is also a need for identifying refuges. Smith wants more

information and suggests tabling this issue until it can be obtained.

Motion: None

E2

Informational update on the intersection Improvement and Curve Realignment at State Route 76 and Valley Center Road; Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment with Finding of No Significant impact. The environmental review for this project is being carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 USC 327. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presents. He says the final review for the project is complete and the state is proposing a roundabout as its preferred alternative, to be completed by 2017.

Motion: None

E3

Discussion and possible vote on PDS staff recommendations presented by Kevin Johnson for Zoning of the Boulos property (located at Valley Center and Canyon Road intersection). DPDS Staff suggest retaining the Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) General Plan Land use designation and changing the zoning use regulation to Residential Commercial. RC zoning can be allowed under the SR-2 designation upon completion of special circumstances findings. The zoning change could be included in the Draft Plan for the 2015 General Plan Clean-Up and would be consistent with the Valley Center Community Plan if three changes to the Community Plan were made. (Quinley)

Discussion: Kevin Johnson, County PDS staff, presents. He graciously extends his appreciation of planning groups and especially the VCCPG, which is a particularly active one. He hands out text and map materials related to this zoning issue, as well as information presented in February 2014 meeting of the VCCPG related to Valley Center Community Plan changes. The subject Boulos property is on Valley Center Road. The Community Plan language will be included in the 2015 clean-up General Plan Amendment [GPA]. Norwood asks about her need to recuse herself on this issue. Johnson says this consideration does not apply to the Norwood property reviewed previously. Johnson presents the staff recommendation to retain SR2 General Plan [GP] land use designation and change zoning to RC, residential commercial. He clarifies what permitted uses can be achieved with the recommended zoning with various levels of permits. He explains the maps presented [General Plan, zoning, regional categories], and says the two northern subject properties could work with the proposed residential commercial zoning. He notes that PDS cannot consider the previous General Plan [GP] designations on the subject properties. He reviews GP policies pertinent to the discussion and recommendation. He observes that the Valley Center Road design makes the GP required pedestrian friendly commercial development difficult at the two properties. He explains other materials included, including typical uses of such zoned property.

He outlines the process for acquiring various levels of permit. He asks for questions. Smith asks Abe Boulos, audience, for a statement. Boulos asks for 15 minutes. He explains the process he went through with Kevin Johnson. He says the issue began with the property purchase. Jeana Boulos, who had earlier recused herself, inserts a brief explanation of the history of the property zoning. Abe Boulos then read from a Valley Roadrunner article [Reading from March 21, 2012 edition] that says he closed escrow on the property in 2007 and began development. But, he had problems with percolation test conditions. The property's status changed with land use changes in the General Plan Update [GPU] process: it was then also rezoned rural residential. VCCPG reviewed this case. He says he has always put the community first. Jeana Boulos takes over presentation. Jackson asks if Boulos agrees with the County recommendation. She says no. She says the vote of VCCPG in April 2012 approved the change to commercial zoning. VCCPG considered it again in June 2013, and she says the Boulos' were not advised of the agenda item. The vote did not carry. Smith asks about the April 2012 vote and if they have a problem with the outcome of that item? Jeana Boulos says no, they agreed with that result. Jeana Boulos says no new information was presented at the June 2013 meeting and so that vote is not relevant according to County policy. She identifies the possible uses available to her under the present recommendation from the County and notes the limitations. She justifies the commercial zoning request by the proximity of her property to the North Village and says the stream on the southern boundary of her property will act as a barrier to further commercial development. Abe Boulos suggests that the County did not do their work properly and asks for a re-designation to commercial zoning. Jeana Boulos asks about compensation for the

loss of property value if the proposed zoning were to stand. She notes the approximate 500 signatures on a petition by Valley Center residents. She notes the particular conditions of her property. She asks VCCPG to reject the County recommendation and vote to change the zoning to commercial.

Johnson responds regarding the June 2013 VCCPG vote saying it was needed since there was no vote on GPA. Glavinic asks about the possibilities offered by residential commercial zoning. Johnson clarifies pointing to the handout materials that suggest possible uses. Jeana Boulos emphasizes the need for a residence to justify any commercial use on the property. Johnson clarifies, referring to the handout materials. Glavinic says the development of the Boulos property can be problematic. He adds that he never supported down-zoning and the consequent loss of value. Johnson says the County is trying to make the zoning consistent with the community plan and GP. He emphasizes that the recommendation will not be inconsistent with either plan. Jackson asks about other properties involved in property specific requests and the process to resolve them. Johnson explains how the General Plan Amendment will be implemented and could include this item. It is expected to be before the Planning Commission in the fall of 2015.

Rudolf asks about the size of the Boulos parcel. Johnson says the parcel is slightly over 1-acre. Rudolf notes that this property is the same as the other two properties zoned RC presented on the maps and should be treated equally. He observes that the North Village is bounded on the west by Miller Road, and the South Village is bounded on the north at Lilac Rd. Jeana Boulos says she suggested the Keys Creek tributary crossing at Valley Center Road as a natural boundary for the North Village. Britsch asks about possible approval for a C-34 commercial zoning. Johnson explains how that would work. Britsch asks about the ramifications of C-34 zoning for Boulos' property. Johnson says Commercial zoning would not work with the present land use designation. The County would be required to change the land use designation to permit commercial zoning for that parcel. That would possibly allow reconsideration of neighboring properties, leading to further muddling of the North and South Village boundaries. Vick asks about the possibilities for a C-34 zoning. Johnson explains. Vick asks about the VCCPG votes Jeana Boulos cited. He then asks her to read the petition language, which she does. Norwood asks about the Valley Center Road classification. Johnson clarifies the road classifications. Norwood observes that the Boulos' originally purchased the property because of its C-34 zoning. Rudolf suggests it was originally requested for C-40. Jeana Boulos contests Rudolf's statement. Miller asks if the County was aware of economic consequences of such decisions. Johnson says economic considerations cannot influence such decisions. Rudolf explains the history of an equity mechanism suggested during the GPU process. He says that the County considered the equity issue, but nothing was done to implement such a mechanism. Glavinic expresses concern about the adequacy of Valley Center Road in front of the Boulos property to handle the traffic volumes predicted for the future. He suggests it may need to be widened to six lanes. That would reduce the size of the property. Johnson cites state legislative bill 743, which changes traffic considerations from level of service [LOS] to miles traveled and says that will change how roads can be evaluated in such cases.

Abe Boulos summarizes his position and asks VCCPG to follow their consciences. Johnson wants to clarify the original proposal for GPA and does so.

Motion: Move to support VCCPG vote made in April 2012 on this property, which supports Boulos in retaining a C-34 zoning

Maker/Second: Smith/Norwood

Carries: 8-5-2 [Y-N-A]

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

Notes: Boulos recuses because of direct interest in the subject property; Fajardo abstains because she is unfamiliar with the property and issue history.

E4

Discussion and possible vote on two letters. The first letter requests that the VCCPG be included on all correspondence for Newland Sierra (formerly Merriam Mountain) because of the traffic impacts of that project on

Valley Center. The second letter addresses three concerns to DPW: oversize trucks on West Lilac; Vesper/Valley Center Road intersection controls; and a request that more of the larger Radar Speed Indicator Displays replace smaller ones. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presents the first letter saying that Newland Sierra is an iteration of the former Merriam Mountain Project to the southwest of the Valley Center planning area. He notes the likely considerable potential impacts on Valley Center from traffic generated by the project. Jackson points out that the VCCPG has already been included on the distribution list for project information as a result of Smith's recent phone conversation with PDS. Smith notes that VCCPG cannot comment as the planning group would if the project were in the VCCPG planning area, but it can comment as any individual would.

The second letter initially concerns DPW and road conditions on West Lilac. The second part of this letter concerns the speed indication signs on Valley Center Road and the need to upgrade all of the signs to the larger format. Smith says he talked to the County about the upgrades as well as the location of one of the signs.

Motion: Move to authorize the chair to send both letters [Attached below]

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Laventure

Carries: 15-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice

E5

Discussion and possible vote on asking Chairman Smith to attend a VC Water District meeting to discuss how the VCCPG has reviewed and handled solar projects in light of the Water District's intention to install solar power. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith Presents. He explains the concern expressed by a neighbor to the solar project by the water district. He wants to attend the next water board meeting to explain our history with such projects. He recounts some of the problems of other projects proposed and built in Valley Center. He wants to attend the water board meeting as a friend of the community and explain how VCCPG works with neighbors to resolve problems. Gary Arant, General Manager, Valley Center Municipal Water District [VCMWD], speaks to their proposed project. He notes that VCMWD has been involved with solar energy since 2006. He cites those projects specifically. He explains the need for generating their own power to pump water. He shows pictures of Tyler, one project that is typical. Says they have identified about 10 sites for such facilities. The Cool Valley facility will power pumping to Rincon Reservoir. It will substantially improve pumping efficiency. He speaks to the effort to notify neighbors. He presents photo simulations of the project. Jackson asks if the solar panels rotate; Arant says no. Arant shows the view of the proposed project from the Davis property and others. He observes that the neighbors are elevated above the project site and cannot effectively be screened from a view of the panels. He says they have a public meeting on 15 December that will address this project. He says VCMWD will do whatever is practical to accommodate neighbors. Vick asks about landscaping and suggests some fast growing trees, perhaps pepper, might help if irrigated. Arant acknowledges that possibility and reviews the specific problems for each neighboring property. He says the neighbors have been viewing the reservoir and pumping facility for some time. Vick asks about the roof on the reservoir. Fajardo says eucalyptus trees may grow fast, but are a fire hazard. Arant agrees. He is waiting for community and professional input to make a recommendation for a landscaping solution. Rudolf asks about the need for County review. Arant says no permit is required for this project. Arant says he is seeking input because of the size of the project. Smith explains his desire to go to the meeting to relate VCCPG experience with such projects.

Ms Stefan, a neighbor to the project, says she supports solar generation. She notes the loss of vegetation at project site. Arant says since 2007 they have had a policy of reducing brush at their facilities. Stefan says that the trees planted on-site are deciduous and will not provide much screening in winter. Stefan's principal view is toward the proposed solar site. She is asking for different types of vegetation to be considered. Rudolf says Cole Grade/Via Valencia solar project had a similar problem of elevated neighbors. He notes the suggestion to plant screening trees on the neighbors' property may be a more effective solution – no word from developer of that project. Arant says he would consider planting screening vegetation on the neighbor's property. Glavinic

suggests up-sizing the project to generate more power for pumping. Arant says facilities must be net metering and sized for projected use. Rudolf points out there is no need to vote to send the chairperson to the water district meeting.

Motion: none

F	Group Business
F1	Reminder to Sub-committee chairs to poll subcommittee members about their willingness to serve in 2015. In addition, Sub-Committee chairs and all members should think about what sub-committee chair duties they can/will shoulder. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith reminds subcommittee chairs to confirm membership on their respective subcommittees so that they may be reconstituted at the January 2015 meeting.

Smith acknowledges the contributions of the three departing members. He praises the opinions, popular and unpopular, of these three departing members. Rudolf asks about the website subcommittee and getting the VCCPG handbook on the County website or on a VCCPG site. He says the County doesn't present local rules on the County website, but spoke to PDS staff member Sherry McPherson about adding this material to the County website. This may obviate the need for a local website, especially since it costs to maintain and provide such a site and the County will not reimburse the costs. Boulos says the cost isn't that much for a local website.

Motion: None

F4	Next regular meeting scheduled for January 12, 2015	
G	Motion to Adjourn:	9.17 pm
	Maker/Second: Quinley/Smith	Carries: 15-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

a)	Mobility – Mark Jackson, Chair
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

Public Disclosure Notice

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

Attached materials for Agenda item E4:
December 8, 2014
To: Mark Slovick Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Inclusion of Valley Center Community Planning Group for all Newland Sierra (formerly Merriam Mountains) General Plan Amendment pre-application letter and future related documents.

Mr. Slovick – Newland Sierra pre-application letter PDS2014-MPA-14-018 was not distributed to the Valley Center Community Planning Group. The proposed Newland Sierra Project has direct impact on Valley Center traffic and other environmental impacts.

Please include the Valley Center Community Planning Group on all correspondence with regards to the Newland Sierra project.

Sincerely,

Oliver Smith

Chairman Valley Center Community Planning Group

Attachment for Agenda Item E4:

December 1, 2014
To: Kenton Jones Kenton.Jones@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Two Mobility Concerns from the Valley Center Community Planning Group

Kenton – Citizen input has been received in the following two areas:

1. Tractor trailer traffic on West Lilac Road between Circle R Drive and Lilac Road – Citizens have “experienced” close calls on the tighter horizontal curves with tractor/trailer rigs that are 40 feet length from the kingpin. As DPW is aware, the current “as built” configuration of this section of West Lilac can’t accommodate this size vehicle without severe encroachment into the opposing travel lanes, particularly on horizontal curves. It is observed by residents that this size vehicle transits this route three or four times a week.

Could DPW analyze the “as built” configuration of this road segment and determine the maximum safe vehicle length?

Assuming that facts verify observations: Is there an appropriate measure to control this potential safety issue such as posting “no oversize vehicle” signs at the Circle R/West Lilac and Lilac/West Lilac intersections that can be implemented?

2. Valley Center really appreciates the noticeable traffic calming effect of the larger radar speed displays that have been placed on Valley Center Road.

At some point in the past few months, DPW indicated that the smaller displays would be upgraded to larger display configurations. Some of the currently installed smaller displays are not displaying speed indications. Is the plan to upgrade to the larger displays (which we heartily support), or repair the smaller displays that are experiencing anomalies? Is there any schedule updates for installation or repair that you can share?

Also, the installed speed indicator at approximately Miller and Valley Center Road has another sign blocking speed display view. Is it possible to move one or the other of the signs?

DPW also indicated that one of the speed indicator displays (Southbound Valley Center Road just south of Lilac Road) would be relocated approximately 150 yards further south, closer to the intersection of Valley Center Road and Sunday Drive. Is this still the plan, and are there any schedule updates that you can share?

Sincerely,

Oliver Smith

Chairman Valley Center Community Planning Group