

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Preliminary Minutes of the 11 May 2015 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 June 2015

Approved:

<b>A</b>		<b>Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:</b>								7:02 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M I L L E R	O C O N N E R	J A N I S C H	H U T C H I S O N	B R I T S C H	P L O T N E R	Q U I N L E Y	F A J A R D O	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	V I C K	R U D O L F	G A R R I T S O N	V A C A N T
P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	

**Notes: Britsch arrives 7.10 pm**

**Quorum Established: 11 present**

<b>B</b>	<b>Pledge of Allegiance</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Approval of Minutes:</b>

**Motion:** Move to approve the minutes of 13 April 2015 as corrected

**Maker/Second:** Hutchison/O'Conner

**Carries: 11-0-0 (Y-N-A):** Voice

<b>D</b>	<b>Public Communication/Open Forum:</b>
	<p>Smith reviews the agenda and notes that Park Circle has not been included on the agenda. Larry Glavinic, audience, laments that the planning group corporate memory of years past has been lost. He speaks of the recent vacation of Irrevocable Offers to Dedicate [IOD] on 2 parcels along Mountain Glen Way at the west end of Mirar de Valle. He notes that the Community Evacuation Route Study identifies an evacuation route on that road. He says the planning group must reassert the need for a mobility element road at that location. O'Conner asks for a more specific location. Glavinic clarifies. Glavinic suggests it is a fire hazard not to have the exit to I-15 from VC. Dorothy Kennedy, audience, addresses the VCCPG on the same IOD vacations. She spoke to Supervisor Horn and he said the vacations are approved per the recommendation of DPW. She notes that the IODs were intended to make the connection of VC to Hidden Meadows. Now without the IODs we will have to buy back the Right of Way [ROW] when we decide to build the road. Vick responds that he did not receive Kennedy's initial email regarding the BOS hearing and vote. Rudolf responds that as an interested party, the County should have notified VCCPG more formally about the vacation. Mark Jackson, audience, says the IODs are in the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group planning area. Jim Chagala, a Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group member in the audience, says Hidden Meadows SG was told that it was impossible to put the road on the ROW in question using the two IODs because of its location. He says the road to connect Mirar de Valle with Hidden Meadows will be realigned in a different location. Smith says he will follow up.</p>

<b>E</b>	<b>Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:</b>
<b>E1</b>	Final vote on proposed VCCPG Standing Rules Amendments to Articles II. Members, III. Duties, and V. Subcommittees. (Rudolf)

**Discussion:** Rudolf cites the history of the proposed rule changes. The changes were made in March and the final vote was delayed by other business until this meeting. He notes that only a vote is needed.

**Motion:** Move to approve rule changes first read in March 2015. [attached]

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Rudolf/Janisch		<b>Carries 12-0-0:</b> [Y-N-A] Voice
<b>E2</b>	PDS2015-7PM-21219, PDS-2015-ER-IS-02-001 Hill Top Ranch located at 30718 Pauma Heights Rd and Palomar Vista Road; owners are Gregory Beck and Suzanne Chaves at 714-308-0423; contact person is Larry Paxton at 760-294-4871. The project plan is Emmet Aquino at 858-694-8845. The project consists of a 21.1 acre parcel which will yield 5 lots each at least 2 acres. The project will rely on septic. (Fajardo)	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Fajardo presents. She describes the project site as a 21-acre parcel, with the owner's home currently on-site. The proposal is to build four additional homes on 2-acre lots, for a total of five homes [her complete report is attached below]. She notes that she has received the County's scoping letter, which identifies several major issues with respect to the project. Among the issues confronting the project are:</p> <p>(1) The project is six miles from the nearest fire station with an emergency response time of 10.85-minutes. The project is located in a semi-rural land use area requiring a 10-minute standard response time.</p> <p>(2) The project exceeds the maximum allowable dead-end road length without an alternative access. The maximum allowable length is 1320-feet. The project dead-end road length is 6200-feet.</p> <p>(3) An SDGE high voltage transmission line [69,000 volts] crosses the site on a 20-foot wide easement. SDGE requests that the County study the potential unacceptable impacts of the project on the existing easement and defer issuance of building permits until any conflicts have been resolved with the developer.</p> <p>(4) The County Department of Environmental Health says three of the parcels have rocky soil that will make septic systems problematic.</p> <p>Fajardo spoke to the owner and says that he knew difficulties were there but was unfamiliar with the review process. The owner will discuss the problems with his developer-consultant. Fajardo notes that the County's project manager, Emmet Aquino, indicates that he has not received a response from the owners to the scoping letter. Aquino estimates that there is potentially a year's worth of studies yet to be done before a decision on the project can be made.</p> <p>Vick asks if all the difficulties cited were in a scoping letter. Fajardo says yes. O'Conner and Smith <b>concur with</b> the difficulties <b>presented by</b> the SDGE lines at the site.</p>		
<b>Motion: None</b>		
<b>E3</b>	Lilac Plaza project PDS2013-MPA-13-018: PDS2015-REZ-15-004 (rezone), PDS2015-GPA-15-003 (GPA), PDS2015-TPM-21224 (TPM), and PDS2015-STP-15-006 (Site Plan). Owner is Lilac Plaza LLC at erik@erikfox.com; applicant is Jerry Gaughan as 619-204-8797 or gerrygaughan@msn.com; Location is southwest corner of Lilac Road and Valley Center Road; The project site is 7-acres and there are plans to construct 10 commercial buildings; some will be two stories. Also included are 36 residential units and 223 parking spaces. The documentation received from the county regarding the Lilac Plaza project (PDS2015-REZ-15-004PDS2015-GPA-15-003PDS2015-TPM-21224, and PDS2015-STP-15-006) was insufficient to initiate a review. The proposed GPA document itself was not included so there is no basis for evaluating important aspects of the project. (Smith).	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Smith reports that he put this item on the agenda to inform the community about the project in spite of the fact that VCCPG has not received all of the information needed for a recommendation. The General Plan Amendment is still missing. He says he will consider creating a new SC for this project because of the extensive load already on the South Village SC.</p>		
<b>Motion: None</b>		
<b>E4</b>	Discussion of possible traffic light at the corner of Ridge Ranch and Valley Center Roads. The light would be useful both to allow egress from Ridge Ranch and as a traffic-calming aid for the South Village. (Vick)	
<b>Discussion:</b>		
<b>Motion:</b> Vick presents. He notes the dangers at the intersection of Ridge Ranch Road and VC Road. He		

reports that residents want some sort of traffic control at the intersection. Smith spoke to Murali Pasumarthi, SD County DPW, who suggested that residents make a request to DPW and he will review it.

**George Wier**, resident, says DPW studied the intersection previously, but could not identify any warrants. He observed that traffic has increased with the development of the tribal casinos. He requests a traffic-calming device for the intersection. He asserts that such calming would help control vehicle speeds approaching VC. He cites a number of accidents, including a fatality. Smith asks if the death was before or after the County lowered the top of hill. Weir replies that it was since the hill was lowered. **Martin Mass**, resident, reports that his wife was t-boned at the intersection, sustaining serious injuries. He cites the lack of a right turn pocket for north-bound traffic. **Mike [last name not recorded]**, resident, spoke to DPW asking if they would like to have a similar intersection near their house. He asserts that another fatality is inevitable. He wants the County to be more attentive, considering the tax dollars residents pay. He postulates that DPW was ambivalent about the problem. When he asked for a right turn pocket the County was doubtful of the need. **Diana Mass**, resident, who was t-boned at the intersection as reported earlier by her husband, recounts her accident. She feels lucky to be alive. She cites the very limited visibility. **Harvey Mitchell**, resident, says the intersection is dangerous. His daughter was struck at the intersection. When the road was rebuilt, a U-turn accommodation was promised at Woods Valley Road, but did not materialize. He cites the high speed of traffic at the intersection. He wants an opportunity to make the intersection safer. **Riece Zoest**, resident, agrees with the comments already made, and adds that people are risking their lives when they exit the Ridge Ranch community. He notes the excessive and dangerous speeds of traffic advancing up the grade to the intersection. He wants the County to review the problem. **Weir** cites the promise to create a U-turn at Woods Valley Road, but is not aware of the promise having been made in writing, just verbal. He has contacted other government offices for help and is hoping for collaboration. He suggests that a potential funding source could be casino mitigation funds.

Smith reviews the origin of the mitigation funds and County/City of Escondido efforts to widen Valley Center Road. Janisch cites left turns out of Ridge Ranch as a problem but says she was unaware of a right turn issue. She suggests a demand light as a possible solution for both turn directions. Rudolf asks about the need for a formal letter. Smith says it is not necessary to make a formal request, he can make an informal request. Rudolf notes that the proposed public Road 19 would allow for U-turns **as promised by the County at the time of the widening of Valley Center Road** and that VCCPG must insist on the development of Road19. He cites **the willingness of the County to make an accommodation for Sunday Drive at Valley Center Road, where a similar request for a turning solution was made for a less dangerous intersection. He thinks Ridge Ranch is a demonstrably more dangerous intersection than Sunday Drive, a safe U-turn for south-bound travel is much longer and more inconvenient there, so a traffic light at Ridge Ranch Road is the safest alternative.** Miller says the view angle doesn't allow a determination of which lane approaching traffic is in, making it dangerous. O'Conner supports some sort of traffic calming at the intersection and recommends that some of the \$9+ million tribal mitigation funds be set aside for such improvements including the north-bound right turn pocket. Jackson, audience, says those funds are already 'fenced' for other projects. Miller observes there are two separate issues: getting approval and then getting funding.

**Motion:** Move to have the chair write a letter to the DPW's Murali Pasumarthi citing all the concerns voiced on this issue.

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Rudolf/ Vick	<b>Carries:</b> 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>F</b>	<b>Group Business</b>
----------	-----------------------

<b>F1</b>	Discussion and vote on subcommittee membership. (Smith)
-----------	---

**Discussion:** Bob Franck has resigned from the South Village SC. Vick suggests Malcolm Smith might drop off to give the SC seven members rather than eight to make decisions more easily achieved. Vick suggests that Malcolm Smith presently lacks the time to attend meetings. He adds that at a later time Smith could be reinstated.

Discussion of Tribal Liaison SC and its membership begins. Quinley says Garritson is presently the only member. Rudolf asks if Garritson has additions. Garritson says he has not been able to contact all the former members. He notes that Claire Plotner expressed interest in the SC previously. Quinley volunteers to join as

well.

**Motion:** Move to add Claire Plotner and Ann Quinley to the Tribal Liaison SC

**Maker/Second:** Garritson/Quinley

**Carries**12-0-0 [Y-N-A]:

**F2**

Introduction of candidates for vacancy in Seat 15 which expires January 19, 2017 (Britsch)

**Discussion:** One candidate has applied for the single vacancy in seat 15, Mark Jackson. Britsch relates his efforts to recruit additional candidates. Three or four prospective candidates requested applications. Only one submitted.

Jackson reviews his application and personal history. He states that he has the time to do the work. He observes that the biggest issue facing the VCCPG is faithfully conforming to General Plan and Community Plan, and making sure the two plans are implemented. He suggests that the strength of the Community Plan is that it is measurable. He cites the value of the VC Design Guidelines. He cites as a weakness of the Community Plan the fact that it is a dated plan and needs to be updated and implemented. Britsch asks for questions; none are asked. Quinley asks if the vote to select the candidate could be done at the second meeting rather than having to wait a month for the third meeting. Rudolf clarifies the need to wait until the third meeting to comport with the current bylaws.

**Motion:** None

**F3**

Possible creation of a subcommittee to review the Lilac Plaza project and/or the Park Circle project (formerly Konyn Dairy project). (Smith)

**Discussion:** Smith presents citing the considerable workload of the South Village, and expressing his concern for that SC and the possibility of burnout by its members. He thinks a new SC would be appropriate for the Lilac Plaza project. He says the new SC needs a chair and members. Boulos and Rudolf volunteer as members. Smith asks Britsch if he would chair, and Britsch asks for time to consider. O'Conner says he is rather committed and would need to withdraw from other assignments before committing to chair the SC. Rudolf and Smith query the County representative, Dennis Campbell, about the possible schedule for review of the project. He says the project is ready for public input. Smith volunteers to chair. Quinley disagrees, citing Smith's existing responsibilities. She asks for additional SC members. Boulos, Rudolf, and Vick will serve as members and Quinley will chair. Rudolf will look for additional citizen members for consideration at the next meeting. Smith wants a thorough review of the South Village projects. All projects presently being considered desire to be on the June 2015 agenda for a recommendation vote. Smith observes that the County has not finished their review. He suggests that the earliest time for a vote is July 2015. Mindy Fogg, SD County PDS, says PDS is scoping both projects now. She acknowledges the questions expressed this evening on proposed Road19. Miller asks for clarification on the scoping for the Park Circle project. Fogg says it should be completed by the end of May. Miller suggests scheduling a review in June. Miller says there is considerable existing information on South Village traffic and other issues that current applicants are not aware of that amounts to 58 MB on disk. Smith will assist with compression of the data for distribution. He notes that he responsible for distribution of project information from the County. Smith asks about the Tractor Supply project. Miller responds that the 2 June 2015 meeting of the South Village SC will include the Tractor Supply project.

**Motion:** Move to establish Lilac Plaza SC with Quinley as chair, and Boulos, Rudolf and Vick as members.

**Maker/Second:** Smith/Rudolf

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

**F4**

**Next regular meeting scheduled for 8 June 2015**

**G**

**Motion to Adjourn:**

**8.40 pm**

**Maker/Second:** Smith/Quinley

**Carries:** 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]

<b>Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group</b>	
a)	Mobility – Jon Vick, 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 –Bill Miller, Chair
g)	Tribal Liaison – James Garritson, Chair
h)	Website – Jeana Boulos, Chair, Garritson says he secured VCCPG.org and plans to address in June. Requests photos for home page.
i)	Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair
j)	Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair: current project hideaway lakes described. Neighbors concerned. Meeting schedule 13 May. No activity SDGE; no activity Via Valencia; another project NLP inactive; Wilkes project inactive ; VCMWD project moving forward with landscaping solution.
k)	Ad Hoc Committee on Handbook Update and Member Training – Ann Quinley, Chair; Rudolf explains status of training and project to update handbook, awaiting input from county. Says findings are crucial to aiding county staff recommendation. Says staff has summary of required findings and Rudolf is trying to get that information.
l)	Lilac Plaza – Ann Quinley, Chair

### **Correspondence Received for the Meeting:**

1. PDS to VCCPG: Lilac Plaza, LLC; t PDS2013-MPA-13-018: PDS2015-REZ-15-004 (rezone), PDS2015-GPA-15-003 (GPA), PDS2015-TPM-21224 (TPM), and PDS2015-STP-15-006 (Site Plan) on April 10, 2015. Owner is Lilac Plaza LLC at [erik@erikfox.com](mailto:erik@erikfox.com) or 6190279-24728; applicant is Jerry Gaughan at 619-204-8797 or [gerrygaughan@msn.com](mailto:gerrygaughan@msn.com); Location is southwest corner of Lilac Road and Valley Center Road; The project site is 7 acres and there are plans to construct commercial buildings on 2.14 acres of the site and to build 1.7 acres of retail, Office/professional. Also included are 316 acres of residential units and 223 parking spaces. Under separate cover, a site plan for the project was received. A general Plan Amendment to amend the GP Amendment Circulation Element to allow private road standards to be used with the project is proposed as well as a rezone to change current zoning from Village Residential to VR-10.9 and General Commercial. A zoning change from RR to C36 is also requested.
2. Valley Center Fire Protection District to VCCPG; Correspondence in response to county PD521A Request for Agency Recommendation for Lilac Plaza PDS2013-MPA-13-018 PDS521A on April 24, 2015.
3. PDS to VCCPG: Park Circle project: PDS2015-TM-5603. Project is located at the corner of Valley Center and Mirar De Valle Roads; Owner is Konyn Reality Investment Company, 27634 Valley Center Road. The gross project area is 74.6 acres and net project area is 69.9 acres. Total number of lots 368 with 318 total dwelling units—dwellings are single family detached and one or two stories. The minimum residential lot size is 2200 square feet. The project proposes to build block walls and privacy walls around the project that will wall it off from Valley Center Road.

### **Attachment for item E1:**

### **Proposed Amendment #1 Membership upon vacancies**

#### **ARTICLE II – MEMBERSHIP**

**Sections I-III:** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1)

**Section IV, Vacancies:** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the following VCCPG standing Rules additions.) **The VCCPG Chairperson shall notify the PDS Department and the Clerk of the Board when a vacancy occurs (not later than 10 days following) and publicly post the Vacancy Announcement.** The Nominations Subcommittee (~~NC~~) shall consist of three members that shall be elected in January each year, at the same meeting during which officer elections are conducted. The Nominations Subcommittee shall manage the process of filling vacancies to the VCCPG and to all other organizations on which the VCCPG is authorized or required to provide a representative (i.e. VC DRB, I-15 DRB). Should a vacancy be known in advance or when there is a scheduled vacancy, the Nominations Subcommittee Chairperson shall, with the concurrence and coordination of the VCCPG Chairperson, initiate the vacancy filling process in advance so as

to reduce or eliminate the time a seat will be vacant.

**MEETING 1**—The VCCPG Chairperson shall officially announce any known vacancy(s) at the first Regular Meeting during which the vacancy is known (Meeting 1). If possible, vacancies shall be included in the preliminary and final agendas for that meeting.

**INTERIM PERIOD BETWEEN MEETING 1 AND MEETING 2**—The Nominations Subcommittee shall initiate public notification of any vacancy(s) in all appropriate venues (newspapers, websites, etc.) in order to maximize public awareness and participation. Public announcements shall begin as soon as possible after the official announcement of any vacancy(s) and shall continue without interruption until the next Regular Meeting [meeting 2]. In order to assure prompt public notice, when a vacancy is known in advance, the Nominations Subcommittee may take action before an official vacancy announcement in order to ensure public notification begins promptly after the official announcement of any vacancy(s). Public notification shall include the vacancy(s) seat number(s), term of office, I-1 requirements, point of contact information for the Nominations Subcommittee and any other pertinent information. The Nominations Subcommittee shall specifically attempt to contact prior candidates, subcommittee members and other known persons who may be interested in serving.

The Nominations Subcommittee shall provide standardized application packages promptly to all persons who indicate an interest in serving. Packages should include:

- a. Welcoming letter,
- b. General information about the PG, vacancy process and candidate responsibilities,
- c. Nominations Subcommittee and VCCPG contact information,
- d. San Diego County Boards and Commissions Application form,
- e. Sample single page resume (long resumes are not desired or required).
- f. Standardized set of questions that candidates will be expected to address before the Planning Group. (Questions should be general in nature and allow the Planning Group to assess the views of the candidates. Questions should deal with how the candidate views the Valley Center Community Plan, their current concerns and vision for the community and specific skills and experience the candidates possess.)

Prospective candidates must return completed application packages to the Nominations Subcommittee no later than **four than five** business days prior to the beginning of the second Regular Meeting (meeting 2)(i.e. applications must be received by the Nominations Committee by 7:00 pm on **Wednesday Tuesday** for a Regular Meeting on Monday evening). After receiving applications, the Nominations Subcommittee shall review the packages, **obtain Registrar of Voters office verification that applicants are registered voters living in the Valley Center planning area, and then** compile the list of qualified candidates and make copies of the application packages for VCCPG members.

Completed application packages must include:

- a. Completed county Boards and Commissions application form,
- b. Statement that the applicant is a registered voter in the planning area,
- c. Resume of qualifications, and
- d. Written responses to the standard set of questions.

**MEETING 2**—Candidate introductions shall be published in the agendas for the second Regular Meeting after a vacancy is announced. The Nominations Subcommittee shall distribute copies of completed application packages for every qualified candidate to VCCPG members at that meeting and introduce the candidates to the VCCPG. The Nominations Subcommittee Chairperson shall make known to the VCCPG if any applications were not accepted along with the reasons for any such rejections. The VCCPG Chairperson shall allow each candidate to address the VCCPG. Candidates should answer the standard questions provided to them by the Nominations Subcommittee along with any other personal comments.

**MEETING 3**—The VCCPG Chairperson shall conduct elections at the third Regular Meeting after the subject vacancy(s) is announced (Meeting 3). By a majority vote of authorized members, the VCCPG may vote to extend scheduled deadlines or votes. In order to prevail, a candidate must receive a majority of votes of the authorized membership (8). If no candidate receives a majority of authorized votes, the candidate with the fewest votes shall be eliminated and another round of voting shall be conducted. Additional rounds of voting shall be conducted in like manner until a candidate prevails. Should two candidates tie for the fewest number of votes, an additional round of voting shall be conducted between those candidates in order to determine which candidate will be eliminated.

**FOLLOW-UP**—The Nominations Subcommittee shall retain applications and applicants will remain qualified candidates for a period of one year from the date of the latest vote in which the candidate participated. Any such candidate must provide a written statement of their intent to run for a specific vacancy to the Nominations Subcommittee prior to the beginning of the meeting at which the vote for that vacancy is scheduled. Such candidates may run for any vacancy on the VCCPG or to the other organizations on which the VCCPG is authorized or required to provide a representative. The VCCPG Chairperson will promptly forward the name of prevailing candidates to the county Board of Supervisors for their approval. **Board-approved nominees assume their seats upon completion of required training courses.**

[Approved 11-14-2005]

## **Proposed Amendment #2 Duties and Minority Reports**

### ARTICLE III – DUTIES

**Section: I** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor’s Policy I-1)

**Section: II** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor’s Policy I-1 and augmented with the VCCPG standing Rules.)

The Planning Group member assigned to report on an agenda item shall notify the project proponent that the project will be on the agenda, and notify the Chairperson that the item is ready for consideration. If the project proponent is not present when the matter is considered, the item may be continued until the proponent is present to answer questions.

Whenever Members identify themselves as members of the VCCPG, they shall immediately state whether they are acting for the group, as an individual member, or as a private citizen. If statements or conduct are not in accordance with the requirements of Board Policies I-1 and I-1A, members may be held personally liable.

**Planning Group recommendations shall focus on: Completeness and accuracy of the Project Description; Compatibility with Community Character; Consistency with the Community Plan; Consistency with the County General Plan and applicable zoning regulations; and Concerns with the Project’s environmental impacts. Minority opinions may also be provided, if declared at the time of the vote. The proposed Minority opinion shall be discussed when declared and supporter(s) identified. Any Minority opinion must be sent to the Secretary to accompany the Majority recommendations to staff, and must include a statement identifying which members supported the Minority opinion.**

**Section: III – IV** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor’s Policy I-1)

## **Proposed Amendment #3 Subcommittee absences**

### ARTICLE V – SUBCOMMITTEES

**Section I-II:** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor’s Policy I-1)

**Section III:** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor’s Policy I-1 and augmented with the following VCCPG standing Rules.)

A Subcommittee may be formed or abolished, at any time, by a majority vote of the VCCPG. The purpose and scope of activities of each subcommittee shall be established by the VCCPG upon creation of the subcommittee. The major purpose of a Subcommittee is to gather pertinent information relative to the committee’s stated purpose, study it, and make recommendations to the VCCPG based on said information.

Membership on Subcommittees is open to all interested residents, including volunteers who reside outside of the planning area, but requires nomination by a VCCPG member and a majority vote from the VCCPG. Non-planning area residents shall not exceed fifty percent of total subcommittee membership. Membership may be lost by three (3) consecutive absences, unless the member notifies the Subcommittee chairperson **and is excused by the Chair** in advance of each meeting. At the next VCCPG meeting removal would be by majority vote. The Chairperson of

each subcommittee shall present a copy of VCCPG's Standing Rules and applicable portions of I-1 to each subcommittee member, prior to commencement of the first subcommittee meeting.

The Chair of the Subcommittee shall make a presentation to the VCCPG quarterly, or more frequently as necessary. The Chair of each Subcommittee shall include within the Subcommittee's report to the VCCPG a record of all votes cast, including which VCCPG members disqualified themselves from participating because of conflict of interest, as required by Board Policy I-1 and I-1A. Any member may file a minority report. No recommendations by a Subcommittee shall be construed as binding or as the official position of the VCCPG.

[Approved 11-14-2005]

**Section IV:** (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the VCCPG standing Rules.)

**Section V.** When time permits, Subcommittee meetings should be announced at regular VCCPG meetings to maximize public participation. Relevant project proponents should be notified at least one week prior to the meeting. The Subcommittee Chairperson shall cause to be posted a meeting Notice and Agenda, outside the meeting place, not less than 24 hours prior to the meeting. There can be no discussion of or action on matters not on the agenda.

[Approved with consolidation of Sections VI-XIV, 10-0 3/8/04]

**Attachment for Item E2:**

This is a review on the Hill Top Ranch project, located at 30718 Pauma Heights Rd, Valley Center, owned by

Gregory Beck and Suzanne Chaves. This is a 21 acre parcel, with the owners home currently located on this property. they wish to build an additional 4 homes on 2 acre lots, for a total of 5 homes across the 21 acres.

I have received the scoping letter, dated March 18 of this year. At this time there are several major project issues.

(1)Travel time: the nearest fire station is approx. 6.0 miles from the project and travel time to the project is approx. 10.85 minutes. The project is located in a Semi-Rural Residential Development Area and per the General Plan, the max travel time allowed is 10 min. therefore, the project exceeds the max travel time requirements.

(2) Maximum allowable dead-end road length. The project exceeds the maximum dead end road length. Allowable distance is 1320 feet, the distance on the project is 6200 ft.

(3) SDG&E concerns preliminary reviews indicate that the SDG&E easement and facilities may be impacted by this project. There is a 20 ft easement containing 69,000 volts of electric transmission lines crossing the parcel. Since there is a potential for unacceptable impacts to SDG&E easements, SDG&E requests that the project be "red flagged" and not be issued bldg permits, grading permits or approval of the map or project until county has reviewed the plans for the project development with the developer and resolved any conflicts.

In addition, the Dept of Environmental Health cannot recommend approval of the proposed parcels at this time. Parcels 2, 3, and 4, have variable surface and subsurface rock outcroppings that have the potential to impact the installation of both primary and reserve leach fields. And parcel 1, has the existing SDG&E overhead power line running from the SE corner to the west property line.

Per Emmet Aquino, the County project manager, He has not received a reply from the owners of the property in regards to the scoping letter. Mr Aquino states there needs to be a meeting with the fire protection district, and county fire marshall with the property owner. At least a year of additional studies need to be done, including a storm water management plan. The property was formerly a citrus grove and has been cleared of the previous grove. And when the property was previously surveyed in 2007, it was deemed negative for cultural resources, altho Native American consultation may be required.

At this time, the owners: mr Beck and ms Chaves, must respond with an iteration letter, indicating problem solving and measures to offset the issues previously mentioned. It is up to the owners to either resolve the problems or decide the problems can't be resolved and withdraw the application. Per mr Aquino, he is waiting to receive further communication from the owners.

The estimated hearing/decision date for this project is May 11, 2016.