

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the 13 July 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 GP= County General Plan N=Nay P=Present PC=County Planning Commission R=Recused SC=Subcommittee VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group VC= Valley Center VCPRD=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 16 July 2015

Approved: 10 August 2015

| A | | Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: | | | | | | | | 7:04PM | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| M I L L E R | O C 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 | P | A | P | P | P | P | A | P | P | |

Notes:

Quorum Established: 12 present

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| B | Pledge of Allegiance |
| C | Approval of Minutes: |

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 13 July 2015 as presented

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Garritson

Carries: 12-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

| | |
|----------|---|
| D | Public Communication/Open Forum: |
| | <p>Jerry Granger, a resident in the audience, comments on the Valley Center Municipal Water District [VCMWD] by wondering how the community can continue to function with a district that seems to want to put community agriculture out of business. He cites water rates that are excessive and are driving agriculture out of business in the community. He claims that local agricultural users pay water rates 13-times more than users in neighboring Riverside County. How can our rates be justified, he asks? Smith queries Wally Grabbe, VCMWD District Engineer present in the audience, regarding the next VCMWD board meeting. Grabbe responds that the board meets the first and third Mondays of each month at 2 pm at the district offices. Granger asks for VCCPG opinion on water rates. Smith responds that water issues such as rates are not part of the purview of VCCPG. He notes there are several independent districts within the community handling different aspects of government and utility services.</p> <p>Patsy Fritz, audience, suggests Granger take a Riverside County water bill to the VCMWD meeting with him as evidence of the disparity in rates.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| E | Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]: |
| E1 | <p>Discussion and possible vote on request from Valley Center Municipal Water District [VCMWD] to vacate portions of an existing drainage easement located over 2 parcels of land owned by VCMWD located on Charlan Road East of its intersection with Valley Center Road (APNs 189-091-01 and 189-091-02). VCMWD is planning to construct a storm water storage facility over the property, which is to be maintained by VCMWD, negating the need for the County's Drainage Easement., County Dept of Gen Services Eric Lazovich. (Miller)</p> |

Discussion: Miller introduces the project and describes it as a holding pond for recycled water. VCMWD Representative, Fernando Carillo, presents the location of the project at the end of Charlan Road. Carrillo says VCMWD is asking the County to vacate a storm water drainage easement across the VCMWD property. Miller asks Carillo to discuss the structure proposed for the site that necessitates the easement vacation. Carillo says the storage pond will have a 46 acre-feet capacity within a 15-foot high earthen berm. Storm water that enters the property will be redirected through a channel and culvert around the pond and then connect to the existing storm drainage at other side of the property. Miller asks about

where the material for berm will come from. Carillo says fill will be imported from a site elsewhere in VC. Miller cites the SC motion to approve the vacation of the County easement. Rudolf inquires about landscaping for the project then questions whether this issue concerning landscaping would go to the DRB for review. Smith says the County may condition such a review. Grabbe says the VCMWD board will make the ultimate decision on landscaping and is not subject to DRB review. Rudolf asks about a new road that is to run to the east of and parallel to VC Road from Woods Valley Road to some point north of Charlan Road and if that road will present a problem to this project. Grabbe says no. Smith, after checking the Mobility Element map, notes that the road in question didn't make it on the Mobility Element map. Patsy Fritz, audience, asks about the quality of the proposed fencing and Smith asks about the degree of safety such fencing would provide. Wally Grabbe, VCMWD District Engineer, says the fencing is consistent with other VCMWD facility fencing.

Motion: Move to approve the vacation of the existing drainage easement to allow the construction of a holding basin to be developed by the Valley Center Municipal Water District. Request by Smith to amend the motion to add screening of the surrounding security fence and landscaping on the side of the berm facing the community. Amendment is acceptable to maker and second.

Maker/Second: Miller/Rudolf

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

E2

Discussion and possible vote on recommendations regarding **Road 14 and Road 19** alternatives being raised and assuring appropriate VCCPG opportunity to comment prior to any formalized decision. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith defines the issue saying VC Road was designed with Road 19 running parallel to VC Rd. from Woods Valley Road to Lilac Road. This was done with the understanding that Mirar de Valle is intended to be a connection from VC Road to I-15 in the future. He says Road 19 is on the Mobility Element map and describes the route from Woods Valley Road to Lilac Road. The prevailing concern is Road 19's relationship to current projects in the South Village and the lack of a realistic alignment because of topography and overlap with sensitive structures. He warns that the discussions of the Road 19 alignment cannot go the way of the Butterfield Ranch median loss issue. He notes that the lost VC Road median was paid for by a combination of private community fund raising and County discretionary funds, but the decision to remove the median was made by DPW and the project developer with no review by the community. He declares that the VCCPG wants to participate in such discussions and have the opportunity to make recommendations and express alternatives. He says, as an example, the County design decision on the bridge at Sunday Drive and VC Road was initially very utilitarian and gray, but the community injected ideas to make the design much more pleasing to the eye.

Smith cites Hatfield Plaza, Park Circle, Tractor Supply Company, and Lilac Plaza as projects currently being reviewed that may be impacted by the ultimate alignment of Road 19. Norwood asks if we have an approved mobility plan. Smith clarifies that Road 19 is presently a line on the Mobility Element map. That line is approved, however, the alignment has never been ground-truthed or evaluated for construction feasibility. Norwood worries that if we approve the subject projects now, the road issue will not be resolved and there may be major issues in the future. Rudolf brings up Road 14 and reports a meeting of North Village SC and Mobility SC at developer Napoleon Zervas' request. He describes the route of Road 14 east from Miller Road to VC Rd. He says the two SCs found it acceptable to retain the present alignment at the south edge of Zervas' property. He observes that there is no present issue with Road 14. Mark Jackson, audience, notes that Road 14 has no alignment officially, and, like Road 19, it must be laid out by DPW.

Rudolf says the County staff must resolve the Road 19 alignment before project approvals are granted. Staff has not responded to the requests made to date. He observes that the staff has not completed the new VC Community Plan with such alignments completed. He again suggests that the staff find needed funding and schedule staff time to complete these issues. The Road 19 issue brings up the lack of community plan completion. He says the County budget of July 2014 included funds to complete the VC Community Plan. Rudolf agrees with Smith that approval of the subject projects before the planned road is clearly designated jeopardizes the community's vision for South Village. He asks staff to bring us what has been promised.

Miller asks about the alignment of Road 14. Napoleon Zervas, audience, says the County asked him to accept

an alignment of Indian Creek Road south of VC Road on his property to accommodate that road north of VC Road. And, he did [suggesting that he had already sacrificed some of his property for the community good]. Zervas says that the Road 14 alignment has to be at least 300-feet south of VC Road, putting it along the south edge of his property. Garritson asks about the similarities between the alignments of Roads 19 and 14. Rudolf clarifies. Janisch observes that Road 19 would impact the VC Community Center. O'Conner cites traffic issues for evacuation and routine travel and congestion as reasons for implementing Road 19. He says that the road issues need to be addressed before the review and approval any of the projects. Garritson says that there are incentives for developers to provide adequate access for projects. O'Conner clarifies the differences between private driveways and public roads. Rudolf observes the lack of cooperation among developers to resolve the road 19 issue, and County's lack of response to the issue. Dennis Campbell, County PDS Project Manager, tries to explain the lack of funding for road planning and construction and the poor planning of the Road 19 alignment. He reminds that there was no ground-truthing of the approved route. He asserts that the County staff will be meeting on the Road 19 issue next week. He says there is nothing in the budget for developing Road 19.

Garritson asks again about Road 14. Campbell says he agrees with Rudolf's assessment of what the SCs decided regarding Road 14. Boulos asks how we are working with developers on this issue. Britsch says the County is involved and the County should move forward to resolve this issue. Fajardo cites the potential impact of Road 19 on the subject projects and that they should be delayed until the road issue is resolved. Plotner says the Road 14 resolution cited by Rudolf should be a model for the resolution of the Road 19 issue. She says working with developers and the community may help lead the County to a resolution. She says we are not digging in our heels, but these are serious issues.

Kerry Garza, developer of Park Circle in the audience, recalls the history of Road 19. Says Road 19 was added to the Mobility Element map at the last minute to accommodate anticipated traffic from Mirar de Valle after it is connected to I-15. He cites other interests for having Road 19, such as added interconnection from Lilac to Mirar de Valle and additional emergency evacuation alternatives. But, he says it is planned for the future. He asserts the County made a mistake by drawing it on the map without ground-truthing the alignment. He met with the County to find alternatives that have been ground-truthed, received biological studies and traffic studies. He acknowledges that he's been working with the County, but he doesn't know what they will ultimately decide. He claims he is here to try to make an alignment that will work. He cites the need for an extremely expensive 450-foot long bridge at the presently mapped location. He cites his current investment of \$8M in the Park Circle project. He notes that the VC Community Plan does not want impacts to Moosa Creek like the road.

Patsy Fritz, audience, says the County staff meeting is planned and the next stage is to include the community and developers. If that doesn't happen, that is, if there is no staff meeting notice, the community needs to go to the BOS during open forum to get resolution. She says the BOS doesn't want foot dragging on such issues. She states that the community has a right to go to the County BOS, but Dennis Campbell should be given a chance to make good on the staff review.

Rudolf expands on Boulos' question of how we are working with developers and how it relates to the North Village model. He recounts the unfortunate story of planning for a North Village strip mall rather than a village center many years ago. The Transportation Impact Fees [TIF] were too great for Herb Schaefer, a North Village developer, to proceed with construction immediately. Then the community worked with Zervas and Jerry Gaughan on a neighboring project. The community resolved the issues between the two projects resulting in a genuine town center rather than a typical strip mall. As a result, VCCPG made changes in the General Plan Update to accommodate the agreements reached. The developers got what they wanted in terms of density and sadly VCCPG subsequently lost the control it once had while the projects were part of a Specific Plan Area. This initial kind of cooperation could be a model for South Village development. Rudolf cites Garza's efforts to get cooperation on interconnectivity in South Village as well as Road 19 from other developers. Garza says that after all that effort to get the North Village plan that the community liked and encouraged earlier, Schaefer is now working on a different plan. Zervas says he is still working with Schaefer on the North Village plan. Garza clarifies that he is talking about the commercial area of Schaefer's project, not Indian Creek Road.

Larry Glavinic, audience says none of the mobility roads are funded. He says there is a disconnect between the BOS and PDS planning. He observes that new roads are only built by developers. Smith asks Campbell about the time line for the anticipated meetings of staff and community on the Road 19 issue. Campbell says that the

community meeting is likely 2-3 weeks away. Rudolf wants a motion on the completion of the VC Community Plan [VCCP] as part of the overall issue in South Village. He wants resources designated for the VCCP. He makes a motion to that effect. Garritson questions whether the Community Plan is approved. Smith clarifies that a version of the VCCP exists for legal alignment with General Plan Update [GPU]. But, it doesn't include more recent changes requested by VCCPG. Rudolf outlines the history of the remake of the VCCP for Garritson. Garza notes he and other developers are working with the 2011 version of the GPU. Miller asks if drafts are complete. Rudolf says mostly, mobility probably needs some update and a couple of others. Plotner asks if there is a draft ready for review. Rudolf says yes, but wants to wait to have all the proposed changes refined and made. Plotner asks if we could have a review copy. Rudolf says eventually, after Bob Citrano has had a pass at it for legal consistency.

Miller gives South Village SC opinion of farthest west route for Road 19. Garza presents a map of alternative routes for Road 19. Rudolf asks if the County is considering routes other than Garza's three? Campbell says those will be the starting point. Rudolf suggests a process for review. Jim Chagala, audience, notes that the alternatives are on Debb's property and he, on behalf of Mr. Debb opposes those alternatives. Kerry Watts asks about Road 19 and the Hatfield Plaza overlap issue, and suggests that there is no resolution presently. Rudolf agrees that no resolution is in sight. Campbell responds to the Hatfield issue by citing the difficulty of construction within the present alignment. Watts says the problem for Hatfield Plaza is the same as for other developers' projects along Road 19. Plotner suggests two two-lane roads instead of a four-lane road for Road 19, thinking that the smaller roads would be easier to accommodate. Garza responds saying one 2-lane road would be sufficient for present traffic and until Mirar de Valle is connected to I-15. O'Conner asks Campbell if developers didn't know about Road 19 at the time they bought their properties. Campbell says they were aware. Ross Burnett interjects that the Tractor Supply Company land has been owned for thirty years, well before the plan for Road 19. Road 19 was added more recently. Garza says he knew about Road 19 but is now trying to make it feasible. Smith, summarizing, suggests that with Campbell organizing Road 19 meetings at the County, our objective is to have the opportunity to review the possible alternatives for that issue, and that the VCCP was not part of that discussion and not on the agenda tonight. He suggests that we can consider each project in relation to Road 19 even if it is not codified in the VCCP. He says there should be no vote on the VCCP motion.

Motion: VCCPG encourages South Village developers to cooperate with the community and the County to resolve the Road 19 alignment issue and encourages the County to fund and assign staff resources for the completion of the VCCP upon which the current list of projects depends for guidance.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Maker/Second: Rudolf/O'Conner | Fails: Chair determines no action can be taken because the issue was not properly noticed as part of the agenda |
|--------------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|---|
| E3 | Discussion and possible vote on Tractor Supply project PDS2015-STP-15-005; Owner is Bell Holdings, LLC, Steve Flynn, President; email: steveflynn@aol.com; phone 858-753-3589; contact person is Ross Burnett; email: rburnett@sterlingwarner.com; phone: 702-210-1944; location is 27444 Valley Center Road south of Mirar de Valle. The project includes the construction of one 18,825 square foot retail store with a 15,000 square foot outdoor display area to be built on 3.70 acres and will include 90 parking stalls. The store will sell livestock and pet products, hardware and tool products and work clothing among other items. (Vick for Mobility; Miller for South Village). |
|-----------|---|

Discussion: Miller presents and recounts the history of the review of this project. He cites the motion at the last meeting of the South Village SC recommending approval based on implementation of conditions in the County's scoping letter. He cites Road 19, screening of the outside sales area and the DRB review as issues identified in the scoping letter. He notes that the South Village SC approved the project, but the Mobility SC did not. He refers to a Vick email, in Vick's absence from the meeting tonight, saying that he wants the discussed traffic calming measures along VC Road funded by the developer in proportion to the property they own along VC Road. O'Conner reads the Vick email that lists several issues, including Form Based Code issues. Miller suggests Vick must be more specific about what the project needs for approval. O'Conner refers to the site plan problem discussed. Janisch clarifies the DRB comments. Ross Burnett, representative of the applicant, presents, first introducing Tractor Supply Company. He characterizes them as 75-years old and started in

South Dakota. They now have about 1500 stores. They do not sell tractors. They sell tack, feed, fencing, and irrigation products. They are large and financially stable. He says quality tenants are important for the community. He says they pride themselves on community involvement. He notes that we would not be having this discussion without the Bell family intervention in GP process, since he credits Steve Flynn with salvaging all the commercial zoning in South Village that would have been lost during the General Plan Update process. He says the Bells intervened on Transportation Impact Fees rate reductions. He says the Bell Family pursued sewer expansion. He goes on to lionize the Bell family commitment to the VC community. Burnett introduces Bill Lewis, architect, and extols his credentials. Lewis describes the property, and cites the VC Design Guidelines and how they apply to this project:

- 1) "Valley Center Parkway: He asserts there should be a planted median to slow traffic in the business area. He presents traffic study from 3 years ago. He says the suicide lane at the center of VC Rd. is dangerous. He suggests ways of slowing traffic. He says a roundabout is the most efficient way to slow traffic. He admits he will not push for a roundabout but he does recommend roundabouts.
- 2) Road edge: Lewis lauds the Heritage Trail. He suggests the site plan has massed trees at front to complement the trail. Burnett speaks to road 19 and lack of funding at county, says could accommodate road 19 on west side of property if county desires. Lewis cites tenant concurrence with design.
- 3) Parking: Continues to be in front of building arranged in segments with separating vegetation.
- 4) Architectural floor plan: Shows diagram of floor plan. Shows Box-shaped building and signature arch. Speaks to Spanish Colonial style. Emphasizes landscaping of trees and shrubs. Presents model of building and recapitulation of design of landscape.

Fajardo asks if existing trees would be retained. Burnett say some along the back boundary may be retained, but most would be lost. Garritson asks about the unused southern portion of the property. Lewis says it is not a part of the project. He adds that it could be used for a complementary business. Patsy Fritz asks if venting turbines could be placed on the roof for cooling. Lewis says it is a possibility.

Smith asks about the road easement along the south boundary of the project. He observes that Papa Bear's will become a drive through at some point. He wants to know what the project will do to improve that road for Tractor Supply's delivery trucks and other residents. Burnett says they have an easement right to use the road. Smith counters that there is a difference between commercial traffic and residential traffic. Lewis attempts to clarify the traffic volume for the business and that the easement will be improved to 24' for trucks and residents alike. Fritz asks if there is a road maintenance agreement. Burnett says the project will likely be conditioned to have some road maintenance agreement. Fritz pursues maintenance and asks if they would accept a condition from the planning commission to provide the lion's share of maintenance. Fritz expands on conditioning. Lewis concedes that usage will be significant.

Rudolf asks if customers will use the road loop to exit to the south or will they use the northern 'entrance' to return to VC Rd. Lewis suggests that most, if not all, would use the northern entrance as both ingress and egress. Rudolf asks if the construction of Road 19 would change the site design for Tractor Supply. Burnett say it most likely would. Burnett then addresses the set back requirements for the North Village town center [VC Community Plan] as being not applicable in the South Village. Rudolf asks if DRB considered the set back issue for Tractor Supply. Burnett says no. Hutchison interrupts, reading from the preliminary minutes of the previous DRB meeting at which the Tractor Supply building set backs were discussed and the question was raised about why the building is to the rear of the property rather than forward toward VC Rd.

Lewis discusses the contemporary mission architectural style. He says the Design Guidelines do not allow an agricultural building style. Rudolf asks if the building style was discussed at the DRB. Lewis says an agricultural building was not discussed at the DRB. Hutchison, again interrupts, citing the preliminary minutes of the DRB to reveal that after an architectural presentation, the DRB indicated a preference for an agricultural style building rather than a mission style and requesting that it be changed to something more "barny". Lewis and Rudolf discuss barn-like style and mission style. Hutchison notes that the Tractor Supply Company store in San Luis Obispo has a barn-like building. Fritz suggests the same style was used in Ramona.

Fritz then asks about solar electric systems and whether they are being considered. Lewis responds, yes, the building will have a solar photo-voltaic system. Hutchison asks about the Form Based Code [FBC] for the South

Village and if the proposed design comports with the ideas presented in that effort. Lewis suggests, disparagingly, that the FBC would make his project and VC Rd. look like Escondido's Grand Ave. He defends the massed tree landscape he has proposed rather than the FBC approach. Garritson asks about the length of the building lease. Burnett responds the lease is for 20 years. Garritson then says he supports the project. Burnett adds that the Design Guidelines were discussed at the South Village SC. He says if the Design Guidelines are observed, his project is a 'wonderful design.' He continues to sell his project.

Rudolf notes the time as 9.48 pm and moves to extend the meeting to 10.10 pm. O'Conner objects to such a short extension that will not allow public discussion. Rudolf counters with an amended extension to 10.20 pm.

Garritson approves of the project. Smith calls for other opinions from the VCCPG members. Boulos approves of the project and likes the set back from the road with the massed trees. Britsch likes what he has seen, but wants to hear other comments before deciding. Rudolf says he wants further guidance from the DRB and wants resolution on Road 19 before a decision to approve. He hopes the Road 19 issue will be an incentive for the developer to help the VCCPG to work with the County on resolving the Road 19 problem. Garritson asks about the proposed schedule for the project. Dennis Campbell, PDS project manager, says the County has no major issues with this project. Fajardo likes the project except for the Road 19 issue and the private easement issue. She then raised the issue of the ugly market across street from this proposed project. O'Conner says he likes the project, but not the tenant. He cites competing existing businesses that will be affected by addition of Tractor Supply Company. He agrees that the Bell family has done a lot for the community, but Tractor Supply will not be a benefit for whole community. He acknowledges that it is not in the purview of VCCPG to dictate tenants, but he believes it is important to note the affect this project will have on the existing community. Janisch asks O'Conner if he supports all the gas stations, existing and proposed. O'Conner says yes. Burnett defends Tractor Supply as not competing with feed stores to the point of elimination. He says competition is usually not the reason for most business failures. It can often be family issues. Garritson supports competition, saying it is the American way. Steve Riggins, audience, owner of Armstrong Feed, says he cannot compete with Tractor Supply Company based on the prices he must pay as a small business for feed and supplies. He speculates that he will likely have to cut jobs to stay afloat. Kerry Watts, audience, says there is no rush to vote because the sewer is still far off and it must be complete before building can commence. Plotner likes the architecture and admits she doesn't use big box stores generally, preferring to shop at local businesses. Boulos says the Tractor Supply business may attract customers from outside the community. Rudolf sees no reason to vote tonight. He wants the Road 19 issue resolved first. Janisch likes the design and set back and agrees with the notion that competition is an American theme. Norwood says the businesses she has spoken to will be affected and she can't support it. She acknowledges that her own business is one that will likely suffer if the project is approved. Steve Flynn, representing the project, says it is not right to wait for the Road 19 issue to be resolved with no date for resolution in sight, and there is no sewer issue, so no need to wait, the sewer expansion is already in progress. He says the competing businesses will adjust and so will VC. Garritson moves to approve the project. Smith wants to amend the motion to approve to include a condition for a road maintenance agreement as part of the project. Rudolf advises that there is no second to the motion and, therefore, no motion to amend.

Motion: Motion to extend the VCCPG meeting to 10.20 pm

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Maker/Second: Rudolf/Plotner; | Carries 9-3-0: [Y-N-A] Voice: Garritson, Fajardo, and O'Conner oppose |
|--------------------------------------|---|

Motion: Move to approve the project

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Maker/Second: Garritson/ no second | Fails for lack of second |
|---|--------------------------|

E4

Discussion and possible vote on **South Village Form Based Code**. Comments on the program drafted by South Village Sub-committee in response to the County's Administrative Draft dated June 4, 2015. (Vick for Mobility; Miller for South Village)

Discussion: Meeting time expired before this item could be addressed. It will be placed on a future agenda.

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| E5 | Discussion and possible vote on letter to the Department of Planning and Development Services requesting an analysis of the amount of commercial space that is required to service a population the size of Valley Center, both currently and in 2030. The analysis should include information on how the space required compares to the commercial space currently planned for in the General Plan. (Plotner, Smith) | |
| Discussion: Meeting time expired before this item could be addressed. It will be placed on a future agenda. | | |
| F | Group Business | |
| F1 | Discussion on additional raised medians and roundabouts in place of traffic signals along Valley Center Rd between Ridge Ranch Road and Cole Grade Rd. Discussion to include how to get representative plots and information so as to have informed full community input from all affected parties (property owners, businesses, residents of Valley Center plus fire/sheriff/water district) (Smith). | |
| Discussion: Meeting time expired before this item could be addressed. It will be placed on a future agenda. | | |
| F2 | Next regular meeting scheduled: 10 August 2015 | |
| G | Motion to Adjourn: | 10.20 pm |
| | Maker/Second: Rudolf/Smith | Carries: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice |
| Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group | | |
| 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 | |
| i) | Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair | |
| j) | Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair | |
| k) | Ad Hoc Committee on Handbook Update and Member Training – Ann Quinley, Chair | |

Correspondence Received for the Meeting:

1. Valley Roadrunner to VCCP; Proof of publication for June 8, 2015 agenda.
2. VCFPD Fire Marshal to PDS 05Jun2015, PDS2013-TPM21202; PDS2013-STP-13-011 / Request to Omit Banbury Road access to project (Hatfield Plaza).
3. Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, Jim McPherson, Manager, Rincon Cultural Resources Department to VCCPG. The letter represents official notification that Valley Center is within the Luiseno traditional cultural territory. The band requests notification of all projects within the planning area that present the possibility of human remains or cultural artifacts being found.
4. PDS to VCCPG 15Jun2105, Scoping letter for Lilac Plaza, 28214 Lilac Rd, Valley Center 92082.
5. PDS2015-GPA-15-003, PDS 2015-REZ-15-004, PDS2015-TPM-21224, PDS2015-15-STPPDS to VCCPG: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Agricultural Program: PDS2014-POD 14001.Log NO. PDS2015-ER-15-00-001. The project is a proposed amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance to implement the Agriculture Promotion Program. The project applies to all Community/Regional Planning areas within unincorporated San Diego County. Comments must be received no later than July 16, 2015 at 4:00. A notice of Preparation document, which contains a description of the probably environmental effects of the project can we found at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/ceqa_public_review.html
6. PDS to VCCPG, PDS will be circulating the CEQA documents for the Hatfield project for 30 days starting Thursday, July 2nd. The Hatfield project has been reviewed numerous times by the DRB and the South Village SC. We welcome any public comments during the 30-day review period. After that, we will incorporate any additional changes that are needed per the comments received. We will then bring the project back to the DRB and the SC/CPG for recommendations. The project documents will be available online at http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa_public_review.html.
7. PDS to VCCPG 01Jul2015, proposed revision to Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to “cluster” or “lot area average” to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in SR-1

and SR-2, 1 acre in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewered and providing that:

a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency.

AND:

Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.

8. VCFPD Fire Marshal to PDS/VCCPG 02Jul2015, response to Request for Project Availability (FIRE) for proposed Granger A82, LLC Photovoltaic Solar System (commercial) / Mesa Crest Road & Avenida Annalie / 129-162-07-00