

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the 10 August 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 TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group VC= Valley Center VCPRD=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 13 August 2015; resubmitted 25 August 2015

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									7:01 PM				
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 O 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	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P		

Notes: Oliver Smith is out of the country – Vice Chair Ann Quinley presiding

Quorum Established: 13 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
C	Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 13 July 2015

Maker/Second: Hutchison/O'Connor Carries: 13-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

D	Public Communication/Open Forum:
	None

E	Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:
E1	Discussion on anticipated decisions from PDS and DPW staff regarding Road 14 and Road 19 alternatives and how they impact Hatfield Plaza, Tractor Supply Company, Lilac Plaza and Park Circle projects. (Vick)

Discussion: Vick introduces Mindy Fogg and Dennis Campbell, both of the County Planning and Development Services Department. Fogg says the County is having great difficulty implementing Road 19. She continues saying she and Campbell are working with a variety of DPW and PDS staff to explore ideas for a workable alignment. She and Campbell are exploring the possibility of a community workshop to solicit public alternative ideas for the alignment. Fogg will seek permission from PDS Director Mark Wardlaw to plan the workshop.

Plotner asks what the issues are. Fogg says Moosa Creek is a major impediment with a bridge requirement for Road 19. Quinley asks if moving the bridge farther west is possible. Fogg notes that farther west the riparian habitat becomes more significant than the presently mapped site. Rudolf asks about the schedule for the proposed workshop and suggests a route for Road 19 that doesn't require a bridge. O'Connor asks why it's not viable for developers to pay for needed roads and their bridges rather than putting the burden on taxpayers for the additional infrastructure. Fogg reiterates that the solution is very difficult and wants an optimal solution. O'Connor pursues his point asking whether the general plan includes provision for the construction of the roads in the South Village. Garritson asks about the schedule for construction of Road 19 and says he is concerned about the younger generation in VC who will eventually need housing. O'Connor follows up with a statement about the General Plan and what it is supposed to achieve. Fogg admits there is uncertainty and it is causing delay in addressing several pending projects. Plotner wants a better balance between the expected growth and the road network. Jim Wold, audience, asks about the proposed workshop and adds that he wants to be included in it.

Jim Chagala presents, representing Mr. Debbs [who owns the property immediately west of the Orchard Run development between Mirar de Valle and Betsworth Road], outlining two alternative alignments for Road 19 that have been proposed through Debbs' property. Chagala says that Debbs was unaware of a potential realignment of Road 19 until recently. Debbs is hoping to have a resolution of the alignment issue by December so the cloud of uncertainty will lift and he can pursue development. Chagala presents illustrations of the possible alternate routes, noting that the County has the discretion to adjust the alignment by up to a quarter mile in either direction without having to amend the General Plan Mobility Element. He cites a prospective wet weather storage site on Debbs' property, and how the alternate routes would compromise it [Valley Center Municipal Water District has expressed interest in the site as a possible location for two storage ponds and an elevated tank for storage of reclaimed water]. Quinley suggests Chagala send his comments to Fogg. Chagala describes the original alignment of Road 19 running between the Orchard Run and Park Circle developments, through the existing VCPRD ball fields, and then through the Community Hall to Lilac Road. He suggests it could work if the right price were offered for the route [this received with skeptical chuckles from the planning group]. He estimates that a bridge crossing at the farthest west alternative route would be about 80-feet long and at the original site a 400- to 450-foot bridge would be needed. He notes that Park Circle is proposing 318 dwelling units while Debbs is only proposing 63 dwelling units [the suggestion is that the larger development could better afford the cost of bridge construction]. Chagala says the alternatives would require a General Plan Amendment to proceed. He claims the riparian vegetation at Debbs' crossing site is "pristine" while at the Park Circle bridging site the vegetation is mostly removed making it less disruptive to biological resources.

Quinley suggests Chagala's presentation materials should go to Fogg. Garritson asks about costs of bridging, but Quinley says that question is premature at this point. Plotner asks about the ramifications of upgrading Betsworth Road between the alternative Road 19 routes entry point and Lilac Road. Chagala says that short stretch must have a GPA because Betsworth is not a mobility element road. Plotner asks about expanding the County's consideration beyond a quarter of a mile. Fogg says they are open to that possibility. Rudolf clarifies need for staying within ¼ mile to avoid a new environmental impact report and general plan amendment. Kerry Garza, developer of Park Circle, audience, expands on the two alternative routes and the environmental issues and evacuation issues associated with the three alignments. He suggests that Road 19 could be growth inducing. He reports that he has been asked to buy Debbs' property for development and that Road 19 could be designed into a plan for that property without sacrificing any elements of its potential.

Motion: None

E2

Update and further discussion 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 saying the **Tractor Supply project [TS]** is representative of several South Village projects regarding Road 19 and other issues. He observes that his opinion on moving these projects in South Village forward is complicated by Road 19 uncertainty. He agrees that Road 19 is a major obstacle to the approval of several projects in the South Village. Vick says the Mobility SC hasn't approved this project and would like to see more traffic calming along VC Road and roundabout at Mirar De Valle and VC Road. He reads an excerpt of Logan Jenkins' article on roundabouts printed in the Union-Tribune. The article extols the virtues of slower traffic and safer transit with roundabouts in the Bird Rock section of San Diego. He cites architect Bill Lewis' study of roundabouts for Valley Center from a few years ago. Vick says he wants to see more discussion on roundabouts. Rudolf asks if TS went to the DRB for review. Ross Burnett, developer of TS property, in the audience, says TS did go back to DRB a second time, but no vote on a recommendation was recorded. Rudolf says we want a vote from the DRB before VCCPG considers the project. Burnett reports that he did ask for a vote. Miller says the DRB had comments and questions that were unanswered and thus, didn't vote. Rudolf says TS needs to work with the DRB to arrive at a compromise design that is acceptable and more barn-like. Garritson asks if all buildings in Valley Center need to look like a barn.

Rudolf asks Vick about the roundabout proposed by CALTRANS at Highway76/VC Road. Vick says it may

have been approved. There is considerable discussion of the reason why a vote was not taken on TS in July. Garritson objects to only considering the community's needs and not the property owners' rights. Garritson says the VCCPG is predisposed to object to the project. Plotner expresses the need for the DRB to be more open to other designs.

Joe Napier, Chief of Valley Center Fire Protection District, audience, returns to the roundabout issue and wants VCCPG to consider the needs of fire apparatus in emergency evacuation scenarios. He suggests that roundabouts may delay emergency responses.

Eric Jockinsen, project neighbor, audience, says he will be affected by TS use of the easement at the south end of the property. He worries about safety for children who play around the easement, neighbors who use the easement for ingress and egress, and noise. He notes that United Oil erected a block wall at the back of their property that mitigates the noise and lights from cars pulled up to their pumps. Quinley asks if he has met with the South Village SC. He says he just found out about TS. He estimates that up to 200 customer vehicles a day will be routine and that large delivery trucks will be operating in the early morning [he suggested about 1.30am]. He cites the utilities buried along the south side of the easement road, and worries that water pipes could be put under the widened pavement making detection of leaks and repair much more difficult. He suggests that a road maintenance agreement could work. He has no problem with the proposed building design. He notes that there is a school bus stop at the easement road outlet to VC Road. Quinley suggests these issues should be handled at the South Village SC. Miller advises that Janisch has tried to contact neighborhood people, but security gates make it difficult. Quinley directs that the neighbors' names be collected and that the SC invite them to their next meeting. Burnett says TS won't have as many deliveries as a grocery store, perhaps an average of 1.5 per week. Judy Green, resident in audience, says she is concerned about complaints on the internet about TS products. She also expresses concern about traffic congestion as a result of egress from the TS site. Quinley suggests that such issues should be taken up by the South Village SC. Jockinsen adds that better notification of such issues needs to be made to surrounding neighbors. Miller asks Jockinsen if neighbor contact information can be made available in time to schedule a meeting next week. Jockinsen affirms it can be. Rudolf cites Community Plan goal [page 8] for the South Village: "Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages... development that maintains Valley Center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design."

Motion: None

E3

- 1) Discussion and possible vote on **South Village Form Based Code [FBC]**. Comments on the program drafted by South Village Sub-committee in response to the County's Administrative Draft of June 4, 2015. Bill Lewis will also speak. (Vick for Mobility; Miller for South Village)

Whereas:

- a. *The County has failed to complete both the NEW Valley Center Community Plan, and the finer-grained planning the department promised would accompany the intensification of land uses that took place during the General Plan update.*
- b. *This failure to complete the planning project is resulting in chaos in the development of Valley Center's village areas, as evidenced by the many inconclusive discussions at our S/C meetings and pleas by developers for more clarity in what the community wants.*
- c. *The VC community has repeatedly asked the County to complete the planning project in order to provide clarity to property owners and developers who are doing their best to invest.*
- d. *It is impossible to approve individual projects that are being processed piecemeal, without a comprehensive plan for the North and South Village areas.*

Therefore the VCCPG resolves to hereby encourage our developers to cooperate with the community and one another, by also actively encouraging the County Planning and Development Services Department and our Supervisor to immediately allocate the necessary staff and/or consultant resources necessary to complete the VC Community Plan and finalize the Form-based Code for the South Village. (Rudolf)

Discussion: Vick presents on the FBC. He describes the need for an FBC and the parameters of an FBC. He says developers all have different ideas for what is needed. Chaos is reigning. He indicates that we presently have an FBC study. He asserts that we need help from the County to make the study a useful document. Kevin

Johnston, PDS, speaks for Joe Farace, PDS' FBC lead, and says Farace wants comments before moving forward. Bob Citrano, PDS Advanced Planning, says the June 9 presentation in Valley Center generated no comments. Vick says there was no direction on how to implement the study. Miller asks how VCCPG should move forward if there is no funding to complete the study. Citrano insists that there is a need to have more refined comments to arrive at a consensus. Citrano suggests the possibility of the development of a workshop to train VCCPG and the public on the FBC. Rudolf says VCCPG asked PDS to come forward with an enforceable Code but it was delayed for over a year. When Rudolf asked Howard Blackson, PDS consultant, when the FBC would go to the Board of Supervisors for approval and adoption, there was no answer. Citrano asks what VCCPG expects from the County. Quinley says without an FBC we cannot move forward with confidence. Vick says we need leadership from the County. Plotner asks for a copy of the FBC study. Citrano and Campbell offer to provide copies, although many VCCPG members already have copies from the earlier meeting. Boulos asks if we can take advantage of Citrano's offer of a workshop. Citrano corrects Boulos, saying he will ask for permission to develop a workshop to train VCCPG members and the public on the FBC. Miller suggests investigating the Ramona FBC as it is well received in that community and has resolved much of the rancor over village development.

Norwood asks for clarification about item a in the second motion. Rudolf explains history of the General Plan Update and the promises made by the County staff for accepting higher density in the North and South Villages and accompanying commercial land uses. The changes made for the North Village are now embedded in the General Plan, but there was no time to do the same for the South Village. The result was that density was crammed into the Konyn dairy, while waiting further planning. The Community Plan is still not completed. Rudolf laments the lack of a comprehensively updated Community Plan. Quinley summarizes the desire for completion of the Valley Center Community Plan.

Bill Lewis, audience, says the people he represents [Ross Burnett and Steve Flynn, Bell Holdings LLC] did not participate in the FBC process. Citrano clarifies the notice for the earlier FBC meeting in June. Lewis asks to have representatives at the proposed workshop. Garritson speaks in support of Tractor Supplies' application. Lewis supports training for the FBC. Kerry Garza, developer of Park Circle, says the Design Guidelines and current Community Plan provide effective guidance for developers. He suggests that there is conflict between the Community Plan and the FBC. He claims the FBC is more urban village oriented. He asserts that the existing Community Plan and Design Guidelines work for him. He wouldn't have come to Valley Center if the present draft FBC had been in place. He defends his project design and lauds the direction provided by the DRB and SCs. Quinley suggests there will be a workshop or meeting to discuss the FBC. Garza observes that the FBC doesn't apply to his project and others already moving through the review process, so the FBC won't be applied to many large properties in the South Village. He suggests that his project is designed according to desires of the community.

Motion: Move to encourage Bob Citrano to ask for a training workshop to help the VCCPG to understand the FBC study.

Maker/Second: Quinley/Janisch

Carries: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

Motion: Whereas:

- a. The County has failed to complete both the NEW Valley Center Community Plan, and the finer-grained planning the department promised would accompany the intensification of land uses that took place during the General Plan update.
- b. This failure to complete the planning project is resulting in chaos in the development of Valley Center's village areas, as evidenced by the many inconclusive discussions at our S/C meetings and pleas by developers for more clarity in what the community wants.
- c. The VC community has repeatedly asked the County to complete the planning project in order to provide clarity to property owners and developers who are doing their best to invest.
- d. It is impossible to approve individual projects that are being processed piecemeal, without a comprehensive plan for the North and South Village areas.

Therefore the VCCPG resolves to hereby encourage our developers to cooperate with the community and one

another, by also actively encouraging the County Planning and Development Services Department and our Supervisor to immediately allocate the staff and/or consultant resources necessary to complete the VC Community Plan and finalize the Form-based Code for the South Village.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/O'Connor

Carries: 11-2-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice;** Plotner and Garrison dissent

E4

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)

Discussion: Quinley announces the concern and Plotner presents. She discusses overbuilding and the problems it presents. Plotner reads the prepared draft letter [appended below]. She explains that the letter is not aimed at a particular property[ies]. She asks for comments. Hutchison refers to a 2004 Economic Research Associates study of the commercial property in Valley Center, citing the data that conclude that a commercial property surplus existed in Valley Center in 2004 and was projected to exist in 2020 as well, under the projected General Plan Update [excerpt appended below]. Bob Citrano, PDS Advanced Planning, confirms the study but suggests that is not politically feasible to downzone existing commercial property. Plotner asks for clarification of the population density assumptions. Citrano attempts to clarify the 2004 study and how the commercial parameters were determined. Hutchison affirms Citrano's observations. He suggests that there is little point to asking for a new economic study of commercial property in Valley Center when so little has changed since then to warrant a new study. He adds that essentially it will become a horse race for developers to see who can get tenants and get approval for and build their project first.

Napoleon Zervas, developer in audience, says he has had a plan for some time. In 2004, he designed the town center in the North Village. He says there is a need for a sustainable plan. He says VCCPG must "protect" the design that is already done. He suggests that 3-acres of commercial space support 1000 population. He asserts that Valley Center has too much commercially zoned property now, and that VCCPG should not recommend the approval of more. He says VCCPG needs to hold him [Zervas] to the plan. He says he has worked with the County to achieve his plan.

Fogg says it may not be useful to preempt the opportunity to consider new commercial proposals. VCCPG should consider projects case by case. She says VCCPG shouldn't just stop development. Quinley says much of the conflict expressed tonight is the result of the lack of an approved plan. Kerry Garza, audience, says Valley Center does have a plan [Community Plan and Design Guidelines] and that he cannot afford to build without committed tenants and financing that depend on a viable approved plan. He says projects like his are in a beauty contest to attract tenants in order to be successful. If he can't attract tenants, he is not going to build his project. Vick proposes closing discussion.

Fajardo asks about the intention of the draft letter. Plotner explains the intent of the letter, explaining that the letter came out of discussions first with her neighbors and then Chairman Smith.

Motion: None

E5

Discussion and possible ratification of a letter from VCCPG to PDS on **Hatfield Plaza [HP] (TM21202)** and responses to the Hatfield CEQA document (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf presents. He states that HP went back to the County staff for further review and would subsequently return to DRB and the South Village SC, but it was revealed that the project was judged exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] by PDS, leading to confusion about what the exemption meant. Several comments on the project were sent in, and because of time constraints, Smith drafted and submitted a letter to PDS with comments for retroactive ratification by VCCPG. Rudolf wonders what effect it may have had or didn't have, and whether VCCPG has lost its ability to appeal the determination of exemption for CEQA. Mindy Fogg, PDS, clarifies that the comments are still timely. She advises that the PDS director will

decide the appeal of CEQA exemption and explains that the findings of the existing General Plan EIR provide mitigation options. She says a different process would be necessary if the project were judged to need a GPA. Dennis Campbell, PDS, corrects Fogg, saying it is the Zoning Administrator's decision, and can be appealed to the Planning Commission. Rudolf notes that the Planning Commission's procedures on the internet say "staff Determinations of Exemption are appealable to the Planning Commission" but offer no process or timing for doing so. Rudolf says Smith's letter suggests a GPA is required and Fogg says she will review the comments and appeal procedures and get back to us.

Motion: Move for ratification of Smith's 28 July 2015 letter on Hatfield Plaza. [attached below].

Maker/Second: Rudolf/O'Connor

Carries: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

E6

Updates on:

- a) Hatfield Plaza (Miller);
- b) Lilac Plaza (Quinley)
- c) Park Circle (Miller)
- d) Lilac Hills Ranch hearing at the Planning Commission (Hutchison)
- e) Solar Project Subcommittee (Hutchison)

Discussion: Hutchison comments on Lilac Hills Ranch planning commission hearing held Friday, 7 August 2015. He states that the PDS staff gave their report on the project in about an hour followed by Accretive's group presentation, Hutchison's presentation on behalf of the VCCPG and the Bonsall Sponsor Group's presentation delivered by Steve Norris. The commission heard twelve group presentations from the public on several issues, 10 of which supported the VCCPG position. Hutchison says there were 110 speakers, 64 of whom opposed the project. Quinley notes the high level of questions from commissioners to the staff following the group presentations. O'Connor comments on the safety of roads and evacuation routes and notes the inadequacy of the applicant's presentation on the subject. Quinley observes that the winding narrow roads proposed for the commissioners' site tour are inadequate. Rudolf notes there are only four stops on tour and none in the North or South Villages to provide perspective on Valley Center's community development model configuration. He notes the maladroit quality of the presentations by supporters of the project without much factual information included. He also observed that the paid economic consultants supporting the project performed poorly. Janisch notes that, regarding the phasing aspects of the project, the commissioners were surprised by the commitment to build only one phase of the five proposed. Quinley applauds the multigenerational Britsch family presentation.

Motion: None

E7

Discussion and possible vote on tentative approval of a **staff-proposed VC Community Plan Amendment**, as part of the 2017 Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment, to reduce minimum lots sizes allowed in Land Use Designations SR-4 and SR-2 under some circumstances (Kevin Johnston, and CPU Subcommittee Report). (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf explains how the recommendation from PDS staff to amend the VC Community Plan came about regarding the Champagne Gardens parcels [CPU SC report attached]. He identifies the open space characteristics of the parcels and the difficulties they present. He says certain open space configurations can be problematic, such as so-called piano key lots with a house at one end and a long narrow extension designated as required open space. Using a smaller parcel size for a home and preserving the open space in a larger County managed easement works more effectively to preserve the open space. The proposed amendment to the Community Plan is in the context of the 2017 Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment. Kevin Johnston, PDS staff, explains the purpose of the revision to the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 [page 12]. He recounts the history of the Specific Plan Area that comprised the three parcels that expired during the development of the General Plan Update and the County's desire to reanalyze the land use designations for the parcels along with the property specific requests. The Champagne Gardens parcels CG2, 3, & 4 are wholly or partly in the VC Community Planning Area. He states that these parcels have very high value riparian habitat, steep slopes and Coastal Sage Scrub plant

formations that should be set-aside in open space.

The County estimates that only 8- to 10-acres is buildable on parcels CG3 & 4, and just over 2-acres is buildable on parcel CG2. The County has developed three alternatives as a result of their analysis of the parcels:

1. Preliminary Staff Recommendation: SR-4 over CG2, 3, and 4 – estimated 2 potential lots on CG2 and 8 on CG3 & 4 [same owner]
2. Referral Map [closer to what the property owner is requesting]: SR-2 over CG3 and 4, but still SR-4 over CG2 since it's mostly floodplain – estimated 2 lots on CG2 and 17 lots on CG3 & 4.
3. Environmentally Superior Map: SR-10 over all three sub-areas – estimated 1 lot on CG2 [no CG2 subdivision potential with this alternative] and 3 lots on CG3 & 4.

Regional Land Use Category SR-2 applied to parcels 3 & 4 would yield 17 lots. The current plan would mean 17 lots on 8-10 developable acres. The policy change would leave designated open space managed by the County or another competent conservation management entity. Johnston notes that the number of lots, once established, cannot change without a GPA.

This proposed amendment would apply only to parcels with sewer availability and significant environmental resources and would more properly manage the resulting open space. The three parcels are part of the draft Multi-Species Conservation Program/Pre-Approved Mitigation Area MSCP/PAMA, which is hoping for 75% preservation of habitat on these lands. There is also an environmentally superior option of Regional Land Use Category SR10, when applied to the three parcels will yield 1 lot on parcel 2 and 3 lots on parcels 3 & 4. Johnston says he is not looking for a vote tonight. The staff recommends a lower density than VCCPG recommended in April. Garritson asks how the property owners feel about the alternatives. Johnston suggests that the property owner is looking for the maximum lot yield and is likely most pleased with the VCCPG's previous recommendation. He says with the three alternatives, VCCPG will have another opportunity to provide input and make a recommendation of one of the alternatives in the light of the staff's analysis.

Motion: Move to extend the VCCPG meeting until not later than 10.30 pm

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Garritson

Carries: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

Motion: Tentatively support the proposed policy changes to the Valley Center Community Plan, subject to further future review by the Valley Center Community Planning Group in context of staff's recommendations on other Valley Center Property Specific Requests. [appended below]

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Boulos

Carries: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]: **Voice**

E8

Discussion and possible vote on **Draft Letter to the San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee** concerning the intersection of Ridge Ranch Road and Valley Center Road (Vick)

Discussion: Vick presents a draft letter addressed to the Traffic Advisory Committee regarding the Ridge Ranch Road intersection with Valley Center Road. Garritson relates a personal story regarding his father's accident at that intersection.

Motion: Move to send the subject letter to the Traffic Advisory Committee. [appended below]

Maker/Second: Vick/Norwood

Carries: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]: **Voice**

F

Group Business

F1

- 1) Introduction and discussion on candidates for the Design Review Board, Seat 4, which expires June 18, 2018. (Britsch)

Discussion: Chris Steidemann is introduced and explains his work background, and his current employment

with Poseidon. Rudolf asks if he has any kind of architecture or design training. Yes, Steidemann has school training and did work for an architect for a time. O'Connor asks about his understanding of the level of commitment necessary to do the job. Steidemann says yes, he understands the commitment required. Rudolf explains the nominating process. Plotner asks about Steidemann's interest in design and why he is interested in this position. Steidemann elaborates on his interest. Miller asks if he rents or owns a house. Steidemann owns a home, and expects he will be around after Poseidon's desalination project is completed. Rudolf questions vacancy situation on the DRB, and it is discussed.

Motion: None

F2	Next regular meeting scheduled for September 14, 2015	
G	Motion to Adjourn:	10.21 pm
	Maker/Second: Plotner/Vick	Carries/Fails: 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]

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. Notice of Lilac Hills Ranch Planning Commission hearing on August 7, 2015 with continuation planned for September 11, 2015 , Website for Lilac Hills Ranch FEIR:
http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/regulatory/docs/LILAC_HILLS_RANCH/draft-FEIR.html
 Link to country responses to LHR comments is:
http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/regulatory/docs/LILAC_HILLS_RANCH/responsetocomments.htm
2. VCFPD to PDS, 02Jul2015, Request for Project Availability (FIRE) for proposed Granger A82, LLC Photovoltaic Solar System (commercial) / Mesa Crest Road & Avenida Annalie / 129-162-07-00
3. VCFPD to PDS, 01Jul2015, PDS 521A request / NLP Valley Center Solar LLC, Photovoltaic Solar System (commercial)
4. PDS to VCCPG: documents pertaining to a Discretionary Permit for Major Use Permit PDS2015-MUP-15-019 Granger Solar/Photovoltaic Solar Farm, (APN) is 129-162-07, application for development and operation of a photovoltaic (PV) solar farm to be located on privately-held lands at Mesa Crest Road and Avenida Annalie. The proposed PV solar facilities. The fenced unmanned facility would encompass approximately 40 acres,
5. Mindy Fogg PDS to VCCPG Chair 16Jul2015, RE: Valley Center Cemetery project PDS214-MUP-14-029, The MND for this project went out for public comment last week: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/ceqa/MUP-14-029.html>

Appended material for item E4:

Table B-20
Sensitivity Analysis Scenario 1: Retail Sales @ \$200/Sq. Ft.

Retail Land Comparison: Retail Land Allowed Under Proposed General Plan & Forecasted Supportable Retail Acres

Community Planning Area (CPA)	Subarea Group	Estimated Gross Resident Supported Retail Acres At Build-out ²	Comparison of Proposed General Plan with Estimated Future Supportable Acres ¹	
			Estimated Gross Acreage Allowed under Proposed GP	Surplus/(Deficit)
Alpine		104.13	134.46	30.33
Barona		n/a	0.00	n/a
Bonsall	Bonsall	52.13	127.77	75.64
Central Mountain		0.66	0.00	(0.66)
Central Mountain	Cuyamaca	2.36	1.98	(0.38)
Central Mountain	Descanso	7.72	6.63	(1.09)
Central Mountain	Pine Valley	9.34	19.09	9.75
County Islands		8.55	0.00	(8.55)
Crest/Dehesa		31.24	17.01	(14.23)
Desert		6.77	18.79	12.02
Desert	Borrego Springs	57.91	281.51	223.60
Fallbrook		154.74	240.18	85.44
Jamul-Dulzura		62.32	88.28	25.96
Julian		19.30	71.65	52.35
Lakeside ³		188.52	380.77	192.25
Mountain Empire		0.70	28.50	27.80
Mountain Empire	Boulevard	7.82	122.17	114.35
Mountain Empire	Jacumba	10.49	24.50	14.01
Mountain Empire	Lake Morena/Campo	13.47	51.39	37.92
Mountain Empire	Potrero	5.71	24.30	18.59
Mountain Empire	Tecate	1.24	54.72	53.48
North County Metro		153.22	53.55	(99.67)
North County Metro	Hidden Meadows	30.28	2.07	(28.21)
North County Metro	Twin Oaks	10.29	39.45	29.16
North Mountain	North Mountain	23.90	38.07	14.17
North Mountain	Palomar Mountain	2.69	1.53	(1.16)
Otay		28.00	111.20	83.20
Pala-Pauma	Pala-Pauma	26.21	36.36	10.15
Pendleton-De Luz		36.09	0.00	(36.09)
Rainbow		7.58	41.22	33.64
Ramona		127.03	336.63	209.60
San Dieguito		162.29	44.65	(117.64)
Spring Valley		116.23	200.78	84.55
Sweetwater		42.14	29.92	(12.22)
Valle De Oro		134.67	218.66	83.99
Valley Center		100.72	215.53	114.81
Total		1,746.4	3,063.32	1,316.89

¹Includes Neighborhood Commercial, Service Commercial, and Rural Commercial designated lands, two-thirds of General Commercial lands, for the July 2004 Baseline General Plan Scenario, plus an assumed share of Specific Plan Areas per County staff estimates in 2002.

²Neighborhood and community serving only. Regional/Superregional not included as these are likely to occur in more urbanized areas.

³Pepper Drive/Bostonia CPA merged into Lakeside CPA

Sources: Technology Associates International Corporation, Consumer Expenditures in 2000 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor), SANDAG 2001 GIS Database, and Economics Research Associates.

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082

July 28, 2015



Oliver Smith
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Ann Quinley
Vice Chair

Annquinley@gmail.com

Steve Hutchison
Secretary

hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Jeana Boulos

Jeana.h.boulos@gmail.com

Hans Britsch

thomas@westerncactus.com

Susan Fajardo

susanfarr@vcweb.org

James Garritson

vc@garritson.com

Susan Janisch

socaljj@cts.com

Bill Miller

cdmiller@aol.com

LaVonne Norwood

lavonne@armorfabrication.com

Mike O'Connor

firemanmic@aol.com

Claire Plotner

claireplotner@mac.com

Rich Rudolf

richrudolf@sbcglobal.net

Jon Vick

JonVick2@aol.com

(one vacancy)

Dennis Campbell
Planner, San Diego County Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

SUBJECT: Response to Hatfield Plaza PDS-2013-TPM21201 et al Determination for Exemption of CEQA Review

Director Wardlaw,

The Valley Center Community Planning Group has reviewed the Hatfield Plaza Minor Subdivision, PDS2013-TPM-21201 Determination for Exemption of CEQA Review dated 02July 2015. The VCCPG strongly recommends denial of the exemption based on the following issues:

- 1) The project current plans show removal of many mature trees and landscaping that is inconsistent with the approved San Diego County General Plan and the Valley Center Community Plan, as well as a significant change from what was approved by the Valley Center Design Review Board. The community plan indicates retention of mature trees as a key benefit of community character:

Environmental Policies p 11:

POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Environmental Concerns and Issues:

1. Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements. [Paraphrase]
2. Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.

POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS p 13

.....

2. Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, land forms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and viewshed shall be incorporated in the design of the future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area. [Paraphrase]

VCCPG, in combination with the Valley Center Design Review Board, has been working with the applicant for almost 2 years and has made many suggestions and recommendations to improve the project and meet the Valley Center Community Plan goals and needs as well as being consistent with the county's General Plan. A significant issue here is that the applicant originally was indicating the retention of many of the trees he now is planning to remove.

- 2) The project consists mainly of steep slope terrain which is proposed to be landscaped using very high retaining walls and extreme grading, both items in direct conflict with the goals of the General Plan Update as well as in conflict with the Valley Center Community Plan.

Conservation Goals p 56:

6. CONSERVATION

GENERAL GOALS

PRESERVE VALLEY CENTER'S UNIQUE, NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES WHILE SUPPORTING ITS TRADITIONAL SEMI-RURAL LIFESTYLE

Policies and Recommendations p59-60:

2. Restrict hillside cutting and scarring, loss of wildlife habitat, loss of riparian habitat and loss of floodplains ...

11. Grading associated with discretionary permits shall not change natural land contours and shall be minimized to reduce erosion and siltation and damage to downstream properties.

It needs to be noted that the slope and grading issues do not exist to the same degree on another portion of the property and alternatives pointed out to the applicant a number of times by VCCPG and VCDRB.

- 3) The exemption text glosses over the impact of Road 19, a key in the Circulation Element for Valley Center in the 2011 General Plan Update. The appearance is the applicant is simply pushing Road 19 aside in favor of his development plans.

Local road connections essential to efficient traffic circulation are lost if new rural subdivisions are designed and built with strictly self-serving road networks. Therefore, each future subdivision needs to be assessed for its potential to provide linkages for long-term circulation improvement, while still allowing for a road design in keeping with a "rural neighborhood" character.

Mobility Goal and Findings text p 51:

MOBILITY

GOAL

A CIRCULATION SYSTEM THAT ACHIEVES THE COMBINED OBJECTIVES OF CONNECTIVITY AND SAFETY FOR ALL USERS (AUTOMOBILES, BICYCLISTS, EQUESTRIANS AND PEDESTRIANS), AND ALSO PRESERVES THE RURAL CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNITY.

Until the county provides an assessment of where and how Road 19 is to be implemented, any CEQA determination is, at best, premature. We are asking for the county to provide this assessment, then allow VCCPG to review it with respect to all of the projects currently in process that are affected by it. We feel our thorough, reasonable, and practical recommendations will aid the county in evaluating each of the projects currently underway.

If you have further questions, I can be reached at (760) 703-1455.

Respectfully,

Oliver Smith, Chair

Valley Center Community Planning Group

cc: PDS Director Mark Wardlaw
PDS Planning Manager Mindy Fogg

Appended material for item E7:

To: VCCPG

From: CPU Subcommittee

Re: Recommendation to VCCPG for 8/10/2015, Presentation by Kevin Johnston on County staff Proposal to amend VC Community Plan (for 2017 PSR General Plan Amendment Item) to reduce Minimum Lot Sizes in General Plan Land Use Designation areas SR-4 and SR-2 from 2 and 1 acres, to 1 and .5-acre, respectively, under certain circumstances. (Proposal and explanatory maps sent separately); other backup found at [former Champagne Gardens SPA] <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/CG-SPA.html> [and Draft Property Specific Requests GPA] [\http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR.html

Date: August 10, 2015

Request:

County staff proposes changes to the Valley Center Community Plan, which, if recommended for approval, would not affect any current Land Use Designations or Zoning. Instead, the proposed changes would go forward as part of the 2017 PSR (Property Specific Requests) GPA. The requested changes are to reduce, under some circumstances, allowed minimum lot sizes in SR-4 from 2 acres to 1 acre, and in SR-2 from 1 acre to ½ acre. (See the Attachment, showing red deletion/blue addition version.)

Committee Recommendation:

Support the proposed policy changes to the Valley Center Community Plan and recommend their approval by the Valley Center Community Planning Group. Approved on 7/20/15 4-2-1 (O'Connor and Lindburg opposed, Britsch recused, 1 member absent).

Chairperson's Proposed Modified Recommendation:

Tentatively support the proposed policy changes to the Valley Center Community Plan, subject to further future review by the Valley Center Community Planning Group in context of staff's recommendations on other Valley Center PSRs.

Discussion

The VCCPG has previously voted on April 13, 2015 to recommend SR-2 Land Use Designations on Champagne Gardens former SPA subareas 2, 3, and 4. Following input from Bonsall, Hidden Meadows and us, staff developed its preliminary staff recommendation for the entire former SPA area. Their analysis of all the ordinance and environmental constraints on the parcels concludes there are only 8-10 acres of developable land in areas CG3 &4, and just over 2 acres in area CG2. As a result, they have 3 proposed alternatives (just for the former CG SPA parcels, which we are NOT voting on NOW):

- preliminary staff recommendation: SR-4 over CG2, 3, and 4 – estimated 2 potential lots on CG2 and 8 on CG3 & 4 (same owner)
- referral map (closer to what the property owner is requesting): SR-2 over CG3 and 4, but still SR-4 over CG2 since it's mostly floodplain – estimated 2 lots on CG2 and 17 lots on CG3 & 4
- environmentally superior map: SR-10 over all three sub-areas – estimated 1 lot on CG2 (no CG2 subdivision potential with this alternative) and 3 lots on CG3 & 4.

The analysis revealed to staff that, although an additional complicating factor in the former SPA area is

potential future applicability of the (currently Draft) MSCP, the current VC Community Plan Residential Policy 8 could result in “piano key lots” in SR-4 and SR-2, undermining greater conservation and open space preservation. The staff-proposed reduction of potential lot sizes would allow no more lots than currently allowed, but would also allow creation of a large county-managed open space lot for environmental protection and better wildlife corridors, and better prevent lot-owner (intentional or accidental) encroachment into the sensitive areas.

Staff advised the subcommittee: “It would just provide a little more flexibility in lot size so you can have larger, connected open space easements that are important in these areas with extensive constraints and PAMA designations in the draft MSCP (less smaller ‘backyard’ open space easements). Even if C7 weren’t in the community plan, the zoning minimum lot size does not affect allowed density, and the County lot area averaging and Conservation Subdivision programs do not allow a greater number of lots than the GP density, just the flexibility in lot size to be able to keep the development in the least sensitive areas.”

Those positive aspects of the proposed changes resulted in the favorable subcommittee recommendation. However the two negative votes were at least partially based on lack of sufficient information of the potential effect on other non-former CG SPA SR-4 and SR-2 areas throughout the VC Planning Area, especially the MANY pending Property Specific Requests for which staff which have not yet developed even preliminary recommendations. Your Chairperson had post-meeting misgivings, resulting the proposed modification recommendation.

Staff indicates the Chairperson’s Proposed Modified Recommendation is acceptable, and will allow further staff analysis to proceed without adverse effect.

Kevin Johnston will make the staff presentation at our 8/10/12 meeting. Exhibits considered by the CPU Committee will be sent separately.

Respectfully submitted,

Chairperson Rich Rudolf

Attachment

Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 (p. 12)

8. Once 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-2, 2 1 acres 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:

b. 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.

Appended material for item E8: [next page]

Draft Letter to the SD County Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC)
Attn: Kenton R. Jones, Chair

August 19, 2015

Mr. Kenton R. Jones
Chair, SD County Traffic Advisory Committee

Dear Mr. Jones,

As you are aware from recent correspondence, the intersection of Valley Center Road and Ridge Ranch Road presents a very dangerous situation: northbound traffic speeds are 60 to 70 mph; it is very difficult to slow down to turn right onto Ridge Ranch Road, and many times almost impossible to make a safe left turn coming out of Ridge Ranch Road. This is a death trap, as evidenced by fatal and non-fatal accidents and daily close calls.

The residents living on Ridge Ranch Road have asked us to help them find a solution, preferably an on-demand traffic signal that would allow them to turn safely into and out of Ridge Ranch Road.

When we applied to Mr. Murali Pasumarthi, Manager, DPW Traffic Engineering, for assistance, he responded: "Based on your initial recommendation to review the intersection of Ridge Ranch Road with Valley Center Road, staff obtained traffic counts, reviewed all reported collisions at the intersection and, conducted a traffic signal warrant analysis (consistent with state requirements). Unfortunately the required criteria are not met to warrant a recommendation for a traffic signal at this time. We also reviewed other recommendations and have developed a written response (attached)".

No solution to the problem was suggested by DPW.

The residents of VC and the VCCPG would like to appeal to the TAC with a request for a solution to improve safety for this intersection as well as to slow northbound traffic coming into VC south of Woods Valley Road. At the regular monthly August 10th meeting of the VCCPG I was asked to request an appeal hearing at the next TAC meeting.

Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

Oliver Smith, Chair VCCPG