

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the 14 December 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=Yes

Forwarded to Members: 7 January 2016; 8 January 2015

Approved: 11 January 2016

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

**Notes:** Boulos arrives 7.07 pm; Britsch arrives 7.25 pm

**Quorum Established:** 11 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
---	----------------------

C	Approval of Minutes:
---	----------------------

**Motion:** Move to approve the minutes of 9 November 2015, as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley	Carries 11-0-0 (Y-N-A) Voice
---------------------------------	------------------------------

D	Public Communication/Open Forum:
---	----------------------------------

Smith announces receiving the application for a medical marijuana collective to be located on Nelson Way, in western Valley Center. He says he will try to form a public forum with the appropriate agencies represented.

Vick cites a Valley Center Trails Assn. handout regarding new trails and the organization's membership drive.

Jim Chagala updates Weston Town Center plans regarding a 300-page document on the project. He projects that a site plan is likely in 6 months.

Don Richards, Mobility and North Village SCs, asks for clarification of an apparent disconnect between the VC community and County staff. He cites the ARCO developer's claim that the developer could bypass the VCCPG and go directly to the County. He wonders if design guidelines have the same weight as the General Plan and the VC Community plan? He says developers are sent to the DRB and the VCCPG for guidance, but then are able to ignore or circumvent the guidelines at the County level. Smith says VCCPG's role is to make recommendations on projects and VCCPG cannot require adherence. If our recommendations are cogent, they are often incorporated into project requirements. Richards asks why projects with discrepancies in relation to the General and Community Plans are forwarded to VCCPG for consideration as if the discrepancies don't matter. Plotner cites the state requirement that communities have the ability to define their own character.

Jack Fox, audience, notes his residence's proximity to the proposed Medical Marijuana Collective, and cites his contact with several agencies including PDS and the Sheriff's Department. He says the applicant is an out-of-state buyer of the property and owns a business in Chula Vista. He wants help understanding the requirements for such a business. He notes that the applicant has obtained permits to modify an existing house internally. He cites safety concerns he and his neighbors have about such a business. He is concerned that the County

	seems to want to keep the application quiet. The County disagrees that they are trying to hide this project. The Sheriff and PDS have agreed to meet with the community and Fox wants to have the community meeting in January along with the VCCPG. Smith clarifies the requirements for such businesses.
--	--

<b>E</b>	<b>Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:</b>
<b>E1</b>	<b>DPW Presentation</b> by Michael Long, DPW CIP Lead Project Manager, on the Cole Grade Road improvement project. He will present the 70% plans for widening and "improving" Cole Grade Road (Vick).

**Discussion:** Michael Long presents a brief description of the project to widen Cole Grade Road. Says County is approaching 90% design phase introduces team: Sue Waters, Tom Duffy, [Environmental planner]; Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Hanger. He explains that the environmental issues will take about a year to resolve. He says that the notifications to property owners of the project impacts will be ready to go out after that. Right Of Way [ROW] acquisition will take about a year and construction will likely start in 2018. Waters summarizes the history of the project with illustrations of typical road sections showing travel lanes, a continuous left turn lane, bike lanes, and a pathway. She cites the need to address storm water run-off as recently required by the state. She notes the bridge near Cool Valley Road that will accommodate wildlife transit beneath. She observes that the project will widen the parkway on east side of Cole Grade Road north of Cool Valley Road. Long clarifies that the widening of the east side of the roadway at the request of the Mobility SC and the Trails Association will result in a parkway that is 8 feet rather than 6 feet wide. Waters says SDGE will underground utilities along the roadway as much as possible. Garritson asks about the cost of the project. Long says construction costs will be about \$20 million. Garritson asks why there will be only 3 lanes instead of 4. Long and Waters recount the requests of the community for safety and multimodal travel.

Garritson asks about the permeable area at the road edge. Waters expands on the need for that feature and continues on with the description of landscaping and the need to remove many oaks. She quickly follows with the mitigation proposal to replace removed oaks with twice as many specimens at locations that will accommodate them along the project route. An audience member asks about the extent of improvement and the removal of power poles. Larry Glavinic, audience, asks about consideration for a Valley Center Fire Protection District [VCFPD] fire station acquisition at Cool Valley Road and Cole Grade Road. Long responds that there is no coordination as yet, since there is no purchase of property by VCFPD at that location.

O'Connor asks how many property owners are affected by the project. Long says about 50 and adds that no homes are affected, only one shed. He notes that the project will try to avoid concrete block retaining walls and Waters suggests a more natural-looking sculpted concrete technique will likely be used. Garritson asks if \$20M covers the land acquisition. Long responds, no. The \$20M only applies to construction costs. An audience member asks how long it will take to complete construction. Long responds about 1.5-years. Garritson asks where the money is coming from. Long says TransNet funds. An audience member says the County seems to be listening to community, and then asks if the County will release the plan to the community? He suggests that much of the acquired land is on the east side of Cole Grade Road. Long and Waters correct that notion saying that most of the acquired ROW is on the west side. Tom Duffy cites the loss of many oaks along the ROW and the need to complete an Environmental Impact Report [EIR] as a result. He says the design is a good one and it minimizes tree loss and other biological impacts. He announces that there will be a public meeting at library on January 6, 2016 to get public comments. Public review of DEIR will likely take place in the summer of 2016. Garritson asks how many oak trees will be sacrificed. Long says about 180, and that is reduced by 80 from an earlier design. Long cites the transplantation of trees along VC Road during that widening project. Vick notes most of those trees died. Garritson asks how many trees died. 100% says Vick. Garritson questions if it is cost effective to transplant any of the trees. An audience member asks about the type of plantings planned along Cole Grade Road. Susan Moore asks if transplanted trees could be mixed with boxed larger trees. Duffy agrees. Garritson explores the cost of boxed oak trees. Garritson again questions the validity three versus four lanes. Jackson clarifies the logic of lane management, citing the proposed network that will accomplish the same goal.

**Motion: None.**

<b>E2</b>	<b>Tractor Supply PDS2015-STP-15-005;</b> discussion and possible recommendation vote, location 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. In addition to tractors and tractor supplies, the store will sell livestock and pet products, hardware and tool products and work clothing among other items (Miller)
--	--

**Discussion:** Miller presents and introduces Ross Burnett and Bill Lewis. Burnett says there have been some changes to the design based on community concerns. Eric Jockinsen, resident, offers his concerns about routing delivery trucks over the common easement on the south side of the gas station. He worked with Lewis and Burnett to help them fit into the neighborhood with consideration of children. Jockinsen expresses his approval of the revised design. Burnett says that squeezing the retention area allowed for a turn-around area for delivery and fire vehicles and eliminating the use ~~not requiring~~ of the resident's easement ~~of~~ on the south side. Burnett moves on to Road 19 and shows the alternative route and allowance of 30-feet of IOD should Road 19 become necessary to complete. He says they are agreeable to Road 19, but there is no formal agreement with the County. Miller asks for a discussion of the scoping letter issue. Burnett will submit MUP for the product display area along the frontage of VC Road. Vick questions the display area and landscaping statement from earlier discussions. Lewis clarifies that the display area is visible only from the parking lot ~~only~~ and not the roadway. Garritson asks about the size of trees in the landscaping. Lewis says they will be quite large. Susan Moore, Valley Center DRB member, asks about the architectural discrepancy after the last review and if the Applicant will return to the DRB for further review. Lewis refutes the notion of the barn architecture, ~~A~~nd the use of corrugated steel. He cites the Design guidelines. A discussion of architecture ensues with Lewis and Moore. Moore renews her question about further review with the DRB. Burnett says the County is satisfied that the applicant has met the design guidelines. Moore cites the minutes of the DRB ~~citing~~ chronicling the discrepancy. Garritson injects that he likes the proposed architecture. Garritson pursues the architectural complaints and voices his support for Tractor Supply. He says the opposition is un-American. Miller calls for order, and suggests the DRB can ask for further review. Miller says, the 7-0 motion reflects the approval of the South Village SC. He passes out the proposed motion. He reads the motion and amendments are suggested. Discussion of the IOD and construction of possible Rd 19 follows. Vick suggests an amendment to require additional architectural review. Miller is not in favor of the amendment. Steve Flynn says the DRB said not to design to guidelines. Burnett says Fogg told him to not get mixed up in revisions to the design. Garritson expresses support for project. Britsch notes the request to return to the DRB for final review and suggests all of the modifications are good and one final review will address the issues. Burnett defends his position with the DRB. Vick points out the design guidelines have newer documentation. Dave Bohorquez, audience, says he attends the DRB meetings and says the applicant should bend a bit to get the support of the community. Plotner says the applicant's intent is in spirit of the design guidelines. She says the building can't be seen from the road. She suggests the applicant has tried to comply. Don Richards says that the DRB should be considered just as the County should consider the VCCPG. Moore says the DRB would like to have another review with the landscaping plan and signage review. Miller says that is reasonable. Smith notes the VCCPG policy of seeing the DRB comments before making a recommendation. Discussion of how the DRB comments can be formulated and returned to the VCCPG ensues.

**Motion:** The Valley Center Community Planning Group hereby Approves the Tractor Supply project with the following conditions:

1. The project stays unchanged from the site plan submitted to the Subcommittee identified as Exhibit A, dated 11-24-2015. This plan includes the 30-foot wide IOD (irreversible offer to dedicate) along the westerly boundary.
2. If the project is not exempt from the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review, no changes would be required to the site plan of the project as a result of that review.
3. No changes to the site plan as a result of the requirements of the Scoping Letter.
4. The half of Road 19 alignment that is along the west portion of the property is preserved if

Road 19 is built in its current alignment, and the developer will pay to construct its half of the road.

5. The developer will participate in traffic calming solutions of Valley Center Road in conjunction with and in proportion to the amount of their property development. In addition, the developer shall improve as required the existing road(s) to handle their traffic. They shall also enter into a Road Maintenance cost sharing agreement with the other road users.
6. The developers will submit to an additional DRB review, including the landscaping and signage plans and resolution of outstanding architectural issues.

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Miller/Garritson	Motion Withdrawn
---------------------------------------	------------------

**Motion:** Move to table item until January meeting and we can get DRB recommendation.

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/O'Connor	<b>Carries:</b> 11-2-0 [Y-N-A]; Plotner & Garritson dissent
<b>E3</b>	Hatfield Plaza PDS2013-TPM-21202; PDS2013-STP-13-011, discussion and possible recommendation vote, location 27326 Valley Center Rd, commercial retail/office use, 3.3 acres, located on the west side of the Valley Center Rd and Woods Valley Rd. intersection. , The project proposes five buildings with accompanying parking with mixed use retail including a drive through restaurant proposed in the center of the development. It will take access onto Valley Center Road from a point in the center of the site. (Miller)

**Discussion:** Miller presents saying Jerry Gaughan, developer, is not present tonight and has not attended the previous two South Village SC meetings. Miller says the motion to deny, with conditions, was formulated at the previous South Village SC meeting. [See motion below.] Jackson asks about the cut and fill calculations for the project. Miller says none are on the plans. Miller says the Community Plan requires balanced grading [equal amounts of cut and fill to obviate the need for import or export of material]. Jackson expresses concern that the project may require export of material.

Hutchison comments on the Mobility Element Road [Road 19] that traverses the project site with no explanation of how that road is to be accommodated. He suggests that Gaughan knew about the location of the roadway and chose to ignore it, as does the County. He adds that the project is out of character with the Community Plan and its requirement to avoid development on steep slopes. Janisch comments that Gaughan needs fill from the project for a second project in Valley Center. Smith asks for comments from each member. Garritson says he would like to talk to the developer to ask questions. Jackson says the South Village SC did an admirable job. Vick says Road 19 is a major issue that must be addressed before approval of the project. O'Connor says too many projects try to escape the requirements of the Community Plan and we as a planning group must adhere to the requirements. He cites the proposed ARCO AMPM project as another example of a developer trying to circumvent requirements. He thinks the community will be behind this recommendation to deny project approval. Quinley agrees with O'Connor and especially the loss of oaks and grading associated with the Hatfield project. Boulos notes that the project is to be sold in four pieces and we will eventually have to deal with them individually later as well. Britsch agrees with the SC report and thinks that we should push hard on the County for a Road 19 resolution. Plotner is on the South Village SC and cites excessive destruction of the environment and grading. Janisch is on the SC and asked why four buildings are proposed instead of three? She answers her own question suggesting four buildings are more lucrative than three. Norwood agrees with the SC report and opposes the proposed large retaining walls. Smith cites the expediency of siting a road on the General Plan map on property the County doesn't own, and how such an alignment would impact the value of the property. However, the developer should have known the limitations to development. He agrees with the contempt for tall retaining walls, even in view of reduced height of those walls in the latest design. He notes that the proposed driveway doesn't align with Woods Valley Road. He observes that there have been no new design documents since the beginning of the year. Smith asserts concern for the responsibility and the respectability of the developer. O'Connor asks if disclosures are required. Boulos responds that area disclosures must be made.

**Motion:** Whereas PDS2013-TPM-21202; PDS2013-STP-13-001, the Hatfield Plaza project is the entrance to Valley Center, and

Whereas the VCCPG wishes Hatfield Plaza to be an attractive entrance to VC and to represent VC standards,

and

Whereas VC standards are governed by the VC Community Plan and the VC Design Guidelines, and  
Whereas the current plans do not comply with the VC Community Plan Guidelines and the San Diego County General Plan, and

Whereas the developer may sell the project in whole or in pieces at any time to be developed by someone completely new to the project, and possibly new to VC, thus necessitating explicit details to be known and documented prior to approval by the Valley Center Community Planning Group;

Therefore the VCCPG recommends **Denial of Approval** of the plans presented for Hatfield Plaza for the following reasons:

1. Site to be fully graded to the Banbury Road line of trees, contrary to Valley Center Community Plan section Commercial Goals, Policies and Recommendations paragraph 2 [page 13]; and Valley Center Design Guidelines section 2, Protection of Natural Features, D, Topography [page 18].
2. Most of the mature oaks are being removed, contrary to Valley Center Community Plan section Commercial Goals, Policies and Recommendations paragraph 2 [page 13]; and Valley Center Design Guidelines section 2, Protection of Natural Features, B, Oaks and Sycamores [page 18].
3. The project uses very high retaining walls [up to 26 feet above finished surface] and extreme grading, in some areas grading slopes of over 50%, and, in total, 28.5% of the site are slopes of 25% to over 50% contrary to Valley Center Community Plan section Land Use, Policies and Recommendations paragraph 2 [page 13]; and Valley Center Design Guidelines section 2, Protection of Natural Features, A, Hierarchy of Importance, (1) Natural Contours and Land Forms [page 18].
4. The site development is not in accordance with the Valley Center Community Plan section Commercial Goals, Policies, and Recommendations, paragraph 2. In order to offset the issues with the Community Plan, the developer is using mitigation measures that are approved by the County, but are in conflict with the Valley Center Design Guidelines, section 3, Save the Oaks and Sycamores, paragraph A. Criteria for Removal [page 20].
5. The project is inconsistent with the County General Plan requirements to build a Mobility Element Road [Road 19] through the project. In the absence of a General Plan Amendment as part of this project, it is in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] (which requires analysis of the Whole Project and prohibits "Project Splitting"). Without an analysis of removal of the road from the General Plan [or the impacts of moving it to a specific footprint within ¼ mile either way], CEQA is violated. The County's apparent attempt to possibly find an alternative site for the road in the future, in effect, splits the project and prevents analysis. A traffic study is not the equivalent of an EIR, Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration, if it does not resolve whether there will be a road and if so, where.
6. The previously submitted Project Description dated February 8, 2015, had numerous errors that were publicly recognized by the applicant during formal, public meetings of the Valley Center Community Planning Group South Village Subcommittee. These errors have not been corrected by the applicant and formally resubmitted to both the County and the Valley Center Community Planning Group.
7. A scoping letter has not been prepared by the County staff. Therefore, all of the relevant issues may not have been properly identified by the County or be known to the VCCPG.
8. The project, as proposed, is being subdivided into four parcels potentially for individual sale. However, there has been no description of conditions and limitations that the County will impose on those individual parcels, including a description of how the site will be graded and landscaped.
9. The Valley Center Community Plan, Community Character, Findings paragraph 1 [page 4]; and Valley Center Design Guidelines, Design Objectives – Commercial Development on Valley Center Road, paragraph 2 [page 8], Minimum Lot Size is 2-acres. The project proposes four new lots that are less than an acre each.
10. The Valley Center Community Plan, Site Planning Principles – Commercial Development, Development

Regulations, paragraph 2, Minimum Lot Size [page 48] states that the size required for new lot splits that produce commercial parcels shall be a minimum size of two acres. The proposed four new parcels are all less than one acre each.

**Maker/Second:** Miller/ Janisch

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

MILLER	O'CONNOR	JANISCH	HUTCHISON	BRITSCH	PLOTNER	QUINLEY	FAJARDO	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	VICK	RUDOLF	GARRITSON	JACKSON
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y

**Notes:** Fajardo and Rudolf absent

**E4**

**Park Circle project: PDS2015-TM-5603, subcommittee update and** discussion, location corner of Valley Center and Mirar De Valle Roads; 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. (Miller).

**Discussion:** Miller says the South Village SC discussed the Park Circle project at the last meeting and the discussion has been continued. Road 19 is an issue for this project. He asks Kerry Garza, developer, to comment on his project in relation to Road 19. Miller prompts Garza with their previous phone conversation. Garza hopes to get County to make a statement on Road 19 to clarify his project's position when it is considered. He is hoping to bring his project to VCCPG in February. Smith asks about Garza's suggestion to move Road 19 to Debbs's property. Jim Chagala, audience, representing Debbs, says Debbs is opposed to the realignment of Road 19 on his property. He cites the County PDS's Mindy Fogg as having said that realignment farther west is more environmentally sensitive re Moosa Creek and it defeats the desired connectivity within the South Village. Garza disagrees with Chagala's assessment of Fogg's statement. He says there is less environmental impact because of the narrower stretch of creek to be crossed. He notes that he tried to buy Debbs's property to accommodate Road 19, but the price was unrealistic. He reviews the Road 19 stakeholder's meeting and cites the Valley Center Fire Protection District's preference for a farther west alignment, but says no decision was reached. He then reviews the possible alternatives that were considered. He says his firm continues to work with interested parties. Plotner asks if County has asked Park Circle to contribute to construction of the road 19, noting that all of VC will use that road. Kevin Smith, audience, asks if County would allow project to proceed without resolution of Road 19. Garza says he would only go forward after resolution. Chagala observes that where Road 19 crosses Park Circle, the vegetation is already removed. Vick asks if Garza would consider an IOD if Road 19 were to be built. He says his half of road would not provide enough to build a road. Britsch says if developers push for Road 19 and VCCPG pushes for Road 19, it's a good thing. Miller says Park Circle is on hold pending further word from Garza on moving forward.

**Motion:** None

**Motion:** Move to extend the length of the meeting until 10.30 pm [@ 9.57 pm]

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

**E5**

**Road 19 Workshop** – Discussion of issues and alternatives raised at the PDS public workshop regarding the implementation of the GP Update Circulation Element Road 19 for the Valley Center area (Vick).

**Discussion:** Vick presents. He says the public workshop turned out to be a second stakeholder meeting instead. The meeting went forward as a stakeholder meeting and the public audience was not permitted to speak, although they were not removed. The November 17, 2015 meeting provided nothing new from the previous meeting. Three options were again discussed: 1. Constructed as planned with four lanes, or two lanes 2. Move Road 19, between Mirar de Valle and Lilac Road, to the west 3. Eliminate Road 19 altogether. Vick suggests a review of community plan goals will be helpful. He reads from the Valley Center Community Plan Mobility Element Principles. The "as planned" alternative meets the Community Plan Goals. Option two may provide hindered South Village connectivity. Option three thwarts the connectivity goal. Vick is waiting for a

date for the community workshop. Smith advises that Mindy Fogg has moved on to Santa Barbara and Ben Mills is the new planner. The Valley Center Community Plan update has not been completed, so we must use the old Community Plan. Hutchison says Road 19 is mapped on the Mobility Element Map of the current General Plan. Smith acknowledges and says such a road can be moved up to a quarter mile without further environmental review. Smith explains how Road 19 came to be where it is citing traffic flows. He says the current alignment is complicated and depends on Mirar de Valle connecting to I-15. He says that is not likely to happen. He adds that north of Mirar de Valle, bridge construction over Moosa Creek is not cost effective. Moving the road west may not provide the connectivity sought within the South Village. He says the options are not decisively beneficial. Vick cites the need for Road 19, even if Mirar de Valle does not connect to I-15. Smith elaborates on the bottleneck problem on Valley Center Road resulting from a lack of parallel alternative roads and suggests that such a bottleneck exists in other areas as well. O'Connor says if we don't plan for roads now, growth will overwhelm the current road system. He says we need to address this now in order to make sense of growth. Garritson returns to the cost of Road 19 and refers back to Cole Grade Road improvement costs. O'Connor cites the VCFPD and their concern about abandoning Road 19 and minimizing the available network for moving emergency vehicles. Larry Glavinic, audience, says he will make comments to the Mobility SC on this issue. Smith says the County wants a recommendation on Hatfield, Tractor Supply, and Park Circle.

**Motion:** None

**E6**

**Valley Center Rd at Mirar de Valle Rd Roundabout Proposal** – Mobility Subcommittee review and update, including county review of design proposal and funding alternatives for implementation costs above those for a traditional traffic light, county requirements for schedule of infrastructure improvements related to a development project

**Discussion:** Vick cites previous motion on roundabouts. He points to new handouts that offer an updated design by Omni-Means Engineering Solutions, who have considerable experience with roundabout design in California. He cites the reasons for wanting roundabouts, such as safety, higher efficiency of traffic movement, and lower long-term maintenance costs. He proposes that the VCCPG entertain a presentation by the engineering firm, preceded by an additional meeting with Fire Chief Napier to address his concerns about roundabouts. Smith cites the initially higher cost of roundabouts and the need to develop funding above and beyond the cost of a traffic light. Vick says part of the engineering firm's presentation will address funding options. Smith elaborates on the relatively high costs of roundabouts and traffic signals, citing the state's recent efforts at Highway 76 and Valley Center Rd. Hutchison observes that in that case both the signalized intersection design and a roundabout design had very high costs due to the topography of the intersection. Smith continues on about roundabout intersection design meeting a minimum standard that may not accommodate large, long vehicles. Vick notes that a previous design, graciously provided by Kerry Garza, did not fully address the geometry of more modern roundabout standards. He adds that the newest design is by a firm that has designed 130 roundabouts in California. He recommends scheduling a presentation in February.

On another subject, Smith notes the amended schedule for consideration of Property Specific Requests that will allow more time for a VCCPG response.

**Motion:** None

**E7**

**County Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance**, discussion and possible recommendation vote on revised draft to reflect the changes to the State's Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (MWELO). <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/amendments.html>. Generally the amended MWELO has broader project applicability (requires more projects to submit for landscape plan review) and provides for greater restrictions associated with landscaping water use. This includes implementing a Prescriptive Compliance Checklist, which will allow many applicants a streamlined process for review of landscape plans. (Smith)

**Discussion:** Smith presents. He reviews the Legislative requirement to develop landscape water conservation ordinance. He says the new requirement is for projects of greater than 500 square feet to develop a formal landscaping water conservation plan. Smith cites the lack of County review of plans for project of less than an acre. See hand out re complaints and motion. There is discussion of how regulations would affect local control

**Motion:** The VCCPG makes the following recommendations to the County regarding the County Code of

Regulatory Ordinances amendment relating to Water Conservation in Landscaping:

1. The ordinance needs to focus on water use reduction, in addition to water efficiency improvements.
2. Our concern with the county goals of protecting existing habitat and promoting the creation of new habitat is the need for local expert guidance from landscaping professionals practicing in each area of the county.
3. The ordinance needs to be written in a manner consistent with, and making appropriate allowances for, recognized local professional horticultural practices. We suggest the county have the ordinances reviewed by local landscaping professionals to best support San Diego's needs.
4. We find the Prescriptive Compliance Option weak in that there is no requirement for the county to independently verify compliance. Former President Reagan's "Trust but Verify" attitude is applicable here.
5. Update the WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE DESIGN MANUAL as part of this change so it is in sync with, and reflects current knowledge of, the landscaping industry.
6. The checklist approach makes all relevant projects generic while further removing local input. Valley Center community character supports our landscaping NOT looking exactly the same.
7. The County's ability to perform a water use audit is limited to properties 1-acre or larger. It should allow independent County auditing of any property.

The Valley Center Community Planning Group has the following comments to the County regarding the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances amendment relating to Water Conservation in Landscaping:

1. We support the County's improving our ability to capture and reuse rainwater and gray water for landscaping possibilities.
2. It is appropriate that outdoor watering authorization is required before occupancy of a new residence without landscaping.
3. Although we fully support selecting climate appropriate plants that need minimal supplemental water after establishment, there are many plants that are 'drought tolerant' and not appropriate to our area. Simply allowing a more generic plant palette in place of local community input will result in more failed landscapes being planted.

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Quinley	<b>Carries:</b> 13-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice
<b>E8</b>	<b>State OPR proposals for General Plan Guideline updates</b> , GP Update Subcommittee meeting review and possible recommendation vote. The general plan guidelines document updated with sections on visioning, community engagement, social equity, resilience, economic development, healthy communities, and climate change, as well as links to data, tools, resources, and model policies throughout (Rudolf). <a href="http://cert1.mail-msst.com/cdjc2q01lCyyP/IC84e9410/7e3gcnvv31/v7r/vk/0lCwbn">http://cert1.mail-msst.com/cdjc2q01lCyyP/IC84e9410/7e3gcnvv31/v7r/vk/0lCwbn</a>

**Discussion:** Smith presents. He reviews the purpose of the meeting. Smith suggests there is a heavy emphasis on climate change in the proposed guidelines. Also, the proposed guidelines are relying on Vehicle Miles Traveled rather than Level Of Service as a measure of traffic intensity. Also, there are differences of some factor definitions acknowledged, but the legal requirements relating to those factors won't change. The proposed guidelines note that Community Plans are an equal part of the General Plan and must be addressed equally for areas within the county. Smith observes that consistency within the General Plan is paramount. He Notes there is more emphasis on health and social justice as well as low-income housing in the proposed guidelines. Norwood cites the presence of Bob Citrano, PDS Advanced Planning, at the meeting and recalls that he made the comment that VC participants are making his job tough. Jackson says Citrano was joking. Hutchison confirms the jocular nature of the comment. Garritson expresses concerns

about the Guidelines impinging on freedom.

**Motion:** Move to endorse the OPR proposed General Plan Guideline updates

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Vick	<b>Carries:</b> 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice
<b>F1</b>	Next regular meeting scheduled for 11 January 2015
<b>G</b>	<b>Motion to Adjourn:</b>
	<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Quinley      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, Chair
- f) Southern Village –Bill Miller, Chair
- g) Tribal Liaison – James Garrison, 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) Planning and Development Services to VCCPG (email 24Nov2015), Scoping letter for Valley Center Village Station (PDS2015-STP-15-025). Project is located South of Valley Center Road between Miller Rd and Indian Creek Roads. This project is a commercial development fronting on Valley Center Road. The development consists of 7 buildings; four General Retail totaling 19,410 square feet and three service retail buildings (food and beverage) totaling 21,800 square feet.
- 2) Planning and Development Services to VCCPG (email 17Nov2015), Scoping letter for PDS2015-MUP-15-024 at 30777 Pauma Heights Road. The project is a Major Use Permit to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility. The project consists of a 60-foot high faux eucalyptus tree, with 12 antennas, and 1 microwave dish inside. Equipment necessary to support the facility would be located within a prefabricated equipment enclosure, with a total height of 9 feet, 11-inches, with a 30kW emergency backup generator inside at the base of the facility. Zoning for the site is Limited Agriculture (A70). The 3.15 acre site is occupied by a water tank owned by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and has an existing T-Mobile mono-palm facility on-site. Access would be provided by a private driveway connecting to Pauma Heights Road. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project.
- 3) Planning and Development Services to VCPG-Agricultural Preserve PS2015-REZ 15-010 Certificate of Compliance, Rezone, located on Lazy H Drive. 328 acres; 16 lots. Owner and Applicant, Gary and Patricia McMillan; Contact Hunsaker and Associates Phone 858-558-4500. (Norwood )