

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Preliminary Minutes of the 8 February 2016 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: 22 February 2016; 12 March 2016

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:03 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 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	V A C A N T	G A R R I T S O N	J A C K S O N
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P

Notes: Britsch arrives 7.30 pm; Quinley departs 8.35pm

Quorum Established: 13 present

B	Pledge of Allegiance
C	Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 11 January 2016 as corrected

Maker/Second: Quinley/O'Connor

Carries: 13-0-0 (Y-N-A); Voice

D	Public Communication/Open Forum:
	<p>Vick comments on the North Village SC's review of Village Station. He notes that the applicant had already met with the DRB for an initial review and that a local architect, Will Rogers, was employed to help guide the design in a way consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines. He suggests that the North Village SC likely would have approved the project at the last meeting if that had been possible. He cites the utility of using a local architect with local sensibilities, and meeting with the DRB before finalizing the design. He recommends that VCCPG take steps to require developers to meet with the DRB first and use an architect that knows and understands the Valley Center Design Guidelines.</p> <p>O'Connor commends Rich Rudolf, recently resigned from the VCCPG, for 13 years of superlative service on the VCCPG in holding developers to our guidelines and community plan. The sentiment is joined by the entire VCCPG.</p> <p>O'Connor seconds the comments of Vick regarding project design and the need for understanding and applying the Valley Center Design Guidelines.</p> <p>Vick notes that Valley Roadrunner will be doing a tribute article on Rudolf and it is looking for comments. David Ross suggests sending any personal comments on Rudolf to Valley Roadrunner, attn: David Ross.</p>

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

E1	<p>Valley Center Rd at Mirar de Valle Rd Roundabout Proposal and feasibility study. Ross Ainsworth, President of Omni-Means, an experienced roundabout engineering company from Roseville, CA, will discuss how a roundabout would facilitate traffic movement, increase safety, emergency vehicle and evaluation issues and funding alternatives. (Vick)</p>
-----------	--

Discussion: Vick introduces the discussion of VC Road and its intersection with Mirar de Valle. He cites the commercial development at the intersection and reads the Mobility SC's goals for the intersection:

1. Maximize safety for traffic, pedestrians, bicycles, etc.
2. Keep traffic moving at a safe speed
3. Calm traffic speed to no more than 45 mph, the posted speed limit, in commercial area
4. Traffic to move at a speed that allows safe entrance and exit from S. Village businesses
5. Reduce severity of intersection accidents when they occur
6. An intersection design that does not impede emergency vehicles or evacuation traffic
7. An intersection design that allows long vehicles to cross easily and safely
8. An intersection that will be an attractive centerpiece for the South Village
9. Funding source[s] for the feasibility study and for the best traffic solution
10. Increase community awareness of benefits of solution selected

He notes that the developers affected at the intersection don't object to a roundabout solution as long as there is no delay for their projects and the amount of land needed is determined timely. He cites the application for a Neighborhood Enhancement Grant already submitted to the Fifth District Supervisor Horn, that if granted would be applied to the cost of initial design. He introduces Ross Ainsworth, Omni-Means Engineering, who makes an educational presentation on roundabouts. Ainsworth says his presentation is not intended to address the specific intersection at VC Road and Mirar de Valle. He observes that roundabouts are becoming much more prevalent across the country. He notes that projects for the State of California are now required to consider roundabouts on all highway intersections. He presents a PowerPoint series based on the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. He describes the safety of slow movement of traffic through a roundabout. He points out that roundabouts reduce accidents 40% and injury accidents 80%. He mentions that public attitudes change after use of roundabouts. Ainsworth reiterates the safety value of roundabouts especially injury accidents. He notes that roundabouts are safer than signaled intersections. In roundabouts, pedestrians are safer with shorter crossings that offer reduced exposure to traffic, and center pedestrian refuges provide additional protection. He cites pedestrian chances of death in a collision are much higher at typical intersection speeds than in a roundabout. He confirms that pedestrians have the right-of-way in roundabouts as at other intersections. He shows a Michigan State University video that displays the interaction of pedestrians and autos in roundabouts. He says bicycles traverse roundabouts either as pedestrians or travel on vehicle lanes through a roundabout. He notes that fatalities are reduced 90% by roundabouts. He says roundabouts increase traffic capacity and reduce delay compared to traffic signals. He also notes a significant reduction in Green House Gas emissions related to the efficiency of roundabouts because traffic doesn't stop and idle. He points to a roundabout example that has a design similar to the Valley Center requirements and says it will handle growing demand for capacity without requiring additional construction.

There are several questions from the audience: Can pedestrians use crossing signals with roundabouts? Ainsworth says, yes crossing signals can be effectively employed in roundabout design. Will roundabouts handle a 40-foot truck? Ainsworth says yes, trucks of all sizes can negotiate properly designed roundabouts. Are roundabouts scalable in VC? Yes, they can be scaled to fit most intersections according to Ainsworth. He adds that a roundabout will also address the high-speed traffic currently present on Valley Center Road. Are roundabouts always round? Ainsworth, referring to the presented video, notes that the examples are actually oval and have dimensions of about 160 ft by 128 feet. Would it be possible to put a roundabout at Lilac and Valley Center Roads? Ainsworth said he is unfamiliar with that intersection but likely a design could be made to work there. Are roundabouts suitable for semi tractor-trailer rigs? Ainsworth says yes, well-designed roundabouts have a mountable apron in the center to accommodate long vehicle transit. He elaborates on the suitability for large trucks by showing video examples of trucks of varying size negotiating roundabouts. He also shows fire trucks moving through roundabouts. Ainsworth then presents aesthetic touches possible in the center of roundabouts. He says it is important to obstruct the view through a roundabout to focus attention on oncoming traffic in the circle. He suggests that vegetation also helps direct traffic through roundabouts. He contends that roundabouts can reduce capital costs in many instances. Question from audience: are any signals used in connection with a roundabout? Ainsworth says no, roundabouts are based on right-of-way only,

with traffic yielding on entry. Question from audience: do roundabouts benefit businesses? Ainsworth says, yes. In one case a 40% increase in tax revenue was achieved that correlates to increased business. He observes that public opinion changes after exposure to roundabouts from negative to positive. Question from audience: are roundabouts suitable for smart cars? Ainsworth says the slower environment of a roundabout can work better for autonomous vehicles, and research on this issue is continuing. Larry Glavinic, audience, presents a diagram and suggests roundabouts won't work in the event of a wild fire. He contends evacuation will result in gridlock. There is scattered reaction and it is noted that Valley Center experienced gridlock with signals in the last major fire. Question from audience: what is the operating speed in a roundabout. 25-30 mph is the typical speed. Question from audience: is the county mandating consideration of roundabouts or is the VCCPG studying them? Jon Vick says that the VCCPG is studying alternatives for the Mirar de Valle/VC Road intersection. Vick says at this point we are looking at options.

Motion: None

E2

Cole Grade Road Widening Community Public Meeting. Notice of preparation of Environmental Impact Report. At 6:30 PM documents will be available for viewing and at 7:50 PM Chris Hanger new Project Manager from the Department of Public Works will make a presentation about the project. The meeting and the comments received during the public review will provide input into the alternatives developed for the proposed project that includes removal of 180 oak trees. (Vick)

Discussion: Vick introduces the Cole Grade Road widening project and introduces Tom Duffy, lead environmental planner for the project, who presents for the County. The presentation is responding to the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] requirements. Duffy notes that residents can submit comments on the project in writing and they will aid in developing an Environmental Impact Report [EIR]. The Notice of Preparation [NOP] of a Draft EIR was sent out 17 December 2015. The County will be accepting comments until 16 February 2016. Sue Waters, Chris ?, and Holly ?, environmental planners with the Department of Public Works are also present to respond to questions and comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report [DEIR] process and CEQA. The Initial study, revealed the impact of removing 180 oak trees of varying sizes from the project site. Duffy describes the location of the project and maps it on an aerial photo from Fruitvale Road to the high school. He cites the deficiencies of the present roadway for bicycles and pedestrians. Duffy says the new roadway will enhance safety for bikes and pedestrians, and expand vehicle capacity. Duffy explains the proposed cross section of proposed roadway. It has a center turn lane, road edge swales instead of curbs and gutters, permeable shoulders and a decomposed granite [DG] pathway on the west side with fencing where needed on the outside of the path. He notes that some retaining walls may be needed [up to 25-feet high] to address cuts along the right-of-way [ROW]. The ROW is 84-feet wide. The project will use staged construction. No oaks larger than 36-inches would be affected. The present plan would replace impacted oaks with trees of varying sizes. Duffy acknowledges that removal of oaks will impact the aesthetics of the community. He refers to a review of the Valley Center Community Plan and how it discourages removal of oaks and other large trees. The County will be looking for alternatives to the removal of so many oaks. Duffy reminds that comments will be accepted until 16 February. The DEIR will be available for review in June 2016, and unless there are unforeseen difficulties, the Final EIR will be certified in November 2016.

Questions: Norwood asks about the taking of property for the ROW. Duffy says the County will work with property owners to resolve takings and notes that no houses are affected. Norwood asks if there is a funding mechanism in place. Duffy says, yes, Transnet funds will be the main source. Garritson suggests a four-lane road would be more useful than three lanes. Chris ? says the Community Plan requires three lanes and the community made it clear that three lanes is preferred. Vick suggests that the decision to remove oaks will affect Keys Creek oaks mostly. Chris ? concurs saying about 80 trees in the Keys Creek area are identified for removal. Vick suggests the possibility of reducing the roadway to two lanes through the Keys Creek area to preserve more of the oaks. Duffy welcomes that kind of suggestion as an alternative to oak removal. Quinley asks why the widening of Cole Grade Road is necessary given present traffic conditions. Could it not work as it presently is? Duffy responds that the capacity after widening will be enhanced and will be necessary for eventual build-out. Garritson questions the benefit of adding only one lane given the projected cost. Plotner points out that the footpath is also a very important addition to the roadway, but she is wondering about the possibility of putting bike lanes side-by-side one another separated more from traffic. Waters says the bike

lanes are needed where they are planned or the County would have to create a wider shoulder. Diane Conway, audience, asks about the planned retaining walls and their projected height. Waters speaks to the approach of making them look like natural stone using a specific finishing technique. Will Rogers, audience, asks if EIR will address visual impact of project. Duffy says it is required. Fred Wollman, Chair of the VC Trails Assn. in the audience, asks about the DG paths and whether the width is sufficient for horses. Duffy says they are a standard width and should be sufficient. Wollman continues with a question about curbs and gutters in the plan. Waters responds saying no curbs and gutters are planned except where they already exist near the High School. Question from the audience: will the electric utilities be placed underground? Chris ? responds that yes, SDGE will underground as many lines as possible, with the principal exceptions being residential service lines. Susan Moore, audience, asks if the County will be replacing removed oaks with only one species of oak? Duffy responds that the County will consider replacing removed oaks with multiple species of oaks. Deb Hofler, audience, asks if the bridge design over Keys Creek can resemble the bridge at Sunday Drive on VC Road? Waters responds that the County will consider it, but that will depend on suitability and cost. Hofler asks if the power poles between Horse Creek and Fruitvale can be relocated as part of the project? Waters responds that the County will meet with SDGE to discuss a resolution to the location of those poles. Hofler cites a number of accidents in the area. Rich Rudolf, audience, asks about the location of the fence on the outside of the trail. He recalls that the County agreed to locate the fence between the pathway and the roadway. Waters says the fence between the path and the roadside will be a community responsibility. Rudolf says the fence should be drawn in the plans to include a type D special trail and the community will aid in obtaining grants to fund the fencing. Waters says fence will be an encroachment and must be maintained by the community. Chris ? says the community will have to maintain the fence and Rudolf adds that may be true unless that attitude is changed by this process. The County worries about liability, litigation and maintenance costs. Rudolf says Michael Long, DPW, agreed that the fence is to be placed between the path and the road for safety. Also, Rudolf cites County ownership of Heritage Trail. Waters says the intent is to have the fence located so it will not be a hazard. Hofler tries to clarify the need to have the fencing appropriately located on the plan. Glavinic asks about the ROW expansion if the planned roadway expansion is principally the on east or west. Waters says the road meanders through the ROW and is split about 50-50 east/west. Glavinic asks if ROW is fixed now? Waters and Chris ? say no, it is not fixed at this point. Will Rogers, audience, asks why the fence is considered a liability? Waters says collisions are more dangerous with the fence. The imputed danger is to the cars rather than the pedestrians.

Motion: None

E3

Agricultural Preserve PS2015-REZ 15-010 Certificate of Compliance, Rezone. Discussion and possible vote on project 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)

Discussion: Norwood presents, noting her handout with findings of compliance with the VC Community Plan Goals [appended below]. She introduces Chuck Banity who will present the project. Banity says the opportunity to purchase the Borden property arose in January 2015. He said a premium price was paid for the property because of water rights and availability. He cites the advantage of putting the property into a Williamson Act contract in terms of property tax reduction. He says the property is very steep. He adds that the Williamson Act contract will make it feasible to farm. Smith asks about the size of the project in VC. Banity says 300-acres is within the VC planning area, **the remaining 28-acres is in the Pala/Pauma Community Sponsor Group planning area**. Hutchison asks what agricultural product is proposed for the property and how much acreage will be used. Banity says that 210-acres will be planted in avocados, pomegranates, and grapefruit. Banity says there may be a fractional impact on the community in terms of loss of revenue to service districts. Janisch asks if there are buildings on the property. Banity says, yes, there several buildings for farm uses and some provision for workers living on-site. Norwood asks if VCCPG should ask for a 25-year **Williamson Act contract to be consistent with the Pala/Pauma Community Sponsor Group's request** instead of **the usual** 10-year contract. Hutchison clarifies that the Williamson Act is a state law and cannot be modified without legislative action. Britsch suggests another County program that lowers property taxes on agricultural land and preserves land in perpetuity for agriculture. O'Connor asks whether the tax savings will be substantial. Banity says, yes. Fajardo asks if there are fees to pursue this application. Banity says, yes.

Motion: Move to recommend approval of PDS2015-REZ-15-010, PDS2015-AP-15-001 for establishment of an agricultural preserve and approval of a Williamson Act contract.

Maker/Second: Norwood/Vick

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

E4

Notice of Preparation of Supplemental EIR for County's Property Specific Requests countywide General Plan Amendment Discussion and possible vote on additional recommended Comments to the county. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith presents. He says at a planning commission meeting he learned that all a developer has to meet is the Community Plan currently in force. He observes that Valley Center has not had its community plan update completed, although it was promised to be completed shortly after the adoption of the 2011 General Plan Update. Smith says our community plan should be updated before the current round of Property Specific Requests [PSR] are considered further. He suggests taking the funding designated for the PSRs and applying it to the completion of the community plans that have not be completed. He also suggests that the time allowed for the completion of the outstanding community plans be cut from over a year to six months. Smith proposes to present this issue at the BOS in March along with other planning and sponsor group chairs.

Motion: Move to approve the draft letter document [appended below].

Maker/Second: Vick/Janisch

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

F

Group Business

F1

Announcement of Vacancy of VCCPG Seat #13, term expiration date 01-02-2017. Rich Rudolf has resigned from the VCCPG.

Discussion: Smith formally announces the vacancy of Seat #13 on the VCCPG roster. Garritson asks if this information is good for the website. Yes, says Smith. Applications are being sought for replacements. Miller notes that Rudolf's term expires in January, so there may not be much time for a replacement to serve if the County is slow to make the appointment.

Motion: None

F2

- 1) Reports of subcommittees of the VCCPG
 - a. Mobility – (Jon Vick, Chair).
 - b. Community Plan Update -- (Mark Jackson, Chair).
 - c. Nominations – (Hans Britsch, Chair)
 - d. Northern Village – (Ann Quinley, Chair)
 - e. Parks & Rec. – (LaVonne Norwood, Chair)
 - f. Southern Village - (Bill Miller, Chair)
 - g. Tribal Liaison – (Claire Plotner, Chair)
 - h. Website – (Jeana Boulos, Chair)
 - i. Solar Projects (Oliver Smith, Chair)
 - j. Lilac Hills Ranch (Accretive) (Steve Hutchison, Chair)
 - k. Lilac Plaza (Ann Quinley, Chair)
 - l. Ad Hoc Committee on Handbook Update and member Training (Ann Quinley, Chair)

Discussion: Ashly Mellor, member of Website SC, presents the look of the VCCPG website [vccpg.org]. She shows possible looks for subcommittee pages and how related documents will be stored on a Google drive as opposed to the VCCPG website. Jackson asks if there is a cost for the domain name? Mellor says, yes. Boulos notes that the County may decide to fund such websites given the increasing dependence on the internet for communication. Discussion of where files will be stored most efficiently ensues. Garritson

suggests that this could function as a message board for VCCPG notifications of new projects and other information. Smith says the County expects all members to be equally aware of all projects, so it is likely he will continue to send out such information as he has been doing rather than rely on members visiting the website regularly for updates. Garritson suggests the use of folders for specific information that would be used by members and possibly the public. Boulos says the site sounds more complicated than it is. Smith clarifies members' responsibilities to the Brown Act, in terms of having access to information not available to the public in a timely manner. Garritson says some folders could be closed and for use by members only. Garritson makes a suggestion to collect members' emails on a single address to make them more easily accessed and archived. O'Connor asks if there will be a comments page that would allow messages to VCCPG. There is some discussion, but it may be better to allow comments that remain private. Could add form to collect public comments for use by VCCPG. Smith notes the need to have an email that the public can use. Garritson notes the possibilities of forwarding from one account to another. Smith suggests the website should be initially information only, and we can use a dropbox for public comments. There is further discussion about the utility of Google Tools. Boulos says vccpg.org can go public at this point. Will Rogers, audience, asks about the release of documents sent out by the County and the timing of it appearing on the VCCPG website. Smith clarifies the need to receive documents from the County, rather than an applicant, for accountability.

Norwood, chair, Parks & Recreation SC, says the VCPRD needs some of the County-collected Park Land Dedication Ordinance [PLDO] funds to maintain existing parks. Smith will address the need with a letter to the County with ratification retroactively by VCCPG in March. Norwood wants to amend the PLDO a bit to allow supervisors to allocate a portion of those funds for maintenance of existing parks. Plotner asks about other funding options for maintenance. Vick says there are none. Garritson asks how much money is needed. Vick suggests 20-40 % of PLDO is a good number.

Motion: None regarding SCs

Motion: Move to extend the VCCPG meeting for 10 minutes until 10.10 pm [made at 10.00 pm]

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley

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

F3

Vote on adding a member to the South Village Subcommittee

Discussion: Miller, chair of the South Village SC, wants to add Eric Jockinsen to South Village SC. He cites Jockinsen's continuing interests in how the South Village develops.

Motion: Move to add Eric Jockinsen to the South Village SC

Maker/Second: Miller/Janisch

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

F4

Next regular meeting scheduled for 14 March 2016

G

Motion to Adjourn:

10.12 pm

Maker/Second: Vick/Hutchison

Carries 13-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice

Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

- a) Mobility – Jon Vick, Chair
- b) Community Plan Update – Mark Jackson, 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 – Claire Plotner, 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
l)	Lilac Plaza – 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. (Quinley)
- 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. A private driveway connecting to Pauma Heights Road would provide access. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project.

Appended Material for item E3: see next page

MCMillan Ag Preserve

PDS2015-REZ-15-010, PDS2015-AP-15-001

This is an application for an existing thriving avocado grove to be an Ag Preserve under the Williamson Act. This applicant is not intending to make any changes to the property. I spoke with Mr. McMillan in December and he stated that his family have been farmers for 25 years, and he is a 3rd generation farmer. He also stated that being an Ag Preserve will help him keep the property a grove due to the tax cut Ag Preserves receive. The applicant can not build on the property anyway due to the steep slopes of the property. He can also not build on the property for as long as the contract is in force.

I worked with the Pala/Pauma Support Group Chair, Charles Matthews, and attended the Sponsor Groups meeting last week. The property is in both areas.

At the Sponsor Group Meeting their motion was to approve with the condition that the contract had to stay in effect for at least 25 years. The way the Williamson Act works is its first term is 10 years. After the first term if there have been no violations and or the property owner does not withdrawal the term goes on for another term automatically. So, in the spirit of being consistent with the motion of Pauma/Paula Sponsor Group, **do we want to put the same condition on our recommendation?**

As per the recommendation of the VCCPG per Scope of Review:

- The completeness and adequacy of the Project Description
The application was complete and the project description was good.
- Compatibility of the project design with the character of the local community
The application meets the following VCCP's Goals:

*" RURAL LANDS
PRESERVE AND MAINTAIN THE OVERALL RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL
CHARACTER OF THE RURAL LANDS AREA OUTSIDE THE SEMI-RURAL
AREA."*

This application meets this Goal.

“Environmental concerns and issues:

Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.”

This application meets this Goal.

**“AGRICULTURAL GOAL
PRESERVE AND ENHANCE EXISTING AND FUTURE AGRICULTURAL USES
IN THE VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLAN.**

This application meets this Goal.

The VCC Plan states in *FINDINGS POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

- “1. Support agricultural uses and activities throughout the CPA, by providing appropriately zoned areas in order to ensure the continuation of an important rural lifestyle in Valley Center. [AP]*
- 2. Encourage the formation of Agricultural Preserves in areas with active agricultural operations and in locations that will be optimal for future agricultural production. . [AP]*

The application is in total compliance with Board Policy I-38 which states the requirements for Agricultural Preserves.

For the above reasons, my motion is as follows:

Motion:

It is the recommendation of the Valley Center Community Planning Group to approve PDS2015-REZ-15-010, PDS2015-AP-15-001 for establishment of Agricultural Preserve and approval of Williamson Act contract.

Continued retention of agriculture for future use and encourage the county to do more of this type of application approval.

Respectfully submitted by:

LaVonne R. Norwood

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Appended Material for item E4:

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082



Oliver Smith
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Ann Quinley
Vice Chair

Ann.quinley@Pomona.edu

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

Mark Jackson

cksonmark92026@gmail.com

Susan Janisch

socaljj@cts.com

Bill Miller

cdmiller@aol.com

LaVonne Norwood

vonne@armorfabrication.com

Mike O'Connor

firemanmic@aol.com

Claire Plotner

claireplotner@mac.com

Jon Vick

JonVick2@aol.com

(open)

February 8, 2016

The Valley Center Community Planning Group has the following additional comments on the Notice of Preparation of Subsequent EIR for County's Property Specific Requests to the countywide General Plan Amendment and Rezone.

It is inappropriate for the county to be proceeding with this project without first completing all of the outstanding community plan updates. Per the General Plan Update, community plans are a basis for making land use decisions. Projects continue to be judged against the old community plans without an opportunity for revision based on local community representative input. Land use decisions using old and outdated community plans do not accurately reflect the current community input to their unincorporated areas. Updating of these plans has the right to be the same priority as the PSRs now being proposed.

This is the **second** PSR project since the approval of the General Plan Update in August 2011. Valley Center is one of eight communities that have been asking for the county's help since GP Update approval in completing their community plan updates. The county help has not been forthcoming. The needs of the communities should have equivalent priority with county resources as those who are requesting the first round of PSRs, let alone this second round of PSRs.

Note that many of the community plan updates performed during the General Plan Update process only included the barest minimum necessary wording to keep the plans legally in line with the released GP Update. The process changes that occurred with the GP Update, including a complete reboot halfway through the process, did not allow many communities to focus on updating their community plans. They instead needed to be focused on the many complex changes and procedural issues involved with the GP Update itself. As such, significant community plan input was not available in an advanced form such that it could be included in the GP Update.

The Director of Planning and Development Services has publicly stated an estimate of 12 months to process each community plan update. He also stated PDS can only do two plan updates simultaneously. The reason given is limited resources with which to help the CPGs and CSGs. To help the county resolve this issue, it is strongly recommended that:

- 1) County PDS resources be immediately reallocated from the PSR project to the Community Plan Update projects until such time as the Community Plan Projects are completed.
- 2) PDS evaluate its community plan update process to reduce update time to 6 months. Valley Center Community Planning Group stands ready to assist the county in this reasonable goal.

The motion to approve the additional comments was approved by a vote of xx-xx-xx at the regular Valley Center Community Planning Group meeting on February 8, 2016.

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, VCCPG