

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Preliminary Minutes of the 8 August, 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: 16 August 2016; 31 August 2016

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:12 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
MILLER	O'CONNOR	JANISCH	HUTCHISON	BRITTSCH	PLOTNER	QUINLEY	FAJARDO	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	VICK	STIEDEMANN	GARRITSON	JACKSON
P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	A	A	P	P

Notes: Stiedemann arrives 7.30pm; Plotner arrives 7.35 pm

Quorum Established: 12 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of 11 July 2016

Maker/Second: Jackson/Quinley

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

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

Jackson **discloses his resignation effective 9 August 2016** and his intent to not run for re-election to the VCCPG in November due to conflicts with other interests.

Smith announces receipt of information on the marijuana growing ground planned for the Nelson Way site too late for distribution and consideration.

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

E1

Discussion and possible vote on Department of Public Works Cole Grade Road widening and improvement project. Project Manager Chris Hanger's presentation on road design and efforts to preserve the existing oaks on Cole Grade Road. Two alternative designs have been developed that will offer reduced road width at the bridge and culvert crossings, and a few travel lane changes. The major impacts are to trail width, bike lanes and parkway width. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson introduces **the DPW project team**, Chris Hanger, **DPW project manager and his team that includes a civil engineer responsible for road and trail design, and an environmental planner.** Chris Hanger recalls the project history to establish the need for a recommendation from VCCPG. He describes the criteria of saving oaks and maintaining safety of travel. He presents four alternatives [see handout attached]. Hanger indicates that the three existing stream crossings would be inundated in a 100-year flood.

The audience raises questions regarding the number of oaks to be removed. Hanger cites the number of trees to be removed for each of the four alternative designs. He elaborates on the parallel pedestrian bridges for stream crossings near Cool Valley Road for two of the designs.

The audience asks questions about the sacrifice of oaks for Alternative 1. Garritson asks about the costs for Alternative 1. Hanger replies it will be \$22M for Alternative 1 and \$13M for Alternative 3. Norwood asks about the acquisition of private property for the upgraded alternatives. Hanger responds that Alternative 1 requires the greatest amount of property acquisition [undetermined amount] and Alternative 3 requires the least. Hanger explains how the property will be acquired through purchase and ultimately eminent domain if necessary.

Fajardo asks if some trees will be transplanted? The DPW environmental planner says, yes, some smaller trees may transplant. Hanger notes that the County will mitigate the lost oaks with two new oaks for every one lost along Cole Grade Road with 5-years of irrigation to enhance survival. Jackson offers his experience with transplanting 5-gallon oaks on his property successfully. The DPW environmental planner says the County will source the mitigation trees from local nurseries to help survival. Hanger advises that DPW prefers Alternative 1. The County's second choice is Alternative 2.B [see attached handout]. O'Connor questions how many residents will be affected by the project. Hanger says virtually all residents along the project route will be affected. A neighbor suggests alternative 2 [A or B?] is best for her. Hanger explains the crossings and loss of oaks in more detail. Garrison asks about the size of the mitigation oaks. Hanger suggests they may gather acorns from local trees and grow locally for smaller plantings. The larger trees will likely be 5-gal container oaks.

Jackson asks Hutchison to present discussion points from a joint meeting of the Valley Center Trails Association and Mobility Subcommittee held 3 August 2016. Hutchison notes that the Mobility SC didn't have a quorum so there is no formal recommendation, but the issues were discussed and several points were agreed to. Hutchison acknowledges the work that created the four alternatives, but notes that alternatives 1 and 2A received most attention and alternative 3 was essentially dismissed. He then suggests that the joint meeting group preferred a fifth alternative that is basically a modification of Alternative 2.A. He then describes the modifications to Alternative 2A suggested:

1. Rebuild the culverts as in Alternative 1 but to a width of only 2 lanes at the stream crossings and of a size that will facilitate wildlife transit. [This to be done with the least disturbance to the existing oaks]
2. Include the pedestrian bridges as proposed in Alternative 2A.
3. Reallocate the 3-foot unpaved recovery strip along the west side of the roadway to widen the trail width to 15-feet [per Type D Special standard]
4. Realign the roadway to the west at the Miller Road approaches as much as feasible to avoid excessively high nail wall construction on the east side.
5. The fencing proposed [similar to that along VC Road] should be shown on the drawings along the roadway edge between the trail and the storm water swale.
6. Confirm irrigation of the mitigated oaks [previously done by Hanger and the DPW environmental planner during their presentation] and indicate where along Cole Grade Road replacement oaks would be planted.
7. Grant funding for pathway amenities will include post and rope fencing. We request that the County's grant representative join the VC Trails Assn. grant representative, Larry Gardner, to apply for an Environmental Mitigation Program [EMP] grant for the trail amenities. And, can that grant include permanent irrigation for the mitigation plantings?

Norwood is okay with saving the trees, but she is concerned about the amount of private property that will be needed. Hanger explains that he only has that information for Alternative 1 now, and he would need to reassess the property required for Alternative 2.A in a modified form. Hanger reaffirms that no homes will be lost. The DPW environmental planner explains differences between the 84-foot right-of-way [ROW] in Alternative 1 and the 72-foot ROW in Alternative 3. Audience member asks about the power lines along Cole Grade and whether they will be put underground. Hanger says almost all lines will be underground south of Cool Valley. However, north of Cool Valley Road, they will not be underground. The previous audience member suggests that for the last widening project on Cole Grade Road south of Fruitvale Road, the cost of undergrounding the utilities was shifted to property owners. Hutchison reminds the audience that SDGE has a specific fund for undergrounding utilities in cases like this one. Hanger concurs. Janisch asks if the path can be adjusted at the stream crossings to save trees. Hanger says the path will be meandered under all alternatives to save trees. A Cool Valley Road resident expresses concern about the meandering trail at the stream crossings north of Cool Valley Road allowing public access to her property. This resident also expresses the need for a lowered speed limit on Cole Grade Road approaching Cool Valley Road. Fajardo asks to minimize the number of alternatives. Hutchison/Hanger explain that all alternatives will be presented in the subsequent Environmental Impact Report [EIR].

Hutchison proposes a motion. Jackson offers an amendment to optimize saving the oaks with innovative construction techniques in regard to the box culverts at the stream crossings. Quinley proposes an amendment to the motion that would allow DPW to review VCCPG comments and return with an analysis of the modified alternative for VCCPG review. Hutchison agrees to the amendments.

Motion: Move to recommend a modification to the County’s Alternative 2A with the suggestions 1-7 listed in the discussion above; recommend that the County employ innovative construction techniques to optimize saving oak trees during construction; recommend the DPW review VCCPG comments and return to the VCCPG with a revised analysis of the alternatives for VCCPG review.

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Jackson **Carries: 13-1-0 [Y-N-A]**

MILLER	O'CONNOR	JANISCH	HUTCHISON	BRITTSCH	PLOTNER	QUINLEY	FAJARDO	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	VICK	STIEDEMANN	GARRITSON	JACKSON
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y

E2 Discussion and possible vote on PDS 2016-STP-16-006-- Nelson Way, Phase II, located at 8530 Nelson Way and old HWY 395. Project is a cultivation facility serving an adjacent medical marijuana dispensary. The Proposed structure is a 1 story made-of-wood framing and stucco. The project is ground up and has no grading required. Owner is T and M holdings at 609-802-2301. Applicant and contact person is Darren Machulsky at 609-462-4234 or dmachulsky@yahoo.com. PDS project manager is Michelle Connors at 858-2636. (O'Connor).

Discussion: O'Connor presents. Neither neighbors nor applicants are present. O'Connor reports that he talked with the property owner’s representative and encouraged him to talk to the DRB about a fence for the nearest neighbor. The representative was dubious about getting DRB suggestions. O'Connor says the DRB has not reviewed this proposal. Smith received suggested options from Joe Farace at the County, but there has been no discussion of them. Smith suggests tabling this issue until DRB has reviewed the project. Without a building permit, this project is on hold along with others in County in any case. Smith asked the County why the County didn’t use residential use rather than residential zoning to limit the location of dispensaries and growing facilities. Smith explains the need to employ industrial zoning regardless of use to accommodate dispensaries and growing facilities. State law requires counties to accommodate these uses somewhere.

Action: Consideration postponed

E3 Discussion and possible vote on PDS2013-STP-13-029, Weston Towne Center. Project Address is Valley Center Road between Indian Creek and Cole Grade Road. The commercial portion of the project covers 11.3 acres. The proponent is Herb Schaffer of 1180 Beverly Drive, Suite 409, Los Angeles, CA 90035. The contact person is Jim Chagala at 760-751-2691 or jchagala@hotmail.com. The project includes a grocery store, drug store and ancillary commercial buildings and outbuilding that may include professional offices, restaurants, a bank or specialty retail. Additionally, the project contains a public Village Green, 520 parking spaces and project signage. Off-site improvements include project-serving roadways, such as Indian Creek Road, School Bus Lane and utility line extensions for sewer and imported water service. (Quinley)

Discussion: Quinley presents. She introduces Jim Chagala who will present features of Weston Town Center. Herb Schaffer, project principal, recounts his history with this project and his orange growing years in VC. He says the Weston Town Center property is the largest in VC and it is at the center of VC. He states that the project will be integrated with the fabric of the community. The first element will be the commercial center. Chagala briefly reviews the project features and site plan. He reiterates that the discussion tonight is centered on the commercial portion of the project. He reports that the project has applied for a B-designator that requires a site plan as does any commercial development. He refers to the scoping letter of 300-pages that included the entire 100-acres of the combined housing and commercial areas of the project. He recounts the arduous

submittal process. He reports that the project will apply for a minor use permit, which is required for drive through businesses, such as those proposed along VC Road. He cites the several DRB reviews and their approval thus far, with only signage remaining as an issue. He recalls the North Village SC vote to recommend approval to the VCCPG with conditions [the vote being 6-2-0].

Richard Dell, project architect, presents site plan for the commercial center of about 12-acres. He describes his design saying it emphasizes the town center. He recounts the design features that were the result of community input for the town center. He wants the project to be a destination. The project includes a 40K square-foot market and a drug store. He observes that there will be 3 drive-through pads that will empty traffic into the shopping center not to VC Road. He comments that there will be 40-50 trees in the market parking lot shading parking. He cites changes to the center's crossroads to make more adjoining patio space by sacrificing parking stalls. He notes that the crossroads can be cordoned off for special events, without eliminating traffic through the shopping center. He points to the retention of the Heritage Trail along the southern perimeter. He mentions the building designs and their compliance with design guidelines. However, he notes that the drug store is not in compliance with all Valley Center Design Guidelines. He draws attention to the small public park on the north side of the project. He reviews the landscaping themes along with elevations of various buildings and a windmill feature. Matt Sollenberger, landscaping, presents the landscaping plan. He plans to use native coast live oaks and the non-native Quercus ilex. He explains the parking-stall width [7-feet by 9-feet] planting spaces in the market parking lot. He reminds that the project will have bio-retention areas around the perimeter. He cites the project's cooperation with the DRB on the plant palette. The plan will use many California native plants.

Smith asks the project's civil engineer about the two traffic signals between Miller and Cole Grade Rd. The engineer explains the history of that design and the County's change of mind regarding the center's entrance. The engineer explains that the four signals [Miller Road, Indian Creek, Center Entrance, Cole Grade Road] will be synchronized for easier transit. Smith says the Village Station project needed to realign Indian Creek Road on the south to match the alignment of that road on the north side of VC Road. Napoleon Zervas, audience and principal of Village Station project, says 20 homeowners still own the existing ROW for Indian Creek Road. He says the realignment is helpful to developments on both sides of VC Road. Quinley asks to present a motion. Chagala asks to summarize prior to that. Quinley accedes. Chagala cites the coordination with Zervas on both Weston Town Center and Village Station projects. Quinley recalls the review process and makes her motion. She notes that the signage condition is agreed in principle by the DRB.

Janisch asks about the usual procedure of the VCCPG to wait for a DRB recommendation before voting on a recommendation. Quinley says at the latest DRB meeting that, although DRB wants final review of the signage proposal, in general they approve of the project design and agree in principle on the signage issues.

Garritson asks about the two negative votes at the North Village SC. Hutchison explains his objections to the unresolved traffic issues created by the project along Valley Center Road and Cole Grade Road, saying that the four signals from Miller Road to Cole Grade Road will unnecessarily cramp traffic flow. He reminds that roundabouts were considered and rejected, but they would better maintain traffic flow. O'Connor explains his no vote revolved around the strip mall appearance of project and that the project failed to effectively create a town center.

Smith moves to extend the meeting to 10.20pm [9.47 pm].

Garritson asks about the development schedule. Chagala suggests it is in the neighborhood of two years. Hutchison offers a minor amendment to clarify the specifications for the Heritage Trail. Quinley accedes.

Motion: Move to extend the VCCPG meeting to no later than 10.20 pm.

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

Motion: See motion appended below.

Maker/Second: Quinley/Garritson								Carries: 12-2-0 [Y-N-A]						
MILLER	O'CONNOR	JANISCH	HUTCHISON	BRITTSCH	PLOTNER	QUINLEY	FAJARDO	BOULOS	NORWOOD	SMITH	VICK	STIEDEMANN	GARRITSON	JACKSON
Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Notes:														
E4	Discussion and possible vote on PSD2016-AD-16-020, Gharmalkar Agricultural Clearing at Miller Road and Cole Grade Lane. Project owner is Dinanath Gharmalkarat 714-724-8244 or dinagharmalkar@yahoo.com . Contact person is Michael Wunderlin at 760-644-2944 or wunderlin@earthlink.net . The project involves an agricultural clearing permit for Herb Farming. The Property purchased 2" water meter from VCMWD in 1973 and installed water well in 1986. There has been crop farming periodically by a previous owner who has now moved from the area and the property has not been farmed in the last five years. The current owner has been herb farming in Valley Center for over a decade. (Fajardo and Norwood)													
Discussion: Fajardo presents. She recounts the history of Dina Gharmalkar's agricultural experience in Valley Center and the motivation to acquire the Miller Way project site for his continued interest in cultivating herbs. The project site was previously used for agriculture but has been lately fallow. The scoping phase for the project is not yet completed. During the permit process, Gharmalkar was informed that a clearing permit is needed. The clearing permit is the reason for his appearance before the VCCPG. No further information is presently available from the County at this time. Fajardo's assessment is that there are no particular issues except that it is a renewed clearing of the property. Jackson asks what was on the property previously. Fajardo says there is a secondary succession of brush and weeds presently, but the property was previously used for agricultural activity. The neighbors, present, approve the proposed use.														
Motion: Move to approve this project														
Maker/Second: Fajardo/Garritson								Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice						
E5	Report on Board of Supervisor's action on the Lilac Hills Ranch Project. (Hutchison)													
Discussion: Hutchison presents the results of the BOS consideration of the Lilac Hills Ranch initiative. He reports that the BOS requested an impact report before voting on approving the measure or placing it on the November ballot. The PDS staff prepared a thorough impact report that compared the General Plan, the project approved with conditions by the Planning Commission, and the Initiative. A member of the audience suggests the need to enlist more opponents to LHR in order to defeat project. Smith advises that the issue cannot be politicized at the VCCPG and he cut off further discussion.														
Motion: None														
F	Group Business													
F1	Next regular meeting scheduled for 12 September 2016													
G	Motion to Adjourn											10.18pm		
Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley								Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]; Voice						
Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group														

a)	Mobility – Mark Jackson, 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. From Michael Vu, Registrar of Voters to Valley Center Community Planning Group. The Registrar of Voters provided notice of an election to be held on November 8, 2016 to select 8 members to serve on the Valley Center Community Planning Group. Candidates must be registered voters residing within the boundaries of the community planning group area. Official nominating documents for eligible candidates may be obtained from the Office of the Registrar of Voters, 5600 Overland Avenue, San Diego beginning July 18, 2015 and ending at 5 PM on August 12, 2015. If, by 5 PM on August 12, 2015 there are no candidates or an insufficient number, an election will not be held and an appointment will be made by the Board of Supervisors as prescribed in the Board of Supervisors Policy 1-1.
2. From Planning and Development Services to VCCPG. PSD2016-AD-16-020, Gharmalkar Agricultural Clearing at Miller Road and Cole Grade Lane. Project owner is Dinanath Gharmalkarat 714-724-8244 or dinagharmalkar@yahoo.com. Contact person is Michael Wunderlin at 760-644-2944 or wunderlin@earthlink.net. The project involves an agricultural clearing permit for Herb Farming. The Property purchased 2" water meter from VCMWD in 1973 and installed water well in 1986. There has been crop farming periodically by a previous owner who has now moved from the area and the property has not been farmed in the last five years. The current owner has been herb farming in Valley Center for over a decade.
3. From BayWa re. to VCCPG concerning doing something for the Valley Center Community in the way of solar installation for charity purposes. Company requests a list of charitable organizations in the community that might benefit from the company's donation. For more information contact Patrick Brown at Patrick.Brown@baywa-re.com.

Material appended for item E1: [next page]

COLE GRADE ROAD

EIR ALTERNATIVES

July, 2016

	EIR ALT 1	EIR ALT 2A	EIR ALT 2 B	EIR ALT 3
Cole Grade Rd segment	current design, 3 lanes, bike lanes, pathway, bridge	3 lanes, reduced width at creek crossings, bike lanes, pedestrian bridges	2 lanes, new left turn pockets at Cool Valley Rd and Hilldale Rd only, pedestrian bridges	2 lanes, new left turn pockets at Cool Valley Rd and Hilldale Rd only, gapped path and bike lanes
south of Cool Valley Rd	3 lanes, bike lanes, 12' path north of Bernaboe	similar to Alt 1, but reduced width at creek crossing north of Bernaboe	2 lanes, bike lanes, pathway, reduced width at creek crossing north of Bernaboe, same as Alt 3	2 lanes, bike lanes, pathway, reduced width at creek crossing north of Bernaboe, same as Alt 2B
Cool Valley Rd to Hilldale	3 lanes, bike lanes, 12' path typical	existing box culverts remain, pedestrian bridges, bike share road, left turn pockets at Cool Valley Rd and Hilldale Rd only	turn pockets at Cool Valley Rd and Hilldale Rd only, same as Alt 2A	widening for left turn pockets only, no path, no bike lanes
Hilldale to Pauma Heights	3 lanes, bike lanes, 12' path typical, 6' min graded parkway east side	3 lanes, reduced width north of Hilldale, bike lanes, pathway	2 lanes, bike lanes, pathway, same as Alt 3	2 lanes, bike lanes, pathway, same as Alt 2B

7/26/2016

Comparison sheet
Oak removal for Cole Grade Road Alternatives

Alternative	impacted oaks total >5"	impacted oaks total >24"	impacted oaks south of CV Rd >5"	impacted oaks north of CV Rd >5"	Improvements					
					Left turn lane	Public roads	driveways	path continuous	bike lanes continuous	creek crossing upgraded
EIR ALT 1 - proposed design continuous 2-way left or LTPs pathway, bike lanes & bridge	187	16	83	104	X	X	X	X	X	X
EIR Alt 2A - Ped Bridges ITPs at most intersections	122	9	69	53	X		most	X		mostly
EIR ALT 2B - Ped Bridges 2 lanes, LTPs at CV Rd and Hilldale same as alt 3 south of CV Rd	117	8	64	53	X			X		mostly
EIR ALT -3 2 lanes, new ltps at CV Rd and Hilldale only no bike lanes or path between CV Rd and Hilldale	103	6	64	39	X					

Material appended for item E3: [next page]

Motion Concerning Weston Towne Center-3.0

From North Village Subcommittee to Valley Center Community Planning Group

Weston Town Center Site Plan- PDS2013-STP-13-029- Located on Valley Center Road between Indian Creek and Cole Grade Road. The commercial portion of the project covers 11.3 acres.

The Weston Towne Center is the commercial portion of a major project that has long been proposed for construction in Valley Center. The project brings an integrated Town Center to the Valley Center community. It will contain 108, 652 square feet of commercial space. It will include a grocery and drug store, 8 ancillary commercial buildings with space for restaurants (including a drive through), a bank, specialty retail shops and other commercial activities. It will have a public park (Village Green) with space for community gatherings. In several years' time, Weston plans the construction of homes adjacent to the Towne Center that will provide housing for the community and draw customers to the Center.

The project captures the character of Valley Center by its generous provision of space, the inclusion of a public park, trails and landscaping. The design of the project and the buildings are attractive and fit well with the rural ambience Valley Center wishes to cultivate.

The community's long standing conception of the Weston Towne Center and desire for the project is to create a true town center which will preserve and enhance the Valley Center community character. The small town nature of Valley Center and its unique farm village origins should be conveyed in the architecture and construction of the project.

The North Village Subcommittee recommends to the Valley Center Community Planning Group that the site plan (as presented to the North Village subcommittee on June 27, 2016) for commercial portion of the Weston Towne Center be approved with the following conditions:

1. That the Design Review Board be satisfied with the design features of the project and stamp the plans with their approval.

In addition, the following changes must be shown on the plans that are presented to and accepted by the Department of Planning and Development Services (with a copy presented to the North Village subcommittee and the VCCPG). Further revisions of site plan, the traffic study and other elements of the plan are expected and they shall come back to the North Village Subcommittee for its comment and approval.

1. The project pathways shall be "Type D Special" as per Valley Center Design Guidelines. This necessitates a fence between the trail/pathway and the road.
2. The southern edge of the Village Green shall contain a focal point other than the drive-through window and the blank wall of the pharmacy and parking lot. Deliveries shall come to the North East side of the building, adjacent to the road. All store/tenants fronting or backing onto the Village Green must provide amenities such as public access to the Green, seating, patios and decorated building elevations. The Village Green must not be surrounded by delivery doors, sterile building elevations and blank walls. Landscaping adjacent to the Village Green and building facades must complement the tenant's usable areas. These facades and landscaping will accent customer and Village Green activity points.
3. The developer will move the Valley Center Road frontage north as far as needed in order to widen the road and improve the landscaped medians (a distance estimated to be between 4- and 8-feet). In so doing, the developer will remove and replace the Heritage Trail as a Type D Special trail. Further, the developer will replace, at his expense, all Valley Center Road landscaped medians removed when the Weston Towne Center is constructed. Those medians will occupy the same or greater dimensions as the removed landscaped medians. The new medians will be landscaped with a minimum three to four foot planted area median (along Valley Center Road), except for 100 feet on the east side at Indian Creek Road. With this 100 foot exception, the medians will be landscaped throughout including the medians along the turn pockets. (See Exhibit A which is attached)