

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Draft Minutes for a regular meeting held on **February 13, 2017** at 7:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.
 Oliver Smith, **Chair**; Ann Quinley, **Vice-Chair**; James Garritson, **Secretary**

A=Absent; Ab=Abstention; 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

A. Roll Call

#	Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									Time:		7:06 PM		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Q U I N L E Y	V A C A N T	S M I T H	H U C H I S O N	B O U L O S	P L O T T E R	D E L A R	F A J A R I D O	J A N I S C H	N O R W O O D	M E L L O R	V I C K	G A N E S	G A R R I T S O N	M A C K E N Z I E
P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A

C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of February 13, 2017

- **Motion Carries:** 13-0-1 (Y-N-A).

D. Public Communication/Open Forum

- Art Birele, 30530 Mesa Crest, makes an announcement giving thanks to Susan Janish for taking the time to review the Mesa Road Association Meeting.

E. Action items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items).

1) Discussion and possible vote on Keyes Creek Winery, PDS2016-AD- 16-043 administrative permit for small winery at 12028 Keys Creek Road, Keys Creek Road and Dowling Lane, APN 128-480- 07, 2400 sqt ft winery building plus parking lot on 7.32 acres, GP designation SR2 (Semi Rural 2ac/dwelling unit) Zoning A72. Proponent is Keyes Creek Vineyard LLC, contact person Adam Phillips (Boulos)

- Janisch recuses herself because she has property near the winery.
- Boulos explains some details about the location of the winery and its parking lot. She says that neighbors are excited about the possibility of having a winery near their homes.
- Gaines and Boulos did reach out to a few of the neighbors and they are not aware of any concerns. Boulos makes the motion to approve the administrative permit, subject to the County findings. Garritson seconds the motion.

- Adam Phillips, 306- N W. El Norte Pkwy #54, Escondido, 92026, the property owner, introduces himself and asks whether the planning group has any questions. Quinley is concerned about alcohol issues, but Phillips reassures her that they will follow all County requirements. This means that the winery will close likely at 8 p.m. and vendors will stop serving at 10 p.m.
- Hutchinson and Oliver would like to see the scoping letter from the County before approving the administrative permit. Del Pilar has concerns about voting without this letter. Phillips says that he will come back at a future date. Boulos agrees to table the motion with the hope of it being on the March Agenda. She will contact the County to make sure quick progress is made. Del Pilar asks the question of how many jobs the winery will create. Phillips says there will be 3 at first, with others to probably follow.
- Oliver makes the motion to extend the meeting to 10:20 PM and Garritson seconds it.

3) Update on PDS2015-STP- 15-022; PDS2015-ER- 15-08- 021 Valley Center Rite Aid located at Cole Grade and Valley Center Road. Contact person is Gary Wynn, 27315 Valley Center Road, Valley Center; 760-749- 8722 or gary@wynnengineering.com . The project consists of an 11, 900 square foot drug store that sells liquor. The PDS Planner is Benjamin Mills at 858- 495-5234. (Quinley)

- Quinley identifies concerns she has about the square footage and traffic issues of the Rite Aid project. Jim Chagala, 10324 Meadow Glen Way East, Escondido, explains some concerns he has about the project because of the Town Center. The building is too big, according to Chagala. He says it can be no larger than 7500 sq ft. The standard drug store model is 14,500 sq ft, according to Jerry Gaughan. He has concerns that the building is too big for the property. Del Pilar asks Quinley to clarify concerns she has about the project.

5) Discussion and vote on Chairman Smith's letter to the County regarding applicant proposal to change a planning group subarea within another planning group area as a means to avoid conforming to the subgroup area's community plan. The issue is whether or not an applicant can change the community planning rules by changing the planning area boundary. (Smith)

- Smith shares that he would like to send his letter to the County. He has concerns that the boundary changes will lessen public involvement.
- **Motion Carries 13-0-1**

6) Discussion and vote on motion from the Community Plan Update subcommittee concerning recommendations of EIR alternatives for four PSR study areas. (Hutchison)

- Hutchison explains background about the recommendations and then introduces Kevin Johnson from the County. Johnson says that the staff have no recommendations for the PSRs and we need to discuss a reasonable range of alternatives. Hutchison reads his letter concerning this matter. **(Appendix)**
- Johnson explains that there are 227 versus 253. Both Gaines and Del Pilar asked Hutchinson to explain the maps instead of reading his letter. Oliver asks all board members to review the maps before the meeting. Hutchison explains one of the maps on display. Boulos says that the subcommittee came up with an alternative plan. Johnson says that there are three proposals and the Subcommittee came up. There are potentially 366 lots on the plot of land.
- Garritson asks who currently owns the land and Johnson responds that there are a number of property owners. Lavonne asks how the property owners feel about the alternatives and

Johnson says that all property owners have preferred the plan allowing for more density. Hutchison explains the Williamson Act and how it limits property owner's options. Johnson says that an additional 13 units are possible with this plan.

- Bill Rice, 11273 San Gabriel Way, 92082, wmricejr42@gmail.com, explains how stringent rules are getting on his 16 acres. Rice says that he was forced to cut down his avocado grove because of NAFTA and other regulations. He has worked to preserve the land. He has invested \$125,000 into a vineyard and hopes to keep it for farming, but wants to keep his options open. Garritson asks Rice what is his preferred plan and he favors the one proposed by Hutchison. Johnson explains that the area is a moderate fire hazard and the closest fire station exceeds the ten minute County requirement. Hutchison spends time explaining background about the alternatives.
- Boulos explained that the subcommittee recommends changing the SR-4 back to the original SR-2 zoning. Plotner asks why we don't just make all of the land into SR-2 zoning, as it makes more sense. Hutchison is concerned about doing that because some of the property is excellent farm land. The habitat of VC-67 is discussed by Hutchison and the subcommittee proposes to change the SR-2 zoning to I-2. He says that this will allow industrial usage in response to a question by Garritson. Johnson says that additional vehicle storage is allowed.
- Jerry Gaughan, 9620 Palm Beach Ln, San Diego, 92129, 619-438-4980, explains how the shops were permitted back in 1972. He has spoken to FEMA and the County about the inaccuracy that substantiates the floodplains. The County says that the area flooded in 1960, but there is no evidence of it. The County wants Jerry to get a Backwater Study done on the property, but that would cost \$60,000-\$70,000. He has agreed to give up a 50 foot buffer zone. Johnson reads the VC67 Policy Issues and explains how the property is a floodway. Garritson asks Jerry to explain why he believes the County proposal will take away 40% of the industrial zoning. Gaughan explains his reasons and also is in agreement to give up 50 feet for a buffer zone. Boulos clarifies that the plan suggested by the subcommittee will keep the industrial zoning.
- Plotner would like to have all of the land zoned as SR-2 instead of piecemealing it into SR-4.
- Hutchison makes the motion to approve the proposal.

8) Discussion and vote on approval of specific items for PLDO funding AND aligning Parks and Recreation District boundary with VCCPG planning area boundary. (Norwood)

- Norwood would like to postpone this until the March meeting.

9) Discussion of drainage issues associated with the Granger Solar Photovoltaic Solar Farm (PDS2015-MUP-15-019) located at the northeast corner of Mesa Crest Road and Avenida Annalie. (Smith).

- Patrick Brown explains his attempts to fix the drainage failure. The site drains out to approximately 7 acres. He hydroseeded one side of the property. He deployed 2000 sandbags, millions of pounds of riprap, and fiber matrix. Riprap slows down the velocity of the water and vegetation will likely come back. The drain pattern is still the same. He has worked with Chris and Steve to correct drainage issues. He cannot retain 100% stormwater on his solar site. The County approved grading and draining. He strongly believes Granger Solar has fixed the problem and the matter is now Civil.
- Steven Berneberg of 30696 Mesa Crest Rd, 92082, says that Granger Solar has exceeded the 10% flow rate required by County regulations. Del Pilar asks if his road has ever been blocked. Steven says that the flow rate could be around 25-30%, but this is a guesstimate.

He asked the County prior to the approval of the project for numerous reports, but they never responded.

- Steven says that Chris Ambuul has taken numerous videos showing the drainage conditions. Chris has lived on the property for 14 years and since living there has only seen drainage problems when the rain has come as a huge downpour. In the past rains this year and last, the rain has not fallen as a tremendous downpour. He speaks about the riprap and explains the history of rain on his property.
- Karl Ulle is a board member of Mesa Roads Maintenance Association (MRMA), 12448 Country Rd, 92082. He doesn't believe there is more water, but has observed a lot of silt, which might be the problem. He compliments Granger Solar for working with property owners in the past. There is piles of silt in the drainage pipe. Karl suggests that in some places, they make the pit deeper, which might slow down the water and catch the silt.
- Garritson asks whether this issue is a Planning Group topic or whether it is a Civil matter. Smith believes that the silt and riprap problems can be corrected and hopes the neighbors can create a solution to resolve the drainage. The County has interest in this solar project to see how this matter is addressed for future solar farms. Del Pilar explains that if this does go to a civil trial, there are huge financial costs. He hopes all parties will try to resolve their differences and correct the problem. Patrick says that he has spent already \$100,000 to correct the problem. Gaines also recommends the parties come up with a solution and avoid taking the matter to court.

F. Group Business

1) Meeting Updates: Next VCCPG meeting: March 13, 2017

3) Approve reimbursement for Vice Chair Quinley for cost of annual post office box rental--\$140.

- Garritson moves to reimburse the cost and Vick seconds the motion.
- **Motion carries 12-0-1-1 (Y-N-A-A)**

4) Discussion and possible vote on appointment of Ashly Mellor as Associate Vice Chair

- Quinley asks that Ashley Mellor be recognized as an assistant Vice Chair. The Planning Group approves her in this unofficial role.
- **Motion carries 13-0-1 (Y-N-A)**

G. Reports of subcommittees of the VCCPG

h. Tribal Liaison – (Jeana Boulos, Chair)

- Wehay QuisQuis, Skye McMichael, Frank Shoemaker, and Brandon Strausbaugh were approved as members.

i. Website – (Ashly Mellor, Chair)

- Susan Janisch was removed from the website subcommittee.

k. Lilac Plaza (Ann Quinley, Chair)

- Dave Bohorquez is nominated as a member.

H. Adjournment

- **The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.**

- Minutes were approved on ...

James Garritson, Secretary

Appendix VCCPG February 2017 Minutes

Community Plan Update Subcommittee

13 February 2017

Requested Action: Develop a General Plan Amendment alternative for each of four analysis areas in the Valley Center planning area [VC7+, VC51, VC57, & VC67] that can be used in the project Environmental Impact Report [EIR] to satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The focus of the review is environmental constraints, but there are other constraints as well, such as public roads and other infrastructure.

The SC met for a total of 5.5 hours to review the four analysis areas and develop one alternative for each.

VC7+ – The current land use is SR-4 and the request is for SR-2. Analysis area VC7+ includes PSRs VC7, VC9, VC11, VC20A, VC20B, VC54, VC60, and VC61. The analysis area is constrained on the west, southwest and northeast by steep slopes. The analysis area is constrained in the western and southern portions by riparian and bordering habitats that support up to 13 federal, state and county listed biological species, although it is not in a PAMA or MSCP area. The northeastern extension of the analysis area borders the Lilac Ranch mitigation land and Keys Creek and is partially within the PAMA. Access is by private roads as well as West Lilac Road. Parts of the analysis area are in a very high fire hazard severity zone. There are prime and statewide significant agricultural soils within the analysis area.

The SC recommends an EIR alternative that reduces the study area for SR-2 designation. It is bounded by West Lilac Road on the north and east to the intersection of West Lilac Road/Covey Lane/Rodriguez Road then south on Rodriguez Road to Jay Way, then west on Rodriguez Road to the southwest corner of VC61, then north along the western boundary of VC61 on a line that intersects the West Lilac Road starting point. This reduced study area would include PSRs VC54 and VC61.

VC51 – The current land use designation is RL-20 and the request is for SR-4. VC51 is currently under a Williamson Act contract as are three abutting properties. Parts of VC51 are constrained by steep slopes as are surrounding properties. Access is by private road. The analysis area is in a high fire hazard severity zone.

The SC recommends an alternative that reduces the study area for SR-4 designation to include VC51 [128 43 023], the parcel immediately north [128 43 005] and the parcel to the west [128 43 004].

VC57 – The current land use is SR4 and the request is SR-2. The analysis area includes PSRs VC57, VC63, and VC64. The analysis area is constrained by some steep slope areas in the southern portion. The analysis area has some very high fire hazard zone in the same southern portion. The western portion of the analysis area is constrained by the 100-year floodplain/floodway as well as wetlands and wetland buffers. The analysis area has extensive prime agricultural soils and statewide significant soils. The southwestern portion of the analysis area borders the north county MSCP PAMA. About half of the analysis area is composed of relatively large parcels.

The SC recommends an EIR alternative that reduces the study area for SR-2 designation to an area bounded on the east by Sunset Road from Vesper Road south to the southern boundary of the analysis area, then east to the southwestern corner of VC57, then north along the western boundary of VC57 and continuing north to intersect with Vesper Road, then east to the Sunset Road starting point. The reduced study area includes VC57 and VC63.

VC67 – The current land use is SR-2 and the request is for I-2. The analysis area is constrained along the southern boundary by riparian habitat. It is also constrained by the 100-year floodplain/floodway. There is a portion containing upper tier riparian scrub vegetation. The current use is CHP and Sheriff vehicle storage. The property has had several industrial uses over the past several decades.

The SC recommends the change from SR-2 to I-2 with a 50-foot biological buffer.

Motion: Move to approve the recommendations of the Community Plan Update SC regarding the EIR alternatives for the four Valley Center PSRs VC7+, VC51, VC57, & VC67 as presented.