

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Approved Minutes for a regular meeting held on **May 8, 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/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

A. Roll Call

- Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and a Quorum was established with 14 members present. **Call to Order by Seat Numbers:**
- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - P | 6. Claire Plotner - P | 11. Ashley Mellor - P |
| 2. (Vacant) | 7. William Del Pilar - P | 12. Jon Vick - P |
| 3. Oliver Smith - P | 8. Susan Fajardo - P | 13. Mary Gaines - P |
| 4. Dina Gharmalkar - P | 9. Susan Janisch - P | 14. James Garritson - P |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - P | 10. LaVonne Norwood - P | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - P |

B. Pledge of Allegiance - Janisch

C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of April 10, 2017

- **Mellor made the motion to approve the minutes. MacKenzie seconded the minutes. Motion Passed 12-0-2 (Y-N-Ab). Quinley and Janisch abstain.**

D. Public Communication/Open Forum

- Mr. Vick passed out a handout and discussed County proposals that include **four traffic lights** in the North Village and **four** in the South Village for a total of 8 traffic lights. Valley Center currently has **three** traffic lights on **Valley Center Road between Cole Grade and Woods Valley Road**. He shared information about traffic calming measures that are used in the Bird Rock section of La Jolla. Mr. Vick said that roundabouts calm traffic better than traffic lights by making roads safer, reducing transit time, and also facilitate emergency vehicle passage. He thanks Kerry Garza and Ross Burnett for their support of roundabouts presentations. Mr. Vick hopes to make Valley Center Road safer, keep traffic moving, and decrease the number of stops made at traffic lights. There will be three presentations at the Valley Center Library Community Room on Wednesday, June 28th.
- Mr. Vick also suggested that the \$20 million that is being spent on the expansion of Cole Grade Road would be better spent on Road 19.
- **Fire Chief Joseph Napier** shared his concerns about slowing emergency response times if roundabouts are built. This will especially become a problem as the population of Valley Center grows.

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

1) Discussion and possible vote on motion from the Community Plan Update subcommittee concerning recommendations on Property Specific Request study areas. Kevin Johnson will attend this VCCPG meeting. (Hutchison)

- Hutchison presented the alternative land use designations for the five Property Specific Requests [PSR] being considered for final recommendation by VCCPG. Ms. Gaines asked why members did not receive this information earlier. Ms. Boulos and Mr. Hutchison explain that members were given this information in the February meeting. Kevin Johnston, County Planning and Development Services, explains that alternatives for Champagne Gardens were created in 2015 and are now being reviewed for a final recommendation. The County needed an environmental study, which explains why consideration is taking place now.
- PSR CG [along Champagne Blvd. between Old Castle Rd. and Lawrence Welk Resort]– The first PSR consists of four parcels called Champagne Gardens. A tributary of Moosa Creek flows through part of the property. Water, fire protection services, and sewer are close to this property. There is only one other developable property to which the proposed changes to the VC Community Plan would apply. Ms. Quinley asks why the subcommittee did not vote in favor of the environmentally superior option. Mr. Hutchison and Mr. Johnston explain that the decision on which alternatives to recommend took place in 2015 and now the options for the final recommendation are consequently more limited. Also, the environmentally superior map would require a 4-acre minimum lot size that would make the parcels nearly impossible to develop.
- Jerry Gaughan (audience) believes that two-thirds of this property is in the Hidden Meadows Subarea of the North County Metro Planning Area and that Planning Group has already given their recommendations. Hidden Meadows voted to recommend the Referral Map Recommendation on this project and left it to the developers to determine how many dwelling units could be built.
- The Chair has no issue with Hidden Meadows and Valley Center Community Planning Groups having a discussion about the property. Mr. Hutchison understands Mr. Gaughan's point suggesting VCCPG may want to be consistent with the recommendation of the adjoining planning group.
- Jared Soptco (applicant) shares information about previous plans for his parcels that are being discussed. He asks for our consideration of the option that would allow the maximum number of dwelling units. They have had the property for 35 years and his family would like to build a responsible development there. He believes 17 units are possible to build on the property and hopes it is zoned as SR2. Mr. Del Pilar asks about when was the last time the property was flooded. Mr. Soptco has agreed to respect the studies.
- Mr. Vick asks about the density of Lawrence Welk- and Mr. Johnston explains it's close to 1 dwelling unit for each acre. San Diego County estimated that the county had a significant flood this year. Mr. Gaughan believes that the 100-year floodplain map is outdated. Mr.

O’Conner (audience) does not agree with Mr. Gaughan’s comment about the floodplain. The Chair reminds the audience that the meeting will be conducted in an orderly fashion.

- Mr. Garritson asks for clarification about the Staff Recommendations with Policy Change versus the Referral Map - No Policy Change. Mr. Johnston thought the vote was 3-2 in favor of making the policy change. Smith has concerns about making a change. Ms. Boulos says the project does not change density. Mr. Johnston says this policy change would only apply to an extremely small area. [policy 8, page 12: changing minimum lot size in SR2 to 0.5 acre, SR4 to 1.0 acre from 1 & 2 acres respectively]. The policy change could change the zoning of an eight-acre property, but that is the only area to which it would apply. The availability of sewer is one of the reasons that the property will support a higher density clustering of dwelling units. Ms. Gaines asks for further clarification about the number of dwelling units possible for the different plans. Ms. Gaines proposes to vote separately on each Property Specific Request. Mr. Hutchison agrees to consider and vote on each PSR separately.

- **Motion: Move to approve the Preliminary Staff Alternative for Champagne Gardens Subareas 2,3,&4 with land use designation SR4**

- **Maker:** Hutchison/ **SECOND?**
- **Motion Carries 10-4-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- **Roll Call Vote:**

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - Yay | 6. Claire Plotner - Yay | 11. Ashly Mellor - Yay |
| 2. Vacant | 7. William Del Pilar - Nay | 12. Jon Vick - Yay |
| 3. Oliver Smith - Yay | 8. Susan Fajardo - Yay | 13. Mary Gaines - Yay |
| 4. Steve Hutchison - Yay | 9. Susan Janisch - Yay | 14. James Garritson - Nay |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - Nay | 10. LaVonne Norwood - Nay | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - Yay |

- **Motion: Move to adopt the proposed changes to the Valley Center Community Plan proposed by PDS staff that will lower the minimum lot sizes for designations SR2 and SR4 to 0.5- and 1.0-acres respectively**

- **Maker:** Hutchison/**SECOND?**
- **Motion Carries 8-6-0 (Y-N-Ab) after Ms. Janisch reconsidered her original abstention. Motion failed 7-6-1 (Y-N-Ab) on the first vote.**
- **Roll Call Vote:**

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - Nay | 6. Claire Plotner - Nay | 11. Ashly Mellor - Nay |
| 2. Vacant | 7. William Del Pilar - Nay | 12. Jon Vick - Yay |
| 3. Oliver Smith - Nay | 8. Susan Fajardo - Yay | 13. Mary Gaines - Yay |
| 4. Steve Hutchison - Nay | 9. Susan Janisch - Yay (Ab) | 14. James Garritson - Yay |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - Yay | 10. LaVonne Norwood - Yay | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - Yay |

- **PSR VC57 [adjacent to Valley Center Rd, between Vesper and Sunset Roads] – Mr. Hutchison shares information about the floodplain and the prime agricultural soils. Many of these parcels are fairly large and would be conducive to agriculture The County says that agriculture is profitable on 2-acre parcels. Hutchison says that the County cannot spot zone, that is making land use changes to certain parcels but not adjoining ones. Ms. Gaines asks**

about the property in yellow and Mr. Hutchison explains that when voting, it is a proposal for all of the property in that study area. Chair Smith points out that he lives in this region, but his property is already zoned as 2-acres.

- Mike Schimpf is a property owner in VC57 and explains background about his property originally being zoned as 2-acre. He favors the VC57+ Analysis Area.
- The County looked into the high water areas and three-quarters of the property is not buildable.
- Subcommittee voted 5-0-0 to keep the existing zoning.

- **Motion: Move to recommend the Existing Alternative that leaves the study area SR4**
- **Maker: Hutchison**
- **Motion Carries 9-5-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- **Roll Call Vote:**

1. Ann Quinley - Yay	6. Claire Plotner - Nay	11. Ashly Mellor - Yay
2. Vacant	7. William Del Pilar - Nay	12. Jon Vick - Yay
3. Oliver Smith - Yay	8. Susan Fajardo - Nay	13. Mary Gaines - Yay
4. Steve Hutchison - Yay	9. Susan Janisch - Yay	14. James Garritson - Nay
5. Jeana Boulos - Nay	10. LaVonne Norwood - Yay	15. Kathy MacKenzie - Yay

- PRS VC51 [Between Couser Canyon and West Lilac Roads] – RL20 is the current zoning of the property. The request is to make the property SR4. Three of the parcels remain under Williamson Act Contracts. It takes ten years to get out of this contract. The subcommittee recommends to keep existing zoning. Garritson asks about the reason for the property owner requesting a change. The property owner has concerns about getting loans under present zoning. Mr. O’Conner (audience) asks if the County is sympathetic for property owners who cannot get loans. Ms. Boulos said that the subcommittee voted 4-1-0 to keep the existing zoning.

- **Motion: Move to recommend the retention of the existing land use and zoning regulations.**
- **Maker: Hutchison/SECOND?**
- **Motion Carries 10-4-0 (Y-N-Ab).**
- **Roll Call Vote:**

1. Ann Quinley - Yay	6. Claire Plotner - Nay	11. Ashly Mellor - Yay
2. Vacant	7. William Del Pilar - Yay	12. Jon Vick - Yay
3. Oliver Smith - Yay	8. Susan Fajardo - Nay	13. Mary Gaines - Yay
4. Steve Hutchison - Yay	9. Susan Janisch - Yay	14. James Garritson - Nay
5. Jeana Boulos - Yay	10. LaVonne Norwood - Nay	15. Kathy MacKenzie - Yay

- PSR VC67 [On Cole Grade Road south of Valley Center Road] – Mr. Hutchison explains VC67 and the recommendation of the subcommittee that would allow a little more development by making approximately half of the property SR-2 and the other half industrial.

- Gerry Gaughan explains that he owns 19 different properties in Valley Center. This property is 100% occupied. He says that the map is from 1989 and is inaccurate. Mr. Gaughan explains that the County approved storage units and now is condemning a commercial property that has been there for over 50 years. He has asked the County to show them proof of the backwater study. Mr. Gaughan says the County asked property owners to raise \$50,000 to pay for the EIR. Mr. Gaughan has fought the County for over five years over this project. FEMA did not agree with the studies of the County. He says that the County now wants a 100 foot Bio Buffer. He purchased the property for \$1.8 million dollars back in 2002. He claims that the County wants almost half of the property because of the 100 foot Bio Buffer. He would agree to a 50 foot buffer.
- The subcommittee voted 3-2-0 for the Alternative. The two voting No preferred the Existing plan.
- Mr. Johnston recommends that Mr. Gaughan gets anything the County says in writing. He says that the County has not stated that there needs to be a 100 foot buffer. Mr. O'Conner (audience) says that the property owners have been there for numerous years and he finds it odd that the County is now deciding there are floodplains and bio issues. He has lived here for 25 years and believes this section of Valley Center is a major industrial area. Norwood asks the question about Road 14 and Kevin Johnston shows where it might go through the property. Mr. Johnston explains what would happen if the property was zoned half and half. Del Pilar asks a question about the 50 foot buffer zone. What is the buffer? Mr. Johnston says the buffer is SR-2. Hutchison says that part of the VCCPG charter is to look at the general plan. Gaines asks what does the County want for this region. Boulos explains that the subcommittee made a compromise by voting in favor of the Alternative plan. Kevin Smith (audience) says that the County wants to probably protect the creek in this area. He would like the property zone as Industrial.

- **Motion: Move to recommend the Alternative plan that would leave the study area half SR2 and half industrial.**

- **Maker: Hutchison/SECOND?**

- **Motion Fails 5-9-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

- **Roll Call Vote:**

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - Nay | 6. Claire Plotner - Yay | 11. Ashly Mellor - Yay |
| 2. Vacant | 7. William Del Pilar - Nay | 12. Jon Vick - Yay |
| 3. Oliver Smith - Nay | 8. Susan Fajardo - Nay | 13. Mary Gaines - Yay |
| 4. Steve Hutchison - Nay | 9. Susan Janisch - Yay | 14. James Garritson - Nay |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - Nay | 10. LaVonne Norwood - Nay | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - Nay |

- **Motion: Move to recommend the change to medium impact industrial, I-2, for the entire study area**

- **Maker: Hutchison/SECOND?**

- **Motion Carries 13-1-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

- **Roll Call Vote:**

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - Yay | 6. Claire Plotner - Yay | 11. Ashly Mellor - Yay |
| 2. Vacant | 7. William Del Pilar - Yay | 12. Jon Vick - Yay |
| 3. Oliver Smith - Yay | 8. Susan Fajardo - Yay | 13. Mary Gaines - Yay |
| 4. Steve Hutchison - Nay | 9. Susan Janisch - Yay | 14. James Garritson - Yay |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - Yay | 10. LaVonne Norwood - Yay | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - Yay |

- Mr. Johnston explains some of the environmental information about the property. The subcommittee voted 2-2-0. Ms. Boulos explained her thinking about voting in favor of the Alternative plan. She wanted to allow development in certain areas.
- Mr. O’Conner (audience) is against the alternative proposal. He strongly believes that the roads in the backcountry are terrible and does not want any changes made to zoning until this problem is fixed.

- **Motion: Move to recommend the retention of the existing land use and zoning regulations**

- **Maker: Hutchison/SECOND?**

- **Motion Carries 10-4-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

- **Roll Call Vote:**

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ann Quinley - Yay | 6. Claire Plotner - Yay | 11. Ashly Mellor - Yay |
| 2. Vacant | 7. William Del Pilar - Yay | 12. Jon Vick - Yay |
| 3. Oliver Smith - Yay | 8. Susan Fajardo - Yay | 13. Mary Gaines - Yay |
| 4. Steve Hutchison - Yay | 9. Susan Janisch - Yay | 14. James Garritson - Nay |
| 5. Jeana Boulos - Nay | 10. LaVonne Norwood - Nay | 15. Kathy MacKenzie - Nay |

2) 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 square foot 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)

- They have the scoping letter, but are not ready to present tonight.

3) Discussion and possible vote to ask the Chair to write a letter to request expedited TAC consideration of Vesper Road, the provision of a timeline for completion of agreed upon tasks and a letter that incorporates current concerns about Vesper [Action Item 5](Plotner)

- This Item was moved to a later meeting.

4) Update on Tractor Supply’s meeting with the Valley Center Design Review Board on May 1, 2017. If DRB approves Tractor Supply, the VCCPG will move to discussion and a possible vote on the project. [Action Item 4](Vick)

- The Mobility and South Village voted for approval of this project with the agreement of traffic calming solutions. The DRB approved the project on April 8th. Tractor Supply also agreed to vote in favor of roundabouts.

- **Motion:** Move to recommend approval of Traffic Supply with their agreement to create traffic calming solutions. (See Appendix)
- **Maker/Second:** Vick/Janisch
- **Motion Carries 14-0-0 (Y-N-Ab)**

5) Discussion and possible vote on Park Circle project. PDS2017-TM-5603 located at corner of Valley Center and Mirar De Valle Roads. The project area is 69.9 acres. The total number of lots is 368 with 318 dwelling units planned for construction. Dwellings are single family detached home and one- to two-stories. The minimum residential lot size is 2200 square feet. The final traffic study was released by PDS on April 27, 2017. [Action Item 6](Vick)

- Both the Mobility and South Village recommended approval for the project with the agreement that the developer encourages the County to develop Road 19. Votes for Mobility were 5-0-0 and South Village were 4-1-0.
- Kerry Garza introduced the project and shared a four-minute video. The project complements the rural community and also provides a new center for Valley Center. There are grassy paths and trails connecting the community. Park Circle Commons is a shopping area. There is a community garden. There are cottage homes with front porches, farmhouse villages, and traditional homes. Mr. Garza introduced Ben from the County. The project will bring over a 1000 jobs to the region. There are 65 permanent jobs created by the project. This development will generate **3.8 million dollars a year** in property taxes. Mr. Garza believes this will be one of the biggest projects since the casinos came to Valley Center.
- **The Chair makes the motion of staying until 10:30 p.m. Quinley seconds the motion. Motion Carries 14-0-0.**
- The Chair would like a guarantee that the park will remain public. If the residents ever pursue a gated community, the park district will be reimbursed the entire 1.4 million dollars. This figure is rounded from 332 homes multiplied by 4,200 dollars.
- Ben Mills shared information about the major use conditions for the project. The circular park will remain public and one of the roads is guaranteed to serve as a public road. Mr. Garza took the advice of the community and will ensure the development will always remain wide open to the public. The Chair asked if there is a wall going down Valley Center Road. Mr. Garza explained all houses will have fencing around them. Ms. Quinley asked if there was originally a sound wall. Mr. Garcia said that was the case two or three years ago. Walls are not on the road frontage. There are some privacy and sound walls between 6-8 feet. Most walls are 6 feet. The County said that there will be wood fencing, wrought iron fencing, and some masonry walls. These fences will eventually be covered by landscaping. Walls are almost 40-50 feet away from Valley Center Road. The Chair asks if the subcommittees took in account the additional 47 homes at Shady Oak. The traffic consultant looked at the County 2050 forecast. Mirar de Valle is being made wider to meet the 2050 forecast. Plotner asked if the County had plans to look into Roads 19, 14, and even a possible two lane road through Mirar de Valle.

- The County believes that most transportation will continue to be single passenger vehicles. Advanced planning is internally working to update the Community Plan. Mirar de Valle will be rebuilt at the entrance. There is a plan to widen the road from 40 feet to 60 feet, with a full 80 foot easement. Mr. Garza explained that a number of people in Valley Center have prevented Mirar de Valle from becoming a four lane road. The Chair explained that the County had proposed at one time to make Lilac into a four lane road. The Chair would like a guarantee that this development will never become a gated community. Mr. Garza explained that the County will take over the park. Ben Mills said that once something is made public, it can never become private.
- **Motion: The Mobility and South Village vote to approve the Park Circle project with traffic calming solutions. (See Appendix)**
- **Maker/Second: Vick/Plotner**
- **Motion Carries 12-1-1 (Y-N-Ab). Fajardo votes nay. Mellor recuses herself because of the proximity of her home to the project.**

6) Discussion and possible vote on Orchard Run Extension. The project as it stands does not meet current General Plan Update standards, Community Plan standards or community character. Two out of three final maps for Orchard Run have already recorded on this project and third is in a position to record, pending the completion of an Affordable Housing Agreement with the County. At this point the Affordable Housing Agreement has already been in process with the County for over a year. [Action Item 4](Mr. Vick, Chair)

- VCCPG did not discuss this Item tonight.

7) Discussion and possible vote on PDS2017-STP-17-010, Shell Office Space, 27301 Valley Center Road (Northeast corner of Valley Center Rd. and Woods Valley Rd.) The discussion will center on the project's Design Review Exemption and input received from PDS Advance Planning Group Program Manager Joe Farace. There may be a vote to request an appeal of the Design Review Exemption for this project so that it can be heard by the VCCPG as a full planning group instead of having the VCCPG's position considered as equivalent to an individual community member. [Action Item](Smith)

- Chair Smith shares that he does not believe an exemption is appropriate for this project. DRB looks at the aesthetics. This project will be brought back in our June meeting.

H. Adjournment

- **The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.**
- **Minutes were approved on September 11 , 2017.**

James Garritson, Secretary

Appendix

Park Circle Draft Motion to VCCPG/May 8, 2017

Whereas the Park Circle project has been determined by the County to meet all General Plan, Community Plan and zoning requirements, and... Whereas the County will be providing an extensive list of conditions now in draft form prior to final approval by the County, and... Whereas the VC DRB has approved this project with conditions agreed to by the developer on November 2, 2015, and... Whereas the project Traffic Study has been analyzed and approved by the County and traffic impacts on LOS determined by the County to be less than significant, and an IOD provided for Road 19 (funding TBD by the Supervisors at a future date), and reviewed by the S. Village and Mobility S/Cs on May 2, 2017, and... Whereas the S. Village S/C has met and reviewed the project with the developer on 6 occasions over the last several years, and provided an advisory approval to the VCCPG on 12/15/16 (due to lack of a quorum), the S. Village and Mobility S/Cs hereby recommend approval of the project as presented, with the provisos that...

1. The developer will participate in traffic calming solutions for VC Road in conjunction with and in proportion to the extent of the Park Circle development, and...
2. That the developer participate in encouraging the County to develop Road 19 due to the community's need for fire evacuation routes and projected significant increase in traffic.

Vote: Mobility S/C: approved 5/0/0 (8 S/C members: 2 recused, 1 absent) S. Village S/C: approved 4/1/0 (7 S/C members: 2 recused) **Note:** TIF fees from the Park Circle project will be approximately \$1.4 million. These fees are intended to be used "to mitigate cumulative traffic impact by providing a proportionate share for new development to pay for capacity increasing improvements associated with the build-out of the Mobility Element". The VCCPG should ensure that all TIF fees paid by VC developments will be used to mitigate traffic in VC, and not used elsewhere.

Tractor Supply VCCPG Motions: March 13, 2017

Motion #1: The VCCPG Mobility and S. Village Subcommittees recommend approval of the mobility and land use aspects of the project as presented on March 13, 2017 with the following understandings (approved by the Mobility and S. Village subcommittees and reconfirmed by the developer on March 7, 2017): That the developer will participate in traffic calming solutions for VC Road in conjunction with and in proportion to the extent of the Tractor Supply development. In addition, the developer shall improve as required the existing entrance and/or exit road(s) to handle their traffic. They shall also enter into a Road Maintenance cost sharing agreement with the other road users. It is thus moved that the VCCPG hereby approves the project as presented. Motion #1 was approved 12-0-0 (Y-N-Ab) on May 8, 2017.

Motion #2: With regards to "community character" requirements, the VCCPG denies approval of the project until it has DRB approval for design.

Note: The proponents of Tractor Supply and the Liberty Bell Plaza have agreed to support possible roundabouts in the S. Village as long as any plan or proposal for roundabouts does not delay their projects, increase their costs, or involuntarily require additional ROW from their projects.