Attachment G – Community Planning/Sponsor Group Recommendations

Summary of CPG/CSG Meeting Minutes

Analysis Area	Community	Recommendation	Vote			
			Ayes	Noes	Abstained	Recused
BO18+	Bonsall	Existing	5	0	0	0
CD14	Crest-Dehesea	Alternative	9	0	0	0
DS8	Borrego Springs	Existing	4	0	0	1
DS24	Borrego Springs	Existing	7	0	0	0
FB2+	Fallbrook	CPG rec of all SR-10 (beyond range of options)	12	1	0	0
FB17	Fallbrook	Existing	13	0	0	0
FB19+	Fallbrook	Proposed	12	1	0	0
FB21+	Fallbrook	Proposed	12	1	0	0
ME26	Campo/Lake Morena	Proposed	5	0	0	0
ME30-A	Campo/Lake Morena	Proposed	5	0	0	0
NC3-A	Hidden Meadows (NCM)	Proposed	6	0	0	0
NC18-A is located in an area of the North County Metro Subregion that is not represented by a planning group.						
NC22	Twin Oaks (NCM)	Existing	4	0	0	1
NC37	Twin Oaks (NCM)	Alternative	4	1	0	0
NC38+	Twin Oaks (NCM)	Existing	4	0	0	1
PP30	Pala-Pauma	Alternative	5	0	0	0
SD15	San Dieguito	Existing	9	0	2	0
VC7+	Valley Center	Existing	10	4	0	0
VC51	Valley Center	Existing	10	4	0	0
VC57+	Valley Center	Existing	9	5	0	0
VC67	Valley Center	Proposed	13	1	0	0
WCG	Bonsall	Alternative (Alternative and Proposed are the same for WCG)	4	2	0	0
ECG	Hidden Meadows (NCM)	Proposed	6	1	1	0
(ECG is split between Hidden Meadows and Valley Center)	Valley Center	Alternative	10	4	0	0
VC CP Policy Revision	Valley Center	Approval	8	6	0	0

BO18+ CSG VOTE

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, March 7, 2017
7:00 P.M.
31505 Old River Road
Bonsall, California

One seat is open for a new member of the Bonsall Sponsor Group please contact Margarette Morgan, Chair 760-630-7070.

A. CALL TO ORDER - 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Morgan, Davis, Carullo-Miller, Schwartze, and Norris.
Vacancy: Seat #2 South of 76 and East of Camino Del Rey. Seat 4 and Seat 6

d. Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005-REZ14-006) B018+ Preliminary Policy Analysis. Voting was based on each board submitted. After presentation by Kevin Johnston with question from both the community members and sponsor group members motion on board one shown on page 4 of document supplied by Johnston was by Norris to deny analysis B018+ per County General Plan 2011 second by Morgan passed 5- 0 – 2. Second board submitted titled Potential Alternative B018+ (existing) motion Davis second by Norris passed 5-0-2

CD14 CPG VOTE

CREST-DEHESA-GRANITE HILLS-HARBISON CANYON SUBREGIONAL PLANNING GROUP. Minutes of the meeting on 12 December 2016, at Dehesa School, 4612 Dehesa Road, El Cajon

A. CALL TO ORDER. Chairman Wally Riggs called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

B. ROLL CALL. Planning Group members Bowen, Ulm, Slagill, Carroll, Walls, Wessel, Riggs, Bretz and Manning were present, forming a quorum of 9. Members Harris, Hertel and Underwood were absent, but excused. Seat 10, Seat 12 and Seat 15 are vacant.

F1. Property Specific Request General Plan Amendment and Rezone GPA 12-005-REZ14-006. (Johnston) Chairman Riggs introduced Mr. Kevin Johnston and invited him to explain the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone. Mr. Johnston reviewed some of the history of the subject property since the 2011 Plan Update, including the process for reconsidering a Property Specific Request, which has led to the current GPA 12-005-REZ14-006. He discussed with Group members various factors that are relevant to the appropriate designation and density of development allowed for the property, which included the fire hazard potential, protected wildlife corridors, emergency secondary road access, and septic system soil percolation limitations. Group Chairman Riggs noted that the Planning Group previously recommended further consideration of 14 lots for the property, and that a 2-acre minimum lot size would be helpful for providing adequate soil percolation. Johnston and the Group discussed the possibility of designating a portion of the property SR-2, the area of which would be calculated to yield only 14 units.

Darin Wessel moved the Planning Group recommends consideration of a separate alternative for the amendment and rezone GPA 12-005-REZ14-006, adjusting the proposed SR-2 area in total acres, using the GSI slope model, to yield 14 residential units. The motion passed (9 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain).

DS8 CSG VOTE

County of San Diego

BORREGO SPRINGS COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 7, 2016 at 4:30 P.M.

Borrego Springs High School Community Room

2281 Diegueno Road, Borrego Springs, California

Administrative Items

A. Chairman Beltran called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

B. Roll Call of Members. Members present: Tom Beltran, David Farley, Rebecca Falk, Judy Haldeman, and Bonnie Petrach.

C. Property Specific Request for "Rudyville" presented by Kevin Johnson and others from San Diego County planning and land use. There are two, P.S.R.s in the Borrego area. One being "Rudyville" the other is a zoning change close to the Village area. Maps were presented showing locations of PSRs in Borrego designated as D.S.8 and D.S.24. DS8 located about one half mile from Christmas Circle and DS24 is "Rudyville".

D. DS8 is a proposal for changing the "Borrego Springs General Plan" to allow more than 2 "units" per acre in the "Village" area as is presently zoned. Up to 330 dwelling units may occupy the property at this time. If the plan is amended to accommodate the change, up to 726 units may occupy the same area.

G. It was noted that approval by the County, denial or alternative recommendations are solicited from the Sponsor Group to the County.

N. Motion was made by Haldeman to deny the request for upzoning of DS8, seconded by Petrach. Ayes- Farley, Petrach, Falk, Haldeman. Nays- none. Abstained – none. Recused – Beltran. Motion approved.

DS24 CSG VOTE

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

BORREGO SPRINGS COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

*****MEETING MINUTES*****

Thursday, March 1, 2018, 4:30 p.m.

Borrego Springs Library Meeting Room, 587 Palm Canyon Dr. #125, Borrego Springs, California

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m. Members present were – Chair Rebecca Falk, Secretary David Farley, Bill Haneline, Bonnie Petrach, Clint Brandin, Judy Haldeman and Linda Haddock.

D. ACTION ITEMS:

1. Reconsideration of the Sponsor Group's April, 2016 vote on the property specific request (PSR) for increased density for DS24- Country Club Estates, commonly known as "Rudyville" from SR10 (one dwelling per 10 acres) to SR1 (one dwelling per one acre). A list was brought forward of people wishing to speak to the Group concerning DS24 that were present. Kevin Johnston from San Diego County Planning and Development Services was on hand to give a presentation of possible development options for DS24 and his department's recommendations. Kevin passed out maps of the area for the Group to study as well as copies for the public. Approximately fifty people attended the meeting. One hundred percent spoke against the project. No person spoke for the project. A motion was made by member Judy Haldeman to unconditionally deny the up zoning of DS24. Second was made by Linda Haddock. Chair Falk called for the vote of members. All members voting unanimously to deny the up zoning, Property Specific Request for DS24, the motion passed.

FB2+ CPG VOTE

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 September 2016, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Thirteen (13) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Jean Dooley, Roy Moosa, Donna Gebhart, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney, Tom Harrington, Lee De Meo, Margaret Singleton-O'Leary and Jerry Kalman. Ron Miller and Bill McCarthy were excused.

3. Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006) – CPG Review of 4 PSR Analysis Areas in Fallbrook. Project Description: During the hearings of June 20, and June 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to process a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to analyze 47 separate PSRs along with their associated study areas (added for mapping consistency). Four PSRs were handled in a separate process and approved by the Board in 2014 and a fifth PSR was withdrawn in 2016, leaving 42 remaining PSRs. A PSR is a request/petition to the Board to change the General Plan land use designation. In cases where multiple PSRs were in the same area and proposing the same or similar change, with a common study

area, these PSRs and study area were grouped together in what's referred to as an analysis area. PDS staff will be providing some preliminary analysis of the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas and soliciting any input from the CPG (links to analysis to be sent prior to meeting). In addition to providing any project recommendations for each Analysis Area, the CPG can provide input on a potential land use map alternative for each Analysis Area, (for analysis in the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report). Additional information on the project along with information on the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas (FB2+, FB17, FB19+, and FB21+) can be found on the project web page at - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR.html. County planner **Kevin Johnston,** (858) 694-3084, Kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Kevin Johnston introduced the request to support four areas of re-zoning in the Fallbrook area. These areas had been dramatically affected by the General Plan update. Property owners in the areas had requested that changes to their zoning be considered. Per Mr. Russell's request, Mr. Johnston went through them one at a time.

The third area was designated "FB 2+". The parcels were along Rice Canyon Road north of SR-76. The request was to change the zoning from RL-20 in the northwest and RL-40 for the remainder of the property to SR-4 in the northwest and RL-20 for the remainder. Mr. Johnston went through the in depth study that the County staff had done on the request.

Mr. Wood reported that FB 2+ did not match the recommendation the Planning Group had requested in 2012. At that time the Planning Group had recommended RL-10 for the entire area. The Land Use Committee had recommended the RL-10 over the entire area.

Legal Counsel for the majority property owner within the limits of the proposed rezone stated that the property owner was dramatically affected by the General Plan update and supported the RL-10 rezone request.

After limited discussion, Mr. Wood motioned to approve the request of RL-10 over the entire limits of the area. The motion passed with Ms. Dooley voting against the motion.

FB17 CPG VOTE

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 September 2016, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Thirteen (13) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Jean Dooley, Roy Moosa, Donna Gebhart, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney, Tom Harrington, Lee De Meo, Margaret Singleton-O'Leary and Jerry Kalman. Ron Miller and Bill McCarthy were excused.

3. Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006) – CPG Review of 4 PSR Analysis Areas in Fallbrook. Project Description: During the hearings of June 20, and June 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to process a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to analyze 47 separate PSRs along with their associated study areas (added for mapping consistency). Four PSRs were handled in a separate process and approved by the Board in 2014 and a fifth PSR was withdrawn in 2016, leaving 42 remaining PSRs. A PSR is a request/petition to the Board to change the General Plan land use designation. In cases where multiple PSRs were in the same area and proposing the same or similar change, with a common study area, these PSRs and study area were grouped together in what's referred to as an analysis area. PDS staff will be providing some preliminary analysis of the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas and soliciting any input from the CPG (links to analysis to be sent prior to meeting). In addition to providing any project recommendations for each Analysis Area, the CPG can provide input on a potential land use map alternative for each Analysis Area, (for analysis in the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report). Additional information on the project along with information on the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas (FB2+, FB17, FB19+, and FB21+) can be found on the project web page at - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR.html. County planner **Kevin Johnston,** (858) 694-3084, Kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Kevin Johnston introduced the request to support four areas of re-zoning in the Fallbrook area. These areas had been dramatically affected by the General Plan update. Property owners in the areas had requested that changes to their zoning be considered. Per Mr. Russell's request, Mr. Johnston went through them one at a time.

The final area was designated "FB 17". The parcels were north of Reche Road and west of Ranger Road. The request was to change the zoning from SR-2 (one unit per two acres) to SR-1 (one unit per one acres). Mr. Johnston went through the in-depth study that the County staff had done on the request.
Mr. Wood reported that FB 17 did not match the recommendation the Planning Group had requested in 2012 . At that time the Group had recommended that the northerly half of the property remain SR-2 and the southerly half of the property be changed to SR-1. The Land Use Committee had supported the 2012 recommendation.
Several neighbors of the proposed re-zone spoke in opposition to the proposed change. They felt the SR-1 zoning would allow extremely dense development that would not match the community character.
After lengthy discussion, Mr. Wood motioned to approve leaving the northerly half of the property in SR-2 and changing the southerly half of the property to SR-1. The motion failed.
A second motion was made by Mr. Wood to leave the entire area in the SR-2 zone designation. That motion passed unanimously.

FB19+ CPG VOTE

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 September 2016, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Thirteen (13) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Jean Dooley, Roy Moosa, Donna Gebhart, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney, Tom Harrington, Lee De Meo, Margaret Singleton-O'Leary and Jerry Kalman. Ron Miller and Bill McCarthy were excused.

3. Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006) – CPG Review of 4 PSR Analysis Areas in Fallbrook. Project Description: During the hearings of June 20, and June 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to process a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to analyze 47 separate PSRs along with their associated study areas (added for mapping consistency). Four PSRs were handled in a separate process and approved by the Board in 2014 and a fifth PSR was withdrawn in 2016, leaving 42 remaining PSRs. A PSR is a request/petition to the Board to change the General Plan land use designation. In cases where multiple PSRs were in the same area and proposing the same or similar change, with a common study area, these PSRs and study area were grouped together in what's referred to as an analysis area. PDS staff will be providing some preliminary analysis of the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas and soliciting any input from the CPG (links to analysis to be sent prior to meeting). In addition to providing any project recommendations for each Analysis Area, the CPG can provide input on a potential land use map alternative for each Analysis Area, (for analysis in the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report). Additional information on the project along with information on the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas (FB2+, FB17, FB19+, and FB21+) can be found on the project web page at - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR.html. County planner **Kevin Johnston,** (858) 694-3084, Kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Kevin Johnston introduced the request to support four areas of re-zoning in the Fallbrook area. These areas had been dramatically affected by the General Plan update. Property owners in the areas had requested that changes to their zoning be considered. Per Mr. Russell's request, Mr. Johnston went through them one at a time.

The second area was designated "FB 19+". The parcels were along Stewart Canyon Road east of I-15. The request was to change the zoning from RL-20 (one unit per twenty acres) to RL- 10 (one unit per ten acres). Mr. Johnston again went through the in-depth study that the County staff had done.

Mr. Wood reported that FB 19+ matched the recommendation the Planning Group had requested in 2012 and had been recommended for approval by the Land Use Committee.

After limited discussion, Mr. Wood motioned to approve the proposed zone change. The motion passed with Ms. Dooley voting against the motion.

FB21+ CPG VOTE

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 19 September 2016, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

Mr. Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Thirteen (13) members were present: Anne Burdick, Ike Perez, Jean Dooley, Roy Moosa, Donna Gebhart, Jim Russell, Jack Wood, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney, Tom Harrington, Lee De Meo, Margaret Singleton-O'Leary and Jerry Kalman. Ron Miller and Bill McCarthy were excused.

3. Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006) – CPG Review of 4 PSR Analysis Areas in Fallbrook. Project Description: During the hearings of June 20, and June 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to process a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to analyze 47 separate PSRs along with their associated study areas (added for mapping consistency). Four PSRs were handled in a separate process and approved by the Board in 2014 and a fifth PSR was withdrawn in 2016, leaving 42 remaining PSRs. A PSR is a request/petition to the Board to change the General Plan land use designation. In cases where multiple PSRs were in the same area and proposing the same or similar change, with a common study area, these PSRs and study area were grouped together in what's referred to as an analysis area. PDS staff will be providing some preliminary analysis of the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas and soliciting any input from the CPG (links to analysis to be sent prior to meeting). In addition to providing any project recommendations for each Analysis Area, the CPG can provide input on a potential land use map alternative for each Analysis Area, (for analysis in the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report). Additional information on the project along with information on the four Fallbrook PSR analysis areas (FB2+, FB17, FB19+, and FB21+) can be found on the project web page at - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR.html. County planner **Kevin Johnston,** (858) 694-3084, Kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Kevin Johnston introduced the request to support four areas of re-zoning in the Fallbrook area. These areas had been dramatically affected by the General Plan update. Property owners in the areas had requested that changes to their zoning be considered. Per Mr. Russell's request, Mr. Johnston went through them one at a time.

The first area was designated "FB 21+". The plus indicates that there are more parcels being considered in the change than originally requested the modification. The parcels were along Sandia Creek just south of the San Diego County line. The request was to change the zoning from RL-20 (one unit per twenty acres) to RL- 10 (one unit per ten acres). Mr. Johnston went through the in-depth study that the County staff had done on the request, topography, wetlands, vegetation, land use and County policies.
Mr. Wood reported that FB 21+ matched the recommendation that the Planning Group had requested in 2012 and had been recommended for approval by the Land Use Committee.
After limited discussion, Mr. Wood motioned to approve the proposed zone change. The motion passed with Ms. Dooley voting against the motion.

ME26 CPG VOTE

County of San Diego

Campo Lake Morena Planning Group

Mountain Empire Community Center, 976 Sheridan Road, Campo, CA

7 p.m., Monday, December 19, 2016

Approved Minutes

3. ROLL CALL:	1-Joe Carmody -*P*	4-Linda McCoy -*P*	7- vacant
	2- vacant	5-John Clarke -*P*	
	3-Billie Jo Jannen -*P*	6-Steve Biddle -*P*	

b. **Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment and Rezone (GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006)**. Review and discussion of property-specific density requests (PSRs) previously reviewed by CLMPG. One is adjacent to KB Homes/Campo Hills and the other is out on Cameron Truck Trail. This is a still-pending issue from the general plan update approved in 2011. Kevin Johnston of Planning and Development Services to present. Discussion and vote.

Kevin Johnston presented the two remaining PSRs and answered questions from the board and community members present. The PSRs were previously approved by CLMPG. Billie Jo Jannen asked several questions regarding past voting record of the planning group. The PSRs were unanimously approved by CLMPG in 2012. ME26 "study area" is new in comparison to previous years' presentations of PSRs and currently there is no staff recommendation.

Billie Jo Jannen asked questions regarding rainfall maps and groundwater. Rainfall is 18-21 inches equating to 5-acre minimumlot size. Kevin Johnston explained land use policy for both ME26 and ME30 PSRs. Kevin Owen asked whether U.S. Border Patrol was included in the jobs analysis. Kevin Johnston stated Border Patrol was not included and that he would make a note to include that in the jobs equation for our community.

ME26 land owner Rancy Lenac read a letter he had written to CLMPG many years ago.

Joe Carmody made a motion to approve ME26 and John Clarke seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

ME30-A CPG VOTE

County of San Diego

Campo Lake Morena Planning Group

Mountain Empire Community Center, 976 Sheridan Road, Campo, CA

7 p.m., Monday, December 19, 2016

Approved Minutes

3. ROLL CALL:

1-Joe Carmody -*P*	4-Linda McCoy -*P*	7- vacant
2- vacant	5-John Clarke -*P*	
3-Billie Jo Jannen -*P*	6-Steve Biddle -*P*	

b. **Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment and Rezone (GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006)**. Review and discussion of property-specific density requests (PSRs) previously reviewed by CLMPG. One is adjacent to KB Homes/Campo Hills and the other is out on Cameron Truck Trail. This is a still-pending issue from the general plan update approved in 2011. Kevin Johnston of Planning and Development Services to present. Discussion and vote.

Kevin Johnston presented the two remaining PSRs and answered questions from the board and community members present. The PSRs were previously approved by CLMPG. Billie Jo Jannen asked several questions regarding past voting record of the planning group. The PSRs were unanimously approved by CLMPG in 2012. ME26 "study area" is new in comparison to previous years' presentations of PSRs and currently there is no staff recommendation.

Billie Jo Jannen asked questions regarding rainfall maps and groundwater. Rainfall is 18-21 inches equating to 5-acre minimumlot size. Kevin Johnston explained land use policy for both ME26 and ME30 PSRs. Kevin Owen asked whether U.S. Border Patrol was included in the jobs analysis. Kevin Johnston stated Border Patrol was not included and that he would make a note to include that in the jobs equation for our community.

Joe Carmody made a motion to approve ME30 and John Clarke seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

NC3-A CSG VOTE

Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group

Covering the area bordered by Escondido, 1-15, Valley Center, & Circle R

Meeting location: The Hidden Meadows Community Center 28208 Meadow Glen Way West

Thursday, October 27 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Final Minutes

1) CALL TO ORDER: Wayne Dauber, Chairman at 7:03 PM

2) ROLL CALL: Cox, Rings, Dauber, Sealey, Cook, Caster; a quorum is established. Coultas and Chagala are excused.

b) Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006) – CSG Review of Two Analysis Areas in Hidden Meadows (NC3A and Sub-Areas 4 & 5 of Eastern Champagne Gardens)

NC3A – County presented a summary of rezoning options. There are currently no pending plans and there is no staff recommendation for zoning. Road access is currently limited from the south. If the maximum change is approved, it would result in up to 11 additional units across the approximate 1000 acres under consideration. Sealey made a motion to change the specific plan area from RL-20 to SR-10. Caster seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

NC22 CSG VOTE

Final Minutes: October 19, 2016 meeting of the
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Co-Chairman Karen Binns, acting as Chair, called the meeting to order. Present: Karen Binns (Co-Vice Chair), Sandra Farrell, Rob Peterson, Colleen Branin, and Ana Rosvall
Absent: Tom Kumura and Erik Chapman

2. **Property Specific Requests 1) NC22; 2) NC37, and 3) NC38+**: PDS staff will provide a brief presentation on the existing and proposed PSR maps, constraint maps, and other information on preliminary analysis and proposals for possible map alternatives for SEIR analysis. Focus will be on General Plan policies that are applicable to "stand-alone" General Plan Amendments and Rezones, with no associated development applications/proposal. Web link (page with preliminary analysis documents for Twin Oaks) http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/public-meetings.html; Kevin Johnston, Land Use/Environmental Planner with the County Planning and Development Services; kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov; 858-694-3084.

Discussion: Sandra Farrell recused herself from discussion of NC22

Action: Motion was made by Ana Rosvall to not support the density increase due to all the environmental constraints in the County area including the wildlife corridor, headwaters of the Agua Hedionda Creek, coastal sage scrub, wetlands, and pre-approved mitigation areas. Rob Peterson 2nd. Motion passed 4-0-1.

NC37 CSG VOTE

Final Minutes: October 19, 2016 meeting of the
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Co-Chairman Karen Binns, acting as Chair, called the meeting to order. Present: Karen Binns (Co-Vice Chair), Sandra Farrell, Rob Peterson, Colleen Branin, and Ana Rosvall
Absent: Tom Kumura and Erik Chapman

2. **Property Specific Requests 1) NC22; 2) NC37, and 3) NC38+**: PDS staff will provide a brief presentation on the existing and proposed PSR maps, constraint maps, and other information on preliminary analysis and proposals for possible map alternatives for SEIR analysis. Focus will be on General Plan policies that are applicable to "stand-alone" General Plan Amendments and Rezones, with no associated development applications/proposal. Web link (page with preliminary analysis documents for Twin Oaks) http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/public-meetings.html; Kevin Johnston, Land Use/Environmental Planner with the County Planning and Development Services; kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov; 858-694-3084.

Action: Motion was made by Sandra Farrell to support an increase in density. Western Study Area to remain at SR-10. Rest of area is SR-4. Colleen Branin 2nd. Motion passed 4-1-0.

NC38+ CSG VOTE

Final Minutes: October 19, 2016 meeting of the
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Co-Chairman Karen Binns, acting as Chair, called the meeting to order. Present: Karen Binns (Co-Vice Chair), Sandra Farrell, Rob Peterson, Colleen Branin, and Ana Rosvall
Absent: Tom Kumura and Erik Chapman

2. **Property Specific Requests 1) NC22; 2) NC37, and 3) NC38+**: PDS staff will provide a brief presentation on the existing and proposed PSR maps, constraint maps, and other information on preliminary analysis and proposals for possible map alternatives for SEIR analysis. Focus will be on General Plan policies that are applicable to "stand-alone" General Plan Amendments and Rezones, with no associated development applications/proposal. Web link (page with preliminary analysis documents for Twin Oaks) http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/public-meetings.html; Kevin Johnston, Land Use/Environmental Planner with the County Planning and Development Services; kevin.johnston@sdcounty.ca.gov; 858-694-3084.

Action: Motion was made by Rob Peterson to not support an increase in density due to the FEMA Flood Plain, lack of water in the area, drought conditions, it would double the density and we want to preserve agriculture. Sandra Farrell 2nd. Motion passed 4-0-1.

PP30 CSG VOTE

PALA - PAUMA COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP
P.0. Box 1273
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
Phone: 760-742-0426

REGULAR MEETING, DECEMBER 6, 2016
Final Minutes

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

Place: Pauma Valley Community Center
16650 Hwy. 76
Pauma Valley, Ca. 92061

1. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM.**

   a. Roll Call and quorum established: five members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ben Brooks, and Bill Jacobs. Stephanie Spencer was absent and we had our new member in waiting, Suzie Caughey, present again to sit in on our meeting while her appointment is approved by the BOS.

4. **ACTION ITEMS:**

   a. We then considered the County's review of the owners proposed amendment to the GP to designate 260 acres of some 11 parcels totaling 518 acres, as SR-2 instead of the current designation of RL-40. This would potentially add some 122 additional dwelling units. This property is owned by Loomis / Armstrong; McCormick Ranch LLC and is located near the intersection of SR-76 and Valley Center Road. Kevin Johnston of the County's DPD was present to deliver this review of proposed General Plan Amendment and rezone (Request) under Property Specific Reviews PSR's, specifically PP30. The tax payers are funding $1.56 million to review 44 of these proposals throughout the county! The county has not made any recommendations on this proposal currently or in the initial reviews in 2012. Staff recommendations are due out in the summer 2017. No development is currently proposed, only GP Plan Amendment.

   We then listened to all of the details of the proposed changes and the current list of concerns with them. We were tasked with Approving, disapproving or recommending an alternative to the proposal. The main concerns against approval revolved around LU1 and the mandated push to keep new large developments close to existing infrastructure and avoid leapfrog development. For this project there were compounding issues with being groundwater dependent and many sensitive habitat concerns. We considered many options to the SR-2 but all agreed that the combined SR-10 with the agreed RL-40 land was appropriate. This would result in 31 dwellings instead of 134 in proposal. Andy made the motion that requested SR-2 was inappropriate but that we could support SR-10 as discussed. Fritz gave the second and our alternative recommendation was approved 5-0. See Attachment A

SD15 CPG VOTE

SAN DIEGUITO PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 2789, Rancho Santa Fe, CA, 92067

Minutes of Meeting

March 8th, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 P.M. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Present: D. Dill, T. Parillo, S. Biszantz, M. Hoppenrath, J. Zagara, P. Fisch, N. Christenfeld, S. Williams, J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, S. Thomas, L. Lemarie
Absent: D. Willis

B. **Property Specific Request (SD15) to General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA12-005; REZ14-006)** PDS Planner Kevin Johnston to answer questions concerning the proposed change from SR-1 to a combination of General Commercial (C-1), VR-10.9, and SR-0.5 bringing an estimated total potential dwelling unit increase of 301 units. The parcel(s) are located adjacent to a City of San Marcos suburban area, and the property owner is exploring annexation. The group revisited their original decision because new information had become public through the release of a new EIR and to accommodate community feedback. Project web page at - http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/advance/PSR/prelim-analysis-sd15.pdf

Applicant/Owner *Steve Bieri* gave a brief overview of his request; they have not submitted specific project plans. Property is within the San Marcos SOI and he prefers to develop in that city. He said any project developed in the County would follow the Guiding Principles of the General Plan and conform to the Community Development Model.

Kevin Johnston explained why the proposed rezone would not be inconsistent with LU-1.2 and would have a "D" designator requiring development according to LEED guidelines.

The group first addressed the issue of whether they would change the last motion, agenda item 5A made at the December 8, 2016 SDPG meeting supporting the PSR-Owner Request Map. Members discussed that given additional County Staff provided information, such as the SD15 'Alternative' map, strong public concern, and the fact that this motion specifies land use changes, such as a 5x increase in density of residential dwelling units and adding commercial uses that would significantly increase development potential, they would like to reconsider the motion. The property is in a designated Very High Fire Severity Zone.

Motion: By J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, **second** by L. Lemarie, to rescind first SDPG motion of December 2016 and make a new motion.

Vote:	ayes = 9	nos = 1	abstain = 1	absent/vacant = 2
		P. Fisch	D. Dill	

J. Arsivaud-Benjamin reported that the property originally had a lower density, just 30 units, and then was increased to the current 61 in the GP update. She noted it is adjacent to conservation areas and has a high fire risk and felt that the 80 units (EIR alternative) and 362 units (PSR- Owner request), both with commercial areas, might be unwise planning. *M. Hoppenrath* commented that the General Plan Guiding Principles require areas of high fire risk to have reduced density.

Markus Spiegelberg of the Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM) said the CNLM owns the surrounding open space, called the Rancho La Costa Habitat Conservation Area. He said they plan for the current density, and that higher density will increase vandalism and adversely impact the Preserve.

Kevin Barnard of The Escondido Creek Conservatory (TECC) said that because funding is calculated on the amount of land, the loss of this potential open space would reduce the ability of conservation groups to manage these lands. He pointed out that the property was adjacent to an old landfill and that the liner membranes meant to retain leachates would eventually fail. He also was concerned about increased traffic congestion during wildfire evacuations.

Richard Murphy (TECC) felt that the owner should increase the number of acres being purchased for mitigation because the edge effects of increased density would degrade the adjacent conservation areas.

Kathe Kline lives nearby in San Marcos and noted that it took 2 hours for residents to evacuate during the Cocos fire. She felt the area roads were already inadequate, especially during times when schools let out. She was afraid of becoming trapped in the event of another fire and felt that there should be no high-density development.

Matt Simmons, Land Use Consultant to the owner, said the County has learned from each fire season and now manages fire risk better. He suggested that a staggered release of evacuation notices would help to avoid overcrowding on area roads. *J. Arsivaud-Benjamin* cautioned that the benefit of such policies was dependent on assumptions about how fast the fire was moving, the direction and strength of the wind, the amount of combustible fuel, and the availability of County resources. In the recent Santa Rosa tragedy, she noted, the residents had no time to evacuate. *J. Arsivaud-Benjamin* pointed out that the Harmony Grove Village South Fire Protection Plan called for over 100 officers to direct evacuation traffic, a number that exceeds the standard daily allocation of officers for the entire City of San Diego. She stressed the importance of having a calculation of the evacuation capacity of the local area road network before adding density to the General Plan. *Richard Murphy* said there were 5 fires on the same day as the Cocos fire and anticipating an officer at every intersection was unrealistic. *S. Williams* said that the Fire Chief stressed in a meeting with Harmony Grove Village residents that people often ignore evacuation notices and choose not to leave in the predicted traffic patterns. *Kathe Kline* remarked that during the Cocos fire, about half of the residents of Old Creek Ranch in San Marcos never evacuated, according to their FaceBook page.

Ginger Perkins said her family has had a ranch in the area since 1951. She said that runoff water from nearby irrigated developments and the landfill scours the land and causes Copper Creek, once seasonal, to now flow year-round. The degraded condition of the land prevents regrowth of vegetation needed to absorb runoff. She said her family filled in the old Copper Creek Mine in 1965, but that area trails give the public 24-hour access and people have attempted to dig up some of the dangerous mine shafts. She was opposed to higher density that would encourage more trespassing activity on restricted open space and undeveloped private property in proximity to SD15.

JP Theberge of the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council was very concerned about the fire risk and traffic congestion. He cautioned about changing the zoning before there was a specific project to evaluate impacts, noting that the land could be sold to a different owner.

A further eight attendees submitted slips in opposition to the project, but either did not wish to speak or felt their issues had already been mentioned: Les Briney, Dee Folsa, Leeann Fiolka, Dave Aylmer, Robert Petitmermet, Jon Dummer, Sheri Powers, and Scott Sutherland.

L. Lemarie said an upzone now would mean the owner could get higher density "by right". *Kevin Johnston* clarified that higher density would not be "by right" but rather subject to discretionary approval, but that the maximum density allowed would be determined by the zoning.

T. Parillo felt that if the group disapproved of the upzone, it would be easier to stop a bad plan in the future from going forward.

N. Christenfeld believed that the zoning should determine the density appropriate for the property. A Specific Plan Amendment and Subdivision Map would be more appropriate in evaluating a 5x increase in density.

S. Biszantz thought the main focus should be the commercial area along the street. She asked the owner for his preferences, and *Steve Bieri* answered that he felt mixed use with residential and commercial would be best.

P. Fisch thought that it would be better to keep the 'Existing' zoning rather than speculate on the merits of possible future development.

Motion: By J. Arsivaud-Benjamin, **second** by S. Williams, to retain existing County zoning.

Vote:	ayes = 9	nos = 0	abstain = 2 S. Biszantz D. Dill	absent/vacant = 2

VC7+ CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith **- P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar **- P**
5. Jeana Boulos **- P**
6. Claire Plotner **- P**
7. William Del Pilar **- P**
8. Susan Fajardo **- P**
9. Susan Janisch **- P**
10. LaVonne Norwood **- P**
11. Ashley Mellor **- P**
12. Jon Vick **- P**
13. Mary Gaines **- P**
14. James Garritson **- P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie **- P**

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

VC51 CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith **- P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar **- P**
5. Jeana Boulos **- P**
6. Claire Plotner **- P**
7. William Del Pilar **- P**
8. Susan Fajardo **- P**
9. Susan Janisch **- P**
10. LaVonne Norwood **- P**
11. Ashley Mellor **- P**
12. Jon Vick **- P**
13. Mary Gaines **- P**
14. James Garritson **- P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie **- P**

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

VC57+ CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith **- P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar **- P**
5. Jeana Boulos **- P**
6. Claire Plotner **- P**
7. William Del Pilar **- P**
8. Susan Fajardo **- P**
9. Susan Janisch **- P**
10. LaVonne Norwood **- P**
11. Ashley Mellor **- P**
12. Jon Vick **- P**
13. Mary Gaines **- P**
14. James Garritson **- P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie **- P**

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

VC67 CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith **- P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar **- P**
5. Jeana Boulos **- P**
6. Claire Plotner **- P**
7. William Del Pilar **- P**
8. Susan Fajardo **- P**
9. Susan Janisch **- P**
10. LaVonne Norwood **- P**
11. Ashley Mellor **- P**
12. Jon Vick **- P**
13. Mary Gaines **- P**
14. James Garritson **- P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie **- P**

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

WESTERN CG CSG VOTE

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 6, 2018
7:00 P.M.
31505 Old River Road
Bonsall, California

A. CALL TO ORDER - 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Morgan, Davis, Norris, Hatano, Faulk and McGiboney
Absent: Carullo-Miller

E. ACTION ITEMS: (Voting Items)

a. Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment – Champagne Gardens Alternatives is an opportunity to hear proposed use of area between I-15, Hwy. 395, Gopher Canyon Road and Deer Springs Road that was not included in the General Plan update. Davis commented that he opposed any use except possibly a park and ride lot. Norris commented that open "rogue" areas such as these are increasingly becoming illegal dumping areas, and questioned if there is a way to balance usage to maintain rural character. The plan dating back to 1999 and was a SPA allowed for heavy commercial use dependent on high level planning, permitting and EIR. The county is planning to change the classification of the area to SR-10 and allow some commercial use. Motion by Norris to accept the county staff recommendation to allow Sector 6 (3.5 acres) and Sector 8 (2.5 acres) out of the total 8 parcels to be reclassified as RC (rural commercial) on the understanding that

the use would be consistent with BCSG guidelines for construction. Faulk seconds motion, Norris, Faulk, McGiboney Voting Aye, Morgan, Davis, Hatano Voting Nay. Motion by Davis to accept County's Option B (environmentally superior map), second by Hatano, Davis, Morgan, Hatano voting Aye, Norris, Faulk, McGiboney voting Nay. Norris: no permits for land use give owners no incentive to maintain land and they become junk yards. Johnston: Development does force some open space through easement & maintenance, plus Rural Commercial is the most limited of commercial use. Norris reasserts motion second time for the staff recommendation, second by Faulk. Norris, Morgan, Faulk, McGiboney vote Aye, Davis and Hatano vote Nay. Motion passes 4-2.

EASTERN CG CSG VOTE

Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group

Covering the area bordered by Escondido, 1-15, Valley Center, & Circle R

Meeting location: The Hidden Meadows Community Center 28208 Meadow Glen Way West

Thursday, February 23, 2017

Minutes

1) CALL TO ORDER: Wayne Dauber, Chairman at 7:00 pm.

2) ROLL CALL: Cox, Coultas, Dauber, Caster, Rings, Birch, Chagala, Sealey. Excused absences-Cook.

b) Property Specific Requests (PSRs) General Plan Amendment & Rezone (GPA 12-005; REZ 14-006)-CSG Review of Two Analysis Areas in Hidden Meadows (NC3A and Sub-Areas 4 & 5 of Eastern Champagne Gardens). Chagala recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest with a nearby property. Kevin Johnston from the County of San Diego presented the proposed General Plan Amendment for the aforementioned area. The Specific Plan for this area expired in 2007 which designated limited agriculture and residential/commercial zoning. The Group was being asked to specifically consider areas 3, 4 and 5. Staff's recommendation was to zone the entire area SR-4, which would be compatible with property to the north included in Valley Center. Another option, preferred by the property owners, would zone the property SR-2, allowing for greater density. Sealey stated that he felt the SR-2 proposal was reasonable and not out of character with properties to the south, and he also felt SR-2 zoning along I-15 was appropriate. Caster indicated the SR-2 zoning in this area was not deemed compatible in his opinion with the SR-4 zoning to the north. Discussion ensued amongst the members. Sealey motioned to approve the SR-2 zoning proposal; seconded by Rings. Yes Votes-6; no votes-1 (Caster); and abstensions-1 (Chagala).

EASTERN CG CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith - **P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar - **P**
5. Jeana Boulos - **P**
6. Claire Plotner - **P**
7. William Del Pilar - **P**
8. Susan Fajardo - **P**
9. Susan Janisch - **P**
10. LaVonne Norwood - **P**
11. Ashley Mellor - **P**
12. Jon Vick - **P**
13. Mary Gaines - **P**
14. James Garritson - **P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie - **P**

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.

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

VC POLICY REVISION CPG VOTE

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**
2. **(Vacant)**
3. Oliver Smith - **P**
4. Dina Gharmalkar - **P**
5. Jeana Boulos - **P**
6. Claire Plotner - **P**
7. William Del Pilar - **P**
8. Susan Fajardo - **P**
9. Susan Janisch - **P**
10. LaVonne Norwood - **P**
11. Ashley Mellor - **P**
12. Jon Vick - **P**
13. Mary Gaines - **P**
14. James Garritson - **P**
15. Kathy MacKenzie - **P**

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