

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the March 12, 2012 Meeting

Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice Chair: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 13 March 2012

Approved: 9 April 2012

| 1. | | Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: | | | | | | | | 7:08 PM | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| A N D E R S O N | H U T C H I S O N | H O F L E R | G L A V I N I C | B R I T S C H | F R A N C K | Q U I N L E Y | V I C K | L E W I S | N J O O R H W O S O O D N | S M I T H | J A C K S O N | R U D O L F | D A V I S | B A C H M A N |
| P | P | P | P | A | P | P | P | A | P | P | P | P | A | P |

Notes: Lewis, Davis excused

Quorum Established: 12 present

Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2012

Motion: Move to approve Minutes of February 13, 2012, as corrected

Maker/Second: Quinley/Glavinic

Carries/Fails 12-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

3. Open Forum:

Smith asks VCCPG if an audience member may speak in open forum to address a property specific request presented to BOS [not permitted to speak at BOS]; or, should he be included in item 5.e.? Rudolf, noting that the request was not part of the list of requests already included and reviewed as item 5.e., suggests he speak in open forum rather than 5.e., which would allow the VCCPG to vote on his request at the April meeting. Glavinic doesn't mind if proponent speaks tonight during 5.e. discussion. A vote to allow the proponent to speak during 5.e fails, so proponent is permitted to speak during open forum:
Abe Boulos owns the property at 28582 Valley Center Rd. He relates the history of his ownership, including a failed percolation test in 2008 that required him to retest. The poor economy made it impossible to move forward in 2009. He revisited the project in 2011. However, the property was down-zoned from commercial to rural residential as part of the General Plan Update process. He met with County staff, who indicated they would work with the proponent. But, the staff said he must go before the VCCPG first. VCCPG denied his request to revert to a previous commercial designation. He Indicates his willingness to help the community and recounts some of the ways he has cooperated in the interests of the community. However, he doesn't think the community is now returning the favor. The proponent has met with both Rudolf and Vick on this issue. The proponent is a longtime resident. Questions about the address of the property ensue with the previous owner attesting that he had properly obtained the address presented. Proponent will return in April.

MOTION: Move to allow property specific request proponent, Abe Boulos, to speak in conjunction with agenda item 5.e.

MAKER/SECOND: Smith/Quinley

Carries/Fails 5-7-0 (Y-N-A):

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| A N D E R S O N | H U T C H I S O N | H O F L E R | G L A V I N I C | B R I T S C H | F R A N C K | Q U I N L E Y | V I C K | L E W I S | N J O O R H W O S O O D N | S M I T H | J A C K S O N | R U D O L F | D A V I S | B A C H M A N |
| N | N | N | Y | A | N | Y | Y | A | Y | Y | N | N | A | N |

| | |
|--|--|
| 4. | Discussion Items |
| 4.a. | <p>Report and discussion on Board of Supervisors Meeting on February 29, 2012. (Smith)</p> <p>Smith reports that he attended the BOS meeting on 29 February 2012, and suggests that those interested in the Red Tape Reduction Task Force report issue review the videotape of Patsy Fritz, a local resident, who made a distinguished presentation to the Board. Smith spoke to the BOS for VCCPG as well as for all the chairs of all the planning groups in the County. Smith reviews the time line of the Red Tape Reduction Task Force report review and approval since 7 December 2012. The BOS voted on items approved earlier at a 7 December 2011 meeting, but since retracted. The previously passed and withdrawn items were voted again and passed after minimal discussion. A vote on the remainder of the items was put off until 28 March 2012. The next opportunity for public input on those issues is 28 March 2011. Smith notes one complaint concerning the collective chairs' letter to BOS; it was resolved by removing the man's name from future versions of the document. Norwood-Johnson agrees that Patsy Fritz spoke eloquently. Glavinic says he spoke to the excessive red tape within the County at the meeting. He has concerns about the initial lack of information for projects being reviewed that hinder quick processing of projects. Quinley asks who will go to the next BOS meeting. Smith suggests that as many as can should attend and speak. He says he believes Horn and Roberts will adamantly opposed any changes to the original proposals. He says we should expect some changes. Quinley will act as focal point for VCCPG members who plan to speak, in order to coordinate topics.</p> |
| 4.b. | <p>Status update on Bates' Nut Farm traffic issues. (Smith)</p> <p>Smith spoke to County traffic engineer Buraly [sp] regarding the traffic issue discussed during the past several months. The engineer initially suggested retiming the traffic signal at Valley Center Rd. and Woods Valley Rd. to allow more egress from Woods Valley Rd. than would normally occur. He suggested there were other possible solutions that would relieve traffic pressure and that we should revisit the issue in August, nearer to problem dates. He noted that other events in Valley Center with traffic issues are generally operated by non-profit community organizations, not commercial operations. Smith met with Sherry Ness, Bates' manager, and she has been in contact with CERT regarding traffic control.</p> |
| 4.c. | <p>Discussion of March 28, 2012 Board of Supervisors Meeting (Smith, Quinley)</p> <p>Combined with item 4.a. above</p> |
| 5. | Action Items: |
| 5.a. | <p>Discussion and possible vote on equine ordinance and new potential environmental impacts arising from changes in the existing ordinance and the introduction of new tiered permitting of horse stables. (Smith)</p> |
| <p>Discussion: Continued to April meeting.</p> | |
| 5.b. | <p>Review and approval of Recommendations on "Countywide Single Family Residential Design Guidelines" (POD11-008); Ratify comments sent to DPLU by the General Plan Update [GPU] Subcommittee and the Design Review Board [DRB] (Rudolf)</p> |
| <p>Discussion: Rudolf reviews workshop process for design guidelines that resulted in a surprise result of requiring design guidelines for all single-family homes in the County. He notes that neither the DRB nor the GPU SC anticipated requiring the guidelines to be applied to any but conservation subdivisions. He recommends adoption of DRB residential guidelines by VCCPG. Glavinic expresses concern about the volume of material behind the proposal and getting it too late to review carefully. But, he agrees with GPU SC that the application of the guidelines by the County is too broad. He asks if conservation subdivisions are still supported within the County and by whom. Lael Montgomery, DRB, says the General Plan requires them and is supported by state law. Glavinic worries that any open space set aside in such developments would eventually be usurped for other development in the future. Vick adds his concern about eventual development. Rudolf responds that the General Plan governs such future development should it become possible. Smith adds that BOS reserves</p> | |

right to do as they see fit. Rudolf says that the open-space in such cases is typically owned by a homeowners' association [HOA]. If the HOA dissolves, the zoning status could change. Glavinic worries about risk of losing open space to development. Jackson says the discussion is off track, these are General Plan issues and not design guideline issues. Montgomery's concerns are how the recommendations document fits into the regulatory system. The guidelines shouldn't apply to single family homes or conventional subdivisions. A further issue is whether the guidelines should be mandatory or voluntary. She believes they should be mandatory. She then reviews the major themes of the recommendations. The guidelines should be applied appropriately within the categories of use, i.e. rural residential, semi-rural residential, village, etc. We shouldn't apply village guidelines to rural residential areas, for example.

Motion: Move to accept the report of the GPU SC and ratify the recommendations in the DRB Recommendations [appended below] to be included with the DPLU staff's report to the BOS on Residential Design Guidelines, which were sent to Marcus Lubich prior to the 2/25/2012 deadline for comments.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley

Carries/Fails 11-1-0 (Y-N-A): Voice; Glavinic dissents

5.c.

Discussion and possible vote on the Draft County of San Diego Climate Action Plan, Draft Guidelines for Determining Significance: Climate Change as well as the Draft Report Format and Content Requirements: Greenhouse Gas Analyses and Reporting. Public Comment period runs from February 17, 2012 to March 10, 2012 (Smith)

Discussion:

No discussion

5.d.

Discussion and possible vote on the Escondido General Plan Update, EIR, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan as those plans impact Valley Center. Comments have been submitted in advance of the meeting by the VCCPG Chair and will be subject to a ratification vote. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith addresses development along Valley Center Rd. [Valley Pkwy in Escondido] that will likely impact traffic on Valley Center grade. Another area along I-15 was designated for commercial development that seemed misplaced. Smith sent an email to the City of Escondido objecting to plans for those two areas. Rudolf clarifies some technicalities in the plan, and notes the fuzziness of the boundaries of areas in question. He describes an annexation proposal that may lead to further development of land along the Valley Center grade in what is now designated open space. Glavinic addresses Sager Ranch development and suggests it should be subjected to much higher traffic impact fees [TIF] than what are now required. Rudolf says TIF only applies in County. Glavinic says an equivalent fee should be applied by City of Escondido. Smith says Mirar de Valle would have to be improved to provide second exit. Rudolf says there is no proposal to annex north of Daley Ranch.

Motion: Move to Ratify comments sent previously by the chair, VCCPG, to County and include VCCPG's strenuous opposition to any proposed annexation by the City of Escondido east of Daley Ranch including anything east of Valley Center Road.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Hofler

Carries/Fails 12-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

5.e

Discussion and vote on Property Specific requests including comments on Special Study Area 3. These items were considered at the February 23rd meeting of the General Plan Update Subcommittee. (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf presents a review of property specific requests including the process history of some of the properties. He says all requests can be located on a map posted on the wall in the meeting room. Rudolf and Smith received two calls regarding particular requests, but no property owners attended the meeting of General Plan Update [GPU] SC on this topic and none are present tonight. Smith notes that he spoke to another property owner, advising him of opportunities to speak at this meeting and to other officials. The principal concern among requestors was downzoning to allow fewer dwellings per acre. However, no property owners are present to speak to this issue at this meeting. Rudolf reviews some history of the GPU process and why these requests would defeat the purpose and goals of the General Plan Update. Rudolf specifically

addresses Gaughan request but sees no reason to accept it. Glavinic voices his concerns about the process of downzoning. He also questions the development potential in Lilac Ranch considering a road is proposed through the property. Rudolf says that his best information is that it will not be developed. Smith addresses special study area 3a. Rudolf questions validity of allowing one property owner to up-end entire GPU process given the ramifications of avoiding spot zoning. Smith thinks this property might be addressed without causing a cascade of zoning changes. Rudolf defends recommendation by clarifying surrounding property designations that warrant the recommended designation.

Motion: Move to accept the recommendations as presented by the GPU SC [appended below]

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Hofler **Carries/Fails 11-1-0 (Y-N-A):** Voice Glavinic dissents

5.f. Approval of Vice Chair Quinley's expense statement of \$60 for post-office box rental in 2012. (Quinley)

Discussion: Smith notes a routine submission for expense reimbursement by Vice-Chair Quinley.

Motion: Move To approve expense statement submittal by Vice-Chair Quinley

Maker/Second: Hofler/Glavinic **Carries/Fails 12-0-0 (Y-N-A):** Voice

6. Subcommittee Reports & Business:

- a) Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
- b) GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
- e) Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, Chair.
- f) Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive
- g) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair. :
- h) Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive
- i) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair:
- j) Website – Robert Davis, Chair:
- k) Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
- l) I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- m) Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair

7. Correspondence Received for September 12, 2011 Agenda:

- a) DPLU to VCCPG, Statement of Economic Interest (FORM 700) for VCCPG members. (all)
- b) City of Escondido Planning Division to VCCPG, Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report assessing the Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update and Climate Action Plan Draft. The Draft EIR is Available at <http://www.escondido.org/general-plan-update.aspx>. Written comments must be received by February 27, 2012 at 5:00 PM directed to Jay Petrek, AICP, Principal Planner, City of Escondido Planning Division, 201 North Broadway, Escondido, CA 92024
- c) DPLU to VCCPG; County of San Diego, DPLU will be the lead agency and will prepare an EIR for POD 11-011, Tiered Equine Ordinance which proposes amendments to the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance for equine uses. It will implement a new tiered system of permitting for horse stables with both ministerial and discretionary tiers of permitting. (Smith)
- d) Tentative Agenda for March 9, 2012 meeting of the Traffic Advisory Committee. The meeting will begin at 9:00 AM in the Department of the Sheriff, Room 2, 9621 Ridgehaven Court in San Diego. (Note: there are no items of special concern to Valley Center on this agenda.
- e) Notice of Consideration of Award of Construction Contract for Asphalt Resurfacing and Culvert Replacement of various roads (Oracle Project 1016226). Road segments in Supervisor Horn's district (5) include Fallbrook Street from State Coach Lane to Main Avenue; Lago Lindo from Via De la Cumbre to Ave de Acacias; Via del la Valle from Paseo Delicias to Via de Santa Fe; 1st Street (DG Road) from Chica Rd to Huffstatler; Chica Rd (DG Road) from Rainbow Valley Blvd to 1st Street.

8. Motion to Adjourn: 8.57pm

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12-0-0 Voice

Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 9 April 2012

Appended materials:

Agenda Item 5.b.:

To: VCCPG

From: GPU Subcommittee

Re: Recommendation on Residential Design Guidelines

Date: March 12, 2012

Recommendation:

Accept this Report and Ratify the Recommendations in the Attached DRB Recommendations to be included with the DPLU staff's Report to the Board on Residential Design Guidelines, which were sent to Marcus Lubich prior to the 2/25/12 deadline for comments.

Discussion:

See Attachment 1 hereto, 2/17/12 VCDRB Recommendations. The subcommittee recommends you Ratify its approval of all the DRB recommendations (vote: 5-0-0) All members were present except Dave Anderson, Hans Britsch, Bob Davis and Dennis Sullivan.

The planning group received the DPLU request for comments too late for our 2/13/12 meeting, and subcommittee input before the 2/25/12 deadline. The VCCPG was informed at the 2/13/12 meeting that the GPU Subcommittee would meet jointly with the DRB, and send its recommended comments to DPLU, subject to VCCPG ratification tonight. Any changes made tonight will be immediately reported to staff.

We recommended the entire DRB remarks because we fully participated in their discussion, they included our concerns, and we could not say it any better than they did.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Rudolf

Chairperson

GPU Subcommittee

Attachment 1

Valley Center Design Review Board

February 17, 2012

TO: Eric Gibson, Devon Muto, Joseph Farace, and Marcus Lubich
Department of Planning and Land Use, San Diego County

RE: **Comments: “Single Family Residential Design Guidelines”**

The VC Design Review Board met on February 14, 2012 jointly with the VC Planning Group GPU Subcommittee to discuss these design guidelines in detail. This letter has been prepared by the DRB Chair from the meeting notes and reviewed and approved by the members.

Below are our comments and suggestions for revisions which we believe will connect this document more directly with the GP Goals and Policies that it is supposed to implement, and will make the document more acceptable both to the building industry and to communities where “conservation subdivisions” will be built.

This document implements the new General Plan’s Conservation Subdivision Program. **While the GP refers to design and several ordinances cover use issues, *this is the only document that explains how to design a conservation subdivision***

Our suggestions pertain both to APPLICATION and CONTENT. These guidelines should align succinctly with the GP, County Ordinances and other planning documents so that use regulations for clustered housing are linked to conservation design. Design guidelines should also implement the GP premise that Villages, Semi-Rural areas and Rural Lands should be developed differently.

Application Issues:

- 1) The document should be re-titled “Design Guidelines for Conservation Subdivisions”. It must be used to review conservation subdivisions and must not be used in the review of conventional residential subdivisions or single lot projects.
- 2) It is misleading (and confusing) to present these guidelines as voluntary design ideas for any residential project when these design approaches are required collectively to compose a “conservation subdivision” and many of them are superfluous to conventional subdivisions and single-lot projects.
 - a) In SR-10 and Rural Areas the use regulations mandate Conservation Subdivisions, conservation design approaches are required.
 - b) In other Semi-Rural and in Village areas, the GP allows either a conventional layout or the option of a clustered “conservation subdivision” Again, the clustered option requires a conservation design – doesn’t it?
- 3) We agree that micro design ideas about lot-design, structure orientation and architectural form, for instance, can be cherry-picked and used individually in conventional subdivisions and single-lot projects. However, this document can be distributed as a reference without implying in the text that these ideas are preferred for all projects.

- 4) Comprehensive design direction is essential for clustered projects but adds a layer of confusion to the review process for conventional subdivisions and single lot projects.

Content Issues:

1. Design Guidelines for Conservation Subdivisions should recognize, explain and illustrate that different CONTEXTS require different FORMS. The current draft presupposes that one-form-fits-all-contexts, exactly the idea we are trying to escape.
2. The whole point of design guidelines for Conservation Subdivisions is to produce new development that fits into its context. Design approaches that create a Rural feel are different from design approaches that create Semi-Rural or Village areas. Each of these areas is characterized by different FORMS.
 - a. Diversity and irregularity (of topography, development pattern, lot size and shape, structure location and arrangement, setbacks, housing type, architectural form and everything else) are hallmarks of unincorporated communities.
 - b. Uniformity and regularity that characterize conventional mass-production building techniques will destroy San Diego County's small towns faster than most people can imagine.
 - c. If San Diego County's Conservation Subdivision Program is to be successful in its protection of community character, the design guidelines that implement the program must be explicit in favoring diversity over sameness and irregularity of natural forms over "cookie cutter" geometry.
 - d. It is not enough to say "look around and emulate what you see." The document needs to explain and illustrate what the developers understand least: the concept of irregular pattern.
3. This document should apply to all Conservation Subdivisions.
 - a. It should discuss and illustrate more explicitly that design approaches vary significantly across RURAL, SEMI-RURAL and VILLAGE forms.
 - b. For example, rural and rural adjacent semi-rural design approaches should vary and mix lot sizes and shapes, use organic not geometric forms, and locate clusters according to the natural topography.
 - c. Rural lots should NOT line-up like teeth in rows on both sides of straight roads. Urban forms destroy rural landscapes.
 - d. Semi-Rural areas are in-between RURAL and VILLAGE areas. Design in these areas should lean toward the adjacent form.
 - e. Rural Village design can incorporate more linearity and geometry with irregular natural forms. The idea is to enhance what we have, not to obliterate it and impose a faux model.
 - f. Extremely helpful would be to add info about how to handle additional elements of design (streets, pathways, vegetation/landscaping) in a way that contributes to a RURAL FORM. (Urban approaches, eg curbs, gutters, wide straight streets and so forth, destroy country settings.)

Review Issues:

1. "Design" is a complex subject that speaks to the integration, hopefully the successful integration, of many different elements. Good design is critical to the success of these projects, so critical that the County needs staff with design credentials to review these projects against a set of criteria that designers are trained to recognize and understand.
2. There are a lot of reasons to prefer flexibility over rigid standards. However, it is only possible to be "flexible" AND to create a "good design" if a reviewer knows the rules of good design well enough to bend them when bending creates a better project. Reviewers without design training and experience are stuck with rigid applications because they don't have the knowledge or experience to do otherwise.
3. Reviewers who are trained and experienced designers will MAKE THE ENTIRE PROCESS FASTER, AND A BETTER PRODUCT WILL COME OUT OF IT.

UNDERLYING RATIONALE

There is a paradigmatic difference between the regulation of LAND USES achieved through conventional planning ordinances and the regulation of FORM/DESIGN. Planning (as a discipline and a practice) seems to be straddling the conventional zoning-code approach which regulates USE and the "form-based" approach which guides FORM.

Our new GP is a good example of straddling these two approaches. The GP categorizes land by different contexts or "Regional Categories" and envisions a distinctly different form of development for each context -- VILLAGE, SEMI-RURAL or RURAL. In other words the FORM varies by context.

The new GP also introduces the CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION. This concept fuses USE and FORM because a "conservation subdivision" is defined by particular design criteria AND it is also governed by the use regulations. Most pertinently, conservation design is mandatory for a "conservation subdivision" no matter if the use is mandatory (as in designations SR-10 and R) or voluntary (as in Village and Semi-Rural-1, 2 & 4 designations).

Sincerely,



Lael Montgomery, Chair
Robson Splane, Vice Chair/Secretary
Jeffrey Herr
Susan Moore
Keith Robertson

Agenda Item 5.e.:

To: VCCPG

From: GPU Subcommittee

Re: Recommendations on Property-Specific post-GPU Referrals

Date: March 12, 2012

Recommendation:

Accept this Report and Recommend the Attached Chart and Recommendations be included with the DPLU staff's Report to the Board for May 2012, and forward them to Devon Muto ASAP.

Discussion:

See Attachment 1 hereto, 3/12/12 GPU Subcommittee Property-Specific Recommendations (vote: 7-0-0, except as noted below). The subcommittee recommends you recommend no changes from those you approved and sent to DPLU staff for inclusion in the new general Plan, on 1/31/2011. All members were present except Dave Anderson and Brian Bachman.

PREVIOUS ITEMS:

The subcommittee recommends that the Planning Group reaffirm its previous votes on all items 6 through 66 shown in the column "1/11 VCCPG and GPU Rec," because of topography, fire danger level, remoteness from public roads, consistency with surrounding agricultural uses and with "Smart Growth" principles that growth be concentrated not in green fields but on infill Village development. The GPU Planning Principle of "feathering" justifies SR4 or greater for all of these properties. Feathering density from a concentrated Village core (and established village services and amenities such as sewers, road networks, schools to Semi-Rural and Rural areas adheres to the Board's direction at the beginning of the GPU process that GP updating follow these principles of "Smart Growth". To increase green field development now with a publicly financed Amendment to the new General Plan that was approved only a few months ago and as an after-thought to this entire 12-year process appears a "bait & switch" strategy directed by and for the benefit of a few development interests at the expense of Valley Center's future.

On items 6 and 7 we continue to recommend RL20 because of the VCCPG's previous votes; with the same problems: almost entirely steep slopes, entirely PAMA and extreme fire risk, unique farmland, and high-medium habit value. One reason to consider possible higher density, being close to the higher density of proposed Rancho Lilac, is no longer viable, since those 902 acres have been recently purchased by CALTRANS as a Mitigation

Bank Preserve, and will never be developed. These parcels were part of the Rancho Lilac SPA in the old GP.

Item 51 was separately called out by the Board (See Attachment 2, Board Actions, item 4.24). Staff is requested to review the existing RL20 designation “to identify a moderate solution such as SR4.” The rationale provided to the Board by staff when the staff categorized the potential change as “Moderate” precludes any such modification. The 16-acre parcel is in the extreme north central portion of VC, not far from the Pala Reservation. It is surrounded by RL20 lands of 5 to more than 30 acres. It is separated from an SR4 area (ranging from under 2 to up to 20-acres) by at least one other parcel, and has very limited access. The parcel is entirely steep slope greater than 25%, and entirely Unique Farmland. Staff opined that an additional 131 acres would have to be changed from RL20 to SR4 to accommodate the request. The parcel was designated 1/10 in the old GP, a yield of 1 house, the same as the new GP. Aside from being inconsistent with the Guiding Principles, redesignation to SR4 would require additional environmental analysis beyond that done for the GPU.

On items 6, 7, 9, 11, 20-A and-B, 51, 54, 60, 61, and 66 in the western agricultural area, we recommend the same designations shown on the new General Plan, just adopted in August 2011.

The Board referral to staff and us speaks of “Study Areas.” Essentially, all the parcels designated SR4 in the West Lilac area within and around the Accretive PAA (including items 6, 7, 9, 11, 20-A and-B, 51, 54, 60, 61, and 66) are again being (informally) called a study area, as previously formally requested by Accretive, and rejected by the Board in its final approval of the GPU in August. The subcommittee continues to believe the SR4 or greater designation is THE appropriate designation, based on the GPU Guiding Principles. Our recommendations (All West Side SR4 “Study Area”) would prevent huge, inappropriate, “spot” designations, and be more consistent with topography, and surrounding uses, including agriculture. Additionally, since the Board modified Board Policy I-63 as part of the GPU package, Accretive’s PAA appears to be irrelevant, and will need a new General Plan Amendment in any event. If that General Plan Amendment ultimately comes forward, and is approved, the entire West Lilac area will have to be re-analyzed for appropriate designations. Until and unless that occurs, there appears to be no reason to re-evaluate the designations so recently approved by the Board. (The vote was 6-0-1, with member Britsch abstaining from all votes relating to the West Lilac area, because of the proximity of his home and cactus farm to the Accretive PAA.) Staff estimates approval of the entire “Study Area” would be approximately 2500 acres, adding 7500 population.

On items 57, 63, and 64, the subcommittee recommends the designations shown on ALL

previous maps (Referral, Draft Land Use, and the approved GPU) for each item, SR4. Items 63 and 64 are not shown on the GPU Report to the VCCPG for 1/31/11, but were reported on verbally as late items, and voted on by the VCCPG to be SR4.

Item 57 (Schimpf) is one 21.7-acre parcel adjacent to the Live Oak Ranch SPA, on the east side of Cobb Lane. Item 63 (Caston) is one 6.7-acre parcel, north of the SPA and north of VC Road (almost across the road from #57). Item 64 (Tuluie) consists of 4 parcels totaling 250 acres, west of the SPA.

Item 57 consists of mostly high Habitation Value, high Fire Severity, and about ¼ each Unique farmland and Farmland of Local Importance. It was slope-dependant 1/ 2,4 in the old GP, analyzed and approved at SR4. Staff says accommodating the request would require changing 437 additional surrounding acres, as well as require additional environmental review. The 6.7-acre item 63 (originally asked for SR1, classified a “Major” change by staff, now asking SR2, classified ‘Moderate’) is surrounded by lots ranging from 3 to 20 acres, mostly greater than 2-acres; is entirely High Severity Fire Hazard, and almost all High Habitat Value. Staff information does not specify the number of additional acres that would be required to also be reclassified if this parcel were changed, but it appears to be roughly 300 acres. The change would also eliminate the feathering required by the Community Development Model between SR4 and adjacent easterly RL20. Item 64, although also categorized as “Moderate” is about 2/3 Farmland of Local Importance, 1/3 Unique Farmland, 2/3 High Habitation Value, 2/3 High Severity Fire Hazard, about 1/3 Steep Slope Greater than 25%, and about 1/3 Wetlands and/or in the 100-year Floodplain. These 250 acres were designated 1/ 2,4 slope dependant in the old GP, analyzed and approved at SR4 for the GPU. Staff estimates approval would require redesignation of 470 additional acres to protect General Plan Consistency, as well as additional environmental analysis.

These 3 items collectively result in another “Study Area” (Central/East VC Road ‘Study Area’ on Attachment 1). Together they would require changing an additional approximately 1150 acres (besides the 278.4 for the parcels alone) from SR4 to SR2, adding approximately 4300 population.

NEW ITEM

Item 67 (Gaughan) was added on the last day of the Board Workshop, after Mr. Gaughan obtained a letter from us stating the community liked the landscaping he has accomplished on the former yard site, without addressing his dispute with staff over the land use designation (SR2 instead of I-2, Limited Industrial under the old GP). However, the 2.1-acre parcel was treated similarly to Items 52 and 53, on which the VCCPG voted to accept the county’s compromise with all the parcels in the floodway and floodplain formerly designated Industrial. That is, honor the FEMA Mapping and prohibit any development in

the Floodway unless it obtains a “No Rise Certificate” from the county, unless and until the FEMA mapping changes.

County data shows items 52, 53 and 67 all entirely within the Floodway. The GPU subcommittee recommends no position on Item 67 (we don’t have a dog in this fight). However, the subcommittee recommends that the VCCPG strongly request that the staff look into allowing Solar Farms (allowed in ANY zone with either a Major or Minor Use Permit) in the former Industrial areas. These parcels are very appropriate for such a use (essentially appearing industrial), and are much closer to the SDG & E substation than any of the sites currently being considered by Solar Farm Applicants.

CONCLUSION

The Planning Group should recommend no changes to the Land Use Designations approved by the Board when it adopted the new General Plan. They were crafted over 13 years of negotiations between landowners, the community and staff, honoring the Board’s Guiding Principles for the General Plan countywide within Valley Center. The population “target” for Valley Center’s share of anticipated growth over the life of the new General Plan was 33,000 people. Under the new General Plan, at build out we will have 36,000. Approval of a publicly sponsored GP Amendment as a means to approve the hand full of Property-Specific Requests discussed herein also requires doubling the development potential of approximately 6000 acres on the rural west side and the central valley – because California law prohibits “spot zoning” these properties at higher density than the properties around them. The scheme to make the upzone legal by increasing the density of surrounding green field properties would result in the addition of almost 12,000 to VC’s 2030 population To add another 30% now will destroy the balance we have crafted in dozens and dozens of community meetings during the last 12 years to plan not only land uses but the entire public road network that reflects and supports those land uses.

The new General Plan for 2030 already allows thousands more rooftops than SANDAG is forecasting, particularly in Semi-Rural and Rural areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Rudolf

Chairperson

GPU Subcommittee

Attachment 1

| ID | Owner | Old GP | Referral Map | New GP | Request | 1/11 VCCPG and GPU Rec | |
|-----|---|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-------------------------|--|
| 6&7 | Lynch | 21 SPA | SR2 | SR4 | SR2 | RL20 | |
| 9 | Jackson | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR2 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 11 | Pardee | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR2 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4/SR10 | |
| 20A | Fahr | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR2 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 20B | Crane | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR2 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 54 | Wollam | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 60 | Rahimi | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4/10 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4/SR10 | |
| 61 | Blair | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 66 | Guzman | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 57 | Schimpf | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 63 | Caston | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2(1) | SR4 | |
| 64 | Tuluie | (17) 1/ 2.4 | SR4 | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |
| 51 | Rice | GenAg 1/10 | RL20 | RL20 | SR4 | RL20 | |
| 67 | Gaughan | Lim Imp Indus | SR2 | SR2 | I-2 | SR2 Solar? | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | All West Side SR4 "Study Area" | | | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 SR4/SR10 RL20 | |

| ID | Owner | Old GP | Referral Map | New GP | Request | 1/11 VCCPG and GPU Rec | |
|----|---------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------|---------|------------------------|--|
| | All Central/ East VC Road | | | SR4 | SR2 | SR4 | |

Attachment 2

4.31

ACTION:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Cox, seconded by Supervisor Jacob, the Board of Supervisors formally referred to the Chief Administrative Officer all actions previously approved by the Board of Supervisors as tentative during the General Plan Update Property Specific Requests Workshop (Actions 4.1-4.21, 4.24-4.30), excluding those properties within the West Lilac Study area, and return to the Board with a work plan.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

4.32

ACTION:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Cox, seconded by Supervisor Jacob, the Board of Supervisors formally referred to the Chief Administrative Officer all actions previously approved by the Board of Supervisors as tentative during the General Plan Update Property Specific Requests Workshop (Action 4.23), regarding the properties within the West Lilac Study area and return to the Board with a work plan.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Roberts

ABSENT: Slater-Price

RECUSE: Horn

4.23

ACTION – VC7, VC9, VC11, VC20A, VC20B, VC54, VC60, VC61, and VC66:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the Board of Supervisors tentatively directed the Chief Administrative Officer to review the proposed land use designation for Property Specific Requests VC11, VC20A, VC20B, VC54 and other related parcels in the Valley Center West Lilac study area, including VC7, VC9, VC60, VC61 and VC66, to determine if the request can be modified to be categorized as a moderate request and to determine if the designations can be changed from SR4 to SR2.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

4.24

ACTION – VC51:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Slater-Price, the Board of Supervisors tentatively directed the Chief Administrative Officer to review the proposed land use designation for Property Specific Request VC51 in the Valley Center area to identify a moderate solution such as SR4.

AYES: Cox, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

NOES: Jacob

4.25

ACTION – VC57 and VC63:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Roberts, the Board of Supervisors tentatively directed the Chief Administrative Officer to review the proposed land use designations for Property Specific Requests VC57 in the Valley Center area and other parcels in the same study area, including VC63, to determine if the land use designations can be changed from SR4 to SR2.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

4.26 ACTION – VC64:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the Board of Supervisors tentatively directed the Chief Administrative Officer to review the proposed land use designation for Property Specific Request VC64 in the Valley Center area and other parcels in the same study area.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn

4.27 ACTION:

ON MOTION of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Jacob, the Board of Supervisors tentatively directed the Chief Administrative Officer to review the proposed land use designation for the property described by Jerry Gaughan located on Cole Grade Road in the Valley Center area and include adjacent parcels.

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater-Price, Roberts, Horn