

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes of the December 10, 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 DPDS=Department of Planning & Development Services 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: 10 January 2013

Approved: 14 January 2013

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	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 15 present

Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the Minutes of November 19, 2012 as corrected

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Rudolf

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-2 Glavinic & Norwood-Johnson abstain [not present at that meeting]

3. Open Forum:

None

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

4.a.

Discussion and vote following a presentation by Michael Jabro on a public convenience or necessity, type 21—off sale general liquor license—to be located at 28960 Lilac Road, Unit 1. In addition to alcohol sales, the project will offer 10,000 square feet of grocery and supermarket foods comparable to Vons or Major Market. (Vick)

Discussion: Vick explains the application and presents a letter that was submitted to the County's Department of Planning and Development Services [PDS]. He notes that the project is a family project indicating that Michael and Martin Jabro signed the County's forms. Ikhlas Jabro, San Marcos, owns the subject property, while Tom Jabro owns Harvest Farms next door. Vick notes PDS says there are five other liquor stores in Valley Center. This application represents the sixth liquor license request within Valley Center. Approval of this application would result in two stores selling liquor within 200 feet of each other [the other being the established liquor store in Harvest Farms]. PDS wants an opinion on this application from VCCPG. Jackson asks if supermarket/liquor license is approved. Michael Jabro explains the process of applying for license. Martin Jabro has been operating supermarket/liquor stores for years at other locations. Michael recounts logic of building supermarket and having a combined liquor outlet in Valley Center. He says their experience with handling liquor sales will overcome objections to having so many liquor stores in Valley Center. Martin Jabro cites a civic proclamation presented to them for effectively dealing with alcohol sales to minors in their San Diego store. Michael Jabro cites a requirement for liquor sales to be a necessity or convenience to get a license from the County. He cites the possibility of hiring as many as 25 new employees from Valley Center. Earl Brown, audience, speaks in favor of the proposed new liquor store/supermarket where it will be convenient "to buy liquor on the west side of Valley Center". Pamela Postuma, representing The Eagles Nest restaurant at Harvest Farms, speaks in support of the license request. LaVonne Norwood-Johnson speaks to the character of the applicant and supports the request. Carlos Gonzalez, neighbor to the store, speaks in support of the proposed supermarket's convenience [lives across the street]. Vick notes the request isn't for the supermarket but for a liquor license for the supermarket. Gonzalez

says he supports the liquor license as well. Glavinic asks about the number of licenses in Valley Center and wonders what criteria are used to determine how many may be reasonable. Hofler clarifies the basis for allowing five stores presently rather than only three [based on population size]. Glavinic questions why the Jabro's family license at Harvest Farms isn't moved to the new store next door. Michael Jabro clarifies the requirement for two licenses [two different owners, two different clienteles, & convenience of buying liquor as part of grocery shopping]. Davis wonders why anyone would not include wine and liquor in a supermarket. He supports employment and anything that will aid survival of the market. Martin Jabro says 95% of sales are expected to be groceries. Franck asks if all types of alcohol will be available. Martin Jabro says yes: wine, beer and spirits. Rudolf says the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control [ABC] issues the license being requested. He asks what the criteria are for objecting to new license requests. Vick says the County planner will seek the opinion of the County Sheriff on the advisability of approving this request. Michael Jabro says the application will not be posted on-site until the application progresses further. Smith wonders about the advisability of having another licensed liquor outlet in Valley Center. Michael Jabro responds that it shouldn't be a problem. Smith recalls historical issues with Harvest Farms.

Motion: Move that the VCCPG recommend approval of the liquor license for the sale of wine, beer and spirits in the 10,000 square foot supermarket under construction at Harvest Farms, 28960 Lilac Road, subject to compliance with California ABC and San Diego County Department of Planning and Development Services [PSD] requirements and the Sheriff's recommendation to the San Diego County PSD.

Maker/Second: Vick/Franck **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 14-0-1 Voice

Notes: Norwood-Johnson recuses because she owns an interest in a neighboring residential property

4.b.

Report, discussion and vote on the Harrah's Rincon Casino Expansion's Final Environmental Evaluation (FEE) per a request from the County for input on the FEE before County's negotiation with Rincon. (Glavinic)

Discussion: Smith explains that information was not available to the public in a timely fashion so it is a potential Brown Act violation. So we may not discuss at this meeting. Smith asks if he should use his authority to send a letter to the County addressing this issue that would be ratified, or not, at the next meeting. Glavinic questions the procedure regarding the distributing information to public. Rudolf clarifies requirements for Brown Act compliance. Smith will send a letter for later ratification.

4.c.

Discussion and possible vote following a presentation by Gary Piro requesting a Road Standard Modification at 11920 Betsworth Road. Project number TN 5001, Map 14704. Requestors are Robert and Rose M. Polito, telephone 760-744-3700. Request is for a reduction in the design standard for Betsworth Road, a Residential Collector from which none of the lots fronting Betsworth take access to a minimum of 25 foot paved width and reduced Parkway width to a minimum of 5 feet except between Stations 27+30 to 27+70 which will have a minimum of 3 feet wide Parkway including the existing drainage facilities. Betsworth Road no longer connects to Hidden Meadows. (Davis)

Discussion: Davis introduces the project. He explains the history of project briefly. He cites the Mobility SC's unanimous support for the modification requested. He introduces Gary Piro, President, Piro Engineering, who presents the project and the request by the County to get VCCPG support for the project request. Davis and Piro explain the basic request. The request is for a reduced road dedication requirement that will result in a minimum 28-foot roadway. This request provides for a 5-foot path at the road edge. Hofler asks about which utilities would remain aerial [telephone]. Rudolf clarifies that the project will retain the minimum County standard for the roadway. Davis explains the reasoning behind the reduced standard request, citing topographic challenges for a wider roadway on the side of the subject property. Glavinic cites possible future connection of Betsworth Road to Cougar Pass Road, but sees no problem with this request. Bachman asks about signage relating to the twisting character of the road in that area. Piro clarifies the sign issue and says the applicant will install signs alerting motorists to the dangerous curve ahead.

Motion: Move to follow Mobility SC recommendation and support modification of road improvement condition made by the County; to require signage at east end of improvement citing dangerous curve ahead when west-bound; and, to recommend that applicant should not be required to underground phone utilities along Betsworth Road.

Maker/Second: Davis/Hutchison **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 15-0-0 Voice

<p>4.d.</p>	<p>Discussion and vote on proposal to create a Joint Powers Authority (or Agreement) for transportation/ road issues. After discussion a motion might direct Bob Davis to get more complete information about the validity of such an agreement as a solution for Valley Center's circulation agreement. (Davis)</p>
<p>Discussion: Davis presents. He notes the changes in relationships with the surrounding tribes and a recent presentation by the County on joint projects. He says we need more investigation to determine the best method for achieving transportation goals. He recommends asking the County if they support the notion of a Joint Powers Agreement [JPA]. Smith says the County is working on a Memorandum of Understanding [MOU] with tribes to use money from federal or state sources to which they have access for seed money for larger projects. This would be a way for Valley Center to raise money for road projects. Hutchison notes the potential loss of Valley Center influence over local transportation funds if they are consolidated in a JPA. Norwood-Johnson asks if this consolidation is the same as one Glavinic was proposing [similar]. Davis says such a JPA would be for large-scale projects that couldn't be reasonably funded under the current financing regime. Rudolf speaks to the distinctions between a JPA and other means of funding joint projects. Davis acknowledges there are multiple avenues for sharing funds for joint projects. He cites the need for clarification. Rudolf questions who in VCCPG should be researching this funding. Davis agrees there is overlap of function. Rudolf suggests Smith should determine where issue should reside. Glavinic tries to clarify the JPA issue as still not being finalized. He suggests more research to determine what is possible and how it may work. Smith suggests in January we try to find a way to be included in this conversation on this JPA or other transportation funding issues. Smith will talk to Supervisor Horn's office and other County department heads to learn the direction of this issue. Jim Quisquis, audience, says JPA issue started at Tribal Liaison SC when Bo Mazzetti, Rincon Tribal Chairman, brought up the possibility of a JPA and he clarifies that a JPA cannot be entered into by the Planning Group. Davis cites community interests that overlap between Valley Center and the tribes. He asks if we should invite tribes to be a part of other existing SCs rather than just Tribal Liaison SC. Quisquis says Tribal Liaison SC is a catalyst for moving in that direction. It is becoming more acceptable by the tribes to use that SC. He says history has been standing in the way of tribal participation. He adds that tribes have never felt they had a sincere invitation to participate. Quisquis then devolves into an analysis of a proposed Escondido annexation. He says improvements in the Tribal Liaison SC have occurred in the past couple of years. Glavinic says we need to participate in these issues and we need to figure out ways to work together. Tom Bumgardener, audience, says this is a regional issue and that the County is disinterested in this region. He recounts his perception of the process.</p>	
<p>4.e.</p>	<p>Discussion and vote on motion to join the Boulevard Planning Group in opposing the proposed Wind Energy Ordinance and Plan Amendment POD10-007. The Wind Energy Ordinance would alter the Boulevard Community Plan to allow for commercial and industrial energy generation and transmission zones with dense concentration of wind and solar transmission projects in rural and semi-rural areas with no infrastructure, high fire risk and sensitive resources. (Rudolf) See: www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/ceqa/POD10007.html</p>
<p>Discussion: Rudolf presents. Says Valley Center Design Review Board [VCDRB] is sending a letter that is similar to one proposed by Rudolf. Boulevard will be test case. Glavinic says we should rethink locating power generation locally in order to assure electricity availability. Norwood-Johnson questions the need to set aside tough rules governing such wind electric systems. Smith tries to clarify.</p>	
<p>Motion: Move to support Boulevard Planning Group and send letter, as drafted, to oppose the proposed Wind Energy Ordinance and Plan Amendment POD 10-007.</p>	
<p>Maker/Second: Rudolf/Jackson</p>	<p>Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] 13-1-0 Voice; Glavinic dissents.</p>
<p>Notes: Quinley departs 8.40 pm</p>	

4.f.

Discussion and possible vote following update presentation by Jim Whalen on the Escondido General Plan Update, EIR, Downtown Specific Plan Update and Climate Action Plan as those impact Valley Center. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith introduces Jim Whalen, J. Whalen associates, Inc., who presents. Whalen's PowerPoint presentation was presented to County staff and Escondido City Council previously. The focus of the presentation is a proposed annexation area east of Daley Ranch, south of VC planning area and extending east of Valley Center Rd. The proposal consolidates development rights from surrounding parcels on three other parcels within the proposed annexation. Most of the annexation area is within the Escondido sphere of influence and all undeveloped parcels will be put into a conservation easement. Rudolf clarifies and amplifies that the proposed development rights within the consolidation would be strictly limited. Project underway since 1980s. The City of Escondido is not asking for a County up-zone of density, it will use 1 dwelling unit [du] per 4 acres. The City of Escondido owns several parcels within the annexation area. Escondido presently pays taxes to the County, even though they own the land. The Sager Ranch Project would have 100 du as a result of the consolidation of development rights from the other city-owned parcels according to the existing Specific Plan. The second development project, the Von Seggern Project, 80 du, plans to have access to Valley Center Road from Hicks Grade Rd. [presently a dirt trail but apparently a dedicated road]. Whalen says this project is consistent with the new County General Plan. He cites issues that need to be addressed. Davis questions interruptions to flow of Valley Center Rd. from Hicks Grade Rd. Smith asks about the need to widen Valley Center Rd. near Lake Wohlford Rd. Whalen says that improvement is presently not a part of this annexation. Whalen reviews issues associated with annexation. He says the County is anxious not to accommodate Guejito Ranch access from the east to Valley Center Road. Whalen reviews project processing of properties. He says Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife will review the project. He says it is likely there will be a specific plan for all parcels, including open space parcels. He reviews the density transfer among the properties involved. He reviews the fiscal 'benefits'. Norwood-Johnson asks about schools. Whalen replies that schools will be in the Escondido school districts. Rudolf asks about the entire canyon being part of the Multiple Species Conservation Program [MSCP] and Pre-approved Mitigation Area [PAMA]. Whalen clarifies and says this plan is consistent with PAMA. Rudolf asks about project access from Hicks Grade Rd. near where water and sewer will enter for the identified development projects, and development rights of surrounding properties. Hofler expresses concerns about narrow wildlife corridor from Daley Ranch through the annexation area to the east. Whalen says the wildlife corridor is already built under Valley Center Rd. Hofler persists with concern about narrowness of the corridor. Whalen says this is both a corridor and a preserve of over 2000 acres. Franck asks if there will be less than 200 houses on 2000 acres. Yes. Davis says Escondido doesn't care about Valley Center traffic issues, which this proposal would exacerbate. He says that the major intersection mid-grade on Valley Center Rd. will be a major problem. He cites the Bates Nut Farm traffic issues. Such an intersection would be a huge inconvenience for those traveling to Valley Center from Escondido. He then cites the narrowness of the wildlife corridor between Daley Ranch and Guejito Ranch, and says the proposed development area would choke the corridor. Jim Quisquis, audience, asks about Bureau of Land Management [BLM] lands within the annexation area and suggests that if BLM parcels are restored to an indian tribe and put in trust, it will make an unwieldy development. Whalen counters that Escondido has no control over BLM and those parcels would not have access. Quisquis asks about the cultural resources study. Whalen says there is no study yet. Vick supports the concern expressed by Davis regarding the proposal to install a traffic light at a new intersection on Valley Center Road grade. Glavinic questions the wisdom of the development in area because of wildfire history. He says the project provides no access for evacuation, and exacerbates existing egress problems. He also supports the serious concerns about a new traffic light on Valley Center Road grade. He says we need other emergency access. He fears that a conservancy would fail to manage fuel and would add to fire danger. He would oppose annexation based on fire liability. Whalen says fire liability, cultural resources, and traffic are major issues. He says the next step is to report to the City of Escondido and then return to Valley Center. Whalen asks why Escondido hasn't widened Valley Parkway between Bevin and a point north of Lake Wohlford Rd. Hofler, Smith and Rudolf explain the hold-up for such

widening, and expand on the nature of the problem. Whalen says this project may help speed widening of Valley Pkwy. Davis explains mechanics of problem of adding traffic light.

4.g.

Following the announcement of a vacancy in the I-15 Design Review Board [DRB] and the provision of appropriate information about the position and about the VCCPG to candidates, the Nominations sub-Committee chair Hans Britsch will introduce candidates for the position and invite each to speak. The Planning Group will elect/recommend a candidate to fill the vacancy at its January meeting. (Britsch)

Discussion: Smith turns presentation over to Britsch. Britsch Introduces Dorothy Kennedy, resident of Valley Center. She gives a brief biography and expresses her interest in the I-15 design group. She cites safety issues and an article in VC magazine that sparked her interest. Smith reviews the function of the I-15 DRB as being concerned with the viewshed of I-15, rather than the more comprehensive objectives of the Valley Center Design Review Board [VCDRB]. Vick asks the applicant to describe the function of the I-15 DRB. Kennedy says it is what is seen from the freeway. She cites the Lilac Hills Ranch project as an issue. Rudolf asks if she is a member of another board or organization and familiar with the VCDRB guidelines. She is not a member of another board. She is not familiar with the VCDRB guidelines. Glavinic asks if she has any background with biological issues. She cites limited experience with plants. Norwood-Johnson asks about her place of residence [Valley Center]. Hofler says she knows both candidates and both are wonderful. Britsch notes that most of VCCPG members had little experience at start of their tenure. The next candidate, Andrea Bower, is introduced. Bower has lived along I-15 for many years and presently lives at junction of Bonsall and Valley Center planning areas east of I-15. Says she is familiar with the area. Lewis asks about the time commitment needed for the job. She didn't understand the question on the application form. She is employed full-time and may have an issue if meetings are held weekdays before her workday ends. Rudolf asks about the time and the need to extend the meeting to finish agenda. Vick asks Bower if she is familiar with VCDRB guidelines. No, she is not. Glavinic asks about her biological experience. Bower says, not much. Glavinic asks if she has view of I-15 from her property. Yes, she does. Norwood-Johnson asks why she wants the position. Bower says she wants to help the community. Smith clarifies the procedure: introductions tonight, and voting next month.

Motion: Move to extend meeting by 15 minutes to accommodate final items on agenda

Maker/Second: Smith/Glavinic

Carries/Fails [Y-N-A]: 14-0-0 Voice

5.

Discussion Items [No VCCPG advisory vote is to be taken for the following items]

5.a.

Report and comments on the Board of Supervisors changes to Policy I-1 at their December 5, 2012 meeting. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith reports that chair rotation remains status quo [determined by each planning group]. Planning groups will respond directly to the County, so questions on issues that are outside of our planning area must go through the County. We can work with departments within county. BOS wants to investigate allowing membership on planning groups if a person lives outside the planning area, but is a business owner or property owner within the planning area. Any planning group recommendations on issues outside the immediate planning area will be treated as general public input. There will be no free appeal unless a project is within planning area. Meeting noticing in newspapers for all planning groups is costing the County \$90K per year and could be reduced to \$15K if a much smaller advertising space is used. Smith pointed out the importance of a larger, more informative, advertisement that could include necessary and relevant information on the agenda items to be discussed. Supervisor Roberts asked about using web announcements for required noticing of public meetings, but many residents don't have ready access to the web. BOS wants County staff to investigate a 4"x6" advertisement format and the possibility of web announcements. In another item changed in Policy I-1, discretionary action items on a planning group's agenda must be considered first and internal planning group reports or discussions must be last. Finally, Smith reports that he and the VCCPG were excoriated by Supervisor Horn for rejecting Nikki Symington as a tribal representative to the Tribal Liaison SC.

5.b.

Congratulations and thanks from the Planning Group to members retiring from the VCCPG this December including Dave Anderson, Deb Hofler and Brian Bachman (Smith)

Discussion: Departing members were thanked for their service to the planning group and lauded for their civic-mindedness by Chairman Smith and other members of the VCCPG.

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 19 November 2012 Agenda:	
a)	DPDS to VCCPG, PDS2012-ABC-12-007, Jabro ABC Permit. Permit for a 10,000 square foot supermarket selling meats, produce, grocery and alcohol located at 28960 Lilac Road. (Don Kraft is DPDS project manager at 858-694-3856; Proponent is Martin Jabro at 619-850-9410. (Vick)	
8.	Motion to Adjourn:	10.10pm
	Maker/Second: Smith/Rudolf	Carries/Fails: [Y-N-A] Voice 14-0-0
Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for 14 January 2013		