

Valley Center Design Review Board

Minutes: July 10th, 2012

DRB Members present: Montgomery, Moore, Splane, Robertson and DRB non-voting member Michael Mahan

Planning Group GPU Subcommittee

Rich Rudolph
Andy Washburn
Brian Bachman
Michael Karp
Dave Anderson

4:00 PM Lael Montgomery opened the meeting.
There were no speakers for Public Forum.

Joint meeting with the Valley Center GPU Subcommittee to review San Diego County's Design Review Checklist.

Lael Montgomery presented an overview of the County's proposed Checklist. In the overview Lael expressed her frustration that, for the most part, changes suggested by the DRB had been ignored and issues with the checklist's clarity and application made it likely to add to the confusion of the applicants. It was stressed that the check-lists only applied to small "B" designated projects before the DRB and that the county clerks would determine who was eligible to receive the check list. (It was suggested that the VC Design Guidelines should be issued, or sold, to the applicant along with the checklist.) It was further explained the applicant would present their checklist to the DRB first, and would only present their project checklist at the counter at the county offices as a form of appeal thereafter. It was stressed by all those in attendance that there be a formal mechanism be put in place in which the county would automatically provide applicants with the DRB's contact information and schedule in an effort to encourage the applicants to provide a *preview presentation* to the DRB prior to spending time and moneys on a formal presentation. The question was broached as to whether the DRB must approve the applicant if their checklist was complete. As opposed to allowing the applicants to "self regulate", the general consensus during the meeting was that it would be up the DRB to determine if in fact the checklist met with the VC guidelines.

The two groups as a whole struggled to identify the most productive goals for our review meeting; as it was likely that the adoption of the checklist was, in the eyes of the county, a fore-gone conclusion. The *broad-strokes* of this effort included the suggestion by Lael that the list be rewritten by the DRB for the county, in an effort to achieve several improvements. The first was to provide a clear statement of the "big picture" or goals for the community organize the checklist in a logical order by addressing broad topics first, before addressing details. Rudolph suggested that the process of identifying candidates for the checklist process be addressed by clarifying the 3rd bullet under the DESIGN

REVIEW CHECKLIST EXEMPTION PROCESS by amending the sentence to read: "The applicable community design review checklist will be provided to the applicant, who must then directly schedule a meeting with the applicable Design Review Board (DRB) or Community Planning or Sponsor Group (CPG) *along with the appropriate guidelines*". The addition of a sentence to each and every section was proposed to read that the items in the checklist must meet the existing design guideline requirements" or that they comply with design guideline provisions.

Specific points addressed included several items for change or deletion.

- * That there be a clear differentiation between residential, commercial and industrial.

- * Determine if bullet number 10 (Under the DESIGN REVIEW CHECKLIST EXEMPTION PROCESS) is a new law, or not?

- * #57 under protection of trees within a grading or construction area. Omit "reasonable efforts" and specify safe-guards..

- * Page 9 correct names of tree(s) i.e. no such plant exists.

Lael said that she was expecting to discuss the project with the County planner and the consultant the extent to which the County would require commonality across Design Review Checklists for all communities. This would affect both the extent and content of the edits we should take the time to recommend. There would be no point in working to create comments and revisions that would not be considered. She recommended basing revisions on these discussions.

5:15 The GPU group concluded their business and retired from the meeting.

Lael Montgomery proposed approval of the minutes from our meetings of 5.8.'12 as well as of 6.12.12. The minutes were approve 4-0.

Montgomery closed the meeting at 5:30.