

## Valley Center Design Review Board

**Approved Minutes:** October 5, 2015

**DRB Members Present:** Robertson, Herr, Mahan, Moore

**Visitors:** Susan Barber, Bill Miller, Jesus Antonio Aguilera, Kerry Garza, Brian Nestroff, Jerry Gaughan, Joe Deverien, Erick Van Wechel, Mindy Fogg, Dennis Campbell, Samuel McCuskey

Keith opened the meeting at 5pm.

**Open Forum:** There were no speakers for Open Forum.

Proposed minutes from September 8, 2015 were approved with no changes.

**Park Circle: Major Use Permit/Tentative Map 5603:** 27634 Valley Center Rd. (former Konyn property). Touchstone Communities, Kerry Garza

The project remains the same, with some minor changes. The DRB has been pleased with the overall site plan; architecture styling and the requested changes have been made to the plant palette. Kerry showed colors of stucco, paint and roof materials for both the commercial and residential areas. This will be an approved palette that must be adhered to when building. DRB brought up an issue of white buildings and large areas of white. It is shown to be used as accent walls etc., which appeared ok.

The DRB was presented with signage for the buildings. There are monument and directional signs, hanging signage along walkways and wall signage inside the project. Nothing is backlit. All signs will be created with real wood which will coincide with the residential area signage of wood and iron. They have combined 2 monument signs in order to achieve 1 large sign on the corners of Mirar de Valle and Valley Center Rd. and the residential area has a large entry sign. The monument signs will have copy on both sides, and the material will be the same, and the lettering will be according to the tenant logo requirements.

The Center Identification sign will be a repurposed storage tank from Konyn Dairy. It will store water along with locating the Center at the corner of Mirar de Valle and Valley Center Rd. There will be no tenant information on this sign.

Touchstone is requesting larger and additional signage for the Grocery store and the Pharmacy. Dennis Campbell (S.D. Co) wanted to know why they wanted additional area. The DRB did not agree that they needed additional signage area. They already have secondary signs, and additional lettering size is not necessary.

The DRB reviewed the drawings (which were received that day).

Mike (Architect) explained that the signage on the plans was for location only. They are limited to 100 sq. ft. and the final size would be agreed upon between the owner and the tenant. The DRB asked if we would review any individual tenant reviews and the County said no. It does need to follow the guidelines

and must comply with the MUP. Touchstone at this time is planning on building the commercial center will remain the owner.

There is also signage showing along all the buildings on the 'backside' facing Valley Center Rd. The applicant states that the tenants live and die by signage which the DRB understands, and there is no monument sign listing all the tenants. They are requesting 100 sq. ft. of signage on both sides of buildings. This will be a destination and the DRB feels that the residents of Valley Center which will be most of the business will know what is there. The applicant feels that the casino traffic will be substantial for the tenants' survival, and so signage along VC Rd. is essential. The DRB does not agree and feels the community will actually be the customer base. A smaller size type was suggested, and the applicant was opposed due to the readability from the road. This may be true TODAY, with the road speed at 45, however, the speed of the road will be slower as Valley Center Rd. is developed and therefore a different option may be viable. Mike said the drawings show a sign for each space, which may not be reality. There was also a question about the lighting along the signage, and were told they would all have lighting. The project does have to comply with the Palomar Observatory dark skies policy. One of the DRB's major concerns is the precedent this project will set. The DRB has asked that all the developers work together in order to create a workable village layout instead of all this separate patchwork and they have chosen not to do that. The DRB also acknowledged that there is no General Plan or South Village form based code for the developers and that was an issue for them. We would like the subcommittee to look at the project also and it is on their Oct. 20 agenda. We feel it is important to work with the subcommittees. Obviously, the two entities deal with different issues, but the whole picture is important at this time of our development.

The landscaping plan meets our approval. We would prefer no hydroseeding, as it does not establish well in our area. It typically does not germinate, and the hydroseeding area becomes planted with non-native weed species that germinate far easier than the native plant mix. The fire department determines the type of plants for the hydroseeding mix.

Road 19 is not shown on the plan. Mindy Fogg stated they are having some internal meetings and then there will be a community workshop before there will be a decision on Road 19. In the future, if Road 19 is approved the project will have to return with the road design incorporated. At this time the Community Planning Group is planning on moving forward without Road 19. DRB agreed to do the same.

The DRB received additional information via email from the applicant after the meeting. Due to the issues with the signage, the DRB will be reviewing the signage along with the additional information provided and it will be discussed at the November meeting.

**Hatfield Project: PDS 2013, Tentative Map 21202, Site plan 13-011.** Woods Valley Rd. and Valley Center Rd.

Jerry Gaughan explained a few changes that were required by the South Village subcommittee. Dennis Campbell (S.D. Co.) then explained they had put the project out for comments in June/July 2015 for CEQA requirements. They received many negative comments from both the general residents and the community groups. They took the comments and reviewed the plan and felt the project met the DRB requirements. They acknowledge the large back-of-building retaining walls, that the site will be fully

graded to the Banbury line of trees, that mature oaks are being removed. They also agreed it did not follow the Guidelines for the general site plan. Dennis stated that Jerry wanted to protect one of the oaks with retaining walls, and is planting more oaks in an attempt to appease the community with the tree removal.

Susan explained the existing trees root system go far beyond the canopy or drip line of the tree. The retaining walls shown are in the middle of the root zone, and will only damage the trees not protect them. She suggested that a Certified Arborist, familiar with oaks in our area, write an Construction Protection document for the Oak. Jerry explained the grading and how gentle it will be on the existing tree root zone along Banbury. Susan stated the elevation disruption issue with oak trees, and she would expect to have the trees along Banbury react to the grading, even though they are retaining the line of trees. Mindy, (S.D. Co) explained they are doing what they can do to retain the existing trees and it is about the best it is going to be.

Everyone at the meeting has been concerned about the site. The project is the gateway to Valley Center and a difficult site to develop, and some of the DRB is unhappy with the entire layout and have reviewed and offered comments for a long time. And once again, there is no General Plan or Form Based Code.

A motion was made to approve the plan with a Construction Protection document condition. The vote was 2 to approve, 1 to deny.

**Condition to be added to plan before stamping approval:**

**A local Certified Arborist, familiar with Quercus species of San Diego County must include a Construction Protection plan for the Oak that is to remain.**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55pm.