

# Spring Valley Community Planning Group

## \*\*\* MEETING MINUTES\*\*\*

Tuesday, October 22, 2024

### A. ROLL CALL – QUORUM

Meeting called to order at 6:00pm. Present 11 (Gonzalez, Robles, Pierce, Wallace (arrived late), Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Gettmann, Woodruff, Snyder), Absent 2 (Lowes, Shaffer), Vacancies 2. A quorum was reached.

### B. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – Opportunity for the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within our jurisdiction that is not on the posted agenda.

No public communication contributed.

### C. ACTION ITEMS with designation as to whether there will be a vote or not on the item:

- 1. Approval of Minutes: 9/24/2024.** Vote on this item. Motion to approve by Pearson, seconded by Custeau. Approved 8 (Robles, Pierce, Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Woodruff, Snyder), Abstain 2 (Gonzalez, Gettmann), Absent 3 (Lowes, Wallace (arrived later), Shaffer), Vacancies 2.
- 2. O'Reilly Auto Parts, APN 584-511-20-00, 933 Sweetwater Road, commercial signage, minor deviation request (PDS-1014).** Proponent is Peter Lapsiwala. Vote on this item.

Snyder asked if Peter had a nighttime rendering and he did. No white lit background. Robles made a motion to approve this sign version, Pearson seconded. Vote is 10 Yes (Gonzalez, Robles, Pierce, Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Gettmann, Woodruff, Snyder), 0 No, 1 Abstain (Wallace), 2 Absent, 2 Vacant. Motion passes.
- 3. 8915 Troy Street, APN 503-290-09-00, Request CPG to approve plan changes. Presenter: Robles.** Vote on this item.

Presenter Robles states this project came to the group last month but was tabled. He showed the group's ties to our design review guidelines and made recommendations to PDS regarding the proposed modifications. There is now an open code compliance issue on this property. One of the variances is the lack of stucco on the building according to plan and there is construction debris and trash visible onsite. The window modification is before us today and whether it complied with our guidelines. Robles continued with a flowchart to show our I1 procedures. We recommend, the county permits. Inspectors review the work and the code compliance issue comes to bear. Work is being done that is already out of compliance and not according to plan. That is the county's responsibility to fix with our group being involved in approving any changes to plans at that point. Robles recommended that we approve the minor deviation with the understanding that there is an open code compliance review and that we review again in the future. Custeau asked that we review the photos of the project building stripped to the studs and that substandard work is apparent. The architect has contended that work being done is not correct. Custeau commented that so much modifications have been done that the group should require a full site plan. Robles said the inspectors and code compliance are aware of the amount of work being done. Gettmann commented that there is no fire suppression and with the out of compliance construction, there should be a full site plan. Pierce asked if the current review can be defined as a minor deviation even though they are working under a site plan exemption. Gibbons asked if we can table this review until the county inspectors are through. The discussion continued on the various issues with this project. Wallace emphasized that this is the problem with site plan waivers. Custeau made a motion to deny the minor deviation on this property. Gettmann seconded. Robles wanted to expand the motion to include the group's reasonings on our concerns. Pierce noted the inconsistencies in the approved plans and the actual work being done. Motion is to deny the minor deviation based on inconsistencies in the supplied documents and conflicts with the design review guidelines. Vote is 11 Yes (Gonzalez, Robles, Pierce, Wallace, Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Gettmann, Woodruff, Snyder), 0 No, 0 Abstain, 2 Absent, 2 Vacant. Motion passes.

### 4. 645 Grand Ave, APN 584-410-50-00, PDS2022-STP-19-013M1. Pre-intake before request for minor deviation to change fencing type on approved site plan.

 Vote on this item.

The group had previously approved the site plan but the owner wants to request a minor deviation in fencing type

from 8 foot CMU block walls at the entrance and back of the property to chain link with plastic inserts and with landscaping to cover. The originally proposed wall is too expensive. Custeau referenced our design guidelines regarding block walls and wrought iron instead of chain link, which is discouraged or prohibited. He realizes the cost saving but can't accept chain link on the front. The trash enclosure would remain block wall. Robles asked about cars parked in front of the lot and that it would restrict landscaping. The owner's response is that these are the neighboring business' cars and would be moved and he would pull back the fence line to provide for landscaping inside the sidewalk path. Wallace asked what kind of business this is. It is a concrete pumping rental service, and the lot is already being used. The cars in front are not his and are a code compliance issue. Gibbons asked if the owner would consider a 4-foot wall with wrought iron on top. Custeau is okay with a block wall or wrought iron in front and chain link around the rest of the property, but a block wall is tempting for graffiti. Pierce asked if we would vote on a block wall in front and chain link on the other sides. Robles asked the owner to consider fire resistant landscaping. Discussion continued on taking a vote to recommend the front wall be a guideline acceptable form and the other 3 sides be chain link. The owner would then come back to the group with a minor deviation request. Custeau cautioned the owner that, even though the group recommends the change, a vote on the subsequent minor deviation could be different. Pearson brought up the development feasibility analysis by the county and the changes that could come to the Grand Ave area. On the approved site plan there are no landscaping details. The owner will have his architect detail the landscaping. The group consensus is to change the back and side walls to chain link and detail the landscape. The front wall remains as in the approved site plan. The owner was asked to do this quickly as our group membership changes by two members at the beginning of the year. Even if this item is the only one on the next agenda, we will have the meeting.

**5. Hibbett, APN 584-520-36-00, 641 Sweetwater Road, commercial signage, request for exemption from site plan (PDS-554). Presenter: Gibbons. Vote on this item.**

Gibbons covered the square footage allowed and how much space the proponent is asking for. Guidelines say 10-inch-high letters, proposed is 24 inches. Also proposed is a hanging sign in the breezeway perpendicular to the business entrance and adding the business name to the center monument sign. The storefronts face Jamacha Blvd. Members questioned the corporate logos that are part of the signage and whether we should allow because it is product advertising and not corporate signage. Proponent will check on licensing to use the logos, but they do have hundreds of locations nationally and the logos are used frequently. Custeau brought up the guidelines on minimizing product identification and to focus on business identity instead. Signs should not be used for advertising purposes. We could argue that the logos are advertising and not the business identity. This is mostly an east coast company selling sporting clothing. Discussion went on about the signage dimensions and that what is proposed looks reasonable. The breezeway sign is unusual and not visible from the street. Gibbons said that hanging signs are allowed. Gonzalez said we seem to often allow exceptions on signage and that this would encourage further approvals beyond guideline restrictions. Custeau said the 10-inch height requirement restricts visibility and would be small compared to other signs in the lot. He has rewritten this requirement among others and the county is reviewing the requested changes. Per Custeau, the requested square footage falls within our guidelines. Motion by Custeau to approve this signage as presented, second by Gettmann. Custeau, Robles and Gonzalez further discussed dimension calculations. Pierce asked if our guidelines need to be corrected. Custeau said he did not calculate the size of the breezeway hanging sign and will alter his motion to deny the sign in the breezeway. Motion is amended and seconded to approve sign A and deny sign B. Custeau stressed that here is a sign guideline changes request into PDS but that it may take a long time to get approval. This is a vote on a minor deviation request. Vote is 9 Yes (Robles, Pierce, Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Gettmann, Woodruff, Snyder), 2 No (Gonzalez, Wallace), 2 Absent, 0 Abstain, 2 Vacant. Motion passes.

**6. Xylem, APN 505-640-04-00, 2780 Via Orange Way, commercial signage, request for exemption from site plan (PDS-554). Presenter: Custeau. Vote on this item.**

This is a fairly large building and is deep in the back of the property, mostly obscured by another building as seen from the street. The north face of the Xylem building cannot be seen at all. Snyder asked what Xylem does and the answer was something to do with water and that it is not street traffic business. The monument sign will be replaced as well. Motion to approve as is by Gibbons, seconded by Woodruff. Wallace asked what would happen if they added another sign to the building. The group responded that it would be another minor deviation request and that the square footage would be recalculated. Another sign would probably not be allowed. Custeau felt that another sign would be a moot point as it would not be visible. Snyder gave examples of why this business would not look for more signage but would spend their money in other ways. Gibbons said that when companies usually do sign packages, they include everything they need in their initial request. Vote is 10 Yes (Gonzalez, Robles, Pierce, Eugenio, Gibbons, Pearson, Custeau, Gettmann, Woodruff, Snyder), 0 No, 1 Abstain (Wallace), 2 Absent, 2 Vacant. Motion passes.

#### **D. GROUP BUSINESS**

1. **Announcements:** Custeau had provided the group with photos of the progress on Calavo Park including a car that had been buried there.

2. Reports:

Chair: nothing to report.

CSA 128: nothing to report

TAC: nothing going on right now, but he will follow up on the Jamacha Blvd and SR 94 even though it is not in our planning area. This is regarding the traffic backup to eastbound SR 94 and No Turn On Red in the rightmost lane. 80% of traffic goes east and can back up almost to Trace Road. The right turn volume is not adequate. He will follow up with Caltrans, who supposedly is getting funding from Jamul Casino.

Highway cleanup: Sunday, 10/27 at 8am; Sweetwater Springs Blvd.

APG: Prop G is on the ballot to get more money for Sandag but there are internal issues and the board member cities are not happy. Snyder speculated that there is rumor of the APG getting a seat on the actual voting board, not just the advisory board. Right now, Chula Vista and San Diego are the weighted majority. Transportation money is spent primarily along the coast.

Other: Group officers nominating committee is Woodruff. Snyder is willing to continue to transcribe the meeting minutes from audio, to help out the new secretary. Nominations can be during our December meeting or even January with nominations from the floor.

3. Next SVCPG meeting: November 12, 2024

#### **E. ADJOURNMENT at 8:00pm**

##### **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE**

We strive to protect personally identifiable information, by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information collected becomes public record, subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of conflict, governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other law will control. You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information, which you believe is in error, by submitting a written request that shows, credibly, the error. If you believe your personal information is being used for purposes other than those intended, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity, before granting access or making corrections.

##### **Purpose of Planning and Sponsor Groups**

Advise the County on Discretionary projects as well as on planning and land use matters that are proposed within their respective community planning or sponsor group area.