

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2013 – 6:30 PM

Members Present: Wyatt Allen, Mark Baker, George Barnard, Jeffery Brust, Julie Bugbee (arrived late at 7:00 pm) Lynn Carlson, Chad Enniss (arrived late at 6:40), Laura Cyphert (chair), Milt Cyphert, Glenn Inverso, Tom Medvitz, Kristen Mitten, Paul Sprecco.

Members Absent: Linda Strom, Bob Turner,

Public present: 17

OPEN HOUSE: 6:00pm – 6:30pm

1. Call to Order: 6 :34 pm

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

4. Meeting Minutes of August 7, 2013 were approved by a motion made by G. Barnard, seconded by T. Medvitz. ***Motion Passed (11-0-0-4, J. Bugbee and C. Enniss not present for vote).*** A change was made to the minutes by K. Mitten to remove C. Enniss from “Members Present” Roll Call, as he had been marked both present and absent. Also, under Item #5B the Technical Correction regarding the election of new DRB Appointments was removed.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

A. Audio Recording – Notification is hereby provided that the LCPG meeting will be audio recorded for purposes of preparation of the meeting minutes.

B. Potential upcoming projects scheduled for future meetings – A list of projects and presentations tentatively scheduled for upcoming meetings is provided as an attachment to this agenda.

C. G. Barnard announced that October 12th will be the **Chamber of Commerce’s Chili Cook-Off**

D. M. Baker announced that on October 26th at 10:00am there will be an event, open to the public, memorializing the **10-Year Anniversary of the Cedar Fire**. It will be held at the new Fire District Office (12216 Lakeside Avenue). .

6. OPEN FORUM:

A. Janice Shackelford stated that she saw on a news station that CalTrans is looking for options for median devices (barriers) to install on Highway 67 from Vigilante Road / Slaughterhouse Canyon Road up into Ramona. The public can vote on different types of median materials on the CalTrans website.

B. John Lowe – a real estate agent representing the owners of 12028 Lemon Crest Dr, stated that his sellers were on their 3rd escrow, having lost two buyers over the Lemon Crest Dr. drainage problems. It is not the drainage problem deterring the buyers so much as the slow progress being made towards a resolution. He was informed by the County that it is currently in its Engineering Phase, but implementation would not start until 2016 or 2017.

7. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

A. Underground Utility District on Maine Avenue– This project will underground electric, telephone and cable television lines between Woodside Avenue and Mapleview Street. In addition, 36 poles will be eliminated from sidewalks along Maine Avenue and 52 property services will be converted to underground. Representing the County was Michael Aguilar, project manager with the CIP, Lawrence Hirsch (858) 694-2215 is the Utility Coordinator for the County and is the main contact for this project and can be reached at Lawrence.Hirsch@sdcountry.ca.gov. Lawrence presented the project Maine Ave. Underground Utility District (UUD) project that has been in the works for the last 11+ years. In addition to undergrounding, new black concrete decorative street lighting will be installed along Maine Avenue to replace 26 existing street lights with 26 or fewer decorative light poles. The County has these light fixtures in stock and will be able to maintain and

repair them. Anticipated timeline:

- Nov 6, 2013 – Approve ordinance to create the UUD;
- Nov 12, 2013 – Construction begins;
- Dec 2013 – contractor clears site for December nights;
- April 2014 – contractor to clear site for Western Days; and
- July 2014 - Expected date of Completed construction.

SDG&E will choose a contractor that is used to working in an urban setting and will work to minimize impacts to Maine Avenue businesses. Several questions/concerns included:

- costs of project (will be paid by utilities);
- the potential tripping hazard of metal plates during special events for people (Lawrence stated they would sink plates and asphalt all 4 corners);
- slippage for horses (G. Barnard recommended hard-facing the plates to prevent slippage);
- Location of transformers - to be located on side streets, away from businesses; and in the areas without sidewalks, they would be placed set back from where the sidewalk would be;
- Vaults - will be placed in the street;
- Will the contractor requirements be made available to the public prior to selection? (Lawrence said that can and would be made available)
- Impact to businesses (Lawrence stated that access to business will be maintained 100% of the time. Construction is only permitted during the hours of 9:30a-3:30p, and construction will be phased in sections to minimize impact to businesses relying on on-street parking.
- Several members expressed support for the project.

Public Comment:

- Janis Shackelford raised the issue, in relation of the vaults in the street, the level of asphalt where in some places the street has been built up higher than the side of the road and drainage is a problem. Mike Aguilar stated that they noticed that problem during a recent walking of Maine Avenue and will analyze the drainage issues so that the vault and asphalt can be set at a desired level with appropriate transitions. Once the conversion project is complete, the County may consider resurfacing the entire Avenue.

*A motion to recommend Approval of the Underground Utility District was made by K. Mitten and seconded by M. Cyphert. **Motion Passed (13-0-0-2)***

B. Tree Removal – The Lakeside Library is requesting support for removal of a mature tree located behind the Lakeside Public Library. The tree is a Bunya Bunya tree and is reportedly creating a safety hazard with falling pinecones weighing up to 20 pounds. It was presented to the Lindo Lake Revitalization Subcommittee and the Subcommittee supported the removal of the tree. J. Shackelford made the presentation on behalf of the Library and the County Parks Department. All agreed that if the tree presents a hazard, then it should not be around children in a county park. L. Cyphert commented that she would like to see a native tree planted in its place.

*A motion to recommend removing the tree was made by W. Allen and seconded by L. Carlson. **Motion Passed (13-0-0-2)***

8. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Taco Bell Lakeside– Discretionary Permit for Site Plan Modification (PDS2013-STP-89-095W1) located at 12265 Woodside Ave intersection with Prospect Avenue. This is a site plan modification to an existing Taco Bell restaurant. *Since the applicant was not present, a motion to recommend Deferral of the project was made by L. Cyphert and seconded by G. Inverso. **Motion Passed (13-0-0-2)***

B. Conceptual Plan for proposed AT&T cell site – This project is pre-application and will be presented for early input only. No formal action will be taken. The proposed project site is at 14008 Highway 8 Business, El Cajon in the Lakeside Fire Protection District Station 3 building. Equipment cabinet and antennas are proposed to be mounted inside a tower built onto the existing building.

Prior to the presentation M. Baker made motion to defer hearing this project until this proposal could be vetted/endorsed with the property owner/fire district board. The motion was seconded by W. Allen. Comments on the motion included several members pointed out that this was a pre-application and that the applicant wanted to see if this proposal may garner sufficient support with the community and LCPG before proceeding

too far into the process. A member from the fire department representing Fire Chief Andy Parr stated that he spoke briefly to M. Baker briefly prior to the meeting, wanted to clarify that although they are not aware of all of the details of the project, but as this is informational they are interested to hear about the project as well. The motion to defer failed due to lack of majority of elected body (7-6-0-2 P. Sprecco, L. Carlson, L. Cyphert, K. Mitten, G. Inverso, M. Cyphert dissented)

Bodie Campagna, the applicant, presented the proposed conceptual plan to relocate an existing cell tower on a nearby SDG&E pole, whose equipment is already housed on the Fire Station property, to a new 35-foot clock tower element attached to the Fire Station. It will eliminate the need to retrofit the existing SDG&E pole and will improve the visibility and presence of the Fire Station. The photo simulation distributed depicted a 35-foot tower, next to an 18-foot fire station, and Bodie mentioned that better service coverage could be met if the tower was increased to 45-feet, however most of the members were not supportive of the 45' tower height, but several members commented that the 35-foot tower improved the aesthetic of the fire station and appreciated that the tower was not on a residential site.

Public Comment:

Janis Shackelford inquired if there was another carrier on the site (Applicant stated she was not aware of one).
(No vote at this time)

C. Conceptual Plan for proposed East County Equestrian Center – The East County Equestrian Facility is requesting a letter of support for the center proposed for the N.E. corner of Moreno Ave. & Willow Rd. The organization presented the plans for the facility at the September meeting.

L. Cyphert read the drafted letter of support presented by G. Barnard (see Attachment #1). This plan was discussed at the September meeting.

A motion to provide a letter of support, with the amendment to change the language of the draft letter to say that “the LCPG supports the project” was made by P. Sprecco and seconded by W. Allen. Motion Passed (12-1-0-2, C. Enniss dissented)

D. Eucalyptus Hills Neighborhood Identification Signs – The County is seeking LCPG approval of a request to place neighborhood identification signs at four locations which will state “Welcome to Eucalyptus Hills.”

1. Johnson Lake Road, north side, 200 feet west of Hwy 67 (next to water district property)
2. Posthill Road, north side, 150 feet west of Hwy 67
3. Oak Creek Road, east side, in area near mail boxes, about 1 mile north of Lakeside Ave (before roads turns)
4. Valle Vista, East side, about 1400 feet north of intersection of Lakeside Ave at hill top

Bruce Robertson, passed around a graphic of a sample sign presented the neighborhood signage proposal.

- T. Medvitz expressed a concern about the sign containing more than “Welcome to Eucalyptus Hills”, such as shown on the sample graphic which also included “an Unincorporated Community of the County of San Diego.”, since Eucalyptus Hills is not an unincorporated community, it is a neighborhood of Lakeside.

- L. Cyphert inquired as to whether these signs are on the boundary lines (Bruce mentioned that Eucalyptus used to have definable boundaries, but now there is not an official line.) Another concern would be that other neighborhoods may feel slighted if they don't have a sign (Bruce stated that other neighborhoods could apply as well).

- G. Barnard expressed a concern of having a sign on Johnson Lake Road, which is a CSA or a privately-owned road that is only maintained by the County, as it might encourage through traffic on a road that's only 14' wide. He also stated that the County would not install a speed limit sign on this road, as it is not a legal road. (Bruce pointed out that you should not see the sign until you are already on the road.)

- P. Sprecco doesn't understand the need for neighborhood signs to segregate other neighborhoods and was generally against these signs.

- J. Bugbee expressed concern as to who will maintain these signs, based on a blue Blossom Valley neighborhood sign that is in need of repair.

- W. Allen expressed concern about spending money on the neighborhood signs, encouraging traffic to cut through Eucalyptus Hills,

- G. Inverso expressed concern about spending tax-payer dollars for neighborhood signs when there are other more pressing needs in our community.

- Bruce asked the members to specify if they were against the neighborhood signs in general, or if they were just opposed to Eucalyptus Hills having them. He requested they make a blanket motion for all green signs.

- M. Baker was in general support of neighborhood identification signs, but that we could specify to have the signs only on public roads.

Public Comment:

- Janis Shackelford stated that she would like to see neighborhood identification (Blossom Valley, a neighborhood of Lakeside; Eucalyptus Hills, a neighborhood of Lakeside) and if we deny Eucalyptus Hills signs, then you're sending the message to the County that our Blossom Valley sign should come down also. You could specify that the signs only be placed on public roads.

- Terry Burke-Eiserling pointed out that she doesn't even know what her neighborhood is called, so does that make it less than the others?

*A friendly amendment was made by M. Baker to the motion made by W. Allen and seconded by T. Medvitz to recommend the proposed neighborhood signs in Eucalyptus Hills, with the following conditions (1) signs state "Welcome To Eucalyptus Hills, a neighborhood of the Community of Lakeside", and (2) that the signs are only posted on public streets (not on Johnson Lake Road). **Motion Failed (6-7-0-2; J. Brust, G. Inverso, J. Bugbee, P. Sprecco, G. Barnard, C. Enniss and K. Mitten dissented)***

E. Parking restrictions in Lakeside Community Plan – Discussion of Lakeside Community Plan's parking space requirements and consideration of possible action to request the County to reinstate the multi-family parking standards that were in place prior to the community plan update (2.1 spaces per multi-family unit).

- T. Medvitz inquired as to what the state requires for parking ratios.

- K. Mitten stated that the current planning paradigm is to minimize parking ratios to encourage people to use transit and bicycles to get to work. However, Lakeside is still a rural area and does not have sufficient access to transit to make such low parking ratios feasible. Especially since most households in this area have 2+ cars. M. Cyphert and L. Carlson agreed.

- G. Barnard pointed out that the Community Plan's parking requirement for 2.1 spaces per apartment was established in 1975, however, when the County staff rewrote the plan, this section was struck-out. He wants to go back to the 2.1 ratio.

- J. Bugbee wants the group to vote to demand the County put the 2.1 ratio back in the Community Plan.

- M. Cyphert supports going back to the 2.1 ratio and doesn't believe transit is presently a viable option here.

- T. Medvitz pointed out that when he worked on the 2020 Plan, they were working to keep communities from growing, as they have to support them with infrastructure. The effort was to move everything to the centers of communities. They don't want people driving. He really wants to see a 2.5 ratio, but he'll settle for 2.1.

- M. Baker wants to see it increase above and beyond the old 2.1 ratio to see it parked at 1 parking space per bedroom for 2+ bedroom units.

- W. Allen concurred with M. Baker and stated that developers can meet these ratios and build parking partially underground to allow air to vent through the parking, without taking up all of the land.

Public Comment:

- Janis Shackelford encouraged the LCPG to support the motion and would love to see higher than 2.1 but doesn't think that's feasible. For low-income there have been reduction requests for lower than 1.5 sp/unit.

- Terry Burke-Eiserling – In general support of increasing the parking ratio to 2.1 or even better 2.5.. We have a lot of bike lanes that are being taken up by cars because there are insufficient parking on-site. Silver Sage low-income project at Woodside and Marilla Dr, they have 2.1 spaces and still have spillover parking onto both side of Marilla Drive, and there is never any parking there. She would like to see the ratio raised to 2.5.

*A motion to demand the County to amend the Lakeside Community Plan, to reinstate the previous multi-family parking ratio of 2.1 spaces per unit, was made by J. Bugbee and seconded by M. Cyphert. **Motion passed (12-0-0-3, C. Enniss not present for vote)***

9. GROUP BUSINESS:

A. Design Review Board Appointments: Vote on appointments to the Design Review Board for seats #1 and #2, expiring November 3, 2013. This item was noticed on September 1, 2013. *Seeing only two members requesting to be considered for the seats on the DRB, a motion to appoint L. Carlson and J. Bugbee to the DRB was made by G. Barnard and seconded by L. Cyphert. **Motion passed (13-0-0-2)***

B. Reimbursement: Vote on reimbursement requests for October photocopies - \$7.33. *A motion to recommend approval of reimbursement was made by G. Barnard and seconded by L. Cyphert. **Motion passed (12-0-0-3, C. Enniss not present for vote)***

C. Members Attendance Review: This item will be deferred until the Standing Rules of Order are amended (this item is currently under review by the Standing Rules of Order Subcommittee). If there is a member who has essentially vacated their seat by lack of attendance then the membership would take a vote at a meeting to do so, the member would be notified and then the group could not take a formal vote until the next meeting. M. Baker asked why there a differentiation between excused and unexcused, an absence should be an absence. J. Bugbee asked what is our incentive would be for calling in, if we're not going to be here. T. Medvitz stated we have made a commitment to be here and we have the responsibility to be here, and if we're not going to be here, we have an obligation to let the others know we can't make it. Excused/unexcused shouldn't make any difference, an absence is an absence. P. Sprecco pointed out that we are publishing the attendance record and differentiating between absences can get us into trouble. It is our duty to call in if we cannot be here. G. Barnard has a problem with seeing an unexcused mark on an attendance record, which is a public record, when he goes on vacation. M. Cyphert we all are on this board because we were elected or appointed because we had an interest to be here and that we should all call in. L. Cyphert pointed out that Bob Turner, who has not been in contact with the chair for a couple of months, and has missed 8 of the last 12 meetings. She believes he has effectively vacated his seat. W. Allen pointed out that we are all adults, we care about each other and are flexible, if you're not going to be here a phone call should be made. He also stated that the attendance calendar should only depict the current year. G. Barnard recommended the LCPG to write him a letter, state concerns and to tell him what his options are, and that he be given notice.

*L. Cyphert made the motion, which she amended during discussion, to inform Bob Turner in writing that his attendance record is of concern to the group, to inquire as to his intent, inform him of the County attendance policy, and to request his attendance at the next meeting where we can consider his position or further action, seconded by K. Mitten. **Motion Passed. (13-0-0-2)***

10. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A.** Design Review Board – A waiver for the auto dealership at the corner of Los Coches and Hwy 8 Business.
- B.** CSA 69 – L. Strom emailed a copy of her notes, but they could not be located during the meeting.
- C.** Trails – G. Barnard requested to be placed on the next available agenda regarding 4 issues: (1) Vine Street Trail which connects existing trails at Moreno and Willow to the San Diego River Conservancy; (2) Flume Trail #39A; (3) Flynn Springs Park to Crestridge Open Space Preserve – request County to send letter to the intervening property owner for trail dedication; and (4) Lakeside Mobility Network – a proposed trail that runs along El Monte (which the County shows as a paved bicycles-only trail). Janis Shackelford stated that Lakeside has a Bikeway Plan, which is part of the Lakeside Mobility Element, and it changed drastically during 2020. It now shows a Class 1 Bikeway (paved trail for bikes only) essentially down the entire river valley, which conflicts with our Community Trails Master Plan, which calls for a hiking trail and there is limited space alongside the river for trails. We already lost the connection under the 67, which the LCPG was informed that there would be a bikeway and a trail, but only the bikeway was built and the community was informed there was no money for a trail. The bikeway plan through the river valley is part of SANDAG's master plan for a river trail from the coast to the mountains. The bikeway is already funded from Mission Trails to the Santee border, their next segment they are planning to fund is from Mast Blvd to the Lakeside ball fields. She is concerned we'll get a bikeway, but no trail for horses. G. Barnard pointed out that the bikeway is 10-feet wide and 2 feet on either side. No horses are allowed in Santee. Several members of the board were confused as they thought the horse trails were required.
- D.** Standing Rules of Order – No Update

11. ADJOURNED: 8:40 p.m. The next meeting will be in the gymnasium on November 6, 2013 at 6:30 pm with the Open House starting at 6:00pm.

Kristen C. Mitten, Secretary
Lakeside Community Planning Group
lakesidecpg@gmail.com

*** Visit our website for Agendas, Project Materials, Announcements & more at: LCPG.weebly.com ***
or send an email to the chair/secretary at: lakesidecpg@gmail.com

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
Po Box 2040 Lakeside, CA 92040 / lakesidecpg@gmail.com

October 3, 2013

East County Equestrian Foundation
PO Box 1878
Lakeside, CA 92040

To Whom It May Concern:

The Lakeside Community Planning Group is an elected body that acts in an advisory capacity to the Department of Planning & Development Services (PDS), the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors and other County departments.

In September we were provided a presentation by the East County Equestrian Foundation on the Foundation and County's planned construction of a premier equestrian facility at 11055 Moreno Avenue in Lakeside, California.

The Planning Group has unanimously expressed support for this project. The project, with its arenas, trail access and day use area, will benefit our community and support local businesses.

We are pleased to offer this letter of support to the East County Equestrian Foundation and the equestrian facility project.

Sincerely,



Laura Cyphert, Chair
Lakeside Community Planning Group