

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held April 5, 2012, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chris Anderson	Torry Brean	Matt Deskovick
	Scotty Ensign	Bob Hailey	Carl Hickman
	Eb Hogervorst	Kristi Mansolf	Jim Piva
	Paul Stykel	Angus Tobiason	Richard Tomlinson
	Kevin Wallace		

Absent: Chad Anderson, Dennis Sprong

Jim Piva, RCPG Chair, acted as Chair of the meeting, Chris Anderson, RCPG Vice-Chair, acted as Vice-Chair of the meeting, and Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM (Mansolf)

The Secretary determined a quorum was present.

ITEM 4: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING: Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes

Chad Anderson was absent. Dennis Sprong had an excused absence.

ITEM 5: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)

Ms. Mansolf announced School District fees are going up from \$2.97 per square foot to \$3.20 per square foot for new residential construction and \$.51 per square foot for covered/enclosed space for categories of new commercial/industrial construction.

There will be a public meeting in Ramona, set up by SANDAG, to discuss updates to the Coordinated Plan. Input is encouraged. Social service transportation needs will be considered. The meeting in Ramona will be at the Senior Center/Community Center on April 25 from 3:30 to 5.

SDG&E is doing pole hardening in the Cleveland National Forest in the vicinity of Ramona, replacing wooden poles with steel.

Ms. Anderson said the Ramona Bluegrass and Old West Festival will be May 5 and May 6.

ITEM 6: FORMATION OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION: TO PUT THE MINUTES ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR AND TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Bob Hailey, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick abstaining, and Chad Anderson and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action)

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 11 TO AFTER ITEM 12, AND TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Chad Anderson and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 3-1-12 (Action) – *Approved on Consent*

ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke said there has been no discussion, for the Ramona Street Extension project, on safety, cost benefit analysis, and alternative use of easements or alternatives. This road will create more congested, dangerous intersections than there are at present on Ramona Street and Hanson Lane, Boundary Avenue and Ramona Street, and also at Warnock and Ramona Street. School traffic will diffuse down residential roads in the area. There is no good design for the project, and the Ramona Street Extension project was originally lined out as a flat line on a map with no consideration of topography. This perception has been passed along by all involved groups and agencies through planning. There will be no benefit from the road extension, and area neighborhoods will be degraded if it is built.

Speaker: Sharon Jurist, Ramona Resident

Ms. Jurist lives on Hanson Lane and is against the Ramona Street Extension project. Ramona Street is narrow with houses on both sides. There will be more traffic when it gets bigger. There will be 1600 more car trips on Hanson Lane after the Ramona Street Extension project is completed. There is only sidewalk on one side of the road, and there are 3 schools on Hanson Lane. There is so much traffic during the schools' drop off and pick up times. Her kids have to cross Hanson Lane to get to school and it is very difficult. One of her children was hit by a car. Ramona Street is residential and it makes more sense for traffic to go around than to come up Ramona Street.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers moved to Ramona in 1971. She is speaking for rural Ramona. The fourth plan for Ramona Street is worse than the other 3. This road will only serve and benefit 10 percent of the Ramona population. It will spend a lot of money, and the other 90 percent of the people will get no benefit. She asked the RCPG to think about the children, blight, congestion and the valley being destroyed.

Speaker: Jim Cooper, Ramona Resident

Mr. Cooper said he has heard from members of the RCPG that a justification for extending Ramona Street is that it has existed on the map since 1890. The map of 1890 shows a grid of streets, with

some shown by a double line and some shown by a single line. The double line appears to represent major thoroughfares while the single lines show secondary routes. Looking at a current map of Ramona, many of the ‘major’ roads have never been expanded. Ramona Street, originally a single line on the 1890 map, is being proposed for build-out. The original easement was 30 feet wide – good for wagon traffic of that era. At that time, topographical constraints were not shown on maps. Ramona Street would have been too steep for wagon traffic. In 1979 the County acquired the rest of the 60 foot easement through a lot split/sale requirement. However, the Public Road Standards (March 3, 2010) for a light collector road (with turn lanes) would be 64 to 90 feet, exceeding the actual easement width. Neither the 1890’s map nor current construction plans support the Ramona Street project.

Speaker: Sharon Lynch, Ramona Resident

Ms. Lynch asked what problem the Ramona Street Extension is to solve? There will be more traffic if the road is improved.

The Chair said the Ramona Street Extension project is not on the agenda. The County will bring the final design to the RCPG in the future, and give copies of the new plans to the RCPG and the opposition. They will give us a month to review the plans, and then we will discuss them. The second month the RCPG will hear the oppositions’ concerns and the third month the RCPG will vote. The design should answer people’s questions on the project.

ITEM 10: Presentation on Draft Single Family Residential Guidelines by Department of Planning and Land Use Staff, Marcus Lubich and Joe Farace (Discussion and Possible Action)

Mr. Lubich said the Draft Single Family Residential Guidelines were drafted to be used as a resource tool and a guidance document for anyone developing property. It provides good information on resource protection and design concepts. The guidelines are expected to improve processing time. People will know what the expectations and/or recommendations are before going into a project. The document is broken down into 10 sections. Some of the topics/issues discussed are designing a home for the countryside – and considering where to place lots, how homes are situated on the lots and architectural themes; trail and road interconnectivity; preservation of ridgelines and farmland, and minimal grading. If multi-family housing is proposed, it should fit into the area it is proposed for. There is nothing in the document to regulate applicants. Applicants use this document before they plan their project. Single family homes were included in the first document, but there were concerns over the document including single homes, and the document is really intended for subdivisions.

Mr. Deskovick asked why the County is giving us more regulations on what we can do with building our homes?

Mr. Farace said there is nothing new in the document. It reflects existing regulations and GP policies. In a conservation subdivision, there is more density. A lot of community groups have said the smaller lots do not fit into their communities.

Mr. Lubich said changes have been made to reflect concerns. Remodels are not included in the document.

Mr. Wallace asked about adoption of the document by the Board of Supervisors?

Mr. Farace said the document won't be adopted like an ordinance.

Mr. Tobiason asked if the photos in the document represent the Cumming Ranch? The photos resemble the property.

Mr. Lubich said the photos did not represent the Cumming Ranch.

Mr. Tobiason said he has lived in Ramona 75 years, and he thinks one-half acre lots are horrible for Ramona.

Mr. Hickman said the document is complex. It streamlines the development process. As a planning document, it is very general. What is the process to get approved if someone deviates from the document?

Mr. Farace said they have to go with the regulatory documents.

Ms. Anderson said she doesn't like clustering to be angled so it fits in. At the Design Review Board meeting there was some discussion on the DPLU checklist. One concern is there are 3 documents – the guidelines to standards, the Village Design project, and the new Design Review checklist. As written now, these documents will be in conflict with each other. The terms are the same but the definitions are different. Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Lubich and Mr. Farace to work on correcting this conflict between the documents. Ms. Anderson asked if Specific Planning Areas were removed from the GP Update?

Mr. Farace said the Specific Planning Areas were removed from the GP Update, but someone can apply to do one.

Ms. Anderson asked how farmland can be preserved, as referred to in the document, when the land can't be farmed? She asked about designating open space for agriculture?

Mr. Farace said the open space language has exceptions, and one is agriculture.

Mr. Wallace asked if the guidelines will affect an individual building a house?

Mr. Farace said it is a tool for them to refer to.

Mr. Deskovick said 25 years ago Ramona was cool. Every couple of years the County comes up with stuff like regulations that we have to abide by. He pulls permits. The guidelines and rules need to go away.

Mr. Brean asked about the relationship between the guidelines and the Village Design project?

Mr. Farace said the Village Plan will be Ramona's own unique document dealing with commercial and/or multi family in the Village. Single family homes are exempt from the Village Plan.

ITEM 12: Request from Project Applicant to Present Proposal for a Retail Feed and Pet Supply Store at the Corner of Letton and Main St. (Hwy 67). D and D5 Designators Apply (Discussion) – Taken out of Order

Mr. Rumansoff presented the project. They want to build a new Kahoots retail store with corporate offices and a hay barn. It will be 5,000 square foot retail, with a second story that is also 5,000

RCPG Minutes 4-5-12

square feet. They are required to have 71 parking spaces. They went to the Design Review Board. They have adjusted their plans so no colonnade trees will be removed. Kahoots will have hay deliveries on site using a semi. They met with the public works department, and no more dedication will be needed for the site. The country barn like design will include stone grouting to get a rural look. It was suggested they go to the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee for their input.

Speaker: Ethan Tunnell, Project Applicant

Mr. Tunnel said Kahoots has been part of Ramona and he feels they are a beneficial part of the town. They are working to comply with the existing rules.

Speaker: Mike Bittinger, Project Applicant

Mr. Bittinger said he enjoys doing business in Ramona. There are concerns with ingress and egress. They will have ingress off Hwy 67. It is important to get the trucks off Main Street.

Ms. Anderson gave the report from the Design Review Board. She said one colonnade tree was to be removed, but they are changing their plans. The hay barn will be open on one side. It will be 180 feet long. There will be one curb cut on Main Street. Bioswales and drainage improvements are needed, and the drainage goes to the vernal pools. There is a study being done for flooding in the area. Permeable concrete will be used. Signage is not required yet. Design Review loved the north and south elevations. The project is proposed for the Colonnade area of the Village Design project. Design Review wants a DG meandering sidewalk.

Ms. Mansolf announced the RCPG received a letter from the Ramona Tree Trust regarding their discussion with the applicants on the colonnade tree.

Mr. Tobiason said the area is troubled with water.

Mr. Tomlinson asked about the hay barn being on the property line?

Mr. Rumansoff said it was set on, but then it was moved off. It is setback to a point where it will drain to the sides. The wall will be non-combustible and set up with fire sprinklers.

Mr. Brean said he was encouraged to see the project fits into the community.

Mr. Hickman said this is a good location for the project. He asked Mr. Rumansoff if he has been to CalTrans? They will probably want a site distance analysis.

Mr. Rumansoff said at their current location traffic comes in on Kelly and out on Hwy 67.

Mr. Bittinger said there will be a middle turn lane.

Mr. Hickman said he can't speak for CalTrans, but he can speak from a traffic engineering standpoint. Mr. Hickman said eastbound traffic into Ramona is a concern. It will be safer to turn into the road than into a driveway. CalTrans may require trees to be removed if a driveway is there. Possibly the driveway can be removed from Hwy 67 and project traffic can go onto Letton. CalTrans will probably look at collision data.

Mr. Tobiason asked if there were vernal pools on the property?

Mr. Bittinger said a study was done, and there are no vernal pools.

ITEM 11: TM 4962 MDS Development, 30 Homes on Magnolia, north end of Lapis Ln and west of Black Canyon Rd. Request from County for Final Vote from the RCPG (Action)

Ms. Mansolf said the County asked us to take a vote on the project since they are ready to have it go to the Planning Commission. The RCPG reviewed the environmental document in March. Mr. Ayles is still on an extended trip.

Mr. Hickman said his subcommittee felt the project was a quality project, when the environmental document was reviewed in March.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS LONG AS THE PROJECT MEETS OUR REQUIREMENT AS PER THE MOTION MADE MARCH 1, 2012, AND INCLUDES THE LANGUAGE, "THAT THE PROPONENT SHOW A NOTE ON THE EXISTING DESIGN FOR A DG PATHWAY THAT WILL BE PARALLEL TO THE EXISTING ALTERNATE ACCESS ROUTE. FUTURE DEVELOPERS SHOULD REFER TO THE RAMONA COMMUNITY TRAILS MASTER PLAN FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT."

Upon motion made by Carl Hickman and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 9-0-3-1-2**, with Matt Deskovick, Angus Tobiason and Kevin Wallace abstaining, Richard Tomlinson stepping down, and Chad Anderson and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 13: Subcommittee Reports

13-A: SOUTH (Hailey) (No Business)

13-B: WEST (Mansolf) (No Business)

13-C: EAST (Ensign)(No Business)

13-D: PARKS (Tomlinson)(Action Item)

13-D-1:Development/Confirmation of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Project Priority List and Recreation Programming Priority List (Identification of Recreation Program Needs and Priorities) 2011-2012

Mr. Tomlinson said his subcommittee met and developed a PLDO priority list. The Pony Baseball Lighting project has been completed, and so came off the previous list. For the facilities at Ramona Community School, an MOU is being developed and then the project will be ready for construction. Item 4 is Collier Park Garden Improvements. Item 5 will add signage to the future staging area at the parking lot adjacent to the Arriba Center. This project may need funding. Item 6 is from the soccer league to get funding for an additional field. Item 7 is the old Ramona rodeo grounds. The original rodeo grounds was the Eagle-Davis Ranch.

The subcommittee will discuss more projects at their next meeting. They will meet again in May, so additional requests will be considered in May. The County holds the money for these projects. The fees lose 3 to 5 percent a year. Not a lot of money has been spent during the last few years.

Mr. Brean noted he did not see anything pertaining to disc golf.

Mr. Hickman asked if a location has been determined for the skate park?

Mr. Tomlinson said no site has been chosen. Currently there is no site for the facility.

MOTION: TO SEND THE NEW RCPG PLDO PRIORITY LIST TO COUNTY PARKS.

Upon motion made by Richard Tomlinson and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Chad Anderson and Dennis Sprong absent.

13-E: CUDA (Brean)(No Business)

13-F: Transportation/Trails (Hickman)(No Business)

13-G: DESIGN REVIEW (Chris Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Ms. Anderson said the Design Review Board reviewed The Dollar Tree project, coming to the Kmart shopping center. Signage was approved. They are a national chain and will use a few of the spaces. They had originally wanted stucco, but when they came back, the face of the store had changed. The Design Review Board also approved sending a letter in support of Community Development Right of Way standards.

13-H: Village Design Committee Meeting Report (Brean, Stykel)

Mr. Brean said the committee is still reviewing updates of the Village Design plan.

The Chair said Supervisor Jacob spoke highly of the work of Mark Fenton, a planner who includes health-related elements in his work, making developments healthier to live in. Supervisor Jacob suggested having Mark Fenton give a presentation to the Village Design Committee. He is already under contract with the County, so there is no cost.

Mr. Brean said that regarding the height limit on Main Street – the committee was discussing taller buildings.

Ms. Anderson said there is a 35 feet height restriction in place that stops developments that are 3 story. Three story also triggers the density bonus. If there is a desire to raise the height limit to 3 story, approvals will be needed.

Mr. Tobiason said that a hook and ladder truck is needed by the fire department to access 3 story buildings. The fire department doesn't have a truck that is equipped to access a 3 story building.

Mr. Brean said the main intersections will define the project.

Ms. Anderson said the corner at 10th and Main is already built. She would consider 3 story along Main Street, but not beyond. She doesn't want to see three story on a residential street.

ITEM 14: OTHER BUSINESS (Chair) (Possible Action)

A. Red Tape Reduction Task Force Issue – Report

The Chair said there were 6 or 7 meetings with District 2 CPG/CSG chairs at Supervisor Jacob's office on the Red Tape Reduction Task Force issue. A letter was drafted and presented to the Board of Supervisors based on discussions at these meetings. The Board of Supervisors did not

make any changes to the CPG/CSG structure, except to require training on the Brown Act, Policy I-1 and Form 700. The County will come up with a program that will be available online. CPG/SPG members will have the option to take the training online or in person. The only term limit there will be, will be for the chair, who will be limited to only serving 2 consecutive years as the chair.

B. CalTrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grants – Consideration of Supporting Community Development Right of Way Standards Grant the County will Submit for the Community – Report

Ms. Mansolf said 5 letters of support from the community were gathered plus one from Brian Jones and one from Duncan Hunter. The letters of support will be submitted with the grant application prepared by the County.

C. Report on Highland Valley Ranch Appeal that was Before the Board of Supervisors 3-14-12 and 3-28-12

The Chair said Supervisor Jacob asked some good questions on the Highland Valley Ranch project at the Board of Supervisors appeal hearing, and brought up legitimate concerns. She did a lot of work researching aspects of the project and had Ramona's interest at heart. The project was still approved by the Board of Supervisors.

D. Report on Transportation Impact Fee Meeting in Ramona 3-22-12

The Chair said the buildout of the Mobility Element Plan Roadway Network was to cost \$6.8 billion. Now it is down to \$2.4 billion as a result of the GP Update. Currently only 1 road in Ramona qualifies for local TIF funding. Part of Hwy 67 qualifies, but as a regional road, which has different requirements. The road that qualifies for TIF in Ramona is a portion of Highland Valley Road past the Green Valley Truck Trail. Previously there were several roads in Ramona that qualified for the funding. The part of Highland Valley Road to be improved was not included in the last TIF plan. So far, \$1.4 million has been collected for the local portion for Ramona TIF. More than \$827 thousand has been collected to go to the regional portion. Should the new program go into effect, the money will convert to the new program. He would like to see this money spent as our contribution for the Highland Valley/Dye/Hwy 67 intersection.

Ms. Mansolf talked to Bob Citrano at DPLU about density being removed in areas of Ramona and how that affected future TIF roads in Ramona. Mr. Citrano said the traffic modeling did not include the Ramona Grasslands as conservation lands, however, this area was to be very low density so should not have changed numbers significantly. Mapping refinements caused by the property specific requests that may have resulted in more trips were also not modeled. The thinking was that these 2 situations would balance each other out. He said he thought mobility element roads would qualify for the TIF program. He was not involved in dropping roads from the Ramona TIF program.

Mr. Cooper, from the audience, said he talked to Everett Hauser about TIF roads in Ramona. The new information doesn't include the Ramona Street Extension project, so there will be no TIF funds being used for Ramona Street.

The Chair said there were 3 options before the RCPG, and he was inclined to go with the last option that offered the built in credit.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE THIRD OPTION WITH THE BUILT IN CREDIT (-54 PERCENT).

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Richard Tomlinson, the motion **passed 9-1-3-0-2**, with Carl Hickman voting no, Chris Anderson, Kristi Mansolf and Angus Tobiason abstaining, and Chad Anderson and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 15: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)
A. Form 700, Economic Disclosure Deadline 3-31-12

The Chair reminded everyone to turn in their Economic Disclosure Form 700.

B. Ethics Training

Ms. Mansolf reminder everyone that Ethics training is required for RCPG members.

C. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)

Mr. Hickman received confirmation from most of the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee members and presented their names for confirmation/approval by the RCPG.

MOTION: TO CONFIRM/APPROVE THE FOLLOWING NAMES FOR MEMBERSHIP TO THE TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE: KAREN CARLSON, ARVIE DEGENFELDER, JOHN DEGENFELDER, MICHELE MORTON, DAWN PERFECT, ANGUS TOBIASON AND CHERYL WEGNER.

Upon motion made by Carl Hickman and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Chad Anderson, Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong absent.

D. Concerns of Members – *None*

E. Agenda Requests -- *None*

ITEM 16: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf