

**County of San Diego
Ramona Community Planning Group
FINAL MEETING MINUTES
July 11, 2013
7:00 PM @ Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held July 11, 2013, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center.

ITEM 1: ROLL CALL (Piva, Chair)

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Torry Brean	Jim Cooper
	Matt Deskovick (Arr 7:10)	Scotty Ensign	Eb Hogervorst
	Barbara Jensen	Kristi Mansolf	Jim Piva
	Dennis Sprong	Paul Stykel	Richard Tomlinson
	Kevin Wallace		

Excused Absence: Carl Hickman, Donna Myers

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

ITEM 2: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF 6-6-13

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING JUNE 6, 2013.

Upon motion made by Paul Stykel and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 11-0-1-0-3**, with Dennis Sprong abstaining, and Matt Deskovick, Carl Hickman and Donna Myers absent.

ITEM 4: Announcements and Correspondence Received

Ms. Mansolf announced the Board of Supervisors took action on June 26, 2013, to foster the growth of microbreweries, cheese-making and other agriculture ventures.

The Montecito Ranch project could be going to the Planning Commission for the changes proposed for their project in November 12, 2012, specifically to the roads as early as Friday, July 12, 2013. If the project doesn't go to the Planning Commission on July 12, it will go in August, 2013.

ITEM 5: PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction that is not on posted agenda – None

ITEM 6: ACTION ITEMS:

6-A: (Transportation/Trails Subcommittee Business with CUDA) – STP13-010 Site Plan Tractor Supply Company, Single Tenant Commercial Building on 4 Parcels, North/West Corner of Hunter St and SR 67. An Approval of Request for Exception to Road Standard is Required to have the Intersectional Sight Distance Condition Reduced due to Proximity of Nearest Intersectional

Centerline to the Centerline of Each Driveway on Hunter St. D and D5 Special Area Designations Apply. HSC Ramona LLC, Owner. Powell, Representative

Mr. Powell gave the project presentation. The Form Based Code was applied to the project. The Main Street access was abandoned. There was a meeting with Caltrans on this issue and they would have been required to take colonnade trees out to have access on Main Street. There will be 2 ingress/egress on Hunter Street. This will allow semi trucks to pull into the lot.

Mr. Powell was asked about the “Exception to Road Standards that is required to have the intersectional sight distance condition reduced due to the proximity of the nearest intersectional centerline to the centerline of each driveway on Hunter Street.”

Mr. Powell said that it is less than 200 feet from Main Street for both driveways on Hunter Street. One will be 150 feet from Main Street, and the other will be 85 feet to Vermont.

Mr. Powell said he has received the scoping letter for the project, and there were only minor points that need to be addressed. For the proposed pathway – the applicant wants to continue it onto Vermont. There were no issues from Transportation/Trails, who approved the project.

Mr. Sprong asked about the shielding of the parking? This is an element of the Village Design Plan.

Mr. Powell said it will be difficult to mask the elevation on Main Street. There will be a natural landscape buffer with landscaping going 75 feet back from Main Street. There will be a split rail fence along the road (simulated concrete). There will be a monument, but at this time it is undefined. Originally they had wanted to have a windmill, but they were afraid kids would climb on it. The monument will be in an agricultural flavor.

Mr. Wallace asked if there was a noise restriction for trucks?

Mr. Powell said the project meets the decibal thresholds for Ramona.

Mr. Wallace asked if trucks could arrive in the middle of the night from back east, carrying merchandise?

Mr. Powell said trucks will deliver merchandise only during working hours.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Chad Anderson and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Carl Hickman and Donna Myers absent.

6-C: Montecito Ranch Revised Map, TM 5250R. Review of Montecito Way Amended Conditions (Taken Out of Order – Switched with 6-B)

Mr. Ensign gave the report from the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee on the review of the project in Mr. Hickman’s absence. The subcommittee discussed the project for 45 minutes. The subcommittee did not want 28 feet on Montecito Way. The motion was “*to adhere to the 2010 VTM conditions for Montecito Way off site improvements.*” It passed with 6 members for and one member against.

Chris Brown was in attendance representing the project. He said the project was approved by the RCPG in November of 2010. Previously there were going to be certain Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) requirements. The applicant was going to do the traffic improvements and get reimbursed. The TIF changed, and now there are no reimbursements, so that is why they are asking to reduce road improvements. They are not going to do anything less than what they are required to do. Previously, they were going to do more than the requirements. There are no other changes. The functionality of the roads is not changing. Mr. Brown was concerned when he received the letter from the RCPG to the County asking to pull the project from the Planning Commission agenda for July 12. It feels like a “gotcha” and he wasn’t informed of the Transportation/Trails meeting.

Now the project is going to hearing with the Planning Commission. If it hadn’t been pulled, it would have been an informational item and gone on consent. The hearing is going to cost the developer time and money. They are not reducing trails or mitigation of services. The only change is to the roads.

Mr. Ensign said Montecito Ranch is putting in an equine center. A 5 foot pathway on Montecito Way is insufficient for 2 people on horseback to pass each other on the pathway. The subcommittee wanted the original conditions and at least 8 feet for the pathway.

The Chair said the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee wanted to keep the project as it was approved for Montecito Way. The RCPG motion from November, 2012, was *“To accept the letter from the developer and proponent with the exception of Montecito Way. We would like them to go with the original VTM from the original report and consider, with consultation, modifications that would minimize right of way impacts.”* The motion passed with 9 yes votes. The County Planner had asked for a letter from the RCPG on Wednesday night requesting the item to be pulled from the July 12, 2013, meeting agenda. The Chair apologized for the disconnect.

Mr. Stykel asked when the Planning Commission hearing for the project would be?

Mr. Brown said it would be on August 16. He said there was no bait and switch. He would have liked a call about the meeting.

The Chair said if we didn’t say anything, it would have gone forward and been approved. This is in the community’s best interest.

Mr. Brown said all intersection improvements will stay the same.

Mr. Wallace asked if the bridge on Montecito Road would be widened? When vehicles cross the bridge, there is no margin for error due to the bridge being so small. Mr. Wallace has an additional concern with the traffic. People will use short cuts through town and not use the stop lights.

Mr. Brown said they are not required to widen the bridge on Montecito Road.

Mr. Sprong said the Montecito Way issue is not about trimming costs, but to help the neighbors as they may be impacted by the widening, and the alignment of the road is not straight.

MOTION: TO SUPPORT THE LETTER SENT TO THE COUNTY REQUESTING TO PULL THE MONTECITO RANCH ITEM FOR A FULL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Jim Cooper, the motion **passed 11-1-1-0-2**, with Richard Tomlinson voting no, Paul Stykel abstaining, and Carl Hickman and Donna Myers absent.

6-B: STP13-013, Robertson St. Apartments. AMCAL Proposal to Develop Parcels on the North Side of Robertson St. and Pala St. with Affordable Workforce Housing for Families – Approximately 60 Units in a Walk-Up Building Design. Parcels are Approximately 8 Acres and Zoned for 15 Units per Acre. Mario Turner, Representative from AMCAL (Taken Out of Order)

Mr. Turner presented the project. They are developing 4.2 acres of an 8 acre total land area with 60 units of 2 and 3 bedroom apartments, affordable workforce housing.

Kevin Newman, project architect, said the project meets the height requirements for the area and they are using a rural design to retain the rural nature of Ramona. Softer colors will make up the overall project palette. The clubhouse will be a focal point of the project, and it will be barn red and green. The roofs will be pitched, with the pitched roof for the clubhouse being more pronounced. The apartments will be 2 story ten-plexes with carports to the back of the building.

Matt Schattinger, landscape designer, said the plant landscape palette will have a rustic feel and plants will not be arranged in rows.. There will be connectivity between landscape elements and the overall project that includes the play area, the pool area, the outdoor dining area and the paths within the project.

Speaker: Andrew Crain, Ramona Resident

Mr. Crain has lived in a home in the project area with his family for 9 months. He asked if a thorough credit check and background check are done? Do people have to have jobs?

Daniel Hernandez of FPI, a property management company working with AMCAL, said background checks are done for felonies and misdemeanors for everyone. They interview the household before they move in.

Ms. Mansolf asked about the “F” special area regulation on the property shown on the Discretionary Application. Is that showing because there is floodplain on the property, but they are not developing in the floodplain area?

Mr. Turner said part of the 8 acres is in the floodplain, but the front 4 acres to be developed is not.

Mr. Ensign asked about maintenance of the landscape plan?

Mr. Schattinger said it was to be 60/40 evergreen and maintenance will be done internally.

Mr. Wallace asked what type of fence will be around the landscaping?

A 2 rail fence will be around the landscaping.

Mr. Brean asked about road improvements for the project. Will they improve Robertson and Pala?

Mr. Turner said they are unsure of the exact road requirements, but they will be making improvements.

Mr. Brean asked if they would be participating with the Sheriff's Substation program?

Mr. Turner said they will participate in the Sheriff's Department's Crime Free Multi-Housing Program.

Mr. Brean said Ramona has been shafted by having apartments in Ramona. The apartments have brought crime to the area. He doesn't like apartments, but they are allowed by right with the zoning for the property, and he feels that the project proposed will bring the best of what is possible if apartments are to be built.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Richard Tomlinson and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 11-1-0-0-3**, with Kevin Wallace voting no, and Chad Anderson, Carl Hickman and Donna Myers absent.

ITEM 7: PRESENTATIONS:

7-A: Ed Gros, Project Architect, on a Preliminary Proposal for an Apartment Complex at the 500 block of 16th Street, 3.68 acres, south of Wendy's/McDonald's and across the Street from the Ramona Lutheran Church (Discussion)

Mr. Gros presented the project. There will be easy access to the project, which will be ADA adaptable. The front of the project will be on 16th Street. They are proposing 11 units per acre. There will be 40 units on 3.675 acres.

The buildings will be 2 story with 8 units in each building, and 4 units each floor. The balcony will turn to 16th. In the central area of the project will be a commercial building. They will also have a play area and there will be space for a community garden. There is a drainage on the northeast corner of the property. The landscape will treat the storm drain on the property. Parking will be at the rear of the project.

The buildings will have gable type frontages. In the rear of the building will be private garages. The buildings will have a rural character with the horizontal siding and trim that is accenting the opening. A shingle-type roof will be used.

Mr. Brean said he appreciates the density is only 11 units per acre. Mr. Brean asked if the project will participate in the Sheriff's program for multi-family housing?

Bob Burch, with Mr. Gros, said they are planning to participate.

Mr. Brean said he likes to see variation between the heights of the buildings. He asked what people will see from 16th Street? Is the project Section 8 – low income housing?

The applicant said they will see front porches. The market will determine the pricing. The project is not low income. It will be senior friendly with no steps on the first floor. Tenants will have easy access to businesses and services in town.

Mr. Ensign said he liked the project being put in an area of other apartments.

Mr. Sprong asked if F Street would be improved?

Mr. Gros said F Street is not on the assessor's parcel map.

7-B: Presentation by Chris Thomas, Caltrans, on the Highland Valley/Dye Rd./Highway 67 Intersection Project Report. (Discussion and Possible Action)(Also Discussed by T&T)

Mr. Thomas presented the project report for the improvement of the intersection of the Highland Valley/Dye Road/Highway 67. Caltrans has received many comments on the project report. The intersection was originally signalized in 1992. In 2009 the project report came out for SR-67. The intersection project is where the project improvements for SR-67 will end. Currently the intersection is operating at an LOS F in the morning and afternoon peak hours. The intersection improvements will move it up to an LOS C.

On the north side of Dye Road will be a 10 foot equestrian pathway. They are shifting the street 6 feet to avoid impacts on the north side. There will be a class 2 bike lane on Highland Valley Road and Dye Road and a dual left turn lane from Highland Valley Road to northbound SR-67. They are also making a dual left turn lane from Dye to southbound SR-67, with 150 of storage on Dye. They will be adjusting the intersection to make it truck compliant. There will be a curb ramp on the southwest corner of the intersection.

The project will cost 10.5 million. They should get their environmental clearance in August of 2013. Without funding the project won't continue. If it did continue to move forward, starting in August, they would have right of way certification in December of 2014, advertise the project to contractors in March, 2015, construction would begin in June, 2015, with completion in January, 2016.

Mr. Deskovick questioned the need for a dual left turn lane off of Highland Valley Road? He would like to see the right turn lane extended back to Mussey Grade on SR-67 for Dye Road.

Mr. Thomas said the right turn lane on SR-67 to Dye will be extended more, back toward Mussey Grade Road (but not all the way to Mussey Grade Road), which is not part of the project. The dual left turn from Highland Valley Road to northbound SR-67 was done because of the width of the road. It will help with the intersection in the future. The bike lanes will be 8 foot striped on the shoulder.

Mr. Brean said he would like to be sure there is no conflict with the dual left turn lane from Dye Road south to SR-67 and traffic turning right onto SR-67 from Highland Valley Road?

Mr. Thomas said putting a right turn arrow on the traffic signal could help avoid confusion.

Mr. Ensign said no date is given for the levels of service shown in the project report. Does using the South Bypass in the modeling lessen the numbers using the intersection?

Mr. Thomas said the level of service is shown in the book but not in the graphic. They have to include the Mobility Element in their modeling for the project report which shows Dye Street being built. When built, Dye Street will take traffic off of the intersection.

Mike Aguilar, County CIP Projects, said there are no plans or design for Dye Street.

Ms. Mansolf asked if there will be any restriction for pedestrians crossing at the intersection, once improved?

Mr. Thomas said pedestrians won't be able to cross SR-67 on the south side of the intersection.

Mr. Mansolf said that it is not noted in the project report, but this intersection is of regional significance for the backcountry as it is the largest intersection to the east where a large volume of traffic goes through from many different areas/directions. The trail will be on the north side of Dye, but there is already a pathway on the RMWD property where the fire station is on the south side of the intersection. What will happen to that recent improvement?

Mike Aguilar said it will be removed. Mr. Aguilar introduced Stuart Kuhn, County CIP, who reviewed the project report and made comments.

Mr. Thomas said there will be a revised report based on the comments.

- 7-C: Presentation by Mike Aguilar, County CIP Projects, on the Concept and Status of the Dye Rd Extension Project, Ramona St. to Warnock. (Discussion and Possible Action) – *The project was pulled from the agenda and will be presented at a later date.***

(Mr. Tomlinson left at 9:15)

ITEM 8: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)

- 8-A: Report of Meeting Regarding Santa Maria Creek Cleanup 7-10-13
Presentation of Letter(s) to Send to Wildlife Agencies**

The Chair said that liability falling on the RCPG was a concern brought up at the meeting June 6, 2013. If someone hurts themselves while working cleaning up the creek, or if someone pulls the wrong plant, the County cannot guarantee the RCPG won't get sued. The County would like a person or group to head up the project. Crissy Tobiason agreed to be the lead person. We do all of the paperwork and she will deal with the property owners. The RCPG can help to facilitate what needs to be done, and Ms. Tobiason will work with the RCPG and the County.

Speaker: Crissy Tobiason, Ramona Resident

Ms. Tobiason said she wanted to help with the effort her father, Angus Tobiason, had started. She will be happy to lead the project.

The Chair said when the letter goes out to the property owners, it will be from Ms. Tobiason. He asked Ms. Tobiason to think up a name for the group heading up the project so we can put it on letterhead.

- 8-B: Consideration of Sending Representatives to a Meeting with SDG&E re
TL 637 Wood-to-Steel Pole Replacement Project, Covering 14 Miles
Of Existing 69 kV Wood Pole Power Line between Ramona and Santa Ysabel**

The CPUC project manager and the CPUC contractor for the project want to gather input from the RCPG by meeting with a member or 2 to discuss the wood-to-steel pole replacement project that will go from Ramona to Santa Ysabel.

Mr. Ensign and Ms. Mansolf will attend the meeting and bring the information back to the RCPG.

8-C: County Zoning Ordinance Amendment Related to Signs in Public Right of Way – Informational Meetings Set for 7-12-13 and 7-26-13

Ms. Mansolf announced the County was amending the County Zoning Ordinance for signs and banners in the public right of way. There are 2 upcoming meetings on the topic at the County Operations Center.

The Chair asked if someone would like to go to the meetings and come back to report to the RCPG?

Mr. Sprong said he would plan to attend one of the meetings.

Mr. Cooper asked Ms. Mansolf to email the meeting information to the Design Review Board Chair.

8-D: Subcommittee Reports (Possible Action)
8-D-1: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Cooper) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Mr. Cooper said he had been out of town for the Design Review Board meeting and had been unable to get the minutes of the meeting so he would be able to give the report. He will bring them to the next RCPG meeting.

8-D-1-A: Ramona Design Review Checklist Update – *Design Review Board Item, Not Discussed*

8-D-1-B: Re-Appointment of Jim Cooper as RCPG, DRB Representative Current Seat Appointment Expires 8-17-13 – *Not Discussed*

8-D-2: VILLAGE DESIGN COMMITTEE REPORT (Brean, Stykel) – Ramona Town Center Plan Out for Public Review 7-5-13 with Comments Due 8-2-13. Scoping Meeting to be 7-22-13 at 434 Aqua Lane. For more information, please see: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/ordamend.html>

Ms. Mansolf announced the Ramona Town Center Plan is out for public review until August 2, 2013. There will be a community meeting on July 22, 2013 at the Ramona Community Center to discuss the document and gather input.

8-D-3: Ad Hoc Subcommittee for RCPG Standing Rules, General Review plus Review for Conformance with Newly Revised Policy I-1 – Update

No changes were proposed on the revision Mr. Cooper made of the RCPG Standing Rules. The Chair thanked Mr. Cooper for his work, and said the item should also be on the next agenda, and then we would vote and send them to the County for review and feedback.

8-E: Discussion Items (Possible Action)
8-E-1: Concerns from Members

Mr. Stykel said he would like clarification on when to step down. His property is close to the Montecito Ranch project as are other RCPG members' properties, and all will be affected by the project. He requested clarification from the County on when members should step down if they own property in the vicinity of a project (or other circumstances) that may lead to a conflict of interest.

8-E-2: Future Agenda Item Requests

Mr. Sprong had a concern about parking lot concealment in the Form Based Code, and he would like to add this item to the next agenda. His concern is the use of a facade to mask a building or parking lot. If the facade were part of the building, he wouldn't have a problem with it.

8-E-3: Addition of New Subcommittee Members – *None*

8-E-4: Consideration of Developing an RCPG Website – Update

Ms. Mansolf said she had been contacted by one person who lived on the east coast and would like to be paid.

Mr. Sprong said he would like whoever did the website to be a resident of Ramona.

8-F: Meeting Updates

8-F-1: Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Hearings – Montecito Ranch Revised Tentative Map is Going to the Planning Commission on 7-12-13 for the Changes to the Road Conditions – *Date May Change to 8-16-13*

8-F-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next Meeting to be 8-1-13 at the Ramona Community Library

Mr. Wallace said he would be on vacation for both the August and September meetings.

ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT – 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf