

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held September 3, 2015, at 7:00 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

**ITEM 1: Pledge of Allegiance**

**ITEM 2: ROLL CALL (Piva, Chair)**

In Attendance: Jim Cooper                      Scotty Ensign                      Eb Hogervorst  
Barbara Jensen (Arr 7:10) Frank Lucio                      Kristi Mansolf  
Donna Myers                      Elio Noyas                      Jim Piva  
David Ross                      Dan Scherer                      Paul Stykel  
Rick Terrazas (Arr 7:10)

Absent: Torry Brean and Richard Tomlinson

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 3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING 8-6-15**

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2015, MEETING AS PRESENTED, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: ITEM 7-H – MR. COOPER WAS AT THE MEETING AT SOL ORCHARD TO LOOK AT THE LANDSCAPE; MR. COOPER SUGGESTED A MEETING IN 120 DAYS TO REVISIT THE ISSUE; AND MR. COOPER THOUGHT KIM LASLEY HAD RESIGNED FROM THE PARKS SUBCOMMITTEE.**

Upon motion made by Jim Cooper and seconded by Dan Scherer, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-2**, with Donna Myers abstaining, and Torry Brean and Richard Tomlinson absent.

**ITEM 4: Announcements and Correspondence Received**

Ms. Mansolf announced that Highway 67 would be closed at 9 p.m. to through traffic north of the Highland Valley Road/Dye Road intersection. The closure is due to the need for emergency culvert repair. People leaving the meeting that had to go south on Highway 67 would be detoured to 10<sup>th</sup> Street/San Vicente Road, to Warnock, Ramona and Dye Road and back to Highway 67.

The Tiered Beekeeping Ordinance will be going to the Board of Supervisors September 16, 2015. Input has been taken from many involved in related industries. The environmental documentation is complete and has been circulated for public review.

**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.**

Speaker: Marty Barritt, Ramona Resident

Ms. Barritt has lived in Ramona for 17 years. A few years ago she moved onto Arena Drive, and her home flooded badly from the rain that fell July 18 and July 19, 2015. There is a lack of culvert for Arena Drive and Arena Way. Her property is getting the runoff from the school when it rains. We are expected to get about 18 inches of rain in the upcoming rainy season. Ms. Barritt came before the RCPG previously to report that she had a very bad flooding problem on her property. She is asking the RCPG to help her get the necessary improvements from the County.

**ITEM 6: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action)**

**MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.**

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Jim Cooper, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Torry Breaun and Richard Tomlinson absent.

**ITEM 7: ACTION ITEMS:**

**7-A: (CUDA Subcommittee Item) Taco Bell – 1925 Main St. (Currently Big Apple Bagels) – (Colonnade – V4) – Conversion – Gabriela Marks**

Ms. Mansolf said the applicant sent her an email at 4 p.m. on August 31, saying she would be unable to attend the CUDA meeting. Ms. Mansolf did not receive the email until after 6 p.m. She tried to get a hold of Mr. Stykel to let him know the applicant would not be there, but was unsuccessful.

**7-B: Ramona Wine Trail - Presentation from Mr. Billick on Proposed New Directional Signage for Wineries in the Ramona Area**

Mr. Billick, Vice President of the Ramona Valley Vineyard Association (RVVA), presented a sign concept for the Ramona Wine Trail. The signage would direct people to wineries. There are concerns over the possibility of creating visual clutter. The signs are intended to reduce visual clutter. There were 14 tasting rooms in Ramona 2 years ago. Today there are over 30. There are 140 vineyards in Ramona. This is a growing industry for Ramona.

Mr. Billick needs to discuss the signs with the County and Caltrans, as the signs would go in the right of way. He met with Supervisor Jacob and she endorsed the sign project. The Ramona Chamber has endorsed the project. He is asking the RCPG to endorse the sign project as he would like to have the endorsement when he meets with the County and Caltrans.

Speaker: Dennis Sprong, Ramona Resident

Mr. Sprong is familiar with the wineries in Ramona. He has concerns with how the sign project will be implemented by allowing a type of business to put up signs in the road right of way. On September 5, 2013, the RCPG unanimously supported the County sign ordinance. He has concerns that the sign project doesn't meet the design standards as per the Ramona Design Review Board. He also has concerns that by allowing the winery industry to have signs, this will open the door to other industries wanting to put up signs to support their businesses.

Mr. Billick said the sign project participation would include anyone who meets the bonding and licensing requirements. Wineries would have to register. The RVVA is a non profit.

Mr. Sprong said it is a non profit but it is promoting business.

Mr. Terrazas said the Ramona Chamber has signs up. They are a non profit that promotes business.

Mr. Scherer asked if all non profits will start wanting signs to go up to support their businesses?

Mr. Billick said signs will be added as the project and the industry moves forward.

Mr. Ross asked who will maintain the signs if they are wrecked?

Mr. Billick said the RVVA will fund and fix maintenance of the signs.

Mr. Cooper said Mr. Billick attended 3 Design Review Board meetings. There were some concerns with the traffic hazards that may occur with motorists reading signs, but overall the concept was supported.

Mr. Billick said the RVVA is supportive of the suggestions.

The Chair said he thinks the sign project will bring class to the community. Supervisor Jacob wants uniformity. He is in favor of what the RVVA is doing.

**MOTION: TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED WITH THE CAVEAT THAT THE WINE SIGN TRAIL PROGRAM BE AVAILABLE TO ALL LICENSED, BONDED RAMONA WINERIES.**

**(Discussion on the motion)**

Mr. Scherer said he has concerns that this sign project will open the door to other groups wanting to put up signs. He feels the project contradicts the sign ordinance of 2013 and will open the doors for more groups wanting to put up signs to promote their business. He thinks it is a show of favoritism.

Mr. Cooper said the sign project is consistent with the Ramona Form Based Code.

Mr. Scherer said the Form Based Code contradicts the sign ordinance of 2013.

Mr. Stykel said the sign ordinance went into effect 2 or 3 years ago. Times change. We need to help promote the growth of Ramona.

Mr. Lucio said the sign idea is not a new one. By supporting this sign proposal doesn't mean that all businesses will want to do this.

**(Voting on the motion)**

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Jim Cooper, the motion **passed 12-1-0-0-2**, with Dan Scherer voting no, and Torry Brean and Richard Tomlinson absent.

**7-C: (Parks Subcommittee Item) Update on Current PLDO Projects: Girls Softball LED Scoreboards; Ramona Soccer League Field Expansion; Wellfield Recreational Park Project; Barnett School Playground Project; Skateboard Park Development; Amphitheater Fencing, Sod and Seed ; Skateboard Park Development;; Boys & Girls Club Tennis Court Conversion to Basketball Courts; RHS Baseball/Softball Fencing and Dugouts; Community Athletic Complex**

Mr. Brean, Parks Subcommittee Chair, was not in attendance. Mr. Cooper gave a brief meeting summary in his absence. The list did not change from the previous year. The Parks Subcommittee has not received the PLDO Budget Report. Mr. Cooper suggested the RCPG have an opportunity to hear a full report on the PLDO item before sending any information to the County.

**MOTION: THAT THE RESPONSE TO THE COUNTY REGARDING THE 2015 STATUS OF THE PLDO PROJECTS BE POSTPONED FOR 30 DAYS. THE SUBCOMMITTEE NEEDS TO RECEIVE THE PLDO BUDGET REPORT FROM THE COUNTY IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THEIR DOCUMENTATION ON THIS ISSUE.**

Upon motion made by Jim Cooper and seconded by Rick Terrazas, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Torry Brean and Richard Tomlinson absent.

**7-D: Presentation by the County on cell site applications, the wireless ordinance, the permitting process and other relevant issues pertaining to cell site equipment and equipment operation. Discussion to include potential impacts in residential areas.**

The Chair said that the RCPG takes input from the community. If there are concerns with cell sites in residential areas, he would like to see the cell site companies mitigate the neighbors' concerns. The Chair introduced Jarrett Ramaiya from the County who came to speak about wireless telecommunication issues.

Mr. Ramaiya said the County gives objective consideration to cell sites proposed in communities. The consideration of issues for approving cell sites is identified in the County wireless ordinance that was adopted on April 30, 2003. The ordinance held up in a challenge that went to the Supreme Court. The ordinance is predicated on preferred zones, which are industrial and commercial properties. Everyone is going wireless and there is a consumer driven demand. Cell sites can also be put in areas zoned A-70 and A-72 (agricultural areas) with approval of a Major Use Permit. Cell sites in residential areas have more restrictions.

When the applicant submits a proposal to the County, they need to justify why they want to put it on a given piece of property. Usually the proposal is to fill in a gap in coverage.

A new letter on the Cedar Street cell site was issued to the provider in June. The provider has been asked for alternatives to the current proposal. Why can't the Ramona Airport be used? Why not make it 2 cell sites rather than 1? The County asked that the height of the tower be reduced to 35 feet (rather than 40 feet) and that alternative sites be considered.

If an applicant or impacted residents do not like the Planning Commission decision on a project, they can appeal the decision to the Board of Supervisors.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 came about because of the rapid growth of the industry. The FCC works with the FDA, and in 1996 the FDA studied the issue with scientists. The County can't comment on health effects, but they can comment on whether a site is too bulky for the area; does a faux tree fit in with the area; will the cell site have a negative impact on community character, etc.? Monopolies are allowed in commercial and industrial zones, but not in residential areas. What works in Ramona may not work in Borrego. Due to the agrarian nature of Ramona, the focus has been on elevated faux trees and water tanks.

There is a traffic finding that has to be met. The proposal has to fit in with the County General Plan, the community plan, and it has to meet the conditions of CEQA. The accessory structure that usually goes with the tower contains switching equipment. For noise impacts, the cell site can't exceed 45 dBA at the property line. The cell site should be quiet at night as there is a noise ordinance in place.

Mr. Cooper said the Telecommunications Act of 1996 said health impacts cannot be considered. The studies that made that determination were done in the 1980's and the 1990's. In doing a Google search, studies show that there are health impacts associated with cell sites.

Speaker: Stan Dvorak, Ramona Resident

Mr. Dvorak has lived in the Cedar Street area for 2 years. The cell site proposed in that neighborhood will be 100 to 150 feet from his bedroom. It will destroy the view. He asked that another site be considered. He is concerned with a reduction of property value. He is also concerned with generator noise. There have been many power outages in Ramona. The sky at night is completely dark. The aircraft warning light on the tower will be a nuisance. If the tower is approved, he wants more trees added to shield the site from his property.

Speaker: Carl Graner, Ramona Resident

Mr. Graner said that more cell sites today are using DAS. Coverage is provided from many small antennas on facilities such as street lights. He would like to DAS considered.

Speaker: Rich Martin, Ramona Resident

Mr. Martin has lived in the area since 1991. He will move if the cell tower goes in on Cedar Street. This is not the place for a cell tower. He has a beautiful home and he doesn't want to see junk in his neighborhood. A group opposing the Cedar Street cell site has gathered 250 signatures on a petition. He and his neighbors don't want to be forced to live with the cell tower in the neighborhood. Mr. Martin thanked the RCPG for voting no on the project.

Speaker: Lynn Wright, Ramona Resident

Ms. Wright is a former trainer for Cricket. She is familiar with cell site technology. She has researched the impact cell sites have on property values, and she wants this issue to be considered. Verizon doesn't use DAS. Rancho Santa Fe has DAS. Ms. Wright said she hasn't heard back from Verizon on alternative sites.

Ms. Mansolf said the County gave the RCPG a map showing existing and proposed cell sites (proposed areas of added coverage). When the map came out about 10 years ago, there were 57 locations identified in Ramona.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ramaiya for coming and presenting to the RCPG on wireless issues. He asked the neighbors to go to the Planning Commission hearing when the item comes up. He likes the idea of co-location.

Ms. Myers asked about the cell site selection process? Do residents request to have a tower on their property? She doesn't think it is appropriate to put towers by neighbors' homes.

Mr. Terrazas said that he would like something in writing from the County that shows health concerns are not allowed to be considered so the FCC can be asked about it.

Mr. Ramaiya said decisions regarding siting of cell towers can't be based on health impacts. Studies have been done in other countries. Europe has more restrictions. The studies have been reviewed by the FDA. An example of mitigation that occurred in San Diego County was when a cell site facility was proposed by condos in Sweetwater. Tests were done and shielding was put in to mitigate impacts to residents. As far as what other planning groups are doing – there have been recommendations over time of denial of projects in residential areas.

Mr. Ross asked about the notification process?

Mr. Ramaiya said families want adequate coverage when they buy a home. Property devaluation has not been a big issue because if people don't want to live by a cell tower, they will look elsewhere. The Federal government likes co-location when it is possible. When a cell site is proposed in the County, people are notified within 300 feet of the property for where the tower is being proposed. Up to 20 property owners are notified. A title company usually prepares the notification package as a third party. Cell site providers approach residents in an area and then find someone who they can have a lease agreement with. Recommendations of denial have occurred when there have been findings that community character will be affected. The light on the tower is an FAA safety issue and it is necessary. The emergency generator will only be tested between the hours of 8 to 5, once a week for 15 minutes. Mr. Ramaiya passed around a list to gather concerned residents' contact information so he could get back to them with information addressing their concerns.

**7-E: Presentation by the County on Park Model Units**

The Park Model Unit item was on the agenda to get feedback from the County on their perspective of this issue. Ms. Armand made a presentation recently on Park Model Units as she had registered a Park Model Unit with the County as a health care unit. The unit is considered an RV and she had to leave the wheels on and put skirting around the bottom.

Mr. Ross said he is aware of a 90 day clause where these types of units can be used for annual family visitors and other related uses.

Mr. Ramaiya said that there are regulations for trailers and agriculture. For example, on a 50 acre farm, there could be 50 workers and 6 trailers. A granny flat is considered to be different than a trailer and with different requirements. An Administrative Permit may be required if a second dwelling unit is up to 1200 square feet of the size of the original structure. A second dwelling unit cannot be larger than 50 percent of the original structure. A discretionary permit may not be required for some instances involving second dwelling units, but the Department of Environmental Health would still need to review it. In Borrego, people take the wheels off their trailers to keep them in good shape – however, this is not allowed. What is allowed on the property depends on the restrictions that are on the property. A person can have a second dwelling on the property or a granny flat. People can also apply to have a mobile home park. Septic and water may limit what is allowed on a property. Sometimes licensed contractors need to be involved. Commercial housing is not allowed in a residential area.

**7-F: (Transportation/Trails Subcommittee Item) Update on Trying to Find a Way To Make Mt. Woodson Hiking Area Safer for Hikers and Motorists**

Ms. Mansolf gave the report. Supervisor Jacob's office had the Chief of the Resource Management Division from County Parks contact Ms. Mansolf with the information. The County is actively pursuing the Mount Woodson parking issue.

There was a meeting June 10, 2015, with the County, Caltrans, the City of San Diego, CAL FIRE and the City of Poway.

The City manages the service road and the communications towers. The State owns the land the CAL FIRE station is on. The County owns a parcel behind the State's parcel. This is the parcel where a parking lot could go.

If it is determined the parcel can be used for public parking, access to the service road would need to be established from the parking lot. Ms. Mansolf believes access would also need to be established to the parking lot from Highway 67.

There have been some efforts to try to correct popular misconceptions on social media that make it appear that people can drive all the way to the top of the mountain on the service road (to access Potato Chip Rock, for example).

The service road is not a designated trail but it has been used by hikers and rock climbers for years. City Parks has placed a bulletin board with information for hikers near the bottom of the service road that indicates they are aware of the use. On the bulletin board is a sign that welcomes people to the Mount Woodson Open Space Park. Also on the bulletin board is a map of the Mount Woodson Service Road Trail.

The service road was built by the Civilian Conservation Corps as part of FDR's work program in the early 1930's. They also built a fire lookout at the top of the mountain, which was eventually taken down and replaced with the communication towers that are up there today.

**7-G: (Transportation/Trails Subcommittee Item) Road Resurfacing Update**

Mr. Cooper was part of the ad hoc committee that reviewed the Road Resurfacing list generated by the County in 2014. The RCPG recently received an updated list from the County. Mr. Cooper compared the list received from the County to the list sent by the RCPG in 2014, and there are some discrepancies. He would like to determine what happened to the items that were left off.

**MOTION: TO TAKE THE COUNTY ROAD RESURFACING UPDATED LIST, AND UPDATE IT WITH THE COUNTY. THE TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE IS REQUESTING A REPORT THAT IDENTIFIES WHAT ACTIONS ARE/WILL BE TAKEN REGARDING THE STREETS IDENTIFIED THAT SHOW NO ACTIONS BEING PLANNED. THE LIST OF ROADS THAT WERE IDENTIFIED AS NEEDING WORK IN MARCH, 2014, BY THE TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE RCPG INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:**

**Roads recommended for SLURRY SEAL -**

**Ramona Street from H Street to Hanson Lane (2016)**  
**Arena Drive from San Vicente to Arena Way**  
**Arena Way from Arena Drive to Gunn Stage Road**  
**Glen Ellen Way from Arena Drive to end**

**Spangler Peak Road from Arena Drive to Oakley Road**  
**Bellemore Drive from Ramona Oaks Road to end**  
**Avenel Lane from Ramona Oaks Road to Pappas Road**  
**Pappas Road from Avenel Lane to Reo Verde Drive**  
**Hanson Lane from Ashley Road to Keyes Road (2016)**  
**Hanson from Kelly to San Diego Avenue (added later) (2016)**

**Roads recommended for ASPHALT CONCRETE OVERLAY**

**Dos Picos Park Road from Mussey Grade Road to Park Entrance (2016)**  
**Olive Street from Pine Street to 13<sup>th</sup> Street (2016 &**  
**Olive Street from 13<sup>th</sup> Street to Davis Street 2016)**  
**Steffy Lane from Ashley Road to Keyes Road (2017)**  
**Telford Lane from Ashley Road to Keyes Road (2017)**  
**Sutherland Dam Road from Hwy 78 to end**  
**H Street from Ramona Street to 10<sup>th</sup> Street**  
**Ramona Street from Montecito Road to La Brea Street (2016)**  
**6<sup>th</sup> Street from Hwy 78 to A Street**  
**Ashley Road from 8<sup>th</sup> Street to 9<sup>th</sup> Street (2017)**

Upon motion made by Jim Cooper and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Torry Brean and Richard Tomlinson absent.

**ITEM 8: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)**

**8-A: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Ensign) – Update on Projects Reviewed**

Mr. Ensign gave the Design Review Board meeting report. There was more discussion on the Albersons sign and the Design Review Board would still like the height brought down. The item was tabled. There was discussion on the lighting for the medical marijuana facility on Olive. It is a nice plan and there will be no impact on dark skies. The lighting was approved.

**8-B: Discussion Items (Possible Action)**

**8-B-1: Concerns from Members**

Mr. Cooper has concerns with the medical marijuana facilities coming into Ramona. The Design Review Board is only looking at the outside. The County is under threat of lawsuit from the State because the County ordinance may be too restrictive. Ramona is getting 3 of these facilities in the community and the Sheriff is saying there is nothing they can do.

**8-B-2: Future Agenda Item Requests**

Mr. Ensign said the T&T Subcommittee did not have a quorum at their meeting. He would like the Arena Way/Arena Drive item presented by Marty Barritt to be on the October agenda, and invite Michael Khoury of the County CIP office to attend and give us a report on this issue.

Ms. Mansolf said Bill Groves of Kamps Propane would like to be on the September 28 CUDA agenda to discuss adding a propane tank to his property, and also the October 1 RCPG agenda.

Mr. Stykel said he has concerns about flooding since a lot of rain is being forecast for the winter.

He would like to have a presentation on flood control.

The Chair said maybe County Flood Control could come to the next RCPG meeting and make a presentation on the status of flood control projects.

**8-B-3: Addition and Confirmation of New Subcommittee Members– *None brought forward***

**8-C: Meeting Updates**

**8-C-1: Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Meetings**

Ms. Mansolf announced the Lilac Hills project is going before the Planning Commission again on September 11. This is the project that has brought up the concerns of leapfrog development. It went to the Planning Commission on August 7, and a tour was scheduled of the area, and now it is going back for a final hearing.

**8-C-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 10-1-15 at the Ramona Community Library, 7 p.m.**

**ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT**

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf

The RCPG is advisory only to the County of San Diego. Community issues not related to planning and land use are not within the purview of this group. Item #5: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the RCPG on any subject within the group's jurisdiction that does not appear as an item on this agenda. The RCPG cannot discuss these matters except to place them on a future agenda, refer them to a subcommittee, or to County staff. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes. Please fill out a speaker request form located at the rear of the room and present to Vice Chairperson.

*Public Disclosure*

*We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.*

*Access and Correction of Personal Information*

*You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.*