

**JAMUL DULZURA
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES**

**Tuesday, January 24, 2012
Approved February 14, 2012
Oak Grove Middle School Library
7:30 pm**

1. **Call to Order:** Michael Casinelli called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

2. **Roll Call:**
Present: Bill Herde, Michael Casinelli, Dan Neirinckx, Yvonne Purdy-Luxton, Jonathan Shultz, Jean Strouf, Dan Kjonogaard, Janet Mulder, Randy White, Earl Katzer, Ray Deitchman, Preston Brown and Dale Fuller.
Absent:
Excused: Judy Bohlen, Steve Wragg

3. **Motion to approve the Agenda January 24, 2012, for as posted 72 hours before the meeting and the minutes of January 10, 2012 as corrected. Motion carried unanimously.**

4. **Open Forum - Opportunity for public to speak on any item not on the agenda**
 - a. **Michael Casinelli** announced that the Traffic Advisory Committee has a radar recertification hearing on Jamul Drive, which is now 45 mph, on January 27 at DPW at 9 a.m. and goes to BOS after approval.
 - b. **Michael Casinelli announced Form 700 is due March 31 to Registrar of Voters David Morton from all JDCPG members.**
 - c. **SDG&E notified Michael by Joe Zulouf that they would need to postpone until they notify us even though they told us they would be here in January to report their status. The SDG&E representatives will meet with the Sub-station Sub-committee before they meet with our JDCPG.**

5. **AD11-046 – 2nd Dwelling Unit – 2275 Bratton Valley Road Singh Family Trust – Preston Brown – Dan Neirinckx** visited the site which is an existing garage with a second story that has living quarters in it. The Singh Family bought the property in the early '80s and the building was on it at that time. Someone reported it was built without permits and the Singh's now are getting permits. The land is approximately 10 acres and the second dwelling is at the far end of the property, with correct setbacks and far enough away from the neighbors with room for septic. The well may need to be looked at to see if it provides enough water for two dwelling units even though it has been being used for both dwelling units. There is one water tank providing storage for both facilities. Fire department has told them they need a turnaround. **Dan Neirinckx moved we recommend approval provided that the well production meets the County Groundwater requirements for an additional living space's use of water in the 2nd dwelling unit. Motion carried unanimously.**

6. **FOREST CONSERVATION INITIATIVE LAND – Dan Neirinckx introduced Bob Citrano of DPLU presenting the FCI land in our area. Dan Neirinckx**

commented on why the rezone of previous FCI lands was being rezoned, The Forest Conservation Initiative was passed by voters and expired towards the end of the General Plan Update process; therefore lands under FCI were not included, as that would have delayed the GPU further. The lands under FCI have pre-GPU zoning and now must be brought in line with the GPU, thus the county is doing the FCI Update. **Ms Logan** whose family owns the large parcel within the Cleveland National Forrest and to the north east of Barrett lake was present and inquired as to the impact the down zone would have on her family's land. Randy White recommended that the PG not take a position on the FCI update at this meeting, and permit the Logan family additional time to consider the effects and provide same at our February 14, 2012 meeting.

The two additional areas within the PG's boundaries were at the end of Deerhorn Valley Road, and east of Four Corners and along Lyons Valley Road. DPLU recommended the parcels east of Four corners be rezoned to RL-40 and the parcels at the end of Deerhorn be rezoned to SR-10. Bob Citrano commented that these DPLU recommendations were in line with current GPU principles and adjacent land use zoning classifications. Dan N reminded the PG that the PG's position for the rezone/down zone that occurred due to the GPU had consistently been opposed by DPLU and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors. He further stated that recommendations that did not conform to the existing GP would most likely be rejected

7. MUP10-013 MOBILITE CELL SITE 19151 HIGHWAY 94 DULZURA – DAN KJONEGAARD reviewed the project revised plot plan and design and reported that the applicant had met the concerns of PG and that **Dan Kjonegaard moved JDCPG recommend the approval of the design as submitted. Motion passed 12 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained Dan Neirinckx as he (owns land near the project.)** Yvonne Purdy-Luxton checked to make sure that our recommended sound deadening material was included around the generator building and **Dan** showed her on the plan where there sound deadening material was included in the site plan detail.

8. HOLLENBECK CANYON WILDLIFE AREA / HONEY SPRINGS RANCH (DEPT. OF FISH & GAME), USE OF GROUND WATER UPDATE – Randy White reviewed the sub committee's meeting which was held January 14. He announced the next sub-committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, Jan 25 at Brodys in Jamul.and the current planned attendees to work out possible recommendations for an alternative project that might be an acceptable compromise

9. RED TAPE REDUCTION TASKFORCE SUB-COMMITTEE – Dan Neirinckx reported the sub committee met on Jan 16 and made a list of recommendations and other recommendations have come from the Planning Group members, which will also be included in our report to the Supervisor Jacob on February 3, which will be preceded by a meeting with the DPLU. **Dan Neirinckx read the two recommendations we were most concerned with from the Red Tape Reduction Task Force including:**

- 1) Remove Community Planning an Sponsor Groups CPGs from the County's umbrella and rescind board Policy 1-1 and,**
- 2) Leave CPGs under the County's umbrella with the following changes:**
 - a. Limit the scope of their review to the preparation and amendment of the GP and CP and the PPP as described below.**
 - b. Staff each CPG meeting with a senior level planner and County Counsel.**
 - c. Institute term limits on CPG members to a maximum of 2, 2-year terms in a 10-**

year period.

- d. **Limit the number of CPG members for each group to seven.**
- e. **Revise Board Policy I-1 to reflect the changes listed herein.**
- f. **Revise the Fee Ordinance to clarify that CPGs no longer receive free appeals to the Board of Supervisors.**
- g. **Require applicants for discretionary projects to prepare a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to inform residents of the community of the proposed project. The PPP shall be required for the following projects: TPMs, TMs, MUPs Rezones, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments or other similar permit types, The PPP shall include one publicly noticed community meeting to be held in the community**

Dan Neirinckx read the following recommendations from the sub-committee:

**JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
SUB-COMMITTEE ON RED TAPE REDUCTIONS RECOMMENDATIONS
AS AMENDED BY JDCPG AT ITS 1-24-12 MEETING**

Red Tape Reduction Task Force Comments and Recommendations from JDCPG

Re: Section 9. Community Planning/Sponsor Groups Finding:

Proposed Option 1:

Removing CPGs from the county umbrella would be the same as abolishing the CPGs. No one can expect unpaid volunteers to serve on the county's behalf without the county's protection and participation.

The proposed preparation of PPPs for discretionary projects can be too easily manipulated to circumvent the intent of community participation. (example – Schedule meeting during normal work hours, and/or presentation of a project while downplaying or omitting relevant information to an audience not informed of requirements and practices.) In addition PPPs would encourage lawsuits by unhappy parties and could effectively discourage opposition to a project as well as open discussion of the pros and cons of the project by the community, especially as it relates to community impact. CPGs provide a necessary and low-cost forum for residents and applicants to communicate with each other in a managed environment. Potential issues and concerns can be addressed early in the application process and often resolved outside of a court of law.

Proposed Option 2:

1. Leave CPGs under the County's umbrella and encourage the use of CPGs to achieve the 'Service First' goals of the county by:
 - a. Leaving the current scope of review unchanged, but clarify the extent/authority of that review.
 - b. Eliminate the suggestion of the establishment of a PPP (Public Participation Plan), as the applicant would prepare it and thus effectively put control of the extent of the review in the hands of the applicant, thereby severely limiting the scope of the community public input.
 - c. Create (or designate to an existing employee) an ombudsman position within the Supervisors/county administration staff. This person would not report to an individual Supervisor or their staff. This person would receive calls of complaint regarding planning and sponsor groups and direct it to a person who could correct the matter or arrange for proper training. Additionally this person would report out to the BOS in total. Rather than assigning a qualified person(s) to attend all of the planning / sponsor group meetings and sub-committee meetings; they could be assigned based on complaints or training needed. When the problem has been corrected they cease to attend the meetings. Recognizing that a CPG has authority only to recommend and request, County Counsel should not be required, but should be available should the ombudsman, CPG, or applicant deem it advisable.

- d. Term limit the chair position to two consecutive years (two terms), and remain out of that position for two consecutive years. Term limit the vice chair position to one year (one term), and remain out of that position for one year. Note: there would be no individual term limits for regular members.
- e. Our recommendation is to require eleven, thirteen or fifteen Planning Group Members. To limit the number of CPG members to seven would result in recommendations to be controlled by four votes, which severely limits the voice of the community. The smaller number would make it very difficult to have proportional representation from all of the demographic areas within the Community Planning Areas.
- f. Do not revise the fee ordinance regarding free appeals to the Board of Supervisors, as this process has not been significantly abused by CPGs in the past. Instead require that these appeals be routed via the Project Planner who will review the appeal to ensure it is proper/legal and necessary.
- g. Regarding PPP (Public Participation Plan) preparation, please see our above comments in which we state *“Eliminate the suggestion of the establishment of a PPP (Public Participation Plan) as it would be prepared by the applicant and thus effectively put control of the extent of the review in the hands of the applicant, thereby severely limiting the scope of the community public input.”* The proposed PPP severely limits the scope of community input when projects change due to circumstances such as CEQA requirements that were not identified at the one publically noticed community meeting. This would not allow additional input after the initial required **single** public meeting under the PPP proposal. CPGs are uniquely suited to maintain the continuity of public input regarding an applicant’s proposal.
- h. Encourage applicants for discretionary projects to participate and present in at least one publicly noticed CPG meeting held in the community.

Re: Resource Protection Ordinance:

- 2. Ensure that the requirements of the RPO are indeed covered by “local, state, and federal laws” before it is eliminated by identifying the relevant sections that replicate the RPO requirements in our local laws.

Re: Risk Assumption Finding:

- 3. EIR Risk Assumption Standards – The County must be the determining agent to decide if an EIR meets reasonable standards before an applicant can decide whether to include additional information or make additional revisions to an EIR. CPGs should be afforded the opportunity to comment on whether or not an EIR meets those reasonable standards.

Conclusion:

We urge the Board of Supervisors and DPLU to recognize that Community Planning Groups afford the public an opportunity to give input into proposed projects within their community that would otherwise be difficult if not impossible for them to give. This is true because CPGs hold their meetings within their communities on a regular basis during hours that are conducive to encouraging resident attendance. In addition CPG meetings afford applicants a forum in which they may present their project to the community and obtain public feedback at a low cost. If CPGs are eliminated, then San Diego County will be responsible for holding public meetings within the different communities in order for the public to give their input. This would be far more costly to the County and certainly less conducive for valuable public input.

Dan Neirinckx moved that JDCPG direct Janet Mulder and Bill Herde to rewrite the JDCPG Position Paper to reflect the changes proposed by Dan Kjonogaard and approved by the JDCPG. They will present it with Dan Neirinckx to the DPLU on February 2, and Supervisor Jacob, on February 3, as our final JDCPG recommendation. Motion passed unanimously and the recommendation is part of these minutes, attached above.

- 10. JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE – Yvonne Purdy-Luxton pointed out that there were new poles being placed in the area. Michael Casinelli will contact the Jamul Indian Village**

Robert Mesa to invite them to a future meeting as they agreed to do at the recent Caltrans meeting.

11. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

- a. Michael Casinelli passed out the form 700 to all present and will deliver them to the absent members.
- b. **TPM21104 – Vidovich – 3259 Heidi Lane – Mitigated Negative Dec. Dan Neirinckx will take.**
- c. **Julian Planning Group – comments on Red Tape Reduction Task Force – given to sub-committee to review.**
- d. **TPM 21069 Sajady Appeal - Notice of Public Hearing on the Appeal – recommended by Staff not to grant it. Planning Group had this on the agenda, but the applicant did not show.**
- e. **POD 11-011 Tiered Equine Ordinance - Notice of Preparation of an EIR – Given to Jean Strouf and Yvonne Purdy Luxton to review and report back.**
- f. **Letter from DPLU to Chris Tyson, resident of the area, regarding the Proposed Dog Training Ponds in Hollenback Canyon recommending he attend the sub-committee hearings.**
- g. **Historic Site Board – January 23 – nothing in our Planning Area.**

ADJOURNMENT:

Michael Casinelli adjourned the meeting at 9:29 p.m.

**NEXT PLANNING GROUP MEETING: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2012
OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY**

**Hollenback Canyon-Honey Springs Use of Groundwater Sub-committee meeting,
Wednesday, Jan 25 4:00 p.m at Brody's (behind 7/11 at Steele Canyon)**

Red Tape Reduction Sub-Committee Meeting – Janet Mulder and Dan Neirinckx will represent the JDCPG at the Feb. 2, 2012 meeting at County of San Diego County Operations Center 5560 Overland Ave. San Diego, CA 92123 Room 171 after receiving the information from Bill Herde.