

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2013 – 6:30 PM

Members present: W. Allen, G. Barnard, J. Bugbee, C. Ennis (arrived late at 6:40pm), L. Cyphert (chair), M. Cyphert, G. Inverso, T. Medvitz, K. Mitten, P. Sprecco (arrived late at 6:47pm) , L. Strom, B. Turner.

Members Absent: M. Baker, J. Brust, L. Carlson.

Public present: 11

OPEN HOUSE: 6:00pm – 6:30pm

1. Call to Order: 6:35 pm

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Meeting Minutes of March 6, 2013 were approved by a motion made by G. Barnard, seconded by T. Medvitz. Motion Passed (10-0-0-5); C. Ennis and P. Sprecco had not yet arrived.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Upcoming projects scheduled for future meetings:

1. **East County Sand Mine** (MUP09-16, RP 09-001, AD12-039) Major Use permit & Reclamation Plan.

2. **Laurel Street Apartments** (STP13-006) Site Plan “B” Designator for 10 units.

3. **Settlers Point / Jackson Ridge** (TM 4523 RPL3) Tentative Map for 184 units.

B. L. Strom announced that April 7 is the closure of the Ramona airport, and although the public comment period has officially closed, comments can be emailed to closurecomments@faa.gov until April 7 to protest the closing of air tower.

C. T. Medvitz stated that the AYSO subcommittee assists with scheduling the soccer fields; however, at Dianne Jacob’s Revitalization meeting on March 28th, he met two County Parks & Rec staff members that may also be responsible for scheduling the soccer games. He will look into scheduling a meeting with staff to see if there is an overlap of responsibilities.

D. C. Ennis stated that the 6:30pm start time is problematic for his schedule, and asked why a vote was not made for the meeting time change. It was pointed out that there was a vote at a previous meeting.

8. SUBCOMMITTEE (*Item #8C was moved up in the agenda, as G. Barnard has to leave early*)

C. Trails Subcommittee - G. Barnard provided the following update:

1. There will be a Trails Subcommittee meeting on May 1 at 5:15pm in the Lakeside Community Center gymnasium.

2. G. Barnard stated that he was asked by Dianne Jacob to sit on the Lakeside Equestrian Center Foundation to look at the property where the Sun Bar Roping Club meets, at Willow Road and Moreno Avenue, to establish an Equestrian Center. G. Barnard stated that he spoke to the LCPG Chair and has done some research and cannot find any conflict of interest.

A motion to support G. Barnard’s Appointment to the Equestrian Center Foundation was made by L.

Cyphert, and seconded by W. Allen. Motion Passed (10-0-1-4); G. Barnard abstained, P. Sprecco had not yet arrived.

5. OPEN FORUM.

A. Janis Shackelford, the chair of the Lindo Lake Subcommittee announced that the County is hosting a public meeting to discuss the future and long-term planning for Lindo Lake on April 17th at 6:00pm at the Lakeside Community Center. No money has been budgeted for improvements yet, but the County wants to know what the community would like to do with Lindo Lake as they make their plans. She also announced that the County will be posting the biological studies on their website. K. Mitten stated that she has a copy of the studies and can email to anyone who is interested.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Riverview Courts Tentative Map - Request for Modification of Project Conditions - (TM 5536 RPL2) located on the Northwest corner of Riverview Avenue and Waterhill Road - The applicant requests a waiver of the requirement to underground utilities on existing roads, and to instead relocate two utility poles on the project frontage (Riverview). Applicant stated this project was previously approved 1.5 years ago, and that the frontage on Riverview is subject to the County's standard requirement to underground all utilities, but the undergrounding requirement may possibly be waived if the project meets 1 of 3 conditions. The applicant maintains that this project meets all three, but was unaware of the waiver option when the project went through the process initially.

1. M. Cyphert asked if the applicant would need to add transformers if the waiver was granted and the utility lines stayed above grade. (The applicant stated the relocation poles would be taller than existing, but no transformers or additional utilities would be necessary. Two new poles would be installed wires would be and cleaned up), M. Cyphert pointed out that there may be County funds to underground existing lines on nearby properties to increase value of community. Finally, M. Cyphert asked how much extra undergrounding the lines would cost to the expense of keeping the wires above grade. The applicant stated that it is approx. \$305,000 to underground the utilities, and the overhead utilities would cost approx. \$100,000, with a difference of about \$200,000;

2. T. Medvitz asked for clarification that net increase is one extra pole if the utilities are undergrounded. The applicant agreed saying that two existing poles would be removed and three new poles would be installed: a pole would be placed at both ends of the property and a new pole would be added across the street.

3. K. Mitten asked if anyone had raised the question of the undergrounding of utilities during the previous hearing. The applicant stated that it was not discussed previously.

4. J. Sprecco brought up that the application stated that the surrounding area is entirely built-out, which is one of the conditions the applicant is using for this waiver request; however, he pointed out that the other nearby properties could also increase to a density similar to what this property was rezoned, ~\$200,000 net expense to underground for a \$9 million project. The applicant stated that the Waterhill utilities will not be underground, since it does not front on to a public street;

5. L. Strom inquired as to who would be responsible for undergrounding these utilities once the project is built. The applicant stated that the utilities would be in the ROW and that the County or HOA would be responsible.

6. G. Barnard pointed out the proposed 48" sidewalk width and that the ADA requires a 42" clearance. (Applicant stated that the new poles will not be located on the sidewalk). G. Barnard also stated that it's the County's goal to underground as much as possible;

7. W. Allen stated that if the poles are not in the sidewalk and the utilities are already overhead, then in this market, we don't want to waste anyone's money.

8. C. Enniss stated he's concerned about making the applicant pay to underground their utilities when surrounding properties may not underground in the future, he recommended the applicant to talk to SDG&E about moving the poles onto the private property. (Applicant stated that having the utility poles on private property would require granting utility easements to SDG&E);

9. G. Inverness stated that if we put the burden on the developer to place utilities underground, then those costs will be passed to new homeowners and we should help keep homes affordable in this economy.

10. M. Cyphert stated that utility poles present public safety and fire concerns. He stated that the County wants to underground all new poles, and that the cost of undergrounding equates to approximately \$10,000/unit, which he believes is less than what the County would need to pay if done at future date.

Public Comment

11. Janice Shackelford advised that the street trees will need to be selected carefully to make sure SDG&E does not prune the trees;

12. Gordon Shackelford pointed out the houses will be sold for what the market will bear, so the notion that the cost of undergrounding will be passed on to the homeowners is not correct. He also stated that minimizing the number of poles is a worthy objective and that not undergrounding our utilities presents a public safety concern.

13. Todd Owens stated that when Silvercreek went in, we required them to underground utilities and the County is now working to underground the adjacent utilities, he also asked whether there will be overhead lines connecting to the individual units (Applicant stated that all utility lines running to individual units will be underground);

14. Catherine Gorka stated that she was in favor of undergrounding utilities as the utility poles posed safety problems during the Cedar Fire and also that El Cajon recently had 5 poles that fell inexplicably.

A motion to recommend Approval of the Waiver was made by G. Inverso, and was seconded by J. Bugbee.

Motion Failed (4-8-0-3).

A motion to recommend Denial of the Waiver was made by G. Barnard, and was seconded by M. Cyphert.

Motion Passed (8-4-0-3); J. Bugbee, C. Ennis, G. Inverso, and B. Turner dissented.

B. Winter Gardens Boulevard Sidewalk Enhancements - The Department of Public Works requests input on a proposal to install 350 feet of sidewalk along the east side of Winter Gardens Boulevard. The project location is directly across from Riverview Elementary School and there is currently a continuous sidewalk north and south of this missing segment.

1. W. Allen stated that this came before the group last year and now the County wants additional input from the group;

2. M. Cyphert spoke to County staff and clarified that there won't be any Eminent Domain with this project, it won't impact parking (as parking is currently not permitted), the construction will be coordinated with school activities, and homeowners;

3. T. Medvitz spoke in support of improving this missing portion of sidewalk;

Public Comment

4. Jan Price stated that this sidewalk would provide a safe haven for the seniors, children and parents accessing the nearby senior residences and Riverview Elementary. She showed pictures of a car accident that occurred at this location when it came down the hill and swerved to miss a pedestrian. She stated that by having a sidewalk here, the bus stop could be moved which would make this area safer; and

5. Gordon Shackelford – supports the sidewalk, but expressed concern about members of the LCPG speaking out of turn.

A motion was made to recommend Approval of the Application by J. Bugbee, and was seconded by M. Cyphert.

Motion Passed (12-0-0-3).

C. Town Center Mixed-Use Project on Lakeshore Dr. – Pre-Concept Presentation – The property owner is seeking input on an early-stage development plan for 2+ acres within Lakeside's Town Center. The site is bordered by Lakeshore Drive on the south, River Street on the west, a church (fronting Maine Avenue) on the east, and by several properties (fronting Laurel Street) to the north. The potential applicant is considering proposing retail and commercial on ground-level along Lakeshore Drive, with rental apartments above and behind, serviced by a parking lot. The owner's representative mentioned they were unsure as to how much density could be accommodated, but that is generally driven by parking requirements. He mentioned it would likely not be larger than 2-3 stories tall. He also provided 2012 statistics that 71% of current Lakeside apartments are 25 years or older, and that Lakeside has 2.6% rental vacancy rate. The County has 5.1% vacancy rate, and Santee has 3.4% vacancy rate; Applicant stated they were looking for feedback from the community as to whether this type of use is desirable in this location, how much density would be appropriate, and what kind of retail does the community want to see added to the Town Center.

1. Several members seemed generally supportive about incorporating mixed-use into the Town Center, but stressed that it should probably fit into Lakeside's western theme.

2. Parking was pointed out as a major problem in this area and a good parking study will be necessary as there is little on-street parking or public lots.

3. W. Allen recommended exploring ½ or ¾ below-ground parking which can be vented through and is not that expensive.

4. K. Mitten asked them to consider wrapping retail around southwest corner;

5. P. Sprecco suggested they reference the Town Center Plan/Guidelines;

6. C. Ennis expressed preference that existing buildings be demolished;

7. J. Bugbee inquired as to when the existing building was built (Janis Shackelford informed the LCPG that it was built in 1912);
8. T. Medvitz suggested they look at horse/tack/western-oriented retail;
9. Several members suggested that the applicant contact all or some of the following: the Lakeside Design Review Board (DRB), the Chamber of Commerce, the Historic Society, and perhaps even organize a community meeting to solicit feedback;

Public Comment

10. Catherine Gorka inquired about community character portrayed by neon rodeo sign;
 11. Janis Shackelford asked if applicant had a copy of the current zoning, stated that the 2020 housing element is going to be approved soon, she stated that a different zone and height designator may be necessary to accommodate mixed use at this location, and asked whether we want to lose a business/industrial building in this location. Finally she stated that we probably don't have enough site information to make comments this early;
 12. Gordan Shackelford expressed concern that the Lakeside Community and San Diego County could lose control over this type of project if the applicant applies for CA State waivers to increase density, decrease parking, etc., if they agree to make this a low-income housing project. He also stated that parking is a huge problem in the Town Center;
 13. Applicant stated that it is not the owner's intent to ask for low-income waivers from the State and did not realize the County doesn't require at least some low-income housing units. In regards to parking, they will look at providing more parking than required, to help augment parking in the Town Center.
- (No Vote necessary as this is not a formal proposal)*

D. Proposed Amendment to Ordinance - Site Implementation Agreement - SIA (POD 08-006) – This Policy and Ordinance Development project (POD 08-006) is an amendment to the County Regulatory Code that introduces a new framework for a Site Implementation Agreement (SIA). The SIA would serve the function of a companion permit, in most instances, for subdivision maps. The SIA would assist in assuring the implementation of project requirements (i.e. conditions) associated with the development of subdivisions, mitigation of identified impacts, and on-going requirements after map recordation. Public review period is from March 21, 2013 to April 22, 2013.).

1. P. Sprecco spoke in favor of an SIA that compiles all conditions, but made the request that when the County provides LCPG with amended documents (in the future) to show strikethrough and underlines demonstrating what has been amended.
2. K. Mitten stated that having worked previously in the capacity as City/County planning staff, she can attest to the benefits of this type of document in tracking the different conditions placed by the numerous departments and that this will provide numerous benefits to both the County and applicants.

Public Comment

3. None

A motion was made to recommend Approval of the Ordinance Amendment by K. Mitten and was seconded by T. Medvitz. Motion Passed (9-0-1-5); J. Bugbee abstained; G. Barnard and C. Enniss left prior to vote.

E. Equine Ordinance Amendments (POD 11-011) - This Policy is to update the Zoning Ordinance with regard to Commercial Equine Uses. The Public Review period concluded March 20, 2013, however, Carl Stiehl stated at the Lakeside Community Meeting held on March 13, 2013 that the planning group may still provide comment, if desired.

1. M. Cyphert stated that the amendments to the Equine Ordinance eliminates the need for residents who want horses for personal use to not need a MUP, applies a multi-tiered approach to permitting,
2. J. Bugbee asked if this was dependent on zoning (it was the collective understanding that residents can still have what zoning permits).
3. L. Cyphert read the differences between each of the Tiers provided in the new Equine Ordinance language;

Public Comment

4. Janis Shackelford stated that this ordinance will help current equestrian owners that were operating contrary to zoning. It will allow them to continue in most cases without triggering a Major Use Permit. She

clarified that “horse keeping” means keeping your own horse and “horse stable” means keeping others horses. She stated that County staff continually repeated that there would be no change for horse keeping (own horses); however, now there are new regulations that will apply to “horse keeping” (which are now going to be subject to noise, noise, humane, nuisance, BMP for stormwater). She says the County maintains that horse keepers were already subject to these restrictions, but that it just wasn’t listed in Zoning Ordinance. Her proposed solution is to strike “horse keeping” from Section 12, 3130 #1 and #2;

5. M. Cyphert pointed out that if these restrictions were already applicable, then perhaps the addition of this language in the Zoning Ordinance, could assist with the County’s ability to enforce these regulations.

*A motion was made to recommend Approval of the Equine Ordinance with the Condition to strike the language “horse keeping” from Section 12, 3130 #1 and #2 by P. Sprecco and was seconded by M. Cyphert. **Motion Passed Conditionally (10-0-0-5); G. Barnard and C. Enniss left prior to vote.***

7. GROUP BUSINESS

A. Reminder that LCPG members were required to turn in Form 700 by March 31.

B. Reminder that all members are required to take the on-line Ethics training course every two years.

8. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Design Review Board – J. Bugbee provided the following update:

1. The Rodeo Verizon Wireless Tower and Utilities Building was reviewed and the brick utilities building that LCPG requested be turned 90 degrees cannot be rotated, as it would interfere with ADA parking,

2. The non-illuminated sign at 8807 Wintergardens Blvd for All State was approved; and

3. Taco Bell proposed tearing down the existing Taco Bell building to put in a bigger, more modern Taco Bell; however, the DRB discouraged a modern design.

B. County Service Area 69 – no update.

C. *Trails update moved to earlier in Agenda, prior to Public Forum.*

D. AYSO – T. Medvitz will be scheduling a meeting with School District representative, and wants to meet with Selena at County Parks & Recreation within next two weeks to discuss handing off field scheduling to County P&R staff.

9. ADJOURNED: 8:25 p.m. The next meeting will be in the gymnasium on Wednesday, May 1, 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 NEW website for Agendas, Project Materials, Announcements & more at: LCPG.weebly.com ***
Email us at: lakesidecpg@gmail.com