LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2013 – 6:30 PM

Members Absent: M. Cyphert, C. Enniss, B. Turner
Public present: 11

OPEN HOUSE: 6:00pm – 6:30pm
1. Call to Order: 6:35pm
2. Pledge of Allegiance.
   <Announcement: Meeting will be audio recorded.>
3. Meeting Minutes of April 3, 2013 were approved by a motion made by G. Barnard, seconded by T. Medvitz.
   Motion Passed (10-0-2-3, J. Brust and J. Bugbee abstained)

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. Riverford Road Bridge preventive maintenance - The Department of Public Works (DPW) plans to perform some Preventive Maintenance work on the Riverford Road Bridge over the San Diego River. The intent of this work is to extend the life of this bridge which includes such work as: patching concrete, and repairing erosion under the bridge. DPW will be requesting County Board of Supervisors approval on May 8th to advertise and award a construction contract to perform this work
   B. Upcoming projects scheduled for future meetings:
      1. East County Sand Mine (MUP09-16, RP 09-001, AD12-039) Major Use permit & Reclamation Plan
   C. New LCPG Website - The Lakeside Community Planning Group has a new comprehensive website at: LCPG.weebly.com that provides agendas, meeting materials and links to County information. This website was created, from a free source, by K. Mitten.
   D. New Flagpole at Lakeside Water District - G. Barnard announced that there was a new flagpole installed at the Lakeside Water District. (Dedication will be on May 28th at 2:00pm)

5. OPEN FORUM.
   A. Janis Shackelford, chair of the Lindo Lake Subcommittee, announced that there will be a Subcommittee meeting, next Monday, June 6th at 9am, here at the Lakeside Community Center. The County hosted a meeting last month to get community input on the future of Lindo Lake. The vast majority of the community asked the County to restore Lindo Lake and maintain it, don’t fill it in. The subcommittee is looking to develop specific recommendations to implement that community goal. She requested the LCPG to put this on the Action Agenda for next month to see if the Planning Group will review and endorse the subcommittee’s recommendations. The last letter she received from the Department of Parks & Rec stated that the County needed the Lakeside Community Planning Group needed to support the recommendations.
   B. Terry Burke-Eserling asked if this was the time to ask about items on the agenda. L. Cyphert stated that the Open Forum was only for items not listed on the agenda.

6. PUBLIC HEARING
   A. Laurel Street Apartments Site Plan (STP13-006) – located at 12719 Laurel St, near Ashwood Street.
   The chair asked if the Applicant was present, and when we received no response, she noted that she had not received a confirmation that they could attend.
   A motion to table the project was made by W. Allen and seconded by K. Mitten. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)
B. Jackson Ridge (Settlers Point) Site Plan and Preliminary Grading Plan (STP 13-0002) - located on Business Route 8, southwest of Los Coches Rd. The proposed project consists of 184 new units and 449 parking spaces (approx 2.44 sp/unit), and two drainage basins on a 21.9 acre site with an approved tentative map (TM 5423 RPL3). The project also proposes a new public street to connect Wellington Hill Dr. with Business Route 8.

1. Stefan LaCasse, the Applicant, stated that this is a project has an approved Tentative Parcel Map with an approved minimum (184 units) and maximum (260 units) densities. At the top of the site there is a large play area and individual homes with two-car garages, private backyards and plenty of parking. Down below, this area has 132 duplexes with two-car garages, their own backyards, play areas and the same amenities as above.

2. T. Medvitz pointed out that the northwest corner of property connects to Wellington Dr., what arrangements have been made with the off-site property between this property and Wellington Dr.? The Applicant stated that the County is requiring the road to connect to Wellington and while they have not spoken to the homeowners directly, the Applicant has already secured permissions to grade and right-of-way dedications for the off-site road improvements. T. Medvitz also mentioned that it looks like the only play area is at the north end of the site, next to the single-family homes, far away from the duplexes, the majority of the density. Applicant stated the largest tot lot is in the north, but there is another tot lot in the southern portion, BBQ areas, a dog run and other amenity areas throughout.) T. Medvitz asked if any homeowners of neighboring this project been notified? (Applicant stated that were during the TM process.) What traffic considerations are being taken at the intersection at Business Route 8? (Applicant stated that the traffic study was for 260 units, widening the road, adding turn pockets and the Applicant was going to check to see if they would be adding a traffic signal.)

3. K. Mitten asked if they were proposing parallel parking along the new public road, (the Applicant stated that the design for new public road will have parallel parking on both sides, but they have not calculated that number since it was not required to meet the County’s requirements). K. Mitten noted that street lights were proposed on the sidewalk along along Business Route 8 and asked how much clearance would be on the sidewalk (Applicant stated sidewalks would meet ADA requirements and both sides of the street would be fully improved). K. Mitten asked where the stormwater would drain (Applicant stated that the stormwater would drain to the on-site drainage basins, a bioretention swale and then it flows east to the channel on Los Coches.) K. Mitten expressed concern about the proposed 30 mph speed limit on the new public street in a residential neighborhood with homes fronting on it (Applicant stated this was the County’s standard for a local collector, which is how the County classified it with the TM). Finally, K. Mitten expressed concern for the parking ratio and the small size of most two-car garages.

4. Lynn asked for clarification that the parking tabulations include the two-car garages. (Applicant stated that each home will have a two-car garage).

5. G. Barnard inquired as to the size of parking garage doors (Applicant stated that the garages will be 20’ wide, so the garage doors will be 16-17’ wide) G. Barnard expressed concern that the parking garages may not be large enough to fit pickup trucks and he asked the Applicant to check out Via Diego off Los Coches that has a similar parking layout, where visitor parking was non-existent, G. Barnard asked about the grove of olive trees on the site and whether they could be saved. (Applicant stated that they are trying to give away the trees to anyone who can take them, but they will have to be removed to grade the site).

6. W. Allen stated that we need more quality housing, and this project is a quality project. He stated he understands that the trees will have to be cleared and new trees can be planted. Given this economy today and the need for housing he applauded the Applicant. He also mentioned that the design and building of the project will be brought up at the Design Review Board.

7. L. Strom inquired as to whether all of the homes will have 2-car garages? (Applicant stated that all units will have a two-car garage), L. Strom also pointed out that the HOA will definitely help with any parking issues that arise.

8. P. Sprecco stated that it is a good looking project. He inquired about the distance between the mobile home park and the development’s western border. (Applicant stated that the mobile home park is higher than this project, and referred to the map for distance.) P. Sprecco also asked the Applicant to clarify about where the water drains and whether the water drains to the public stormwater system. (The Applicant concurred that the storm water will flow to a bioretention ditch and then on to the public stormwater system...
through an underground storm pipe. He also agreed that parking is going to be an issue.

<Public Comment>
9. Pat Bixby inquired as to whether there is going to be screening for noise from Alpine Rock & Block? (Applicant stated they added trees and screening closer to the top of the hill)
10. Janis Shackelford stated that this project has been around for a long time, and originally when it consisted of 10-unit buildings, she attended a meeting with the mobile home park residents and that their primary concern was that this project would be below their viewed shed of the mountain. She also noted that the public street through the project will have on-street parking, and as currently proposed the parking for the project way exceeds the zoning requirements and the community’s requirements for parking, not to mention the on-street parking which will be provided, but they cannot count. Compared to the previous project, she stated that this was a wonderful project with half the density allowed on the site, and encouraged the LCPG to support the project.
11. Terry Burke-Eserling stated that she likes that there will be a new housing option for Lakesiders who want to move into newer homes and she likes that they’re providing both single-story and two-story homes. Likes that it will add to the tax base, but wants them to be concerned about traffic and open space. She pointed out that Lakeside was unique in that it has pockets of areas without things for kids to do and given the lack of bus transportation and kids dependent on parents to drive them places, the Applicant needs to provide things for kids to do. She also urged the Applicant to please keep it family-owned.
12. Neil Rodvold (Alpine Rock & Block) suggested to the Applicant that maybe they can discuss replanting the olive trees on his neighboring site along the border. He also stated that he likes that this project, we have a lot of families with adult kids, who still live at home, that can’t afford to move out, and now maybe they can.
13. J. Bugbee stated that she lives on Ha Hana, by Los Coches Estates and after they expanded, they haven’t had any traffic problems.
14. G. Barnard wants to commend Neil Rodvold for being willing to accept the olive trees and what a great buffer that will make.
15. Tom – there is a tree-lined dirt road that will have to come out due to grading. Pointed out there is a property situated between Alpine Rock & Block and project site.
16. K. Mitten - requested the Applicant to update the project description with the County for the street name and to include that there are two commercial pads proposed along Business Route 8. (Applicant stated that they are not part of the project and they will come forward with their own separate process.)

A motion to recommend approval of the project was made by W. Allen and seconded by L. Strom. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

7. GROUP BUSINESS
A. L. Cyphert initiated a vote to reimburse for the Post Office Box Fees of $224.00 for 1 year. Motion to approve by T. Medvitz and seconded by W. Allen. Motion Passed (12-0-0-3).
B. L. Cyphert reminded the group that the Ethics training is due every two years and to please submit certificates for Ethics training to K. Mitten and she will forward to the County.
C. L. Cyphert reminded the group that Form 700 is due if you have not had a chance to submit yet.
D. L. Cyphert announced that the Board Policy states if a member misses 3 consecutive meetings or 6+ meetings in a calendar year, then the board needs to vote to waive that, to allow them to continue to serve, or have them relinquish their seat. We are tracking attendance and as a regular on-going item, we may have to vote to keep a member that has exceeded Board Policy. The way the Policy reads is when a member has an unexcused absence, but it doesn’t define what constitutes excused/unexcused. The way she read it is once you have this volume of absences, then this vote needs to occur. I also no longer want to differentiate between excused or unexcused, to make it more fair. W. Allen agreed that since there are only 12 meetings a year, that if you miss 6 of them, then you’re not helping.
E. There has been additional concerns raised regarding the meeting times and whether it works or doesn’t work for the public and the members. Is there an interest in having this put on the agenda of the next meeting to vote for a new time slot? The options include moving the time back to 7:00pm and then the County would have to pay for venue rental, or if we stay at 6:30pm then the County only has to pay for venue rental if we have an extra-long meetings that go past 8:00pm, so we would save the County money. But if there is a concern that the community cannot make it to meetings, or if the members cannot, then can revisit it. G. Barnard and W. Allen
both stated they were fine with the earlier time. L. Carlson stated that he was very concerned about the earlier
time. W. Allen suggested to call if he’s going to be late, and L. Cyphert suggested even an email may be better.
P. Sprecco pointed out that it may be a problem for the community also.

F. LCPG coordination with Revitalization Subcommittees – L. Cyphert mentioned there is a study that is
being done by a citizen on what our relationship is between the LCPG and the Revitalization Subcommittees
and our role. We’ve been asked for our comments on that. J. Bugbee stated that she spoke to M. Cyphert and he
was willing to interface with the Chamber of Commerce. She also pointed out that the citizen wanted to know
how the Planning Group interfaces with the community and thought she had some very good questions and
thought we should discuss them. L. Cyphert read the questions posed by the citizen:

1. Does the Lakeside Community Planning Group have a representative in each of the committees reporting at the
Community Revitalization Committee meetings?
2. Does the Lakeside Community Planning Group coordinate priorities and issues to address with the Community
Revitalization Committees in a consistent/formal manner?
3. Does the Lakeside Community Planning Group work in conjunction with other community interest groups to
increase the profile of issues that are important to the community of Lakeside?
4. As a resident of the community of Lakeside – do you believe there is a consistent community message being
reported to Dianne Jacob’s office as to the priorities and issues which are important to Lakeside?
5. Do you have any suggestions or ideas on how to increase implementation of the stated wishes of the community
through the forums of the Community Planning Groups and Community Revitalization Committees to the District 2
leadership?

K. Mitten stated that she was on two of the Revitalization Subcommittees (Lindo Lake and Infrastructure) and
asked if anyone else was on a subcommittee. L. Cyphert stated that she was on the San Diego River Park
Subcommittee. W. Allen stated that all LCPG subcommittees have a group member that chairs the
subcommittee. G. Barnard stated that we need to remind ourselves that we are primarily land use, so he doesn’t
want to overstep. T. Medvitz said that unless there are issues that affect land use, we have no reason to be there
as a committee. As individuals there’s nothing wrong if someone wants to participate, but that we shouldn’t be
expected to be involved. K. Mitten pointed out that in her experience on the Infrastructure Subcommittee that
she believes it would help the LCPG to be informed as to where we have drainage problem areas, for example,
when we have new project proposed in those areas to make sure the land use is appropriate and that there are
certain features installed to mitigate any problems. Dianne Jacobs has a revitalization meeting twice a year and
puts out a matrix that I’m trying to get from her office to put on our website, so that we can refer to it and be
aware of what issues are important to Lakeside as we make our land use decisions. J. Bugbee agreed that it
doesn’t hurt to stay informed and that she usually tries to attend the revitalization meetings.

Public Comment

G. J. Shackelford stated that the chair of the LCPG (or designee) has a standing seat on the steering committee,
the subcommittees are open to anyone who wants to participate and they cover a wide-range of interest. She
chairs Lindo Lake and is also on Infrastructure. She believes where things get crossed between Revitalization
the subcommittees may have priorities they believe need to be addressed in the community, for example
drainage on Lemoncrest, however the planning group makes the recommendations to public works on the
priorities for their capital improvement projects (CIPs), if the planning group comes up with a different list then
that is what Public Works looks at, not necessarily what Revitalization thinks should be done. The same with
spending money here in Lindo Lake Park, the LCPG oversees the use of the PLDO funds, so there is a cross
and there is a disconnect between the two groups and it would be nice if the infrastructure reported to this

H. Karen Ensall mentioned that Dianne Jacob’s office has requested someone from the Equestrian Center
Committee represent at the next Revitalization meeting. That will be discussed at the next meeting on Monday.

I. Terry Burke-Eserling agrees there is a cross-over between the Revitalization and what this group does,
especially with Infrastructure, with sidewalks/lights/water run-off issues. She encourages members to get
involved with the Revitalization subcommittees.

8. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Design Review Board – J. Bugsbee reported that Michelin has applied for new signs on Industry road, the
DRB asked for some changes and approved, and for the Laurel St Apartments project, the DRB made some
suggestions and approved.
B. County Service Area 69 – L. Strom announced there will be a meeting next Thursday, May 9.
C. Trails – G. Barnard announced that the next Trails committee meeting will be on June 5 in the Lakeside Community Center at 5:30pm.
D. AYSO – T. Medvitz reported that he hasn’t yet contacted anyone, but it is still his intention to refer the scheduling of the soccer fields over to the Parks & Rec staff member who is in charge of scheduling all soccer fields in the County.

9. ADJOURNED: 7:35 p.m. The next meeting will be in the gymnasium on Weds. June 5, 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 ***
or send an email to the chair/secretary at: lakesidecpg@gmail.com