OPEN HOUSE: 6:00pm – 6:30pm
1. Call to Order: 6:35 pm
2. Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Meeting Minutes of May 1, 2013 were approved by a motion made by G. Barnard, seconded by T. Medvitz. Passed (11-0-0-4, M. Cyphert arrived after the vote was tallied)

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. L. Cyphert announced that this meeting will be audio recorded (recording equipment began recording at the start of Agenda Item #6D.)
   B. Upcoming projects scheduled for future meetings:
      1. East County Sand Mine (MUP09-16, RP 09-001, AD12-039) Major Use permit & Reclamation Plan.
      2. The County of San Diego will be updating the Drainage Facilities Master Plans for the 10 Special Drainage Areas (SDA) in S.D. County.
   C. Poinciana Dr Tree Removal - K. Mitten announced that Steve Nelson, the Vegetation Manager for San Diego County, sent a notification to the LCPG that three dead maple trees in front of 1713, 1728 and 1729 Poinciana Drive will be removed in June.
   D. K. Mitten announced that Politifest is holding its 2013 Idea Tournament to provide a $5,000 grant to a community group to complete a neighborhood project within 12 months. Proposals must be submitted by June 30, 2013 on politifest.org.
   E. L. Strom pointed out that five years ago, the group was advised against making the meeting minutes too detailed to avoid a potential liability issue, and that might be a concern now too. L. Cyphert suggested we discuss at a future meeting.

5. OPEN FORUM.
   A. No one spoke during open forum

6. PUBLIC HEARING
   A. Laurel Street Apartments Site Plan (STP13-006) – located at 12719 Laurel St, near Ashwood Street. The development contains 0.41 acres and proposes a two-story apartment building with 10 units and 49 21 parking spaces. The site plan was previously approved on August 17, 2007, which expired on August 21, 2009. Several LCPG members expressed general support and M. Baker stated that the trash enclosure appears to not be compliant, but that County staff will address that issue. J. Bugbee pointed out the DRB supported the project in April 2013. Several LCPG members expressed concern about the project only having 2 spaces/unit. Public Comment:
      - Karen Ensall inquired if the units will be low-income (Applicant confirmed).
      - A community member expressed concern about the lack of guest parking (applicant responded that they technically have guest parking since they will be providing low-income units).
      - Terry Burke Eiserling advocated to have an on-site manager in contact with the police liaison (Applicant stated there will be an on-site manager). A motion to recommend Approval of the project was made by W. Allen and seconded by G. Barnard. (Motion
B. 13260 Lemon Crest Dr. Cell Site – Major Use Permit (MUP-12-024) – This proposed wireless communication facility project was last reviewed by the LCGP in January 2013, at which time it was recommended for denial. The applicant has revised the cell tower from a 45’ faux broadleaf tree to a 40’ architectural tower and is requesting reconsideration. There is a request for 5’ waiver to the height. The applicant explained that Congress has pressured carriers to provide service in rural America and they typically prefer commercial or industrial areas, however, no commercial locations are available to meet the needs of this residential area. LCPG members expressed concern with EM emissions (EMEs), relocating the proposed tower closer to other residential homes, noise, design resembling a lighthouse, unknown health issues, and proximity to school and homes. (Applicant provided a lengthy explanation of how the EMEs are regulated by the FCC, the sound would be attenuated so that it would not cross the property lines, and the design of an architectural structure was chosen in trying to respect community input on design at January meeting.) L. Cyphert inquired as to whether additional public outreach has been done (applicant replied no). W. Allen inquired as to whether the equipment could be placed underground (applicant stated that it would still need air conditioners to keep it cool). Several LCPG members expressed that it was the location within a residential neighborhood, not the design that made the group reject it previously.

Public Comment:
- Janis Shackelford reminded the LCPG that this is a MUP and it should be rejected as it does not meet all MUP requirements.
- A community member stated that he drove all the streets in the area and found all had ATT service (except for one area behind Ha Hana), he also expressed concern regarding street safety as the applicant is seeking a waiver to avoid having to improve the street.
- Lindsay Depremont suggested the alternative of placing several lower-elevation cell sites in preferred commercial locations. Another neighbor expressed concern about a perceived effect on the real estate market and housing prices.
- When polled for a show of hands:
  37 members of the community in attendance demonstrated they were opposed to the project,
  0 members of the community in attendance were in support of the project, and
  0 members of the community in attendance would support the project if there was a change to the design.

A motion to recommend Denial of the project based on its failure to meet the MUP requirements and community opposition was made by G. Barnard and seconded by M. Cyphert. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

C. Lakeside Rodeo Cell Site – Major Use Permit (ZAP-13-001) – This proposed wireless communication facility project was last reviewed by the LCGP in March 2013, at which time it was recommended for approval with the condition that the proposed utility enclosure be rotated 90-degrees. The Rodeo Association found the LCPG recommendation problematic and the applicant is requesting the LCPG to reconsider the project as previously proposed. The applicant stated that the enclosure was turned 90-degrees, as previously recommended, it would hamper access / parking and would interfere with exhibits placed by the Rodeo Association along Mapleview. J. Bugbee pointed out that the DRB requested a band be painted along the top of enclosure to match the adjacent trailer, and approved the project. Several members of the LCPG, that had originally recommended rotating the enclosure, noted that an existing fence would prevent the rodeo grounds access that was desired, and were now in support of the project as proposed by the applicant.

Public Comment:
- Katherine Gorka pointed out an existing cell site across the street (Applicant stated it was too far away to meet their needs).

A motion to recommend Approval of the project was made by L. Strom and seconded by G. Barnard. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

D. Lindo Lake Subcommittee Recommendations on the Dredging & Restoration of Lindo Lake – The Lindo Lake Subcommittee is requesting LCPG concurrence and support for specific action recommendations that will be presented to the County Departments of Parks & Recreation and Public Works, regarding the dredging and restoration of Lindo Lake. – Janice Shackelford recalled the County’s community meeting in
April, where the community expressed support of restoring Lindo Lake and did not want the East Basin narrowed or developed. She read the list of the recommendations in the Subcommittee’s letter. (See Attachment)

T. Medvitz pointed out there may be an aquifer, so some pumping equipment may be needed, and spoke to the availability of technology for sealing and aeration. M. Cyphert pointed out that the lake is our greatest asset and we should restore the community back to its original splendor, L. Cyphert thanked the subcommittee for this work and L. Strom concurred, G. Barnard thought the condition of the lake was embarrassing and cautioned that there would be odors during the work. Wyatt stated that we needed to make the environmental studies a priority and inquired if there was a way to get it done as maintenance.

Bill Saumier from San Diego County Parks & Recreation stated that the challenge is the CEQA environmental studies (no $ estimate yet for the studies), but the County estimates that the total cost to dredge one basin will be around $3 million. The County heard from the community and is not going to fill in the east basin, he also noted that volunteers were present at the meeting, but is not sure they understand the scope of the project which includes almost 1,500 truckloads. W. Allen stated that the work we can handle, but we need the County to take care of the environmental aspect.

Bill stated he will be meeting with DPW to assess how to fix the storm drains to keep more silt from running into the lake. One of the biggest contributors of silt in the drains is the illegal excavation going on along the hillsides on private property. The County wants to get the education out to the offenders and to create basins that can be cleaned out periodically. Bill stated that this was such a large project that both departments (DPR and DPW) would need to work together.

Public Comment:
- Billy Ortiz stated that it’s a great idea for the community, but to please be sensitive to the nesting birds, the gradual shallow waters are what attract the birds and we need to make it so that the birds come back.

A motion to Support and Recommend the Lindo Lake Subcommittee recommendations and to place this issue in the County Budget as soon as possible was made by G. Barnard, amended by K. Mitten, and seconded by M. Baker. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

E. Digital Billboards – The Board of Supervisors (BOS) is considering a digital billboard ordinance for the County. A staff report was presented to the BOS on February 1, 2013 - Representatives from CBS, Lamar and Clear Channel made a presentation for the technology and benefits of digital billboards and to answer questions by the community.

M. Cyphert asked if the billboards had their own power source to operate during power outages (Representatives stated that they did not, but Clear Channel representative stated they can deploy generators when advantageous during emergencies). Several members expressed strong concern regarding distraction to drivers, and the lights at night that is not keeping with Lakeside’s rural community character. Other concerns noted were the 8-second message frequency, city glow from horizontal lights, and distance to observatories. M. Baker suggested proposing to only locate digital billboards on recognized federal, state or county highways and for every billboard that is placed, to remove 1-2 billboards from community streets. (Lamar stated that there are no reports that show there is any danger with these billboards, and that these will be placed only in commercial/industrial areas and won’t be near/adjacent to residential homes.) M. Cyphert recommended to not place digital billboards in areas of known traffic concerns. L. Cyphert stated that she saw digital billboards in Philadelphia that were much too bright and can see benefits for the City of San Diego, but not Lakeside.

Public Comment:
- Janice Shackelford stated that no option is acceptable and that the visual impact of these billboards will be horrific. If they want to address light pollution, they should fix the existing signs with lights pointing downward instead of upward. She recommended opposing any change to the billboard ordinance for the sake of our community.
- Katherine Gorka stated that she likes to see the stars at night and we don’t want more lights, she’s still opposed to the lights at the high school, and expressed a concern about birds nesting in the billboards.
- Gordon Shackelford pointed out that we have a third of the billboards in the unincorporated county, and that the LCPG has been presented with a lot of reports and information we cannot verify. We have billboards that predate zoning, and that it is unacceptable to go from static to changing colors/brightness, there were many that were outraged by the new sign at Rodeo, driver distraction is unacceptable on a highway that is already dangerous, and relocating or removing billboards is going to have problems with long-term leases. He urged
LCPG to reject.
- Terry Burke-Eiserling is concerned about distractions on Highway 67, does not believe digital billboards belong in our community that rests in the past that only takes baby steps forward, and noted that the SDSU board is very distracting to her and she slows down to see the next message.

A motion to recommend Denial of any zoning amendment to the billboard ordinance was made by L. Cyphert and seconded by W. Allen. Motion passed (11-I-0-3, M. Baker dissented)

A motion to Table Item 6F to the next agenda was made by L. Strom and seconded by G. Barnard Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

F. Draft 2013 General Plan Clean-Up (GPA 12-007) - The County of San Diego has amended several sections of the General Plan to provide clarification and to fix map errors. Refer to the LCPG website for full and Lakeside portions of 2013 Draft General Plan. (Tabled)

A motion to Table Items #7 and #8 was amended by L. Cyphert to only table #7C, 7D, 8A, 8B and 8D was made by M. Baker and seconded by L. Carlson. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

G. Rockcrest Road Parking Prohibition (near Riverview Elementary) – The County is currently investigating the establishment of a parking prohibition on the north side of Rockcrest Road from Winter Gardens Blvd easterly approximately 400 feet from 7 am to 5 pm on School Days. The proposed parking prohibition is an effort to further encourage parents to participate in Riverview School’s desires drop-off/pick-up procedures and utilize onsite facilities. Establishment of the proposed parking prohibition will benefit Riverview School and Winter Gardens Blvd’s operating conditions and further enhance school traffic safety. - Public Comment:
- Darryl Jensen, whose property fronts approximately 300’ of the 400’ proposed parking prohibition, spoke in general support of the project and noted that his sight distance is occasionally impeded by large vehicles and sometimes his driveway is blocked.
- Karla Shulander, the leasing manager at Rockcrest Villas Senior Apartments, across the street from the proposed parking prohibition area, is comprised of 60 senior units, which don’t have sufficient parking as it is. Many of these residents have family, friends and caregivers that come on a daily or weekly basis that need that parking. Another complex also utilizes this parking area. It would be detrimental for the seniors if their parking was further reduced. Some of the seniors have County healthcare givers come, that need a place to park and having that option for care allows them to live independently, instead of in a county-funded facility. There is also a petition that was signed by residents that was given to K. Mitten.
Due to the lack of time to adequately address this issue, a motion to Table Item 6G to be the first item at the next meeting was made by L. Cyphert and seconded by T. Medvitz. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)

7. GROUP BUSINESS
A. Reimbursement: Vote on $30 (for ½ hour) Venue fee for April 3 LCPG meeting. A motion to Approve the reimbursement was made by L. Strom and seconded by J. Bugbee. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)
B. Reimbursement: Vote on $60 (for 1 hour) Venue fee for June 5 LCPG meeting. A motion to Approve the reimbursement was made by G. Barnard and seconded by L. Carlson. Motion passed (12-0-0-3)
C. Members Attendance Review: (Tabled)
D. Ethics Training Reminder: (Tabled)

8. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:
A. Design Review Board - (Tabled)
B. County Service Area 69 - (Tabled)
C. Trails – G. Barnard requested the update be provided by Janice Shackelford, who attended a trail advocates meeting with Supervisor Dianne Jacob to discuss potential new trail opportunities in each community. She stated the subcommittee discussed various options and has come up with three recommendations for an upcoming LCPG agenda: (1) acquire and purchase the flume trail, (2) improve and identify the existing trail from Flinn Springs Park southward to Crest Ridge Open Space Area as a dedicated trail, and (3) on land owned by SDGE in Morena Valley (at the north end of the valley), that is on a parcel that wasn’t part of Landbraun
Lakeside Ranch project, obtain trail easements from Moreno Avenue up into the High Metal Ranch project, where there are existing dedicated trails. The subcommittee will bring these options forward to discuss with the LCPG at a later date.

**D. AYSO** – W. Allen requested we hear from a community member who has been waiting all this time for the AYSO subcommittee report. Heather Hoag inquired as to the status of the sports committee. She stated she was asked by Dianne Jacob and former superintendent Bristol to approach the LCPG about being an umbrella for a sports committee. She has previously worked with G. Inverso, who recently turned it over to T. Medvitz due to work commitments, and hasn’t heard anything. She was concerned that this was listed as an AYSO subcommittee, as this was intended to cover all sports, not just soccer. She expressed confusion that the LCPG was considering disbanding this committee when there are many Lakeside sports teams, not just soccer, that need to be given priority on their home fields. T. Medvitz stated that the LCPG covers land use and the agreement was to assist with the scheduling of soccer fields, and the other sports teams were not within the purview. L. Cyphert stated that this was not on the agenda, but the LCPG can address the expanded question as to whether we can participate in a Sports Committee early on the next agenda to discuss in more detail.

9. **ADJOURNED**: 9:00 p.m.

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
From: Janis Shackelford, Chair  
Lindo Lake Subcommittee  

To: Brian Albright, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation  
Richard Crompton, Director, Department of Public Works  

The Lindo Lake Subcommittee for Lakeside’s Revitalization Steering Committee has a long standing priority of dredging or excavating Lindo Lake, to both restore Lindo Lake and improve its water quality. A community meeting held April 17, 2013 demonstrated overwhelming agreement and support for this priority. The Subcommittee is submitting the following requests to the County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation and Department of Public Works. I will be presenting these requests to community organizations to request their concurrence and support for these recommendations. I will also be requesting the Lakeside Community Planning Group’s support and their recommendation to the County to proceed with all required environmental review that will allow the maintenance of Lindo Lake to begin.

A. Request immediate steps be taken to remove accumulated sediment from the eastern basin of Lindo Lake. This maintenance of the lake should begin as soon as possible during the summer when the eastern basin is dry.

Consider utilizing a Request for Proposals from third parties to remove sediment in the shortest time possible. Alternatively utilize County resources to extract and export material, and/or outreach to the local community to transport and dispose the material. Expedite all environmental permits required.

B. Request the County address storm drains impacting Lindo Lake, identifying methods to eliminate siltation of the Lake. This analysis should begin immediately so de-siltation methods can be implemented after sediment removal is completed.

C. Request sealing of the bottom of the lake and stabilization the shoreline after sediment removal is completed.

D. Request similar treatment of the western basin of Lindo Lake after completion of the eastern basin maintenance with the addition of aeration methods to sustain the western basin’s water quality.

E. Request the County to budget for ongoing maintenance of both basins of Lindo Lake.

cc. Dianne Jacob, Supervisor, District 2