A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held January 9, 2014, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

ITEM 1: ROLL CALL (Piva, Chair)

In Attendance: Torry Brean (Arr 7:30) Matt Deskovick (Arr 7:20) Scotty Ensign
Carlie Hickman Eb Hogervorst Barbara Jensen
Kristi Mansolf Donna Myers Jim Piva
Dennis Sprong Paul Stykel Richard Tomlinson
Kevin Wallace

Excused Absence: Chad Anderson, Jim Cooper

Jim Piva, RCPG Chair, acted as Chair of the meeting, Scotty Ensign, RCPG Vice Chair, acted as the Vice-Chair of the meeting, and Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING 12-5-13 AND 11-7-13


Upon motion made by Richard Tomlinson and seconded by Paul Stykel, the motion passed 11-0-0-4, with Chad Anderson, Torry Brean, Jim Cooper and Matt Deskovick absent.

Ms. Mansolf said the minutes of November 7 were approved on December 5, however, there is no mention of the dollar figure requested for the Barnett School Playground project, and so she added “$75,000” requested for the project into the minutes on page 3.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING NOVEMBER 7, 2013, WITH THE CHANGE TO ADD $75,000 TO THE BARNETT SCHOOL PLAYGROUND PROJECT ON PAGE 3, AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Richard Tomlinson and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion passed 11-0-0-4, with Chad Anderson, Torry Brean, Jim Cooper and Matt Deskovick absent.

ITEM 4: Announcements and Correspondence Received

Ms. Mansolf announced that in-person Planning and Sponsor Group Training had recently taken place, and online training would soon be available to Planning and Sponsor Group members so they could fulfill their annual training requirement.

Regarding the General Plan Update Map Cleanup – the Planning Commission has the item on their agenda for January 24, 2014, and the map cleanup item on Rangeland Road/Highland Valley Road that came before the RCPG in December will be heard at that meeting.

The Chair announced the upcoming Charger playoff game coming up in Denver on January 12.
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. – None

ITEM 6: ACTION ITEMS:
   A. (West Subcommittee Project) TM 5250 Montecito Ranch Proposal. Request for a Reduction in Grading from 2.9 million cubic yards to 2.0 million cubic yards and a Reduction in Blasting due To Reconfiguration of Internal Lots and Internal Road Network. All Amenities Remain the Same. Chris Brown, Representative

Mr. Brown presented the project. Mr. Stykel recused himself due to living in close proximity to the project.

Mr. Brown said that the tentative map for the Montecito Ranch project has been approved by the Board of Supervisors. The next step is approval of the final map by the Board of Supervisors. Previously the project had been back before the RCPG when external road issues had changed. Now they are looking at the engineering and at the internal roads. A new area was laid over the old map and grading changed. This created a ripple effect and hydrological modifications were adjusted. They are avoiding rocky areas and knolls so there is less blasting. 900,000 less cubic yards of dirt will be moved. They reconfigured roads in the cul de sac and connected them. The Director of Planning and Development Services has the final say. He is asking the RCPG to send a motion to the County regarding acceptance of these changes. In early summer, they may be done with the final map.

Mr. Wallace is opposed to the Montecito Ranch project. He feels the project is similar to a city and not in character with Ramona. He was concerned that not many people here know about the project. Regarding the reduction in grading, this will be a well hidden community. He is concerned there may be an archaeological site they are trying to avoid.

Mr. Tomlinson said there is no change to the amenities.

Mr. Brown said there was a full EIR. Studies were done including archaeological studies. They will be avoiding making any impacts to cultural resources. They don’t know what they will find underneath the surface. With the reduction in grading there will be less trucks and less greenhouse gases. Less blasting will be better for the neighbors.

Ms. Myers asked if lots were being reconfigured, and if so, would any lots be less than ½ acre?

Mr. Brown said there will be no lot less than 20,000 square feet.

Ms. Myers said she was concerned families in the area were not involved and aware of the project. She wished there was a representative from that area.

Mr. Brown said the project was approved by the Board of Supervisors, but it is still going through changes that are internal to the project and minimal.

Ms. Mansolf said there was extensive public input on the project over the years. At one time the West Subcommittee had over 20 members on it due to people wanting to give their input on the project. Some liked it and others didn’t. Many lived in the area.
Mr. Hickman said he likes what has been done. He is concerned with an intersection to the far west. It doesn’t have a perpendicular approach. It won’t be a problem at first, but when trees and bushes get big, the visibility will be impaired. Mr. Hickman said he recommends straightening the roads.

Mr. Tomlinson said he is a neighbor to the project and he has been informed through all phases of the project.

Mr. Wallace said the project affects everyone. People will cut through the neighborhoods to take short cuts through town. Montecito Road from Highway 67 will be used more for access than Ash.

**MOTION:** THE RCPG HAS REVIEWED THE MONTECITO RANCH, TM 5250, RPL8, REVISED MAP. WE UNDERSTAND THE REDUCTION IN GRADING AND BLASTING, AND THE CHANGES TO THE INTERNAL CIRCULATION, AND WE SUPPORT THESE CHANGES.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Eb Hogervorst, the motion **passed 10-2-0-1-2**, with Donna Myers and Kevin Wallace voting no, Paul Stykel stepping down, and Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

**6-B.** Request by Mt. Woodson HOA to Process a Minor Deviation Application Regarding Relocation of the North Entrance Gates. Steve Powell, Representative

Mr. Powell is seeking RCPG support for the relocation of the North Woodson entry gates approximately 425 feet to the north on North Woodson Drive as presented on the plans. To accomplish this, a minor deviation will need to be processed.

**MOTION:** TO APPROVE THE MINOR DEVIATION REQUEST REGARDING THE RELOCATION OF THE NORTH ENTRANCE GATES.

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick abstaining, and Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

**6-C.** (CUDA Subcommittee Project) Jim Hagey is exploring the viability of a town square next to Elliott Pond. His early ideas include 3 or 4 small sidewalk cafes, wine bar, brew pub, art gallery, gazebo for plays, place for yoga, free Wi-Fi, a lot of shade. Requests input.

Mr. Hagey bought the land by Elliott Pond 14 years ago. He recently met with the CUDA Subcommittee and the Village Design Committee to discuss what could be done with the property in the future. He would like to see retail or something similar by the duck pond. There were 2 ideas that came out of the recent Committee meeting. One would be for a big box store to go in as an anchor. Possibly it will help to get the entitlements for commodities such as a town square and be a condition for approval. Six of the 20 acres could be used for a town square. Mr. Hagey wants the pond to remain natural. People could come and visit the area and not need to buy anything. People could enjoy food from different restaurants and share their food outside on picnic tables.
Mr. Hagey asked what the RCPG would like to see?

Mr. Brean said the project has been here a long time. It sounds like housing is now off the table. The CUDA Subcommittee doesn’t want to see an isolated big box store. Behind shops there could be things like a music festival. He doesn’t want to see things pushed back to the duck pond.

Mr. Hagey said he wants elements of the project to be synergistic and he doesn’t want a corporate look. He wants it to look as though it were built before 1940.

Mr. Hogervorst asked if Mr. Hagey was trying to create something like Old Town Poway on Midland or Old Town Temecula?

Mr. Hagey said both of those areas are successful. Ramona needs a town square.

Mr. Deskovick said his daughter caught her first fish at a pond similar to the duck pond at a place where people 16 and under could fish. In addition to the duck pond, there was a small amphitheater where kids can play. The pond was stocked with fish.

Mr. Hagey said at one point they were putting water in the pond and there were a lot of fish in the duck pond as well as a variety of birds. The ducks have always been a big attraction. Mr. Hagey worked on the project until the recession when he was told he would have to do an EIR. He determined that he would have to sell homes at $450,000 each for the project to pencil out for him. No one wants to pay that much for a 6,000 square foot lot in town. If a big box eventually goes in, he would like for it to be smaller than a traditional big box store. With 20 acres or more Mr. Hagey can have mixed use. Department stores would be allowed.

Mr. Sprong asked what will H Street be like?

Mr. Hagey said he talked to the neighbors on H Street and all were okay with it but one. Mr. Hagey said there is a floodplain on part of the site. He was thinking cows and possibly 4H could create what goes on that corner.

Mr. Stykel said the concept was great. There could be a little bowling alley, small restaurants and a little movie theater.

Mr. Hickman said there would be a need for pedestrian movement in the area. There would be required improvements on H Street. Currently there are no sidewalks on H Street.

Mr. Hagey said he would have to build sidewalks on H Street. He designed the sidewalks and planted the trees on Ramona Street.

Mr. Hickman said East Lake in Chula Vista worked out good for 10 years then environmental issues came up. It is a huge issue now and fish are dead.

Mr. Hagey said the pond was originally put there to raise turtles. The project would be 210 yards from Main Street. He would like to see a central eating area where people could share food from different restaurants.

Mr. Ensign said that in the winter the pond floods Raymond Street. The County doesn’t like people driving through the water. He felt this is why there are no ponds.
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Mr. Wallace asked how parking will be handled?

Mr. Hagey wants a pre-1940 look, so parking would be hidden. Retailers want them self contained.

Mr. Deskovick asked if Mr. Hagey would put in solar panels?

Mr. Hagey said he could put them over parking areas or create shade with them.

6-D. (East Subcommittee project) Requested Zoning Change on J. Hawkin’s Parcels #287-032-08-00, 287-032-11-00, and 287-050-0200, Previously Property Specific Request RM 22, from RL 80 to RL 40. Littlepage Rd.

Ms. Hawkins presented the issue. Previously her property had been Property Specific Referral RM 22 when going through the GP Update hearing process. It was RL 40 for most of the process. At the end, right before the hearing, it was changed to RL 80. She went to the hearing and was included in a handful of properties that was referred back to the community. In Ramona, 3 properties were referred back to the RCPG for a recommendation. Although the RCPG recommended RL 40 for her property, it was approved as RL 80. A couple of months ago she felt she should try to reopen her case. She has educated herself on these issues for 3 years. Her land is not wilderness land but agricultural land. Parcels to the north are 10 to 15 acres. To the south, west and north, parcels are 40 acres.

Her parcels differ from the RL 80 parcels. She has a County road going all the way through her parcel. She was told she is on a dead end road, but the road goes through to the EA Ranch. When she inherited the property 20 years ago, the zoning was 10 acres. RL 80 is an 800 percent change in 20 years.

Ramona has 45,000 people. There are 2 fire departments within 3 miles of her property – CAL FIRE and the Intermountain Volunteer Fire Department/County Fire Authority. There are well established roads for agricultural businesses in the area. There is a utility project connecting Santa Ysabel with SDCE.

Most recently Kevin Johnston at the County had invited her to attended the January 24 Planning Commission meeting and speak on the GP Update item.

Mr. Ensign, East Subcommittee Chair, said the County took more of a rubber stamp approach to the property in the GP Update. The County doesn’t know of the County road going through her property and it wasn’t on the GP Update map. The County doesn’t seem to be aware of the utility project in the area. Ms. Hawkins family bought the land in 1868 and she would like to get on the GP Update cleanup list.

Mr. Sprong asked what became of the letter the RCPG wrote on the property for the GP Update?

The Chair said the letter was too general.

Ms. Hawkins said she was working with Jimmy Wong through the GP Update and then she heard he had left the County.

Mr. Deskovick said there are parcels of Creek Hollow that are 20 acres bordering her property.
Mr. Hickman suggested Ms Hawkins talk directly to the lead person in Advance Planning about her property. Ms. Hawkins should also attend the Planning Commission hearing January 24, and possibly the Chair could make some calls.

Ms. Mansolf said she talked to Mr. Johnston at the County a couple of weeks before about Ms. Hawkins lack of closure on the RM 22 Property Specific Request. Following the hearing where the Property Specific Requests were determined – Ms. Mansolf and Ms. Hawkins were both sent emails regarding the disposition of the property and Ms. Hawkins never received hers because the County had an old email address. She let him know Ms. Hawkins came back to the RCPG recently and asked for some assistance with her property. Ms. Mansolf, Mr. Ensign and Mr. Wallace talked to County planners at the Planning and Sponsor Group training about Ms. Hawkins property, and she is encouraged the County has contacted her and requested her to be at the January 24 Planning Commission hearing.

MOTION: TO PRESENT THE CASE AND CREATE A LETTER TO THE CHIEF OF ADVANCED PLANNING, BRINGING NEW INFORMATION TO THE TABLE REGARDING THE HAWKINS PROPERTY.

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion passed 13-0-0-0-2, with Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

6-E. Informational Presentation by Bill Saumier and Sean O’Neill, County Parks And Recreation Department, on 1). Upcoming changes to the Parks and Recreation fee ranges, and 2). Parks and Recreation building and facility naming rights. Item to go before the Board of Supervisors in January or February 2014

Mr. Saumier presented the information and Mr. O’Neill was not in attendance.

The Board of Supervisors will consider new proposed fee ranges for the Department of Parks and Recreation at the meeting February 5, 2014. Some of the items didn’t exist previously. Some items will be charged for and some items will be competitive with other fees in the area. Changes are related to cost recovery. County Parks typically does not have full cost recovery.

Another item to come up at the Board of Supervisors meeting will be naming rights. If a community member wants to name something, they would pay a fee. The name would stay on display. It would have to fit in the context in which it is proposed. For some proposals, the Director of Parks and Recreation will be able to decide. If the amount is over $15,000, the Board of Supervisors will decide. It will take 3 months to put a board letter together for this issue.

The request on February 5 will be to amend Board of Supervisors Policy G-6, User Fees, County Parks and Recreation Facilities and adopt a Resolution approving the proposed Department of Parks and Recreation user fee ranges in accordance with Board of Supervisors Policy G-6. If approved, the new ranges will allow the Department of Parks and Recreation to adjust fees in the future in response to escalating costs and market demand.

Funds that are collected will go into separate pots.

Mr. Wallace asked if someone puts a name up, can they recommend whether the money goes into a facility or into the general fund?
Mr. Saumier said the money will go into the same pot.

Mr. Brean asked if the list of requirements for naming rights included RCPG review?

Mr. Saumier said for $15,000 or less, maybe not. But maybe if it is minor, they would still get a chance to review. Anything related to Capital Improvement Projects has to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Brean asked about progress of current PLDO projects?

Mr. Saumier said it is possible a Major Use Permit will be required by the RMWD for the amphitheater. The school district baseball project looks reasonable, as does the tennis to basketball court conversion and the LED girls softball scoreboard project.

The Chair said it is desirable for PLDO funds to be spent soon so they don’t go into maintenance fees.

ITEM 7: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)
7-A: Election of Officers for 2014: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

The Chair opened nominations for Chair for 2014.

Ms. Myers nominated Scotty Ensign for Chair.

Mr. Ensign said he would have to decline the nomination for Chair.

Mr. Deskovick nominated Jim Piva for Chair and Mr. Ensign seconded the nomination.

Ms. Myers nominated Carl Hickman for Chair.

Mr. Hickman said he would have to decline the nomination for Chair.

As there were no additional nominations, the Chair closed nominations for Chair.

All voted in favor of Jim Piva as chair, except Donna Myers voted no, and Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper were absent.

The Chair opened up nominations for Vice Chair for 2013.

Mr. Deskovick nominated Scotty Ensign for Vice Chair, with the nomination seconded by Mr. Hogervorst.

As there were no additional nominations, the Chair closed nominations for Vice Chair.

All voted in favor of Scotty Ensign as Vice Chair for 2014, with Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

The Chair opened nominations for Secretary.

Mr. Wallace nominated Kristi Mansolf for Secretary, with the nomination seconded by Scotty Ensign.
As there were no more nominations, the Chair closed nominations for Secretary.

All voted in favor of Kristi Mansolf as Secretary for 2014, with Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

7-B: Santa Maria Creek Cleanup Update

There has been no additional news on the citizen group that was interested in working on the Santa Maria Creek Cleanup. The Chair suggested inviting Ms. Tobiaison to the February 6, 2014, meeting for an update.

7-C: Consideration of Adding “Approval of Order of the Agenda” to the Agenda

The Chair said one of County staff from the training said the Chair has the authority to change the order of the agenda at the meeting. The Chair said he has talked to other planning groups and some of them have added the “approval of order of the agenda” back to their agenda since the County came up with the new template. He would like the RCPG to consider having a designated item for approving or changing the agenda.

MOTION: TO ADD APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA TO THE TOP OF THE AGENDA AFTER PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Paul Stykel, the motion passed 13-0-0-0-2, with Chad Anderson and Jim Cooper absent.

7-D: Committee Reports (Possible Action)

7-D-1: Parks and Recreation Subcommittee Meeting Business – Update on Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Priority List Submitted August 2013 Parks and Recreation Meeting Canceled

7-D-2: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Cooper) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board – No Report Given

7-D-3: VILLAGE DESIGN COMMITTEE REPORT (Brean, Stykel)

Mr. Brean said there was no Village Design meeting. He has learned that the Design Review Checklist will be included in the Village Design Plan. It is anticipated that the Village Design Plan will be ready to be presented for approval in May, 2014.

7-E: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

7-E-1: Concerns from Members – None

7-E-2: Future Agenda Item Requests

The Chair said that reconsideration items were brought up at the training, and the County wants us to check with them whenever an item is to be reconsidered due to potential complications. There was a misunderstanding when the Robertson Street Apartments came up for reconsideration on November 7, 2013, and we will need to have this item on our agenda again in the future. We were under the understanding that unless a motion to reconsider passed, there would be no speakers on the item. This information was not cleared through County Counsel prior to our meeting. We have
since learned that we should have allowed Dr. Crain to speak, and we need to agendize the reconsideration again to allow the public to speak on the reconsideration. The project applicant will also be notified when the item is on the agenda so he can be present and have the opportunity to do a rebuttal if he wishes.

7-E-3: Addition of New Subcommittee Members

The Chair said subcommittee chairs for 2014 will be appointed at the February 6 meeting. At this time, new subcommittee members will be added and the ones that want to stay on existing subcommittees will be confirmed.

The Chair met with the Executive Director of the Ramona Chamber of Commerce. The Chair would like to see members of the Chamber Board to serve on RCPG subcommittees. The Executive Director was open to this.

7-F: Meeting Updates
7-F-1: Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Meetings

Ms. Mansolf announced that the community banners and signs in the public right of way item went to the Board of Supervisors on January 8 for a first reading. The second reading will be January 29.

7-F-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 2-6-14 at the Ramona Community Library, 7 p.m.

ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf