

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES Wednesday, October 7, 2015 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

Seat 1-Kristen Mitten; Seat 2-Brian Sesko; Seat 3-Karen Ensall; Seat 5-Deborah Montgomery; Seat 6-Josef Kufal; Seat 8-Nathan Thompson; Seat 9-Wyatt Allen; Seat 10-Milt Cyphert; Seat 12-Steve Robak; Seat 13-Lisa Anderson; Seat 14-Julie Bugbee

Members Absent:

Seat 7-currently vacant; Seat 11- currently vacant; Seat 15-Bob Turner

Members Late:

Seat 4-Mike Anderson (6:52pm)

Public present: Signed in: 1 person for Los Coches Rd. freestanding sign size increase, 10 people for Cameron second dwelling unit, 6 people community attendees; approximately 19 present.

OPEN HOUSE (6:00 – 6:30pm)

1. CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 PM

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL - Quorum reached with 11 present.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF: *September 2015*

Motion was made by Julie Bugbee to approve the meeting minutes for September 2015; seconded by Lisa Anderson. Brian Sesko called for correction on page 4, 9.G; his meeting was with County Staff that Dianne Jacob referred him to, not Dianne Jacob herself. Brian also wanted clarification on motion regarding Peacock Hill. He thought he abstained from the vote. The parking situation was clarified and Brian conceded and voted. Karen Ensall asked for clarification on C.3; boundary was talking about easements. Julie made an amended motion to approve the minutes with stated corrections. Lisa Anderson seconded. Motion Passed (11-0-0).

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio Recording – Notification is hereby provided that the LCPG meeting may be audio recorded for purposes of preparation of the meeting minutes.

6. OPEN FORUM

- A. Janice Shakelford, Lindo Lake subcommittee chairman for Lakesides revitalization
 - a. Invited the community and LCPG members to a meeting regarding which is an out grove of the subcommittee's continual push to get Lindo Lake upgraded. Meeting is at Lakeside Community Center, Wed., October 14, at 6:30pm.
 - b. Second thing is Janice submitted to the chairman a website that Janice requested be shared with the LCPG. It deals with the bicycle and pedestrian plan for Lakeside which is somehow all being combined. Example: the plan calls for a class 2 bike lane on Vine Street. In Janice's opinion there is no room for a lane unless parking is eliminated.
 - c. Janice Shakelford and her husband appealed the Planning Commission approval of the Evergreen Project. The Supervisors did not support the appeal, however; county staff didn't look at the zoning

ordinance because importing of stable bedding, manure, etc. is not permitted in that zone. Somehow in three years of reviewing the project county staff missed it, ignored it, or felt it was a small part of the project. This part was removed from the use permit as an erratum at the Board of Supervisors meeting. This helps with the odor impact to the community.

- B. Mark Kennedy, normally here for Lakeside land but is here now as a disgruntled non-agenda person.
 - a. He has been coming to board about 20 years. Thought he would be on the agenda tonight.
 - b. He thought that normally when a project is submitted with VPW the LCPG would schedule the applicant on the agenda but now he was told he had to call.
 - c. This is something new and should be disclosed if the rules were amended. It pushed his project back a month.
 - d. Per Julie Bugbee and Milton Cyphert he was on the agenda at a prior meeting and got bumped because the meeting ran to long. Chairs were changed and the issued accidentally got dropped. He should have been notified and it was an over site, a simple mistake. Per Milton, they talked but it was too late to put on the October agenda, it already was posted. He will be on November's agenda.
 - e. The LCPG is supposed to contact the applicant if their project is put on the agenda.

- C. Anthony Carr, confirming that they are scheduled on the agenda for Greenfield Drive. There are 10 members of the community that want to speak.

7. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

No county presentations this month.

8. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. **9455 Los Coches Rd - MUP modification to increase size of Freestanding Sign** for church
 - a. Proponent Jennifer Lemke, CSI Signs, handed out copies,
 - i. Clarified what signifies the square footage of signs. Only copy on sign designates square footage so the proposed sign is 12 sq ft.
 - ii. The aluminum pan is 18.75 sq ft.
 - iii. Existing sign is 23 (larger).
 - b. LCPG comment, this is just change in the sign so why on the agenda. The county asked for us to review because it is a change on the MUP.
 - c. LCPG comments: Wyatt Allen says it is a nice sign and thought the size is fine. Kristen Mitten went to the site and mentioned that it will be a nice addition at the proposed or alternate (which is two feet larger). Brian Sesko questioned the distance from the sidewalk and if the new sign was going to be closer to the sidewalk. Wanted to make sure the Planning Commission concern about visibility is addressed and that the sign is back off the setback. The new sign is back further than the old.
 - d. Mary Allison, Community member comment; lives on Los Coches and finds the sign a nice addition to the road.

MOTION: Julie Bugbee made a motion to approve the project as presented, Wyatt Allen seconded. Motion Passed (12-0-0).

- e. Proponent asked what happens next. Milton Cyphert said it would go in the minutes and the county notified of the LCPG recommendations.
-
- B. **PDS2015-STP99-055W1 - Trebor-Reynolds Site Plan Modification for the Parcel APN # 483-140-65** Storage Containers on flag lot at 633 Greenfield (we have 10 community members that wish to speak against so far)
 - a. Anthony Carr wanted to speak along with other neighbors.
 - b. Proponent is not present, can't proceed without them.
 - c. The proponent was notified by Kristen Mitten via email and they responded.
 - d. Anthony Carr passed out documentation; we will take names of the community members that were here to speak.

- e. Community asked what the process is, can the proponent stall indefinitely.
- f. Comment by Janice Shakelford is that as she recalls the requirements for the LCPG and the design review board is that there is only a certain amount of time to make a recommendation (she believes it is 45 days) and if the time passes then the county can proceed with an application without the planning group input. She suggests we check on it and verify the requirement.

Motion: Brian Sesko made a motion that we deny the proponents site plan modification, without prejudice with the condition that the proponent can reschedule, based on the proponents failure to appear after being notified that they were on the agenda. Wyatt Allen seconded. Motion Passed (12-0-0).

- C. **Cameron 2nd Dwelling Unit - Site Plan Waiver 15796 Miss Ellie Lane** (addition of 2nd dwelling unit)
- a. Proponent, Tom Caywood, Caywood Design.
 - b. Asked for granting of county waiver per the county's request.
 - c. Kristen Mitten asked why this is triggering a waiver and not going through the normal business permit plan.
 - d. Tom Caywood answered that this is in the designated scenic area zoning.
 - e. Milton Cyphert asked how large the property was and if it was in the multi-species area that required one residence per 8 acres. It is not.
 - f. Property is 175,000 sq, 3.5 to 4 acres.
 - g. Deborah Montgomery mentioned that a the Dept. of Planning and Development corrections list says that the dwelling should not me more than 30% of the main house and it is and they want it addressed. Kristen Mitten talked to the DPD and they assured her he was meeting that requirement.
 - h. Milton Cyphert asked if all the land perks, amount of bedrooms, septic, well, etc. were within requirements. The land is fairly flat, not on a hill.
 - i. It is off the the right and will be a by-right project and out of site.
 - j. Karen Ensall asked if there were neighbor's objections. No public comment. Proponent not aware of any objections.
 - k. Existing house is 3452 sq ft., Interior is 3335 sq ft.
 - l. Second dwelling unit is 998 sq ft., County will make sure it is under the limit.

Motion was made by Julie Bugbee to approve the project, as presented; seconded by Nathan Thompson. Motion Passed (12-0-0).

- D. **STP11-016TE2 Time Extension for Site Plan for RS Recycling for temporary offices**
- a. This is on a side street off Pepper Drive.
 - b. No Proponent present, concept plan and propend does not have plan yet.
 - c. No discussions or actions.
 - d. Karen Ensall asked why votes to continue are done. We have a duty to try to hear the proposal within the 45 day window.

Motion: Julie Bugbee made a motion to continue November. Nathan Thompson seconded. Motion Passed (12-0-0).

- E. **Steel Garage/Ag Bldg at 13536 East Lakeview Rd to decrease rear setback from 25' to 10' or less for 22'x44'x16.5'h motor home garage. (pending receipt of plans).**
- a. Continued to November Meeting per Proponent request.

9. GROUP BUSINESS

- A. Reimbursement: No reimbursements
- B. Brian Sesko's meeting with the county:
 - a. Eric Lardie, planning manager, who oversees what comes to the LCPG group.
 - b. Eric's assistant, Daniel Serrano, who is new and polite but still learning.
 - c. Eric heard Brian's concerns but has no idea and will get back to Brian but it won't be quick.
 - d. Brian's understanding of the process is that before anything comes before the LCPG the chairperson should receive a scoping letter and/or a comment letter. These should be presented by

before anything gets on the agenda. Concept plans are an exception. The county admitted that they don't know why it is not happening that way. They plan on fixing it.

- e. Brian Sesko's second question to the county was what system was in place to assure the LCPG that the public community is notified within the proper radius. The county had no idea. There was no follow-up that things that get presented to the board get notified to the public.
 - f. It is hard to believe there are not more public comments about parking, etc. and that nobody in the Neighborhood has concerns. How are they getting notified?
 - g. The county was sure the LCPG was getting the forms needed to report the status of the LCPG votes on projects. Milton Cyphert assured that the LCPG does get the forms and does send in the recommendations.
 - h. Email from the county says they will look into the concerns and fix them.
 - i. The LCPG rarely gets the scoping letters and the county says they shouldn't be on the agenda without it.
 - j. There is a concern that proponents are asking to get onto the agenda last minute with no time to notify the public.
 - k. Brian Sesko brought up the parking issues and the county said it was taken care of by Paul Sprecco and it was a non-issue with no action. A letter was written from LCPG stating that the LCPG did not agree with the 20/20 plan and parking regulations.
 - l. The county's position is that it would be hard to change and would be controversial to change the parking requirements.
 - m. Brian Sesko's suggestion is for the LCPG members to individually send a recommendation that the LCPG would like to see about parking to him and he will pursue it with the county.
 - n. Julie Bugbee mentioned the October 29, 9:30am, revitalization meeting and suggested several LCPG member bring the parking issue up.
 - o. Kristen Mitten will find the letter that was sent to the county and send it to Brian Sesko.
 - p. Brian Sesko suggests getting a copy of the letter and get more email comments from the LCPG group. He will compile the comments and present back to the group, and make a motion.
 - q. The ratio that the parking used to be was 2.1 regardless of number of bedrooms. Now it is 4 bedrooms at 1.7 parking spaces.
 - r. Janice Shakelford stated that what Brian Sesko described about his meeting with the county is almost totally contrary to everything done in the past and she is mystified. Janice wondered if there was a planning group coordinator. (Eric Lardie). Janice and Gordon Shakefords opinion is that the county has become advocates instead of analysts.
 - s. Normally the county staff is required to complete a scoping document within 30 days unless the applicant asks for an extension. What that does by delaying is eliminate any comment the community has in the process. If the community picks up any issues the county misses it cannot be included post scoping letter, it must be included in the original scoping. To a certain extent what Eric Lardie is essentially saying is to sit back, let us do our job and maybe eventually let the public have its two cents worth.
 - t. Janice Shakelford is going to Planning Commission opposing a staff recommendation on the Lake Jennings Subdivision, TM5578, project on the corner of Lake Jennings and Blossom Valley Rd. The county granted a design exception so the applicant does not have to do road improvements to Blossom Valley Rd. Should be on the staff report. The proponent was also given an exception so he doesn't have to put power lines underground.
 - u. Brian Sesko, disclosed that he met with the sand mining people and they asked that a couple people from the LCPG meet with them to share information. Brian want's to volunteer to be the vehicle for information. A discussion was brought up about ethics and this would be against the Brown Act. The LCPG cannot individually discuss this; it needs to be addressed in front of the board. Officially as a board we cannot take action. Brian can make comments at open forum.
- C. Open Seats:
- a. There are two seats open
 - b. The Chair received one application accepted by the county, Michael Evans Lang.
 - i. Michael spoke of his experiences and qualifications.
 - ii. He worked in the planning office of UCSD for 20 years before retiring.
 - iii. Lived in Lakeside for 5 years.

- iv. Wants to be a part of shepherding the transition of Lakeside.
- v. Has a PHD in social science and a masters in History.
- vi. Enjoys community involvement and is involved with Voices for Children.

Motion: Julie Bugbee made a motion to approve Michael Lang’s application the LCPG board. Kristen Mitten seconded. Motion Passed (12-0-0).

- D. Milton Cyphert announced a meeting for the East County Sports Advisory Committee that will be held at Dianne Jacob’s office in downtown El Cajon, Main Street, starting at 6:30pm. The meeting is to continue to discuss efforts to develop sport facilities throughout East County and to identify projects that could further the ECSAC common goal. Dianne is looking forward to the LCPGs thoughts and ideas. A multiuse soccer/rugby type field has been discussed for a long time and would be a boon for East County children.
- E. A multi use soccer field was on top of the PLDL priority list and the county emailed back to please let them know of any land for sale that can be used for the field. Karen Ensall informed Dianne of a possible piece of property.

C. Member’s Attendance Review: No one missed three meetings in a 12 month running average; September of last year fell off so there is a non-issue.

10. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Design Review Board (DRB)

- a. The only review was Lakeside Land and the project was approved with stipulations because they want to go a little higher than the standard has been. The front of the building will be similar to surrounding buildings and keeping within the visual aspects of the neighborhood and the back part will be taller but 50 feet back and within the setback.

B. County Service Area 69 (CSA 69)

- a. September 21st Karen Ensall and Janice Shakelford met with Mindy Fogg from Planning and Land use and Christine Sloane from Parks and Recreation and presented them with a trail map that was put together after meetings with the community. It was basically the same as the San Diego Trails master plan so was already voted in and approved by the County Board of Supervisors. Some concessions were made with our without the sand mining going through that the staging stay on El Monte road and be similar to Penasquitos Canyon .

11. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING. 7:53pm

Next Meeting Date: Weds. November 4, 2015, starting at 6:30 pm

Deborah Montgomery,
Lakeside Community Planning Group
lakesidecpg@gmail.com

*** Visit our website for Agendas, Project Materials, Announcements & more at: LCPG.weebly.com ***
or send an email to the LCPG chair & secretary at: lakesidecpg@gmail.com

-----**Public**

Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is

being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

FINAL