

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, June 3, 2015 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

Seat 7-Paul Sprecco (chair), Seat 10-Milt Cyphert (vice-chair), Seat 8-Nathan Thompson (secretary), Seat 9-Wyatt Allen, Seat 14-Julie Bugbee, Seat 1-Kristen Mitten, Seat 12-Steve Robak, Seat 2-Brian Sesko, Seat 15-Bob Turner, Seat 3-Karen Ensall, Seat 5-Deborah Montgomery, Seat 4-Mike Anderson
Members Absent: Seat 11-Thomas Medvitz, Seat 6-Josef Kufa, appointed, in attendance, not seated pending County Board of Supervisor vote. (Seat 13 currently vacant).

Public present: Signed in: 48. Room was standing room only, approximately 150.

OPEN HOUSE: 6:00pm – 6:30pm

1. Paul Sprecco, Chair, asked attendees to take seats; stated there was full house and asked that all keep the noise level low, be respectful and courteous to all speakers and talk straight into the microphone. Announced that if their project is done they are welcome to stay or please exit quietly. Asked speakers that are low on the list to please consider deferring if their point has already been made in order to keep the meeting moving expediently.

2. Call to Order: 6:32 pm

3. Roll Call: Quorum reached with 12 present.

4. Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Meeting Minutes for May 6, 2015 was approved by a motion made by Nathan Thompson, seconded by Wyatt Allen. **Passed (12-0-0).**

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

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

B. Welcome new members- The Planning Group welcomes Josef Kufa, seat #6 – Not seated yet, elected last month, will probably sit next month.

7. OPEN FORUM:

A. Janis Shakelford, Red Pony Lane, Blossom Valley, Lakeside. Stated her and her husband were challenging the Planning Commission approved Blossom Valley Evergreen project. Disappointed in the LCPG support of the projects green waste import piece. Detrimental to the surrounding housing and little league field.

B. Jitka Parez, Linden Road, Lakeside close to El Cajon by Royal Road parallel to Wintergardens Blvd. Side street that needs repair desperately.

1. Key points mentioned:

2. Flood Channel for Wintergarden Subdivision

3. 15 owners in area, 10 absent. Residents can't afford to repair

4. Public road not publicly maintained.

5. Estimated \$300K to repair

6. Floods between 10 and 40 feet causing a risk
7. Can't get more than four owners to commit to repairs
8. 1927 was publicly dedicated as part of Wintergardens Subdivision
9. All her documents show is it a county maintained road
10. Asking for county's help to clean up documents, improve road and more.

8. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS:

C. Jim Bennett PDS Project Manager-El Monte Nature Preserve MUP Mod/Reclamation Plan-PDS2015-MUP-98-014W2

Speakers:

Mindy Fogg, Planning Mgr with County Planning Department

1. Initially permitted as golf course in 1998/1999
2. 2007 mining was proposed in place of the golf course
3. Helix water district, owner of site, proposed a different kind of mine, with different permits that were withdrawn
4. Only thing permitted to date is the golf course
5. This application is to modify the golf course permit to a mining and restoration MUP. This application came in late May and process is being scoped
6. A lot of technical studies will be needed as well as an environmental impact report
7. Notice of preparation will come out in July and will solicit public comment regarding the environmental effect during the notice period
8. Will come back before the Lakeside Community Planning group for a scoping meeting, will discuss what goes into the environmental report, and solicit comments
9. Another opportunity for public review and comments after the report is done
10. The application will then be placed before the Lakeside Community Commission for a decision
11. Business cards available and feel free to contact for questions or comments

Jim Bennett, County ground water geologist and Project Mgr

Power Point presentation talked of length of time, what will be mined, when reclaiming is to be done, possible trails, truck exits etc. Depth of trenching and water usage was talked about. 100 acre pond will be left in the valley. Sides will be reclaimed. Will be mined in four stages. Processing plant located at excavation area and will move as processing moves. 15 to 18 years anticipated. Avg. 1 million tons of material anticipated with estimated max of 250 truck loads per day (231 avg.). Talked about reinforcement to keep roads from eroding.

1. First a mining project; then restoration.
2. When complete and in progress the site will be restored to natural habitat.

3. El Monte Nature preserve and Helix water district have agreement for El Monte Nature preserve to buy property if this MUP is permitted and after mining and restoration is done.
4. Maps showed golf course lakes that will be filled in with mining waste as well as where mining is to take place .
5. Talked about local supply of concrete grade sand coming from out of the area.
6. Primarily sand product but some small scale other product.
7. In 7 or 8 years half the project will be reclaimed.
8. Water level about 40 ft below ground level, will mine up to 90
9. Processing will be portable, moving as the mining progresses.

Mentioned project holes:

1. Provide for return of biological wealth and space with recreational trail
2. Provide trails, not cut off access
3. Address need for construction gage aggregates resources, specifically sand
4. Reduce need for imported product
5. Visibly integrate the site with surrounding land
6. Remove existing vegetation and plant back riparian vegetation
7. Minimize and mitigate environmental impacts

Project Specifics:

1. 565 acres, 199 affected (mined)
2. 90ft max depth
3. Primary cut slope ratio 2 to 1 ; 3 ½ to 1 below water level
4. 15-18m tons of product
5. Max traffic 231 truck loads, avg. 150
6. 1 yr after permit before commencing
7. Duration 15 yrs
8. Reclamation during and 4yrs after
9. 75 acres to reclaim include golf course ponds
10. Project completion 2035
11. Post mining land use will be biological open space and recreation trails

Bill Adams, Managing Partner of El Monte Nature Preserve

1. Involved since 1993, started negotiations with Helix Water District
2. Original proponent for Golf Course

3. Fully attends to work with community, wants continued, improved trails
4. Usage right now in trespassing, no rights
5. Trying to change, cleanup, that and have improved trails and easement awarded at the end with perpetual use, will be in the application
3. Mining process will impact the community
7. Wants public to be involved and to keep in contact

Board concerns:

1. Roads traveled by the trucks and amount of trucks
2. Depth of mining, level of valley after the mining
3. Local well water depth and possible pollution
4. Hours/days of operation and affect on locals
5. Dust impact
6. Valley fever
7. Water hole left as usable, be an eyesore, or safety for children
8. Water evaporation and affect on wells
9. Is sand staying local or exported
10. Easements on LLC land and future development
11. Safety for trails next to mining
12. Safety and traffic for El Monte Rd
13. Water table breach affecting entire valley
14. Reclamation, how many yards will backfill
15. Duration of time to finish the mining
16. Maps not showing what is being promised
17. Staging area and views of pond for trails
18. Make something more useful and within the Lakeside vision for what the community wants.
19. Only speculation that it could happen. Helix didn't get it so why should the current applicants get it. Home owners have rights too.
20. Agrees land owner has certain rights also. Reach out to the board of supervisors to show non-support of project.

Public Concerns (approx. 16 speakers):

1. Roads traveled by the trucks and amount of trucks.
2. Valley Fever experience with riverbed excavation.
3. SD trails alliance speaker; concerned with trails and impact to local businesses and boarding stables.

4. Called the project a destruction not reconstruction project and had concerns about the animals.
5. Concerned with affect for 15 years on children in the area, breathing dust. Noticed the plan said trucks will be on Willow Road also.
6. Likes their wells and septic; does not want to go to city. Concerned with discloser because of having to sell because of change in lifestyle and property values and cleaning up dust.
7. Concern with amount of water that it will take to wash sand and keep dust down. Concerned with quality of water remaining.
8. Concerned that any trails allowed would be fire roads, which aren't really trails. Also, what happens to the rest of the acres that is not pond or reclaimed.
9. Trucks cause sizeable vibration with possible home damage. Is it worth having the money at the cost of doing permanent damage to the valley.
10. Concerned with water usage during our drought. We are all on water restrictions. Concerned with loss of Tumbleweed that is used for shows and charity events. Concerned with economic downslide causing the company to fold or slow up the process and how it will affect the riverbed.
11. Concerned that it's all about money and once it is made they will walk away. It's not right for Lakeside. It's about transferring Lakeside resources into another's pocket. No concern for community or residents.
12. There are several places in San Diego that mines sand. There are places that have never been restored so don't expect this to work either.
13. Lots of time out there, saw bikers, hikers, artists, and riders out in the riverbed. Seen lots of animals that will be impacted. Saw endangered birds. How to justify destroying an established habitat and claim that it will be re-established.
14. Rate of sale of sand is based on sales so mining can go on for a lot longer than the stated 15-18 years.
15. Feels people should work with the miners. Concerned with the controversy. We should accept change and try to work it out.
16. Concessions for sand mining are not acceptable. Times stated for operation don't include evening equipment repair and maintenance which creates noise and lights. Rock crushing and concrete recycling can be done. No assurance that the project will be only 15 years, too much sand, don't think they would ever give up.
17. For the project, feels something should be done with the land.

D. Lakeside Equestrian Center project update.

1. New LOMR feasibility study to see if the land could be built on indicated that the dynamics changed over time; the valley water flow has shifted and elevation levels have risen over the flood level in 95% of the land. Looking at putting parking in the small percent still in the flood area in the north. If public does not challenge the study it will be accepted on Aug. 21, 2015.
2. Next step if not challenged will be to look into a business plan.

Public Concerns/Comments:

1. Wonder who owns the land
2. Parcel is surrounded by flood plain so how is the parcel itself not in the plain.

3. FEMA agreed with the findings.

9. PUBLIC HEARING:

C. Peacock Hill-Discretionary Permit for Tentative Map PDS2015-TM-5598, Site Plan PDS2015-STP-15-003, and Rezone PDS2015-REZ-15-002APB

1. No applicant or proponent. Applicant not ready.

D. Marilla Park-Tentative Map-2nd Iteration. PDS2014-TM-5591

1. Owner described redesign and character of the 4 acre project .
2. Reduced amount of grading.
3. Made changes to comply with storm water regulations.
4. Changed to standard subdivision, single family homes on bigger lots
5. Eliminated most of the retaining walls
6. Increased drainage facilities

Board:

1. Question: Are variances needed and does map meet subdivision of 40ft easements as the plans show 30ft. Answer: County has approved the 30 foot access; which was an original plan.
2. Question: The footprint for lot one looks smaller than required and it looks like property line goes into the road. Answer: Property lines go to center of the private road.
3. Question: How do people get to lot 10 from the road? Has this been through the fire department? Answer: Fire department did request a 36 foot turn around, which is included. 25 foot access is in corner for lot 10.
4. Comment: The project seems too dense for this area, the roads are part of the 10K square foot lot sizes; would like objection noted.
5. Question: Assumption that parking and garages are included. Is a road maintenance agreement included? Answer: Yes, covers entire road to intersection of Marilla and improved at the intersection.
6. Question: Is there a great amount of elevation change? Answer: Grading will match the grading of all the properties.
7. Question: Grading Plan shows lot three 30 feet higher than the property across the street. Answer: There is an existing bank now, not changing, are matching the existing topography.
8. Question: Is two cars per lot parking included? Answer: complies with the county code and requirements.

Public (approx. 7 speakers):

1. Comment: Looked at the lot before the meeting. The 10k lots don't fit. Who loses the land when the access road is widened? Surrounding lots are a lot bigger, ½ to 1 acre. Quality of life of current residents will be diminished. Opposed to the project.

2. Comment: Sits on hill and out of character for the area. 3 home over looking into existing home bedrooms. Please deny.
3. Comment: Lots 1& 11 sharing private road questions. How much building envelop is left after all setbacks? Needs 20 foot driveway to accommodate parking. Useful area will be much less.
4. Comment: Zoning might allow but build up might not be the same. Holding to rules is critical to decrease impact. Experience shows 10k square foot lots needs 10k square foot net which is after the easement.
5. Comment: Neighbors petitioned and agree that this is not appropriate growth; too dense. Not opposed to growth, just not 11 crammed into a small area. Voters don't want it.
6. Comment: Encourages the planning group to visit the site. Was condo proposal and it didn't pass. Still doesn't fit. No one is against development, just wants density lower.
7. Comment: Concerned with traffic. This is same project, same density. Residents want less houses, more like 4 to 6.
8. Comment: Houses may be smaller because of lot size but county wants building per the 20/20.

Owner:

1. Comments: Will improve the narrow road coming up to the property. The 10k square foot is net minus the road coming up to the property. It fits the Lakeside Community plan and general plan.

Motion made by Milt to deny the project as presented; too dense; does not keep within the character of the existing community and impacts the current residents negatively. Paul seconded based on bulk, scale, and community character. Vote: 7 deny 4 opposed 0 abstain. No action because of no quorum.

*A motion to recommend denial of the project was made by Milt and seconded by Paul. **Motion has no action taken, no quorum (7-4-0)***

E. RiverWay Planning Areas 8 & 9 Rezone and Specific Plan Amendment

1. **Not on agenda today, Proponent asked to be deferred until July 2015.**

10. GROUP BUSINESS:

A. Vacancy Seat #13

1. There are two applications submitted; Lisa Anderson and Michael Evans Layng. Michael was not present at this point of the meeting. Lisa spoke a little about herself and felt she could bring in a different aspect and is available to serve on a committee. No questions about ability to commit were asked.

*A motion to Approve Lisa was made by Julie and seconded by Milt. **Motion Passed (12-0-0)***

B. General Plan Cleanup

1. Information mailed out a while ago.
2. Semantics and basic changes, info was on a previous agenda
3. Still time to go through and can send recommendations directly to county by June 30, 2015.

4. Concern is with the leapfrog development issue; more of recommendation to avoid allowing leapfrog development to take place as opposed to specific to the general plan amendment.
5. Comment to motion: are we sure we want to send this message, is it limiting? Suggestion made to amend the motion to say a minimum of 2.1 parking spaces. We want to get it back to the 2.1.
6. Julie amended the motion as suggested.
7. A letter of recommendation for the 2.1 parking spaces will be written to the county.

*A motion to recommend getting the 2.1 parking places reinstated for multi-family was made by Julie and seconded by Milt. **Motion Passed (12-0-0)***

C. Reimbursement –

1. Vote for reimbursement for LCPG PO Box rental (6 months) \$116.00 and for the Community Center Room Rental (3 months) \$180.00.
2. Approval of pre-pay for the remainder of the year \$420.00.

*A motion to recommend getting the 2.1 parking places reinstated for multi-family was made by Julie and seconded by Milt. **Motion Passed (12-0-0)***

11. Member's Attendance Review:

- A. Deferred

12. July meeting:

- A. Discussion made to change the July Meeting to the third week, July 15, to avoid issues from the 4th of July Holiday. Letter will be sent.

13. Secretary:

- A. Nathan announced he was stepping down as Secretary.
- B. Board can make a motion to recommend a new person tonight or do later. Volunteers welcome
- C. Chair can assign the task if needed
- D. Deborah will step in during the transition.
- E. Can distribute the work.

14. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A. Looking for Subcommittee members for the County Service Area 69 (CSA 69) subcommittee. Currently the board has no subcommittee member. Looking for a volunteer or two before assigning.
- B. Karen Ensall is on trail subcommittee
- C. Committee members are expected to fill some of the roles
- D. Will defer the subcommittee issues until next meeting
- E. CSA 69 meeting dates are unknown at this time
- F. Design review: Meeting is scheduled with Diane Jacob's office to find out how the process goes for how items come before the LCPG vs. the design review board.
- G. Trails: Karen would like to call a meeting, no trails committee meetings at this time. Need to reinstate the meetings.

15. ADJOURNED: 9:06 p.m. The next meeting will be at the Lakeside Community Center on July 15, 2015 at 6:30 pm with the Open House starting at 6:00pm.

Deborah Montgomery, Acting Secretary
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