

**County of San Diego
Ramona Community Planning Group
MEETING MINUTES
October 7, 2021
7:00 PM @ the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona
Meeting is In-Person**

ITEM 1: Call to Order

ITEM 2: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3: ROLL CALL (Maxson, Chair)

In Attendance: Scotty Ensign Debbie Foster Lynn Hopewell
Casey Lynch Kristi Mansolf Robin Joy Maxson
Elio Noyas Andrew Simmons Dan Summers

Absent: Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel, Kevin Wallace

ITEM 4: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 9-2-21 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF September 1, 2021, as presented.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Andrew Simmons, the motion **failed 7-0-2-0-6**, with Scotty Ensign and Lynn Hopewell voting no, and Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 5: PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to Group on any subject matter within the Group’s jurisdiction that is not on posted agenda. (Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes) -- None

ITEM 6: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action)

Mr. Lynch asked to move Item 7-E to after Item 7-A because they are related.

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 7-E TO AFTER ITEM 7-A.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 9-0-0-0-6**, with Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 7: ACTION ITEMS:

**7-A: Request for an S (Scenic) waiver. Frosted Faces, 1448 Pine St. Proposed accessory. Use/building to existing Kennel operation. Building to be used as exam room and surgical suite to take care of Frosted Faces senior dogs. Proposed building will not be a veterinary clinic that is open to the public
Rains, East Subcommittee**

The Chair stepped down and Mr. Lynch chaired the meeting for this item.

Glenn Torrez presented the project, which was seen at the September 2, 2021, meeting. The site is now used as a veterinary clinic. The proposed new building will not be open to the public. The building will be over 100 feet from the road. It will be visible from the road and is within the scenic corridor, which extends 1,000 feet from the road on either side. If the building is close to the road, a site plan is needed. They are requesting an exemption from having a site plan. They have 50 dogs now and want to bring more senior dogs to Ramona. They want to keep the proposed building in the location shown on the plans. They went to the Design Review Board meeting for feedback at the RCPG request.

Mr. Ensign gave the Design Review report for the project. The Design Review Board likes to see more enhancements, and the people at Frosted Faces have gone overboard and created a great look with the existing landscaping and the color pallet. This is a very visible spot when driving into Ramona. The church has had a strong visual impact on those coming into Ramona on this side of town. The project was approved.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SCENIC WAIVER FOR FROSTED FACES AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Dan Summers, the motion **passed 8-0-0-1-6**, with Robin Joy Maxson stepping down and Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-E. Pine Street Vacation (Taken out of Order)
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee**

Mr. Lynch said this item is related to the Frosted Faces item, so he wanted to move it up on the agenda for discussion. Highway 78 and Haverford were realigned recently. Frosted Faces is limited to where they can put their proposed building due to Pine Street being on a map.

The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee thought Pine Street should be vacated and voted to approve the vacation of Pine Street.

MOTION: TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE COUNTY, ADVANCE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, TO SUPPORT THE VACATION OF PINE STREET BETWEEN HIGHWAY 78 AND HAVERFORD.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 9-0-0-0-6**, with Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

7-B: Radar Certification Archie Moore Rd., SR 67 to Highland Valley Rd. (County of San Diego). Preliminary review of prevailing speeds and roadway conditions could support radar certification of a 50 MPH speed. Currently there is no posted speed limit. Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee

Daniel Stetkevich is a CHP and he is concerned about the speed people are going on Archie Moore Road. He would prefer to see a speed limit of 45 mph rather than 50 mph. There is a school in the area. Right now there is no posted speed limit on Archie Moore. First there was discussion of having a posted speed limit of 45 mph, then the speed limit went to 50 mph. If there is a posted speed limit, police can enforce it. He lives in the area and he has been in law

enforcement for 14 years. He petitioned for the radar certification. People use Archie Moore as a detour, putting more traffic on residential roads. He also recommends signage. The road was designed for a 45 mph speed limit. School zones are usually 25 mph, and there is no posted speed limit by the school.

Speaker: Gabriela Alvarado, Ramona Resident

Ms. Alvarado supports a speed limit of 45 mph on Archie Moore Road.

Speaker: Alisa Padilla supports a speed limit of 45 on Archie Moore Road.

Mr. Lynch said that at the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee, a motion to approve a speed limit of 50 mph passed.

Mr. Stetkevich said there are 3 different sections of Archie Moore Road. The first segment is right off Hwy 67 with no shoulders and with cross streets. People haul down the hill.

Ms. Foster would like to see consistency throughout Ramona and supports a speed limit of 45 mph.

Mr. Ensign supports a speed limit of 45 mph. People go very fast down the hill. There is always the 85 percentile, however, which could be a deterrent for having a 45 mph speed limit. He would like to see signage looked at for Archie Moore Road, too.

Ms. Hopewell said she would like to signage at intervals along the road.

Mr. Lynch said the prevailing speed on Archie Moore Road is 54 mph. There have been 2 reported collisions in a 3 year period. There are driveways/access roads that intersect Archie Moore. Line of site would not be bad at 50 mph.

Mr. Summers like Ms. Hopewell's and Mr. Ensign's ideas. He thinks a "school zone ahead" sign and paint on the road would help.

MOTION: TO SUPPORT A 50 MPH RADAR ENFORCEMENT SPEED LIMIT ON ARCHIE MOORE.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch, the motion failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: TO SUPPORT A 45 MILE PER HOUR SPEED LIMIT ON ARCHIE MOORE ROAD AND TO REQUEST CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES, SUCH AS, SCHOOL ZONE SIGNAGE, PAINT ON THE STREET AND OTHER MEASURES.

Upon motion made Casey Lynch and seconded by Elio Noyas, the motion **passed 9-0-0-6**, with Torry Breaun, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

- 7-C: Proposal to connect 10-12' wide multi-use, multi-directional path on the south side of San Vicente Rd to the existing pathway on San Vicente Rd and continue to where there is a wide asphalt shoulder.**
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee

Mr. Lynch said Mike Ohnysty came to the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee and presented his trail proposal. He is concerned for safety due to the pathway beginning at Warnock and San Vicente Road and ending around Wildcat Canyon Road, with no pathway or trail going into SDCE. Mr. Lynch told Mr. Ohnysty that this is a long term process and he would get Mr. Ohnysty the name of someone at the County in Advance Planning for him to talk to about the project and the process.

7-D: Presentation by County of San Diego on Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations and Ramona Community Planning Group member comments to Supervisor Anderson following presentation.

Ryan Johnson gave the presentation on Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations (MEHKO). Conor McGee from Code Compliance was also in attendance.

Having a new MEHKO program in San Diego County was unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors at their September 15 meeting. In 2019 a State law passed allowing home-based restaurants. Several entities have opted into the program. A MEHKO is a home-based restaurant where owners are limited to serving 30 meals a day or 60 meals a week. Sales cap at a maximum gross sales of \$50,000 a year. People can dine in, pick up food to go, or it can be delivered. Inspections will be handled differently than for a commercial business. With commercial restaurants, inspectors just show up. With MEHKO's, the inspector has to make an appointment. If there is a complaint about a business, it can be investigated.

Mr. McGee said there will be no signage for MEHKOs. The noise ordinance can be enforced. This new industry is creating a home use. MEHKOs are exempt from the Zoning Ordinance as a whole. Berkeley expanded their Public Nuisance Code when MEHKOs were allowed. There are potential environmental health issues such as overseeing food safety and trash disposal. Traffic and parking could become an issue. There could be debris from construction remodels.

Mr. Johnson said PDS can't enforce complaints relating to the Zoning Ordinance due to the law. Coalition groups support MEHKOs. It is a way to make money during the pandemic. They provide food justice and other opportunities. MEHKOs support farm to table. Traffic could be a problem if 30 people park at the restaurant.

Mr. McGee said there is the potential for fires with fats, oils and grease. These substances could also overwhelm septic tanks. The owners would need to get an ABC license to serve alcohol. Bars shut down at 2 a.m. downtown. At this point MEHKOs can't be limited like commercial facilities.

Mr. Johnson said they are working with specific individual groups for feedback. The County plans to host public workshops and they will be looking for ordinance language feedback. Safety aspects will be looked at. A third component is a public education program, where the County will work to educate the people getting into this type of business about food safety, among other things. The main goal now is feedback from the public. Little can be done to adjust State law. They hope to be able to define how many MEHKOs can be on one parcel. State law currently doesn't define where food can be stored, but food can go into a building onsite. The Board of Supervisors could change the inspection frequency. As far as potable water standards – no test will be required for wells.

The Chair said we will be sending our comments on MEHKOs to Supervisor Anderson.

Ms. Hopewell said she has no real questions. She is concerned with traffic and with the ability to sell alcohol in residential areas where the roads are off the beaten path.

Mr. Simmons gave the following comments:

As a restaurant owner, I am concerned that these regulations give an unfair advantage to someone that the restaurant doesn't have, and I'm sure the other restaurants in town will feel the same way. I spent \$25,000 on a new kitchen hood and upgrades to my restaurant that the fire department required, but you're saying that the home kitchen enterprise merely needs to open a window to vent smoke out? How will the maximum number of 30 meals a day or 60 meals a week be tracked? They don't have to pay sales tax? No workman's comp? Almost zero oversight? A liquor license for the home, too? Seating capacity? Will broadliner trucks be able to deliver to homes? That sounds dangerous; I'm sure the neighbors will be thrilled.

There is nothing you have in place to ensure that the person who is operating this kitchen will stay within the guidelines you're proposing. Zero. You can't even enforce anything unless someone has a valid code enforcement issue, and even then it sounds very limited. I should close my restaurant and work from my home instead...

I would ask that some safeguards are added to this to at least make it trackable, to ensure that there is not an abuse of the program. I am all for small business, but I think this program gives an unfair advantage to the restaurants that are already struggling to survive.

Mr. Johnson said MEHKOs will not be allowed to sell raw meat and shellfish.

Mr. McGee said Code Compliance may have reason to go into the facilities if they are getting reports. There is also the fire code standpoint.

Mr. Lynch said he sees the entrepreneurial side. He thinks there is going to be serious problems. It sounds like a good program but it is up to the patrons using the facility to say something if there is a problem. There is the Tiered Winery Ordinance which includes how permittees interface with wineries. Can someone get a MEHKO permit and not consider the Tiered Winery Ordinance?

Mr. McGee said a MEHKO needs to be in a main house.

Mr. Lynch said boutique wineries do catering and sell pre-packaged food. What is someone says they want a MEHKO in their home and a boutique winery in another building on the property?

Mr. Johnson said MEHKOs can't cater.

Mr. Lynch said they need to do what is best to protect the public. MEHKOs could open the door to alcohol getting in the hands of minors. In public restaurants, minor drinking is done out in the open. He is concerned there will be no building inspection to look at electrical or anything else. He asked that the County look at ways to get better enforcement.

Mr. Ensign asked about food trucks?

Mr. Johnson said some food trucks go back to a facility every day. Some are allowed to be stationary, such as coffee huts.

Mr. Ensign said he has concerns that MEHKOs are exempt from Design Review.

Mr. McGee said they are exempt at first, but if changes are made, it will get a review.

Mr. Ensign said he also has concerns about the Form Based Code. He agrees with Mr. Lynch regarding the alcohol – he would like to see it left out. He is also concerned about possible fire hazards and cramming too many people into one space. He asked if the County was going to advertise the program?

Mr. Johnson said they have not thought that far ahead. He thinks that will come with the educational program. They plan to put information videos on the website and educational materials. The County won't be dealing with the public but with business owners.

Mr. Ensign said mobile carts need to have some form of certification.

Mr. Johnson said MEHKOs are different.

Ms. Foster said MEHKOs sound like a nightmare. Who will maintain our residential roads? And then add an ABC license to that? She doesn't need more parties by her neighborhood. This sounds extremely unregulated.

Mr. Noyas likes the concept. Owners should have certification training before they open to the public. It sounds like they need more regulations and inspections. He likes the thought, but feels too many things could go wrong.

Mr. Johnson said they can't change much because this is coming from a State law.

Mr. Summers said he grew up in a steak house in San Diego that was his parents. He feels MEHKOs are a can of worms. The government is allowing them with good intentions, but the driver is social equity. It is grossly unfair to restaurants that have to follow regulations.

The Chair asked that if there were to be a MEHKO in an apartment, can the landlord prohibit them?

Mr. Johnson said if there is language in the rental contract that a business can't be run out of an apartment, then it won't be allowed.

The Chair said that a MEKHO in an apartment complex would cause parking problems. There needs to be a balance. Zoning and planning are non-existent.

Mr. Johnson said he will let us know when the public workshops will be.

Speaker: Jake Gibbs, Ramona Resident

If someone is running a restaurant out of their house, there are times when they can have 40 cars outside of their house. There is zero to little regulation in a residential zone, even though it is a commercial business. Fire regulations limit the capacity of people in a room. A family by him makes tamales for fundraising. From a community standpoint, MEHKOs need regulation. He feels safe going into a restaurant. There is a difference between social equity and not following rules. The government is supposed to protect communities. There are too many holes in this proposal.

MOTION: TO SEND OUR (RCPG) COMMENTS ON MICRO ENTERPRISE KITCHEN OPERATIONS TO SUPERVISOR ANDERSON.

Upon motion made by Robin Joy Maxson and seconded by Andrew Simmons, the motion **passed 9-0-0-6**, with Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-E: Pine Street Vacation (Taken out of Order, after Item 7-A)
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee**

7-F: RCPG to send comments from the August 4, 2021 RCPG meeting on the Draft Municipal Service Review on the Ramona Region done by the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Staff to LAFCO.

The Chair said she wanted to send the RCPG comments from the August 4, 2021, RCPG meeting to the County on the Draft Municipal Service Review.

MOTION: TO SEND THE GROUP COMMENTS (ON THE DRAFT MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW ON THE RAMONA REGION) TO LAFCO.

Upon motion made by Robin Joy Maxson and seconded by Andrew Simmons, the motion **passed 8-0-0-7**, with Torry Brean, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Paul Stykel, Dan Summers and Kevin Wallace absent.

**7- G: RCPG to send a letter of support on the proposal to move to a Community Services District to LAFCO.
Lynch**

Mr. Lynch said he did not have the letter ready yet for review.

**7-H: Greenway Cleanup
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee**

Mr. Lynch said RTA is planning a Santa Maria Greenway Cleanup on January 15, 2022. The staging for the cleanup will be at the former school site on Montecito Road.

**7-I: County of San Diego Cannabis Update
Lynch, Cannabis Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee**

Mr. Lynch gave the report from the Board of Supervisors on October 6. The Planning Commission had seen the need for oversight on the Cannabis Ordinance. The Board of Supervisors held up most of the Planning Commission recommendations. Current marijuana business are now allowed to expand to 10,000 square feet with minimal oversight. The 3 owners of marijuana facilities in Ramona want to stay involved with the community but don't have to. The medical side of marijuana is gone, and the owners can sell edible/drinkable products. If the marijuana business was a small winery and they wanted to add square feet, they would have to get a permit, but not marijuana businesses.

Speaker: Jake Gibbs, Ramona Resident

Mr. Gibbs said on May 14, 2021, \$3.3 million was seized with a search permit, in the 1800 block of Orange Avenue. That was for 4,409 plants. This is the second bust in a year. He is coming to the RCPG to ask for help. What goes on at the house/property is a concern. He has seen 6 wild dogs eating a live goat. A horse broke its neck and died, and the tenants burned the dead horse on the property. They don't have a permit for marijuana. The greenhouse is going 24 hours a day and there is an order of marijuana.

7-J: Welcome RMWD 3rd Ambulance Subcommittee.
1. Share updates
2. Game plan for moving forward
Summers, Third Ambulance Ad Hoc Committee

Mr. Summers said he did not have a 3rd Ambulance Subcommittee meeting due to being sick. This item will be on the agenda next month.

8-K: Monthly update from Mr. Marvin Canton
Summers, Ramona State Routes

Mr. Summers gave the monthly update from Marvin Canton of Caltrans. The major resurfacing project may happen in Spring of 2022. The project hasn't gone out to bid yet and is still being revamped.

Caltrans again sent out the Permit to Enter letters for residents living along Hwy 67 to sign, giving permission so Caltrans has the right to enter their property. Caltrans is getting a better response this time. By giving permission, Caltrans can do environmental studies on private property. If people still do not sign the Permit to Enter form, something legal may be done to access properties to perform studies.

There was no update on the shoulder improvement at Mina de Oro.

Ms. Mansolf said, regarding the Permit to Enter letters – in the most recent letters sent out, Caltrans removed (struck out) the language that would allow Caltrans to create a road on a property for drill rig access for a drill that could drill 200 feet into the ground. She knows some people signing now because that language was removed. Creating a road on private property would be hard to remove after the work is done.

7-L: SANDAG accepting commentaries on road improvement priorities at
CLERKOFTHEBOARD@SANDAG.ORG
Summers, Ramona State Routes

Mr. Summers said SANDAG is still accepting road improvement priority suggestions. Comments can be made at CLERKOFTHEBOARD@SANDAG.ORG

ITEM 8: OTHER BUSINESS
8-A: Announcements and Correspondence Received

September 7th Supervisor Anderson Meeting with Robin Maxson and subcommittee chairs, Casey Lynch and Kevin Wallace. Addressed Cannabis, County Trails Master Plan and Emergency Evacuation Route with Supervisor Anderson and Greg Kazmer, Land Use Director.

At the September 18th County Quarterly Chair Meeting: VMT average for unincorporated areas in the County's Transportation Study Guidelines was not accepted - returning to BOS Jan. 2022

Reminder to RCPG members that emails were forwarded to Group regarding: Inactive Projects Process, CAP/Renewable Energy & Battery Locations.

At the September 22nd Supervisor Anderson Chair Meeting - Capital Improvement Needs Assessment prioritization request from CPGs - will be on our November RCPG agenda.

Mr. Ensign announced that Carol Angus passed away during the last week. She had been very involved in the community

7-B: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Ensign) – Update on Projects Reviewed

Mr. Ensign gave the report. We have already heard tonight about Frosted Faces being approved. Sunbelt Rentals repainted and had their plans stamped at the Design Review Board meeting. They also removed a legal non-conforming post sign. Rite Aid is going to do some rebranding and remove extra signage. It has taken 1 to 2 years to get them to take the signs down. The Olde Ramona Hotel is going to be painted. Regarding Code Compliance, Mr. Ensign said 1 person will work with Mr. McGee. There is nothing that can be done if a business is permitted, but they can review all that are unpermitted.

Ms. Hopewell said Code Compliance sent out a letter to a local business and they have 30 days to comply.

8-C: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

1. Concerns from Members

Mr. Summers there is a compound south of Hwy 67, across from the Livery, that he is concerned about.

Mr. Lynch said travel trailers, that are being placed on properties, are popping up everywhere.

2. Future Agenda Item Requests

The Chair said CIP may be on the next agenda. Also, the County wants us to decide if we want to go back to Zoom or continue to meet in person.

Mr. Noyas said people at SDCE have been asking him about the work going on at Ramona Oaks related to the crosswalk at James Dukes and why they needed to redo the crosswalk, wires, curbs and everything when they just resurfaced the road and the crosswalk was added not long ago. There is grinding on Ramona Oaks going on related to the resurfacing. He asked that this be on a future Transportation/Trails Subcommittee meeting agenda.

3. Addition and Confirmation of New/Continuing Subcommittee Members – *None brought forward*

8-D: Meeting Updates

1 Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and TAC Meetings – *No additional information brought forward*

**2. Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 11-4-21,
Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street**

ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf

The RCPG is advisory only to the County of San Diego. Community issues not related to planning and land use are not within the purview of this group. Item #5: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the RCPG on any subject within the group's jurisdiction that does not appear as an item on this agenda. The RCPG cannot discuss these matters except to place them on a future agenda, refer them to a subcommittee, or to County staff. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes. Please fill out a speaker request form located at the rear of the room and present to Vice Chairperson.

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.