

**County of San Diego County of San Diego  
Ramona Community Planning Group  
FINAL MEETING AGENDA  
January 6, 2022  
ZOOM MEETING  
(DETAILS)**

~~7:00 PM @ the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona~~  
Meeting shall be a Zoom Meeting held at 7:00 P.M  
Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82197775257?pwd=amo5MnNpTEhMMWJ0MXM5L2ZwQ0dXQT09>

Meeting ID: 821 9777 5257

Passcode: 160796

Dial In Numbers: +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose), +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 821 9777 5257

Passcode: 160796

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/addDOS44FZ>

**A Temporary email address has been created to request agenda item information via email.**

Please send an email to: [rcpgcovid19meetinginfo@gmail.com](mailto:rcpgcovid19meetinginfo@gmail.com) to request documents for each item to follow along with during the teleconference.

Requests for documents will be responded to before and during the meeting as possible to accommodate any member of the public wishing to participate during the meeting.

Members of the public are requested to make a speaker request via email prior to the meeting as well. This request is to ensure everyone is heard and has an equal opportunity to speak during the meeting as well as providing the RCPG a chance to organize our speakers ahead of the meeting to ensure we have ample time for each item. Please indicate if you are speaking as PUBLIC COMMUNICATION or as an AGENDA ITEM and note the agenda item you wish to respond to and please limit your written response to 3 minutes or less.

Written comments to be read into the record will also be accepted via email prior to the meeting. Please indicate the item number you wish to respond to and please limit your written response to 3 minutes or less.

**ITEM 1: Call to Order**

**ITEM 2: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ITEM 3: ROLL CALL (Maxson, Chair)**

In Attendance:	Torry Brean	Scotty Ensign	Debbie Foster
	Lynn Hopewell	Casey Lynch	Kristi Mansolf
	Robin Joy Maxson	Elio Noyas	Dawn Perfect
	Matt Rains	Michelle Rains	Andrew Simmons
	Paul Stykel (Late)	Dan Summers	

Absent: Kevin Wallace

**ITEM 4: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 12-2-21 (Action)**

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2021, MEETING, AS PRESENTED.**

Upon motion made by Lynn Hopewell and seconded by Andrew Simmons, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Dawn Perfect, 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)**

**CALL FOR ANY ADDITIONAL SPEAKERS  
VICE-CHAIR SHALL ANNOUNCE EACH SPEAKER REQUEST BY NAME, THE SPEAKER SHALL STATE THEY ARE ON THE CALL AND BEGIN. THE TIME LIMIT IS 3 MINUTES AND THE CHAIR SHALL CALL TIME AT THE END OF 3 MINUTES AND THE SPEAKER WILL STOP ON THE CALL.**

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

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA.**

Upon motion made by Lynn Hopewell and seconded by Dawn Perfect, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**ITEM 7: ACTION ITEMS:**

**7-A: AD 21-029 Applicant is asking for a height deviation from the maximum ADU height of 24 ft to 29.0 ft per plan. Project is an 18 car garage private showroom with a 1200 sf ADU on top. Project address is 15534 Highland Valley Rd, Escondido (in Ramona Community Plan Area) on a 9.88 ac. lot. The ADU and Carriage garage is located at the lowest point of the lot. The property is zoned Single Family agricultural. The height designator is "G" which allows for 35 ft height. This allows applicant to maintain a minimum ceiling height in the garage and have the vaulted ceiling in applicant's ADU on top.  
Mansolf, West Subcommittee**

Gary Seward, representing the owner, Phil Pace, presented the project. The applicant is asking for a minor height deviation to allow for the addition of 4 additional feet to a proposed ADU structure. By adding 4 feet to the structure, they can have vaulted ceilings on the building which will make it look better. Primary structures have a height limit of 35 feet. ADU's have a height limitation of 24 feet. The property has a Highland Valley address and is off of Paseo Penasco. It is located in the hills of the Wild Animal Park. The property size is 9.88 acres. There is an existing tennis court on the property which will be the foundation of the proposed ADU. Solar panels on the property currently will be relocated on to the ADU. Mr. Seward showed photographs of the neighboring properties and from the vantage points of each neighbor. One neighbor is concerned that his view of the sunrise will be blocked. There is no house built on the neighbor's property yet. The ridge is higher anyway, so the project should not impact the sunrise. Trees will help block neighbors' views of the proposed project. They are hoping that the neighbors will appreciate the building and think of it as positive addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Brean read Patty and Larry Karcher's comments into the record:

To Whom It May Concern:

We are the owners of 15396 Paseo Penasco, Par.2, 4.23 ac, the property directly west of the SDC PDS RCVD 10-22-21 - proposed ADU and 18 + car garage. We strongly object to the height of this proposed structure. This area is idyllic agricultural land. The homes and structures are 24' or less in height in this area. At the last public meeting we were told several times by the architect that this was a request for a 29' building height. This is not accurate as a note on the plans says 28' at mid span of the roof on each side of the dwelling unit. The dwelling unit is much higher, possibly 35'. The true height is hidden from the Design Review Board. Our neighbors, Fred and Lorelle Marinello have spectacular views to the west from their home of the valley and sunsets which will be totally destroyed by a building directly adjacent and nearly 35' in height. Steel power poles in this area are 40' and the lower yard arms are 35'. Access to the proposed structure is through a gate and private way road that per the County has no allowed parking. The loss of privacy, security, and congestion looms. We object to the way this public meeting is being held as it should have been postponed.

Mr. Brean read Ladene Aardema's comments into the record:

I have lived on Paseo Penasco since 1995. We chose to live here because of the peace and quiet, beautiful avocado orchards surrounding us and privacy gate. After the 2007 Wild Fire, when we lost everything, we rebuilt.. We love our space. In 2011 Mr. Pace bought the home next to ours and things changed.negatively.,He has big money generated plans for our private neighborhood! He built an unpermitted 50 horse and 11000 sq foot barn. Which was deemed illegal . The barn is still on the property,like a dinosaur! His new project , to build a 39 car garage is ridiculous, and will block several neighbors views .It is also behind our privacy gate! We have no desire for increased traffic and added maintenance on our small rural road. Thank you for your time, Please help us to keep our small neighborhood rural.

Speaker: Lorelle Marinello, Ramona Resident

I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed 18-car garage to be located at 15534 Highland Valley Road (physical location is on Paseo Penasco).

I'm the neighbor who will be most affected by the proposed 18-car garage addition to one of Mr. Pace's investment /vineyard properties. I work as an instructional aide with students with special needs for the San Marcos Unified School District. My husband is a retired high school teacher and Vietnam Vet. We have lived at 15375 Paseo Penasco parcel #276-030-47-00 for 15 years. My husband and I bought the property in 2005 and built a small house in which to quietly retire.

1. The proposed garage is directly in the main viewline of my home. The height would greatly diminish a view, which I now enjoy several times a day. I personally built a stone deck on my front porch specifically as a place to enjoy the quiet valley view. It is a place of solace for me and my family. I understand the additional height of the building may reach as much as 35 feet and would be located approximately 40 feet from my west property line. As you can see in the photo below, the tennis court lights are in my viewline and the proposed building would exceed the height of the light posts considerably, thereby blocking my view.

Mr. Pace's suggestion that my trees already interrupt my view is not true and I'd like to point out that trees can be pruned, buildings can not. The trees are a replacement of the avocado grove we lost in the 2007 fires. I feel that the destruction of my view would greatly diminish my property's value. There are other locations where Mr. Pace could construct his proposed garage on the 9.88 acres where it would not obstruct my view and be less invasive to the peace and serenity of the neighborhood. As you can see from

one of the photos below, he has graded and flattened a large area on the hill adjacent to his rental house which currently remains barren. (see photos below.)

2. After looking at the plans and elevations of the proposed garage, I believe the building is intended to be used as an entertainment venue to showcase one of Mr. Pace's vineyards. The French glass doors, extended porches, ADU, and vaulted ceilings suggest as much. If you look to the southeast corner of the google map, you will see a denuded property with a large barn where a meadow with oak trees once filled my view. This is another reason why I am leery of this newly proposed development. The 18-car garage will be closely located adjacent to the access road/the entrance to my property. Though not recently, but in the past, Mr. Pace had acquired permission from the former owner of 15534 to use the easement road leading into my property for parking while hiring a shuttle service for the transport of party guests to his primary residence on the top of the hill, (a different address). Twice I came home to find the entrance to my property blocked by cars. Beer cans and Solo cups littered the road the next day. I'd also like to point out that the architecture of the proposed garage is in no way similar to the main house at 15534, as was suggested at the subcommittee meeting. The house is a 1979 Spanish Mediterranean and the proposed garage is a modern version of a craftsman style building.

This also raises the concern of increased traffic and noise for me and the neighbors living close to me.

3. I have an environmental concern as well. The proposed garage is located approximately 50 feet from the natural wash that drains the rainwater from several properties upstream. After the recent rains, I have noticed large amounts of silt and washing across the access road leading to the wash from the vineyard/tennis court area. I am concerned about pollutants. This also raises the concern as to where the leach field for the ADU will be located in relation to the wash.

Ms. Mansolf said the project went to the West Subcommittee. Because there was some confusion of what would be allowed by the permit (such as commercial uses) – she had asked the County planner to attend the RCPG meeting to clarify the issues and answer questions. She had not heard back from him before the meeting. A motion to send the comments made at the meeting was linked with a motion to approve the project, and the motion failed. She said she would like to make a motion to send the comments received on the project to the County.

**MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS ON THE PROJECT TO THE COUNTY.**

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 11-2-0-0-2**, with Torry Brean and Dawn Perfect voting no, and Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

Ms. Mansolf brought forward the following motion:

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE HEIGHT VARIATION OF THE BUILDING FROM 24 FEET TO 29 FEET.**

(Discussion on the motion)

Mr. Lynch asked about the high point of the structure on the second page of the plans showing elevations? The construction drawings are confusing. He felt the height shown should go to the top of the building and the weathervane.

Mr. Lynch said there can be view restrictions. Generally in California, there is no right to obstruct the view of neighbors. A view restrictive easement can be placed on a property.

Mr. Pace said there was already a foundation for the garage on the property with the tennis court.

Mr. Lynch said the midpoint of the roof is shown at 28 feet – not the top of the structure. We don't know how tall the structure will be. He asked that the drawings be revised to show the actual height of the building.

Mr. Seward said the way height is shown on the plans is the way the County wants building height shown on plans. They want to see the midpoint of the roof. The County told him that is how the County measures the building height. The midpoint for the roof is at 28 feet, 10 inches. The true height is 33 feet.

(Motion withdrawn)

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion was withdrawn.

Ms. Perfect feels the project is appropriate for the area, even if a little taller.

Mr. Lynch said this is about view protection. Mr. Seward had told us the height of the building and how it was derived. However, the actual height of the building is not in the drawings.

Ms. Foster said she feels 4 additional feet of height added to the structure could be a significant change. Why not have the roof be 4 feet less?

The Chair said it came up in the subcommittee that the top part of the building with the vaulted ceiling would make the building more attractive and less like a large warehouse. The issue on the table is the height deviation.

Ms. Hopewell agrees with Mr. Lynch. She would like to see the actual height information in the plans before approving the property

Mr. Lynch said there has been a point of having clear communication in the past. The members of the public who are neighbors to the property are asking for more clarity and more clarification of the project plans.

**MOTION: TO SEND THE PROJECT BACK TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND ASK THE APPLICANT TO REVISE THE DRAWING WITH THE CORRECT INFORMATION AND COME BACK TO THE RCPG.**

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Debbie Foster, the motion **passed 11-3-0-0-1**, with Torry Brean, Robin Maxson and Paul Stykel voting no, and Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-B: Vineyard Grant James PDS2016-AD-16-013. 25260 E. Old Julian Highway. Administrative Permit (AD) for an existing winery which is operating as a Small Winery per the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance. The project consists of an existing boutique winery with a proposed 3,000 square foot prefabricated building for wine production and tasting room and a 384 square foot detached restroom facility. The small winery would also hold special events seven days a week from 8am to midnight with an average of 100 events per year. The existing as-built metal production building is to be removed along with all other "as built" structures. The project also proposed a 10,000 gallon water tank and pump for fire suppression as well as a water line from the proposed water tank to the proposed**

**prefabricated winery structure. The intent of the permit is to bring the project into compliance with current regulations and expand the allowed uses on the property to include group events and/or weddings with up to 200 attendees. Access would be provided by a driveway connecting to Old Julian Highway, a public road. The project would be served by an existing on-site septic system and groundwater from onsite well(s). No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project.**

**Rains, East Subcommittee**

Matt Mangano presented the project. Susanne and Jacques Sapier, and John Prince were in attendance. The winery is existing. The applicants want to change the existing winery to a small winery with an Administrative Permit. There will be upgrades to the site to bring it to Code. The current production facility is old. A new production facility will be installed. Parking has been reviewed. The site has already been looked at by fire authorities. Stormwater will be isolated to the site. Grapes will be grown onsite, as requested. A restroom will be installed. The property zoned in the area is zoned A-72, for agriculture.

Mr. Rains said the project received unanimous approval from the East Subcommittee. The maximum capacity for the current winery has been reached.

The Chair said she read in one of the documents that events would go to midnight. Is this accurate?

Ms. Sapier said the times put in the application were to reflect maximum times that included closing the facility. Sound will be off by 9 and everyone will be gone by 10. The midnight time allows for cleanup.

Ms. Hopewell said the sound echoes through the valley, so she could see sound being an issue if not handled properly.

Mr. Mangano said a sound study was done. The Sapiers will be conservative with their events as far as sound is considered.

**MOTION: THE RCPG APPROVE AS PRESENTED.**

Upon motion made by Matt Rains and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-C: Jack in Box, 1056 Main St., D5 Waiver Request, Revisions to Lighting and Signage and other Changes**

The Chair said the Jack in the Box project was approved by the RCPG in June of 2020. There have been significant changes to the project, and the County is asking us if we can look at it again.

Gabriela Marks presented the project. The County had asked the applicant to withdraw the project after the RCPG approved it in June of 2020, and there have been changes. Two parking lot lights will be added to the left of the project area when looking at Jack in the Box from Main Street. This is a dark area, and people like to sleep here. She said the light strength will be under 4,000 lumens. The sign drawings were approved by the Design Review Board. The word "Jack" on the sign on the front of the building sign will be larger than the words "in the Box." The project has not been approved by Jack and the Box corporate.

Mr. Brean made the following motion:

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN EXEMPTION REQUEST FOR JACK IN THE BOX.**

(Discussion on the motion)

Mr. Ensign gave the Design Review Board report. The lights and the menu board sign were approved. The menu board sign will be smaller than what is existing. They will be switching out the non-conforming sign on the front of the building with the smaller sign.

Mr. Lynch asked about public improvement plans for the alley. We can't condition the alley way to be paved.

Ms. Marks said that the plans at the County show that the alley will be paved.

(Voting on the motion)

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-D: Presentation by Nicholas Juarez seeking feedback from Planning Group on a conceptual plan to create a small livestock (poultry) processing business in Ramona's industrial area. (Mr. Juarez was not in attendance)**

**7-E: SDCE Traffic Calming Measures (Next Zone Discussion).  
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee**

Mr. Lynch said the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee met and started reviewing Zone 2 and completing traffic data collection. Zone 2 is in the northwest of San Diego Country Estates from Gunn Stage-Arena to Del Amo (Barnett Elementary vicinity).

Based upon the initial assessment by the San Diego County Traffic Engineers and complaints from residents, potential traffic calming measures recommended by the San Diego County Traffic Engineers in this zone include:

1. Close the median on San Vicente Rd to Arena Dr. This will only allow right hand turns off of San Vicente onto Arena Dr with an enhanced pedestrian/golf cart crossing with a rapid flashing beacon across San Vicente to Arena Dr. Traffic entering onto Arena Drive will be directed at Gunn Stage at the first feeder off of that road.
2. Multiple all-way stops are proposed at the following locations:
  - a. Arena Dr and Del Amo
  - b. Arena Dr and Arena Way
  - c. Open View Rd and Arena Way
  - d. Sargeant Rd and Rising Dale Way
  - e. Rising Dale Way and Arena Way
3. An all-way stop is also proposed at Gunn Stage and Arena Way with two crosswalks and a pedestrian ramp

4. A potential change from the double-right hand turn to a single-right with an enhanced crosswalk at Gunn Stage and San Vicente. An upgraded traffic light is proposed with an extended green right hand turn to allow for movement of traffic.

We encourage anyone in our community who wants to be involved in discussing these measures to attend the next Trails and Transportation Committee Meeting.

Zones 3 and 4 will be considered in the future. These zones are currently being assessed by the County Traffic Engineers and as a result there are no traffic calming recommendations to date.

Zone 3 is in the northeast from Gunn Stage to Swartz Canyon Park Zone 4 is in the southeast from Ramona Oaks to Pappas

**MOTION: THE RCPG APPROVE THE MAP TO DISSEMINATE TO THE PUBLIC, AND HEATHER MCGHEE AND JULIE GALLANT TO USE PHOTO SIMULATIONS AND INFORMATION AND ALLOW MORE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE TRAFFIC CALMING ISSUE.**

(Discussion on the motion)

Ms. Perfect said shutting off the left turn on Arena will be of public concern.

Mr. Lynch agrees shutting off the left turn onto Arena will be controversial.

Ms. Perfect said she has concerns with asking for public comment on a map that has not been approved by the RCPG. By doing so, it says we support the map. We should handle this issue like other issues where we make a recommendation. She doesn't think it makes good sense to treat all 8 changes as one item. There are 8 different things here and we should weigh in separately on each one.

Mr. Rains said we are looking for public comment. We are giving a visualization for people to object to. We want to get people involved.

Ms. Perfect said it looks as though we are approving.

Mr. Lynch said each of the 8 items is an individual improvement. We are trying to take the middle of the road stance. How do we facilitate getting public comment? We are doing it with a visualization. These are County traffic engineers' recommendations. We are giving people a visual so people can comment.

Mr. Stykel said he has been opposed to the traffic calming proposal since the beginning. We are not traffic engineers. It looks like the RCPG is putting forward this information to the public. He wants to know if the SDCE Association agrees with this? If they want these changes, let's pursue them. He doesn't think that is what it looks like we are doing.

Mr. Lynch said he would like to take the County plan to SDCE.

The Chair asked if each item is stand along or is there a domino effect where one issue depends on another?

Mr. Lynch said each project is an individual enhancement and stands on its own. There were people from SDCE on the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee call. People live in the SDCE community. We want



them to be part of the discussion. The recommendations are from County traffic engineers. Changes are needed to the map before disseminating the map to the public.

The Chair said Facebook is a bulletin board. The map is public record information we are going to discuss.

Mr. Stykel said he doesn't agree with disseminating information we haven't voted on.

(Voting on the motion)

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Matt Rains, the motion **failed 6-8-0-0-1**, with Torry Brean, Scotty Ensign, Debbie Foster, Dawn Perfect, Michelle Rains, Andrew Simmons, Paul Stykel and Dan Summers voting no, and Kevin Wallace absent.

**MOTION: TO BRING THE TRAFFIC CALMING LIST BACK TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE AS INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS FOR THE NEXT RCPG MEETING, AND THEN GET THE INFORMATION TO THE COMMUNITY FOR COMMENT.**

Upon motion made by Dawn Perfect and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

**7-F: Pine Street Vacation  
Lynch, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee**

Mr. Lynch said that a letter was sent to the County on this issue. At this time the item could be permanently tabled.

**7-G: Ramona Community Planning Group to send a letter to LAFCO expressing interest in exploring the idea of a Community Services District structure for Ramona.  
Lynch**

Mr. Lynch said the RCPG sent their comments to LAFCO on forming a Community Services District structure for Ramona. The letter eludes support and reflects what happened. Support for forming a Community Services District is already stated in the letter. At this time the item could be permanently tabled.

**7-H: Review of column submitted to the Ramona Sentinel regarding 3<sup>rd</sup> ambulance status by Dan Summers  
Summers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ambulance ad hoc**

Mr. Summers said the support for a 3<sup>rd</sup> ambulance in Ramona has been relayed to the RMWD in the form of a letter that can be shared with other entities,

**7-I: Review of entities supporting a 3<sup>rd</sup> ambulance in Ramona  
Summers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ambulance ad hoc**

Mr. Summers said Supervisor Anderson leads the San Diego Fire Advisory Board. There is an upcoming meeting of the board. San Diego County Fire supports the need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> ambulance in Ramona. LAFCO will be voting on this issue. The RMWD voted 5-0 for having a 3<sup>rd</sup> ambulance.

**7-J: Pending LAFCO vote on the RMWD’s plan to transfer control of fire and EMS services to San Diego County.  
Summers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ambulance ad hoc**

Mr. Summers said LAFCO will vote on transferring Ramona fire and EMS services to the County.

**ITEM 8: OTHER BUSINESS (Possible Action)  
8-A: Announcements and Correspondence Received**

Mr. Rains announced the RCPG Facebook page had 475 followers this past, first year.

Mr. Summers said the Caltrans shoulder work at Mina de Oro should start any day. The work will be done at night. Regarding the San Vicente Corridor project – this item will be on the next RSRS agenda on January 26. The San Vicente Corridor project was canceled on the last 2 agendas. Mr. Mercado of Caltrans was going to be at the meeting for Marvin Canton, but he didn’t make the meeting and so there are no comments from Caltrans. RSRS is going to ask for accident reports from Highland Valley Road to Maplevue, on SR 67.

The Chair announced the Independent Redistricting Commission voted on a new map that divides our Planning Area. We now belong to two different Supervisorial Districts - District 2 and District 5. The majority of the Ramona Planning Area remains in District 2. The northeastern section of the Planning Area is now located in District 5. It remains to be seen how the RCPG will work with these two District Supervisors.

**8-B: Ratification and Continuance of Teleconferencing Meeting Option Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e).**

Mr. Brean read the motion to allow the RCPG to continue holding teleconferencing meetings:

**MOTION: PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(E)(3), A MOTION TO FIND THE LEGISLATIVE BODY HAS RECONSIDERED THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE STATE OF EMERGENCY AND STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO RECOMMEND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SOCIAL DISTANCING AND RATIFIES PREVIOUS DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE CHAIR. [THIS MOTION IS INTENDED TO APPLY TO ALL OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODY SYBCOMMITTEES THIS LEGISLATIVE BODY HAS CREATED]. [IF THE LEGISLATIVE BODY DOES NOT HOLD A MEETING WITHIN THE NEXT 30 DAYS, THE CHAIR IS DIRECTED TO REVIEW THE STATUS OF THE STATE OF EMERGENCY AND WHETHER STATE OR LOCAL OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO IMPOSE OR RECOMMEND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SOCIAL DISTANCING. IF BOTH CONDITIONS EXIST, THE CHAIR IS DIRECTED TO MEMORIALIZE SUCH DETERMINATION IN WRITING AND SUCH WRITING WILL BE PRESENTED FOR RATIFICATION AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODY.]**

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Robin Joy Maxson, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-C: Election of Officers for 2022: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary**

The Vice Chair opened nominations for RCPG Chair.

Mr. Ensign nominated Ms. Maxson for RCPG Chair. Mr. Summers seconded the nomination.

Ms. Maxson said she accepted the nomination.

The Vice Chair closed nominations for RCPG Chair.

**MOTION: TO CONFIRM ROBIN JOY MAXSON AS RCPG CHAIR FOR 2022.**

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Dan Summers the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

The Chair opened nominations for RCPG Vice Chair.

Mr. Stykel nominated Mr. Brean for RCPG Vice Chair. Mr. Simmons seconded the nomination.

Mr. Brean said he accepted the nomination.

The Chair closed nominations for RCPG Vice Chair.

**MOTION: TO CONFIRM TORRY BREAN AS RCPG VICE CHAIR FOR 2022.**

Upon motion made by Paul Stykel and seconded by Andrew Simmons the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

The Chair opened nominations for RCPG Secretary.

Ms. Hopewell nominated Ms. Mansolf for RCPG Secretary. Mr. Summers seconded the nomination.

Ms. Mansolf said she accepted the nomination.

The Chair closed nominations for RCPG Secretary.

**MOTION: TO CONFIRM KRISTI MANSOLF AS RCPG SECRETARY FOR 2022.**

Upon motion made by Lynn Hopewell and seconded by Dan Summers the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-D: Annual County Training for Planning Group Members, and Biennial Ethics Training**

The Chair said the annual training for Planning Group members is coming up for virtual and in person training. Online training will be January 29, and in person training is scheduled for February 12, 2022. The training was announced on December 17, before the current surge, and things may change. RSVP'S are required for each session. Form 700 also needs to be filed annually with the County, and some people may have to do their biennial ethics training.

**8-E: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Ensign) – Update on Projects Reviewed**

Mr. Ensign gave the Design Review Board report. For Junk and Disorderly they approved a sign centered on the horizontal window frames on the front of the building. For the sign in the back of the truck, nothing can be done about the mobile sign as it is allowed.

The mural on ALDI was approved and will go in soon.

Ramona Daycare is making some improvements to the building on Earlham. They are adding 3 exit doors, an ADA ramp in front and a chain link fence around a new playground. Signage and lighting will remain the same. Some changes were discussed, and because the project has a deadline, a special Design Review Board meeting was held that same evening, to review the edits to the plans and approve the project.

Ms. Hopewell said that for the ALDI mural, ALDI is paying for it.

Mr. Brean said the murals keep getting better. He hopes the people in charge keep taking good care of them.

#### **8-F: Discussion Items (Possible Action)**

##### **8-F-1: Concerns from Members**

Mr. Stykel said he has concerns with RCPG items/issues being posted on the RCPG Facebook page before they are approved. He thinks whatever is posted on the Facebook page should be approved first.

Mr. Lynch said he has concerns about the County wanting to talk about the Ramona Street Extension being on the CIP list right now. The CIP list is revised yearly. Jim Bolz has asked Ms. Mansolf a couple of times about getting on the RCPG agenda to talk about the Ramona Street Extension.

Ms. Mansolf said Mr. Bolz contacted her and asked if the RCPG still wanted the Ramona Street Extension on the CIP list? She told him the RCPG just voted on the list on July of 2021, and so right now the current CIP list submitted in July is the RCPG CIP list. It was her understanding that numbering on the list did not signify importance of project to the community.

The Chair suggested the item go back to the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee first.

Mr. Lynch said he would prefer it come to the full RCPG first.

Mr. Stykel said it was a big enough topic.

Mr. Brean said the item could go back to the subcommittee after the RCPG discusses it.

Ms. Perfect said that in order to make a change, we would need to reconsider the past motion.

The Chair said Mr. Bolz could make a presentation at the RCPG meeting and then go back to the subcommittee. We can ask him to provide an account of the work that has been done for this project, to include projected cost of the project, and ask him to give us an update.

Mr. Stykel asked why we would want to know the dollar amount for the project?

Mr. Lynch said the dollar amounts have been added in the past. We want to know where the project stands. It looks as though it has stopped, and there has been no progress in 3 years, ever since the Etcheverry project extension started being discussed.

Mr. Stykel said that we need to get the project back on tract. We also need another evacuation route as well as a circulation element road.

Mr. Summers said he had 2 items of concern. The concerns came from the public – real estate brokers. At the south side of town, across from Cheers, there are cars and vehicles parked. These vehicles parked are starting to extend down the road. There are scenic corridors along SR 67 in Ramona. The problem is the area he is concerned with is within the "scenic corridor." Why does this group get to have dump trucks, old trailers, bonfires, ugly temporary fencing, and tents while other property owners have to meet rigid scenic standards? Mr. Summers asked Mr. Ensign if the County has been informed about these vehicles being parked along the road?

Mr. Ensign said there can't be storage vehicles or campers within the scenic corridor. He will bring up this item at the Design Review Board meeting.

Mr. Summers said there is also a concern with the lane design on SR 67 going south after Archie Moore to Rockhouse Road. The road goes from 2 lanes to 1, then back to 2. The lanes are not well designated.

Ms. Hopewell said RSRS discussed the possible installation of signs asking that the slower traffic use the right lane.

Mr. Summers said both RSRS and the Mt. Woodson ad hoc should look at this issue.

Ms. Foster said she is also concerned with possible encampments at the end of town going south, near Highway 67. She asked if Code Compliance was involved?

Mr. Ensign asked Ms. Foster to send him an email on this topic and he will see what he can do.

### **8-F-2: Future Agenda Item Requests**

The Chair said the Jennings cell site off of Highway 67 and the 18 garage ADU will be on the February agenda.

### **8-F-3: Addition and Confirmation of New/Continuing Subcommittee Members** *(None brought forward)*

### **8-G: Meeting Updates**

#### **8-G-1: Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and TAC Meetings**

The Chair said the MEKHO item was going to the Board of Supervisors on January 12. The Board of Supervisors is recommending approval. On January 26, the Board of Supervisors will be voting on the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) issue. This policy impacts our ability to build. On January 21, the San Pasqual cell site is going to the Planning Commission.

#### **8-G-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 2-3-22, Location to be Determined**

**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.**