Excused: John Taylor
Item #2: Approval of Minutes from March 1, 2016. Motion to accept Uwe, second Doc. Aye 12 noe 0 Abstain Mark and Sheri.
Item #3: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject within Planning Group’s Purview but not on the agenda. Presentations are limited to three minutes. No action can be taken on items not on the published agenda but can be added to future agendas for action.
Item #4:
Uwe commented on the trailer situation once again on San Miguel Road at Ball Park waiting to come into Summit Park.
Mark stated that the issue with the homeless in the valley was getting out of hand once again. The Supervisors talk a lot about helping through Social Services, but a large group just want to live in the open. There needs to be a better comprehensive plan to address this.
Liz asked about the striping of the parking lot for the Museum and the Library. The striping is getting so faint it’s hard to park.
Diane stated that the library is getting inundated at times by homeless.

Action Item
Item #5: SD County request for tree removal from right of way at 53 El Rancho Vista. Presenter: Steve Nelson, SD County Vegetation manager: He first stated that the County seldom cut down living
trees unless there was a need. Second, County does not trim trees if cars can pass safely under them.
Several residents spoke in opposition to the trees being cut because no one else had asked the County to do it. They didn’t want to see their tax dollars at work that way. There was a lot of conversation about the trees being in County right of way.
Mark made the motion: To have the two trees one on either side of the driveway removed per decision and agreement with Steve Nelson. Uwe seconded. 13 Aye, 1 noe-Daryl.
Item #6: SD County DPW request for all way stop at intersection of Bonita Mesa Road & Mesa Vista Way. Presenting: Kenton Jones, Secretary Traffic Advisory Committee. Kenton spoke about the volume of the traffic and the apparent dangers. Rick stated that earlier Murali had presented the intersection as the optimal example of how roads should work. Doc motioned: To approve request. 11 Aye noe 3-Tony, Judy and Liz. Harriet stated that the intersection of San Miguel Road and Proctor Valley Road was a much more dangerous area. Kenton stated that he would consult with us on this issue.
Item #7: P/ds2015-ZAP-01-122W1-SanMiguel Ranch Verizon Cell Tower, 6434 Jonel Way, Bonita. Cross Street Procter Valley Road. Presenter Andrea Urbas: After much discussion about height, and having to change the footprint of where it would be placed, that the only road in or out was a private road which some owners did not want the cell company or their construction trucks to use, the motion was made: To approve application for cell tower 60 feet high, Rick. Seconded Irene. Vote: 6 aye, 7noe-Tony, Judy, Liz, Mark, Sheri Diane. Abstentions, 1 Doc. Did not pass.

Non-Action Items
Item #8: PDF-2015/TPM 21226, 3510 Tennis Court Lane- Review revised parcel division, water retention, and concepts for lots-excavation: presenter Anastacio Castillo representing owners. The suggestion now is to make three parcels of just over one acre for each. They would be mixed one and two story homes. Sheri and Harriet met with Mr. Castillo: there will be no new grading, the request for fencing and a noise wall along Sweetwater Road has been abandoned. Lot #1 to the north west has a catch basin for
water run-off, the other two are on sewer. A request was made that the workmen keep an eye out for horse riders as they use the road as access to trails.

Item #9: PLD Ordinance (including Trails) update, suggestions-ideas-Concepts. Diane spoke about the proposed changes to the way in which PLDO monies are appropriated. If the changes are made, then the money can go toward financing the trails. The trails first called out were the Glen Abbey Trail, and second the rest of the Sweetwater Loop Trail. It was decided that Diane should write a letter on our behalf concerning this. (see Diane Carter’s letter of April 18, 2016)

Item #10 Announcements: Rick stated that Summit Park could profit by letting groups who pay in advance be allowed to use the octagon facility for free. And also recommended an octagon-type building is needed in the new portion of the park.

Mark spoke about trails. He said that the homeless were being shifted east as is the custom. The bridge between the western staging area and Willow Street across the river is almost done, but the planks have not been attached yet.

Item 11: Updates. None

Item 12: Announcements. Steve mentioned several people had not filed their Form 700 to the Registrar of Voters.

Item 13: Board Member Communication. Michael De La Rosa stated that the State of Bonita this year would be at the Library Community Room, sometime in July.

Liz mentioned that the Optimist Book Sale would be Saturday and Sunday at the Museum.

Adjournment 8:47 P.M.

Next meeting: May 3, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,
Liz Stonehouse, Secretary,
Sweetwater Community Planning Group
Attached letter about PLDO as requested by Diane Carter.

April 18, 2016

Marcus Lubich, MPA
Park Project Manager
San Diego County Parks and Recreation
5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123
This was mailed and emailed on letterhead.

Greg Cox, Supervisor District 1
Dianne Jacob, Supervisor, District 2
Dave Roberts, Supervisor, District 3
Ron Roberts, Supervisor, District 4
Bill Horn, Supervisor, District 5
San Diego County
1600 Pacific Highway. Room 335
San Diego, CA 92101

We are writing on behalf of the Sweetwater Community Planning Group (SCPG). On March 1st, 2016, Patrick McDonough, San Diego County Parks and Recreation Department, made a presentation relative to the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) at the March meeting of the SCPG. Patrick explained that the Board of Supervisors had requested that the Parks and Recreation Department examine the PLDO to determine if it meets the current needs of the community. As a result of this presentation, we have several recommendations regarding the PLDO.

As you are aware, the San Diego County PLDO was adopted in 1973 and is in compliance with the State of California Quimby Act. The Quimby Act was first established by the California legislature in 1965. It provides requirements for the dedication of parkland and/or payment of in-lieu fees as a condition of approval of certain types of residential development projects. The legislation was enacted in response to California's increased rate of urbanization and the need to preserve open space and provide parks and recreation facilities for growing communities.

While the PLDO has meet the needs of the community over the past years, much has changed with the administration, control and management of land set aside
for public use. We commend the Board of Supervisors, and County Supervisors, for recognizing that the terms and use of the PLDO were antiquated for our community today in 2016. Terms such as “Active and Passive Recreation” were used, which have very different meanings than they did in 1973. In 1973, the designers of the PLDO, wanted to assure that a developer would not give unusable land as a way to satisfy the county requirements. It should also be noted that the PLDO includes Riding and Hiking Trails, nature study areas, open space, steep slopes, water bodies, golf courses, marinas and boating areas, archeological areas, as “Passive” uses. Certainly, a golf course or Marina is not “passive”; but, for example, the County did not want developers building a sub-division around a golf course and then giving the golf course to the county as a PLDO (and let the County pay for maintenance!). Thus, the PLDO arbitrarily used the terms active vs passive as a way to designate between what was desirable and what was not. Now, the terms Active and Passive have an environmental use component not intended by the designers of the PLDO. As such, we recommend that those terms (Active and Passive) be removed from the PLDO.

Secondly, we believe trails should be a part of the PLDO approved dedications. Essentially, a trail is a linear park, and is used by the community for recreational purposes. We recommend changing the wording from “Hiking and Riding” to “Soft surface, non-motorized vehicle, multi-use public trails”, which matches the term used by San Diego County Parks and Recreation Department. In 2005, the County of San Diego adopted a Community Master Trails Plan. We recommend that the PLDO reference the Community Master Trails Plan and include that the County Master Trails Plan should always be adhered to and trail connections be made to those trails currently on the Master Plan.

Currently, the PLDO requirements do not apply to: (1) Subdivisions created for industrial or commercial purposes (2) Transient Habitation resort cabin or motel units 3) Recreational trailer parks, Temporary trailer parks or travel trailer parks t (4) Condominium Projects or stock Cooperatives as defined in T8, Div 1 of the Code of Regulatory Ordinances, which consist of the subdivision of airspace in existing apt. building when no new units are added”. We recommend that the PLDO be revised to include the project developers listed above be required to abide by the PLDO, particularly, hotels, motels and commercial or industrial complexes.

Lastly, the PLDO divides the County into 24 Local Park Planning Areas (LPPAs). Currently, those LPPAs don’t always align with the areas covered by San Diego County Community Planning Groups (SCPG being one such area which does not align with the LPPA). We recommend that the LPPAs align with the San Diego County Community Planning Groups to assure that the PLDO funds are utilized in ways that match community needs.
Thank you for your recognition of the PLDO being a community issue and addressing it with the SCPG.

Sincerely,

Co-Chair, Sweetwater Community Planning Group