



Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting Minutes

June 4, 2014

Attendees: Jon Becker, Thom Clark, Bill Dumka, Stephen Egbert, Steve Gore, John Keating, Ruth Loucks, Cynthia Macshane, Jeanine Politte, Keith Rhodes, Mike Shoecraft, Rod Simmons, Ramesses Surban

Absent: Bill Diehl, Darren Parker, Melinda Vasquez

Community Members & Guests (Voluntary Sign-in): Nancy Denen, Anne DeBevoise-Abel, Mary Ann Eisele, Jennifer Burstedt, Steve Staninger, Brian Eshelman, Harold Meza, Jack McGuire, Joost Bende, Linda Schulman

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:41 pm at the Doubletree Golf Resort located at 14455 Peñasquitos Drive, San Diego, California 92129. A Quorum was present.

2. Agenda Modifications: none

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 7, 2014

Motion: To approve the May 7, 2014 Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting minutes as corrected. M/S/C – Becker/Rhodes/Approved, 11 in favor – 0 against – 2 abstentions (Simmons & Loucks).

4. Public Safety Agencies: not present

5. Public Forum:

a. John Oleson was seeking RPPB's assistance getting a maintenance easement removed (see Attachment 1). RPPB previously approved the Torrey Glens Easement Vacation on 3/7/2012 and the City vacated the easement in June 2012. This easement was a temporary solution to provide a path for students from the adjacent Rancho Peñasquitos neighborhood to Westview High School. It was planned that once the new development to the north was built, that developer would provide a permanent route for students. The Torrey Glens HOA had been maintaining the easement since their development was built in 2002. The Olesons have been trying to get use of their property from the HOA since the easement vacation, but the HOA is not cooperative in giving the property back to any of the affected property owners whose property were temporarily taken to create the easement.

- Becker asked Oleson if he had approached the HOA and if they possibly need 51% approval to vacate the maintenance easement? Oleson replied, the maintenance easement only came into existence because of the City easement and they were told that it would all go away once the permanent route was constructed. Oleson said they've been trying to get the HOA to take action since the City vacated the easement, but they've been told the HOA's CC&Rs contains language that limits how changes are approved and the HOA has received a legal opinion that they can't do it.
- Politte asked Friedman if there is anything we can do through Council Office? She added, Scot Sandstrom was an RPPB member and represented the HOA as president when he brought forth the City easement vacation request. Politte said, it was her understanding from that meeting that the Olesons' would get the use of their property back once the City vacated the easement.

- Discussion: it may be a civil issue; there are other properties involved in the easement, but none are as impacted like the Olesons as the easement runs across their back yard and alongside their garage out to Calderon.
 - Politte will forward info to City Council Dist. 5 representatives (Lee Friedman & Garrett Hager) and Michael Prinz asking them to look into if the City can assist in solving this issue.
- b. Steve Staninger (PQ resident, real estate professor) said that the Rhodes Crossing project goes above and beyond what was originally proposed. He is against the changes being proposed for Rhodes Crossing.
- c. Stephen Egbert commented that City Environmental Services is planning a Mini-Community Cleanup for a neighborhood in Rancho Peñasquitos on August 7th. The City will mail an announcement to only 250 homes/units. He would like to see the City do a bigger area cleanup similar to those done in the past on Sundevil Way. Egbert said he will ask the Town Council if there is a neighborhood that would benefit from this smaller collection.
- d. Mary Ann Eisele (resident north of SR-56 off Carmel Mtn. Rd.) said she was against proposed density increases in Rhodes Crossing and the elimination of an open space which was intended to be an access-way for Park Village Elementary students. She likes the building uses created with Merge 56 with the commercial/office nearest the highway, to townhouse and then single family as it steps south from SR-56. She added that Rhodes Crossing's proposed 3-4 story multi-family buildings don't fit with the existing and planned single family homes or the neighborhood. asked RPPB to protect the Community Plan as is and not allow 3-4 story buildings to go in.
- e. Brian Eshelman (lives on Dormouse Rd.) noted that he and some neighbors are opposed to the connection of Camino Del Sur north to SR-56; fearful of SR-56 traffic taking a shortcut through their neighborhood to get to I-15 and additional crime opportunities. He would like RPPB to consider making Camino del Sur an emergency access/exit only or limit uses.
- f. Politte invited the community to attend PQ-NE Action Group's 8th Annual Neighborhood BBQ/Picnic; June 8th at Rolling Hills Park from 11am – 3pm.
- g. Patricia (BMR) said the I-15 Express buses to downtown will begin operating on Monday from the new Transit Centers along I-15. Surban added that it will be free to ride in June. Keating noted, the last pickup for the Express buses on I-15 to downtown is the Sabre Springs Transit Center.
- h. Linda Schulman (PQ resident for 20 years) said she is in favor of good development, but is against increased density in Rhodes Crossing adding that she doesn't want to see monstrous structures similar to those being built in Mira Mesa along I-15 (Casa Mira View).
6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION ITEMS:
- a. San Diego City Development Services Dept. Report – Michael Prinz, not present
- b. San Diego City Council Member Mark Kersey, District 5 Report – Lee Friedman
- Presented certificates of appreciation to past RPPB members Mike Kenney and Joost Bende for their dedication and time to the board.
 - Distributed Councilmember Kersey newsletter and added that the Councilmember is hosting a Meet the Chief of Police event on June 25th at the Rancho Bernardo Library from 6:00-7:00pm.

- Friedman reported that he will be moving to the Infrastructure Committee as a consultant and introduced Garrett Hager who will be our new liaison for Councilmember Kersey.
- Hager shared his background, previously working with Councilmember Scott Sherman's office (Dist. 7); he can be reached at 619-236-7020 or at ghager@sandiego.gov.
- Politte inquired about the status of our request for additional stop signs, crosswalks and signage on Via Fiesta instead of the road humps that were requested by the HOA. Friedman asked if RPPB sent the request; Clark said the minutes were sent to staff.
 - Keating added, RPPB's motion was to use the alternative process {per CP 200-08} to request additional stop signs, crosswalks and speed signs in lieu of speed humps. Then Traffic Engineering could conduct the needed traffic studies.
 - Clark will resend our motion to Councilman Kersey's office.
 - Keating commented that Park Village residents need to have an evacuation plan and Park Village needs a second route out (referring to the completion of Camino del Sur between Park Village and SR-56). He asked if the Resource Agencies have issues and what is the Councilmember's office doing to get the road built.
 - Friedman said the resource (state & federal) agencies require approval of all aspects before permits are approved.
 - Keating followed up, what is the City doing to prod these agencies?
 - Friedman said that DSD's Kerry Santoro is working on these approvals and tracking progress but Friedman was unsure of what the hold ups are and with which agencies.
 - Clark thanked Friedman for his efforts to assist RPPB, and his work with the CIP & infrastructure processes.
- c. San Diego City Council Member Lorrie Zapf, District 6 Report – Conrad Wear, not present
- d. San Diego County Supervisor Dave Roberts, District 3 Report – Harold Meza
 - It's snake season; contact: Dept. of Animal Control 619-236-2341.
 - Admittance to the San Diego Discovery Museum in Escondido is free to Military (Retired & Active) families through Labor Day.
 - Sign up for Supervisor Roberts' Newsletter for weekly updates. www.supervisordaveroberts.com
 - Meza said that he is taking another position with the Supervisor's office; Tighe Jaffe will be attending RPPB meetings.
- e. 77th Assembly District, Member Brian Maienschein's Office Report – Michael Lieberman
 - Lieberman thanked Becker for taking some time a few weeks back to attend a meeting regarding the east-west connection through the Del Mar Mesa Preserve of which Becker also attended.
 - Any state legislation that was not approved or signed by the Governor is now dead and next week is budget week.
 - If anyone needs help with State issues – let them know.
 - Becker asked if the Assembly member's office had reached out to other agencies, Rangers, etc?
 - Lieberman said their main contact will be California Fish and Game on the Del Mar Mesa Preserve issues.

- Becker thanked Lieberman for their assistance on getting things moving forward.
 - f. 52nd District, U.S. Congressman Scott Peters' Office Report – Hugo Carmona, not present
7. BUSINESS.
- a. **Perez Residence Project #317517, Site Development Permit No. 1109334; 11506 Alamazon St.** – Juan Noe, Engineering Design & Studio (Action Item)
Noe distributed plan handouts.
Juan Quemado said the project is a single family home located at 11506 Alamazon St. with 4 Bedrooms, 2 Baths and 2,100 sq. ft. (2,800 sq. ft. including the garage), on a 24,000 sq. ft. lot (4% lot coverage, footprint is only 1,000 sq. ft.). They have cleared all City requirements and attended the LUC meeting earlier this evening.
 - Surban reported that the Land Use Committee (LUC) reviewed the project and the following concerns were discussed:
 - Initial plans and cycle issues reports included environmental concerns and the lack of grading or brush management plans which are no longer an issue. According to staff, environmental requirements will be per original Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND 6107), no grading plan is required because they are not grading the property and the brush management plan has been added to their submittal and approved by staff.
 - New issues:
 - The Staff Report to the Hearing Officer was inaccurate; concern that the applicant was circumventing the planning board process due the applicant not showing up for the December 2013 LUC meeting and was late for the regular meeting, and then did not show up to present at either the January 2014 LUC or regular meetings as scheduled. The Hearing in front of the Hearing Officer was postponed so the applicant could present tonight.
 - 2 stories over a basement garage is still a 3 story structure.
 - Concern that an additional structure or granny flat could be build on the rear of the property were discussed. It was noted that a conservation easement on the rear of the property is required and will be tied to the property in perpetuity so the owner will not be able to build on the rear of the lot.
 - Surban added that the overall sentiment from LUC was that the Plans are nice, and the LUC approved the project as presented 8-0-0.
 - Loucks asked about the distance from the sidewalk to the retaining wall referencing the elevation drawings.
 - Noe replied, they are trying to be sensitive to the community by setting the garage into the hill; the retaining wall is minimal.
 - Loucks restated her question referencing the plans provided.
 - Becker noted that the plans show a 3' high retaining wall which is set 10' back from the curb.
 - Rhodes asked if they are excavating for the garage, but it isn't considered grading; Noe confirmed.
 - Shoecraft recommended that they provide 100' of defensible space around the house; work with the neighbors to protect their building. He wouldn't want them to experience a fire.

- Macshane inquired about the rear slope and suggested that they include swales or some way to divert heavy rainwater around the house; it didn't look like they were changing any contours.
- No audience questions were offered, other than those discussed during the LUC meeting.

Motion: To approve the Perez Residence Project #317517, Site Development Permit No. 1109334, 11506 Alamazon St., as presented. M/S/C – Becker/Gore/Discussion.

- Clark reported that he has spoken with Glenn Gargas about the language in his report to the Hearing Officer pertaining to inaccuracy on the applicants attendance at RPPB. He would like the report be modified.
- Politte said that she did not want the incorrect language to go the Hearing officer either and proposed an amendment to the motion directing staff to correct the Report to the Hearing Officer to accurately account for the applicant's attendance at RPPB meetings.
- Becker & Gore agreed to the amendment.
- With no further discussion, Clark called for a vote on the amended motion as follows:

Motion: To approve the Perez Residence Project #317517, Site Development Permit No. 1109334, 11506 Alamazon St., as presented with the following condition: Staff correct the Report to the Hearing Officer to accurately account for the applicant's attendance at RPPB meetings. M/S/C – Becker/Gore/Approved, 13 in favor – 0 against – 0 recusals/abstentions.

- Clark noted that he will forward our motion and Distribution Forms to staff.
- Brief discussion on when the applicant was rescheduled in front of the Hearing Officer; applicant could not confirm.

b. **Proposal to Install Speed Humps on Via Fiesta between Via Inez and Camino de la Rosa, San Diego City Traffic Engineering** – Shannon Matwiyoff (Action Item)

- Mike Kenney, who presented this item at LUC, asked the LUC Chair to recap discussion from LUC.
- Surban reported that previously RPPB approved using the alternative process for installing additional stop signs, crosswalks and speed signage. LUC would like staff to go through the alternative process and study installing our alternatives to speed humps.
- Keating added that we thought our recommendation went to the City Council office and was in process to determine if our solution would be approved. We will resubmit our request and should have an answer with a plan of action before the new school year begins.
- Kenney asked if they could be on the June 25, 2014 agenda to revisit speed humps if the studies are completed in time; Clark said yes.
- Matwiyoff assured RPPB that she personally spoke with all homeowners facing Via Fiesta and showed them the plans from Verazanno, Sycamore Walk, Bella Rosa and has signatures from those owners on a petition. She also spoke with the Director of the Montessori School and the Bella Rosa & Sycamore Walk HOAs and they like the speed hump plan. She added, that the person who commented previously that the owners did not know about this proposal is from Cristamar which is a development not located on Via Fiesta.

- Loucks asked if adjacent street's residents were noticed as they will be impacted by the shifting traffic.
 - Matwiyoff said they have circulated the speed hump proposal on their 'Next Door' webpage and didn't have any objections. She referenced the speed studies done by staff on Via Fiesta and Via Azul which are conducive to speeding.
 - Loucks also added that she drove down Via Fiesta and found that it was easy to gain speed on the straight away.
 - Matwiyoff added that with increased enrollment at the Montessori School, there would be additional traffic on Via Fiesta.
 - Becker asked if there was an effort to reach out to the community- did they have consensus of all neighbors not just those fronting?
 - Matwiyoff said that staff asked if they would get signatures of all owners who fronted Via Fiesta. Kenney said that Matwiyoff has spoken with the HOA boards.
 - Keating reported that he spoke with City staff in January and asked if they required all residents be contacted, not just those fronting Via Fiesta and staff's response was no. He is concerned that they are not talking with all residents and said that they should not rely on the HOAs to speak for the property owners. He added that he did not believe the City did enough; there is a disconnect on the communication.
 - Matwiyoff asked if Keating thought stop signs would divert drivers to other streets?
 - Keating replied, not as much as speed humps would. RPPB wants to calm traffic on Via Fiesta but also wants to work through the processes available and study the impacts on other streets.
 - Becker asked if Via Fiesta has Class 2 bike lane or striping; Kenney said it is Class 3. Keating added that striping would dual benefits and provide the additional benefit for students.
 - Politte said that if this comes back to us on speed humps again, she would like all the neighbors be noticed about the meeting and potential decision to be made (all residents on Via Fiesta and the adjacent streets, and all residents who drive to and from the schools) so we can hear directly from them if they are in favor or not. They will all be impacted by our decision whether it's noise, delays, diverted traffic.
 - Keating said that staff has not completed all City requirements in the process to install speed humps and our recommendation will cause staff to do so.
 - RPPB will send an email to Lee Friedman & Garrett Hager (Council Office) formally requesting the Council member to direct Traffic Engineering to conduct the studies needed for our recommendation to install stop signs and the additional items (crosswalks, additional speed limit signage, etc.) on Via Fiesta using the alternative process.
- c. **BMR Site Development Permit No. 24004156 and Amendment to BMR North Village Design Guidelines to Construct 171,437 sq. ft. of Retail Space at Camino Del Sur and Paseo Del Sur – Bill Dumka, BMR (Action Item)**
- Dumka and Becker recused.

- Dumka reviewed the site location and surrounding areas/uses on the Del Sur map. He noted that they have worked with the community over the last two years to determine what the residents wanted in the center. Their input helped create a more friendly facility with friendly pedestrian entrances/accesses and uses including plazas, gathering places for the community. He added, the anchor store is below grade due to slope of parcel.
- Clark asked him to mention parking spaces which came up at LUC. Dumka noted that they are required to provide approximately 170 parking spaces. The project provides 450-470 parking spaces.
- Surban reviewed the LUC meeting discussion and deviations being requested:
 - City typically requires that 50% of the elevation be transparent, open or glass, to the sidewalk/street. This deviation is for the large anchor store portion of the plan. The purpose of transparency is to make pedestrian use more interesting, but in this case the building is separated from the pedestrian experience; additionally, the building is 20' below grade.
 - Dumka said that it is a typical deviation for this type of large box store.
 - Surban said, there is a 25% setback (10' maximum) deviation that was previously approved for 75% of the site so they are only asking for the remaining 25% of the site.
 - Dumka confirmed, they are asking for the same accommodation for the rest of the site.
 - Could parking lot spaces be converted to additional retail space or other uses.
 - Dumka said the site was originally approved for 220,000 sq. ft. of retail space, but only 205,000 is planned. The anchor store tenant will not want to lose the parking spaces so it was not believed that the remaining 15,000 sq. ft. would be proposed for use down the road.
 - Pedestrian experience which Clark will speak about.
 - Potential for incompatible land uses due to adjacency to the K-8 school across the street.
 - Dumka said the school is under construction. There is a substantial grade change between the 2 properties and BMR is not anticipating any conflicts.
 - Mechanical roof elements will be screened from residential view.
 - Could parking be used for park & ride or transit? There is an adjacent property which is being considered for that use.
 - The property has easy access for motorized wheelchairs.
 - There was a gentleman who spoke in favor of the project.
 - Surban reported that the LUC approved the project as presented with assurance that all identified issues in City Cycle report #4 dated May 15th, 2014 be resolved and RPPB be noticed of those resolutions; 6-0-2 (recusals).
- Loucks reported that she lives in the community and participated in the process providing input to what the community would like in the center. She has spoken with her neighbors and friends about the project. She feels the pedestrian issues have been addressed. Del Sur sidewalks are very accessible and feels this is exactly what Del Sur residents are looking for.

- Gore is very familiar, selling homes in the Del Sur community. Del Sur is family friendly, a great community with people pushing strollers, lots of parks and it's an amazing place. He inquired about what store/brand would be in the anchor store; Dumka said, Target.
- Rhodes noted that this plan is very similar to what Rhodes Crossing had originally planned; he likes the project.
- Shoecraft inquired if there are designated walkways through the parking lot; Dumka said, yes there is a main pedestrian walkway that runs through with connections to the perimeter walkways; walkways include pergolas and pedestrian nodes. They had a deep level of conversation with the community on this aspect of the plan.
- Keating said he likes the sidewalks in the parking field.
- Surban noted that Dumka had previously stated, there is a retention basin under the parking lot for storm runoff.
 - Dumka added that the water is treated, detained and slowly released into the storm drains. Some of the landscape areas are used as low impact detention areas.
- Macshane asked about the rooftop mechanical parapets on the large box store, adding that may not be enough to hide the mechanical.
 - Dumka noted that they have had many conversations about the screening; BMR owns the adjacent residential site.
- Egbert asked if there would be crosswalks and types from the school east of the site?
 - Dumka noted that the main entrance to the school will be on the south side of the school site at a signalized intersection. There is a second entry (cul-de-sac drop off) for student pedestrians.
 - Brief discussion that the school will probably be a closed campus.
 - Politte noted that if the school is not fenced, they will need to provide safe crossing from the campus to the retail center.
- Clark noted City planner's comments pertaining to "traditional village" and Clark felt that BMR explained the limitations to his satisfaction. He asked Dumka how he defines "traditional village".
 - Dumka said the issue was to get City staff to look at the North Village in whole as the "village" not just the Retail Center.
- Dumka added that staff has boiled down the issues to 5 remaining issues; BMR understands that staff is satisfied with their response to those issues but are waiting for City staff's reply.
- Clark, referring to pedestrians, noted the concepts being used to strengthen pedestrian use include tree lined streets, pedestrian nodes, etc.
 - Dumka said it starts with the basic grid system used, provides access with lots of pedestrian options in a pleasant environment as demonstrated elsewhere in the community. The project includes 2 external pedestrian accesses into the interior pedestrian routes. The concept includes non-contiguous sidewalks, double rows of trees to canopy sidewalk areas of enhanced paving with benches in widened sidewalks with different treatments like trellises or arbors creating little enclaves where pedestrians can sit and enjoy.

- Clark applauded the plan's perimeter. Page 13 of the old Design Guidelines showed smaller buildings instead of a large building with smaller components. How does he look at the original guidelines to evaluate the proposed design solution and does the developed space have the intended ambiance? Clark made a comparison to San Antonio's River Walk; adding that the interior space, as a parking lot, becomes more bare and not as friendly. Will pedestrians take the time to enjoy the areas and will they know that this isn't your average parking lot.
 - Dumka said that new parking lots are very different from the old that tended to be heat islands. New lots require more exterior tree coverage, trees circulating through the lot, and enhanced paving.
 - Clark said he believes that BMR has the talent on their team to pull it off; some people will like it and others won't.
- Jack McGuire (Del Sur resident and HOA board member) gave BMR accolades adding that they solicited input from the residents. Del Sur is friendly families of all ages. He added that he likes Target as the anchor store which he did not believe is a big box store. BMR has lowered the grade of the Target so that pedestrians can push their carts, strollers, etc into the center.
- Joost Bende said was still unsure if pedestrians would use the interior circulation (pedestrian walkways) or just walk directly to their destination across the lot (from a corner shop over to Target). He mentioned 4S Ranch Town Center's layout of buildings noting the inconvenient routes pedestrians have to take to get from one building to another (example: the shortest route walking from Bath, Bed & Beyond to World Market is across the parking lot and not pedestrian friendly). He suggested that a circular pinwheel design centered on the Target that would connect to the corners and provide better access to pedestrians. Likes what he sees, but believes they could provide a better pedestrian solution.
 - Dumka said they have looked at other alternatives, but they keep coming back to the solution in the plan.
 - Bende suggested that boots on the ground who want to go from point A to point B will go in a straight line.
 - McGuire suggested that shoppers will park nearest their destination.
- Rhodes noted that pedestrians will have a number of routes to get to their destination within the retail center, but you can't accommodate everyone.
- Tony Hsu (Del Sur resident) said the Del Sur is an amazing place to live but there is one thing missing – a destination where parents and kids can enjoy themselves. The destination may not satisfy everyone but with the hundreds of people he has spoken with – they can't wait. He added, there are a lot of entrepreneurs in Del Sur who will love the future commercial.
- Craig Loucks (Del Sur resident) said that he also provided input on the project, supports the proposal, and was amazed with BMR's cooperation with the community.

Motion: To approve the BMR Retail Center Project #344042, SDP Permit # 24004156 and amendment to the BMR North Village Design Guidelines as presented with assurance that all identified issues in City Cycle report #4 dated May 15th, 2014 be resolved and RPPB be noticed of those resolutions. M/S/C – Surban/Politte/Approved, 11 in favor – 0 against – 2 recusals (Dumka, Becker).

d. **Camelot Project No. 238281, Application for a Vesting Tentative Map, PDP, SDP and Rezone for 259 attached dwelling units on 74.4 acres – Bill Dumka, BMR (Action Item)**

- Dumka and Becker recused themselves.
- Clark noted that this item was the same project we reviewed at RPPB's May 7, 2014 meeting. RPPB members wanted to wait to approve the project after we had a chance to review the elevations, architecture and floor plans.
- Politte commented on some of the interior corner garage locations being so close, maybe 10' away from the optional Dens/Bedrooms; concerned with space that drivers would have backing out of their garages. It was suggested that the drivers would back straight out until they were able to turn out to the driveway to exit.
- Politte commented on the width of the driveway into the 7-Plex building courts (approx. 72' wide) and asked what the surface would be.
 - Dumka said they would like to do pavers, but not promised.
 - Politte asked if there is room for an island to separate the in and out drivers.
 - Dumka replied, no adding that there are four 7-Plex planned.
 - Politte pointed out that the units in the perimeter buildings that will have private yards, and Dumka pointed out the locations for recreation (recreation/pool area, tot-lot and grassy areas between the interior buildings). Politte commented that with 3-4+ bedrooms, they would need plenty of play areas for children and mentioned that residents may want to illegally install portable basketball hoops in the courts.
- Becker asked if the exterior walls are screened and planted.
 - Dumka said they would be primarily from below.
- Clark inquired if the drawings intentionally show white structures with no color.
 - Dumka said they are nondescript CAD drawings.

Motion: To approve the Camelot Project # 238281, application for a Vesting Tentative Map, PDP, SDP and Rezone as presented. M/S/C – Surban/Loucks/Approved, 10 in favor – 0 against – 2 recusals (Dumka, Becker).

e. **Vacancies & Appointments –**

- Clark noted the following seats are vacant: BMR 2, TH 2, Rancho Peñasquitos District 8 and Renter-at-Large.
- Politte added that we had received an application for Dist. 8, but the resident pulled his application.
- Rhodes questioned whether a resident who makes public comments stating that a specific project will devalue their property and is or becomes an RPPB member, would they need to recuse themselves due to financial interest?
 - Politte suggested that we get the City Attorney's office opinion on this. It is too early, the comments being made right now are based on hypothetical plans because we haven't seen anything yet.
 - Clark noted his concern that vacancies or new board members may only be on the board for one issue.
 - Discussion on bylaws, removal from the board for absences, etc.
 - Clark will check with City Attorney's office for their opinion.
- Brief discussion on getting the word out about the vacancies, our bylaws and leaving the seats vacant if there are no qualified applicants to fill the seats.

- Politte will notify our email distribution list when sending out the June 25th meeting agenda. If no applicants come forward, we will wait to publicize the seats until we send out our election information with the January meeting agenda.
- Patricia (BMR) suggested that we get RPPB's information in the 92127 Magazine in addition to 92129 Magazine.
 - Politte will contact 92127 Magazine about posting our meetings and where people can get the agendas.
- Macshane agreed to share our meeting dates with the Town Council web person to post it on their website.

8. REPORTS.

a. Chair Report – Thom Clark

- Clark reported receiving Notice of Right to Appeal the Environmental Determination for emergency porch repair to the Mohnike Adobe. The project will include design and installation of emergency shoring to support the porch roof and flooring until long term stabilization/rehabilitation can be implemented. Stabilization will be done through the City; an emergency project for a historical resource is exempt from CEQA. Clark will email to the members.
- Clark noted that he received a offer from Anne Fage with the San Diego Regional Urban Forest Council to make a presentation at an upcoming meeting on San Diego City's Urban Forest Management plan.
 - Becker added that it would be a 10 minute overview on the urban forest, local green assets and additional need in our community. One of the City's studies has noted that southwestern cities should have a forestry coverage between 20-25% of the land and San Diego's is less than 14%
- September agenda will include BMR Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP).
- Kilroy (Santa Fe Summit IV) may be ready to come back in September.
- Clark asked the members to review Ryan Smith's email about Rhodes Crossing that he forwarded.
- Clark noted that he had emailed to members, the letter he received regarding the speed limit increase to 45 mph on Carmel Mtn. Rd. between Twin Trails Drive and Black Mtn. Rd.
- CPC has set up a committee to review the admin piece for CP 600-24 and Clark is on the committee. He asked the members to reread and send him our comments to report at CPC.

b. Vice-Chair Report – Jon Becker

- Becker referring to Lieberman's comments about the meeting on the east-west connection through Del Mar Mesa, added that the Carmel Valley and Del Mar Mesa Planning Groups spearheaded the connection. Issues are related to multiple owners which include state and federal agencies. By going through Assembly Member Maienschein's office, the hope is to get all parties on board with a solution that works.
 - Politte asked if the connection is the same property (dirt road, easement) that we talked about last month that is owned by the agencies.
 - Becker said they are both being discussed, as part of the NRMP trails plan.
 - Simmons asked if the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve CAC is involved in the conversation.

- Becker was unsure, but noted that Carmel Valley Planning Group and the Del Mar Mesa Planning Group have another proposal for the Del Mar Mesa Preserve.
 - Becker reported that the Palomar Pomerado Health (PPH) site on Black Mtn. Rd. at SR-56 was on the market; the property is a Commercial Zone which would allow residential and commercial, but the Community Plan identifies the property for Wellness or Health/Medical use.
- c. Secretary Report – Jeanine Politte
- Approximately 28 new email addresses have been added to our community distribution list over the last couple weeks due to the Rhodes Crossing project. Some of the residents have shared their viewpoint against the proposed density increase in the emails. They are organizing, have set up a Facebook page and contacted the PQ-NE Action Group that organized when the Doubletree and Cresta Bella redevelopment was previously on RPPB’s agenda. Politte said that as a member of the Action Group also, she will be staying out of it and let the Action Group’s Chair communicate with them.
 - Granny Flat – Neighbors of the property have complained about a granny flat that is being rented to one party and the main home is being rented to another party. The problem is the owner works for the Life Guard Service. Politte is forwarding info the City Council reps.
 - RCFs - The property on Del Diablo Way that we were previous watching for license approval has sold the property. The neighbors have been told that the new owner wants to operate an RCF. Politte will continue watching the California Community Care Licensing website for a new application.
 - Politte added that she was fielding numerous emails and calls about construction along SR-56 and based on the maps, it looks to be in Pacific Highlands Ranch. She has directed the residents to contact the Carmel Valley Planning Group for info. Gore confirmed that the construction is part of Pacific Highlands Ranch and there is no undeveloped Torrey Highlands land on the western end.
 - SDPD has been informed of an increase in speeding vehicles on Northeastern Rancho Peñasquitos neighborhood streets (Rolling Hills neighborhood, The Glens).
- d. Standing Committee Reports:
- Land Use (Ramesses Surban)
 - Surban would like the members to consider extending the time allowed for LUC to start earlier.
 - Becker questioned, starting LUC meeting earlier based on the agenda? Clark said yes.
 - Politte added, we would need to be sure that we can have the room starting earlier and we would need to contact the Doubletree much earlier in the month to confirm.
 - Clark said that the earlier start would allow more time to delve into the details of individual projects and take additional comments before reporting at the regular meeting.
 - Rhodes said by doing that, we are basically making the full board attend the LUC also.
 - Surban added that the projects we will be reviewing are generating a lot of interest and will require more time to allow all the questions/comments.

- o Politte noted that Ad-Hoc committees have already been set up for these projects and could do some of the early work prior to the applicant coming before LUC but added that it won't reduce the amount of comments during the LUC & regular meetings from the board or the public when they do make presentations.
 - o Simmons asked why there are LUC meetings?
 - o Becker said that the LUC usually works with the applicant, sometimes hearing the project multiple times before a project gets to the full board; in an open and public meeting.
 - o Politte noted that if we were to change our standing committees which are called out in the bylaws, we would need to change our bylaws also.
 - o Surban said the LUC report could call out all comments or concerns brought forth in committee.
 - o Politte said that attendees will still want to speak at the full board and it is RPPB's formal record of all comments made about the project and we cannot require the attendees to sign in. It is also the record that staff uses in their reports.
- Telecomm (Darren Parker) – absent, no report
- e. Ad Hoc Committee Reports:
- Doubletree Resort (Jeanine Politte) – no news to report
 - Santa Fe Summit II & III (Darren Parker) – absent, no report
 - Santa Fe Summit IV (Thom Clark)
 - Clark reported that Robin Madaffer has said they may be ready to present at RPPB's September meeting. He added that Kilroy doesn't seem to want to meet with the Ad-Hoc committee prior to coming to LUC. – too many groups/meetings. Clark will check in with Madaffer again prior to September.
 - Merge 56 Development (Jon Becker)
 - Becker reported that Merge 56 may want to present on June 25th, asking RPPB to author a letter encouraging the completion of Camino de Sur and Carmel Mtn. Rd. The US Fish and Wildlife and the Army Corp of Engineers are holding up the road permits.
 - Rhodes said that the US Fish and Wildlife are key to get a biological opinion to get approval due to the vernal pools; it's a task.
 - Rhodes Crossing (Jon Becker)
 - Becker noted there is no new information, but there seems to be a lot of interest.
 - Black Mtn. Rd. Reclassification (John Keating) – no report
- f. Liaison and Organization Reports:
- Black Mountain Open Space Park (Bill Diehl)
 - Simmons reported the meeting was canceled.
 - Community Funds (Bill Diehl) – absent, no report
 - MCAS Miramar Community Leaders Forum (Stephen Egbert)
 - April program discussed set aside environmental areas which cause troops to train in other areas. May's meeting was canceled due to the fires.
 - Clark confirmed, Egbert to be RPPB's liaison and report on Miramar activities.
 - PQ Fire Safe Council (Mike Shoecraft)

- June 21st at South Village Park in BMR will be a First Responders Thank You event sponsored by Councilman Kersey and PERC; 11:00am- 2:00pm.
- PERC Classes - June 10th at 6:00pm at the Library will be presented by the Office of Emergency Services and the canceled class on Surviving an Outage is rescheduled for June 30th at the Library at 6:00pm.
- Fire Safe Council meeting at Fire Station 40 to discuss Fire Watch 2014 was cut short and another is scheduled this Friday to discuss having two Fire Watches.
- Fire Watch Volunteer Training will be on 6/19/14 at the Doubletree; 7:00pm. (passive watch in the community, Black Mtn. Open Space and PQ Preserve; what to report and to whom).
- PQ Town Council (Cynthia Macshane)
 - Macshane asked if Clark has received the letter of TC appointment yet; Clark said he has not and will follow up.
 - Town Council will be electing the new President and Board this month.
 - June 22nd is PQ Day at the Fair. Stop by and check out the 20 PQ Booths.
 - Macshane noted the new banners around the community advertising the County Fair; Fair pays for the ads on the banners.
 - Flag day ceremonies will be on June 14th at Hilltop Park.
- PQ Recreation Council (Steve Gore) – no report
- Los Pen Canyon Psv CAC (John Keating) – no report
- Park Village LMAD (Jon Becker)
 - Becker said the recycled water is still being planned for the LMAD and the LMAD is looking at other 2014 projects.
- Peñasquitos East LMAD (Bill Diehl) – absent, no report
- Torrey Highlands LMAD (Darren Parker) – absent no report
- Transportation Agencies (John Keating) – no report

New Business:

1. Website – Clark

- Because of all the inquiries about the projects, it would be nice to direct people to our website. We need to upload documents.
- Brief discussion about Google Drive.
- Gore said the site was set up with the Chair in control under the gmail address.
- Politte reminded Clark that she had previously offered to help load the documents. She also noted that in the past she has been told not to include specific proprietary documents in the minutes as they are not public.
- Gore offered to train Clark and Politte on how to set up permissions and upload files so we can begin to do that. Gore also offered to populate the site.
- Group discussion on what should be posted, what can be posted, when does it become public, copyright issues, # of emails we'll be inundated with, the additional time, potential lack of public participation at our meetings, etc:
 - Dumka said the City usually doesn't want documents distributed until there is an action made/approved.

- o Politte suggested, we really need confirmation from DSD on what can be made public especially while the project is in process and potentially changing; ownership of the information may determine. Politte said that posting our agendas, approved minutes, bylaws, election/candidate eligibility and applications, links to community plan on City website, polls for CIP/community input, etc. should be fine.
- o Clark noted specific emails that he has received requesting all documents received (hard copy or electronically) on specific projects when there are none. He is also getting questions asking for his opinion on the project.
- o Rhodes suggested that the residents should attend the meetings to get the info they are requesting, otherwise the Chair and other members, who are volunteers, will be inundated with requests.
- o Gore noted that the idea for the website came out of discussion on transparency during our CIP prioritization process. Gore suggested using a disclaimer on the website stating that project documents are fluid and could change.
- o Surban said that if the chair receives the document and has a chance to review, why can't the documents be made public.
- o It was suggested that we ask applicants for pdf of all their documents and ask them if they would like the documents posted.
- o Rhodes said that the documents sent to the Chair should be shared with the board members; does the Chair have the responsibility to distribute it to everyone who asks?
- o Surban questioned are we discussing that if the Chair has been sent documents are they public?
- o Becker has ability to scan large (paper sized) documents.
- o Patricia (BMR) asked if the website would be searchable; Gore said, yes. Patricia added there might be privacy issues if the website broadcasts private information contained in those documents to the public. Who will redact the documents?
- Clark reviewed the amount of time he spent over the past month responding to inquiries about pending projects and the Community Plan Amendments by email and phone.
 - o The board had a brief discussion about responding to inquiries about specific projects, or to those who are making specific demands of RPPB members for information and pushing members to comment outside of the public forum. Concerned residents should attend our meetings to ask questions about projects in a public meeting (under the Brown-Act) or read our approved minutes.
 - o Surban suggested that if people have the information, it should reduce their inquiries.
 - (i) Some in the group said it would open up more inquiries outside of the public meetings.

- Becker recommended that we get input from DSD on which documents can be posted on the website and then establish our own policy. The policy and automated response could say something to the effect of “ By standard policy, we have determined to come to these meetings, these public forums, for the purpose of the Brown Act, and for the confidentiality of other’s privacy.” Then send the auto response to inquiries about projects and everyone is treated equally.
- Gore asked if we have decided what we are putting on the website, adding that we had a similar debate when we were in the process of creating the website.
- Politte replied, at a minimum we can post our agendas, approved minutes, and then as we start working through this we will determine what else can be added.
- Clark will check with DSD (Michael Prinz) and/or the City Attorney for advice on what we can post to our website.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanine Politte
RPPB Secretary

Approved 6/25/2014, 10 in favor – 0 against – 1 abstention (Diehl).

The Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board was part of a process that removed a pedestrian easement that ran directly down the side of our home. The understanding and purpose of the Board's assistance was to restore all of our property with no easements of any kind. Despite working directly with the HOA over many years and with the presentation to the Planning Board, the Torrey Glenn Homeowners Association (TG HOA) has refused to remove their easements despite the fact that the City did remove the pedestrian easement in June 2012. We are seeking support in compelling the TG HOA to do what was presented to the Planning Board.

We purchased our home 12/2002 with the knowledge our property was encumbered by a temporary City of San Diego Pedestrian path easement. Within this easement was a Torrey Glenn HOA Landscape maintenance easement (LME). This LME was born out of necessity to allow TG HOA the access to maintain the pedestrian easement.

Adjacent to our new home was a large parcel of land. This land was owned by Pardee Homes which had approval on a new residential development. Within this new development would be the permanent pedestrian path that would meet the City of SD requirements which meant our temporary easement would be vacated.

No one ever expected Pardee Homes to take 10 years to complete their development. So for this 10 year period a significant portion of our home starting in the front yard at sidewalk and running the entire length of our side yard into the back yard to the end of our property. To be clear this meant there was nothing separating our home from the easement. The public at large had the right to walk up our driveway cross over on to the side yard all the while free to touch the side of our home and continue on down the path. We were unable to use the man door in our garage for access as it opened to the easement.

Sometime early 2012 the process to vacate the easement began. The HOA president as well as planning committee board member Scot Sandstrom laid out the proposal. We were asked by Scot to attend meeting as a show of support for vacating this easement since our home was adversely affected by the easement. We eagerly attended meeting. After 10 long years we were more than anxious to regain full use of our entire lot.

During the presentation by Scot, board member Spurr asked the question, "Will the Olesons regain full use of their lot?" Board member Becker answered, in Scot's presence obviously, that the use would be unencumbered. This statement is documented in the March 7, 2012 RPPB Meeting Minutes.

The truthful answer is no, our home is encumbered by a Landscape Maintenance Easement. The HOA has failed to release the landscape easement on our property. We are unable to use or enjoy our property.

That is why we are here today seeking your help.

Sincerely, John and Cheryl Oleson