

Richard Greenbauer

From: Shirley McClune [smcclune@att.net]
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 2:20 PM
To: Richard Greenbauer
Subject: Fw: Fellowship Center

From: Shirley McClune <smcclune@att.net>
Subject: Fw: Fellowship Center
To: rgreenbauer@ci.oceanside.ca.us
Date: Saturday, April 17, 2010, 12:41 PM

Richard Greenbauer - City of Oceanside Planning Commission

I am writing in opposition of this center being built at this location.

The site plan and physical design of the proposed project are not consistent with Section 1.24 and 1.25 of the General Plan Land Use Element as it has not been designed to be sensitive to the existing constraints of the site. The requirement of infill exceeding two thousand (2,000) cubic yards of fill dirt is excessive. The need for excessive in fill violates the current use and historical integrity of the existing terrain; including existing native tribe, historic, cultural and archeological site requirements.

Why does the Center need a new building? Tri-City Hospital, schools, medical centers, etc need new buildings but are unable to have them even tho they serve more people. Many proponents for this project are undoubtedly making money from this Rehabilitation Project. I do not believe any of them live within the neighborhoods that would be affected. NOT in their neighborhood - put it in someone else's. THIS location is the worse with children attending the immediate schools and the Senior Home Park directly behind the proposed new building.

If your elderly parents lived in the Mobile Home Park or your children attended the Mission schools how would you feel with the building of this Center????? I strongly urge you to think about it thoughtfully before making your decision about allowing it to pass.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Richard/Shirley McClune
San Luis Rey Homes, Inc.

Richard Greenbauer

From: Acie Hollinger [aceandjulie1@att.net]
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 12:25 PM
To: Richard Greenbauer
Subject: general plan amendment (D-6-07), zone amendment, etc. public hearing

Dear Mr Greenbauer,
We are opposed to the zone amendment (ZA-2-07) and all other amendments and changes that are necessary in order to build the Fellowship Center (Paul Savo, applicant) in our San Luis Rey neighborhood.

We feel that any zone changes would allow too much development in an area that has much historical value and is also somewhat "rural" and attractive as a natural habitat for wildlife as well as humans to enjoy. We also feel that such development would be dangerous to children who are often on foot in the area and to seniors in cars and on foot. There is already too much traffic on Academy Road and on Mission Ave., and there are schools in the area. Academy Road cannot support any more traffic.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,
Mr. and Mrs. Acie Hollinger
181 Flicker Lane
Oceanside 92057

Richard Greenbauer

From: sarsti@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 6:30 PM
To: Richard Greenbauer
Subject: Fellowship Center in Oceanside

To: Planning Department Staff of Oceanside, CA
From: Sam Rosen, 11 Oriole Lane, Oceanside, CA 92057

Dear Richard Greenbauer,

The Fellowship Center project does NOT meet all of the goals and objectives of the Oceanside City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, including the Historic District Overlay, and the City Mission Design Guidelines. The proposed alcohol and drug rehabilitation facility is NOT compatible with the surrounding land uses and is inconsistent with the seniors/age-restricted communities in areas west of the project site. The project has NOT been designed to complement the existing facilities at the site, and has NOT been developed under the standards set forth by the approved Mission San Luis Rey de Francia Planned Development (PD) Plan. One only needs to visit the existing site of the Fellowship Center's Escondido facility to understand that their footprint and use is totally dissimilar to the area that they have applied to build in Oceanside; the facility in Escondido is in a business district, and their facility is bordered by commercial trade.

It is your responsibility to protect the integrity of the natural environment and the heritage of the built environment, and pay special attention to the interrelatedness of decisions and the long-range consequences of any approval actions that you may consider. It is extremely clear that the merits of the project do NOT meet State and Local Guidelines, especially as they relate to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970; and, as you most likely are aware, the City of Oceanside acting as Lead Agency intends to disapprove the project in accordance with CEQA Section 15270. You must base your findings and decisions in *complete* accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality act, and you must insure the compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and the overall community (having this type of facility within yards of a Montessori School is imprudent and ill advised).

In regards to the established Mission San Luis Rey Planned development, the proposed Fellowship Center does NOT meet the following criteria:

- Create a well-designed site which accommodates desired uses of the Mission and provides adequate infrastructure to protect the health, safety, and welfare of visitors and employees.
- Outline design standards which recognize the importance of preserving the architectural and agricultural heritage of the Mission San Luis Rey.
- The project is NOT in compliance with the Oceanside City Historic Design Guidelines and does NOT maintain the natural and historic nature of the grounds
- This development will NOT promote the heritage of the City of Oceanside

In closing, I want to stress as decisively as possible, that the proposed Fellowship Center is NOT consistent with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinances; does NOT conform to the General Plan of the City of Oceanside; the area covered by the Development Plan is NOT reasonably and conveniently served by existing and planned public services, utilities and public facilities; the project as proposed is incompatible with existing and potential development on adjoining properties or in the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and commitment to the Planning Commissions objectives and requirements.

Richard Greenbauer

From: William Orr [tangolover@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 5:50 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients
Subject: ZONE AMENDMENT - THE FELLOWSHIP CENTER

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

THE TYPE OF ZONING AMENDMENT CHANGE TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 16,591 SQUARE FOOT, 59 BED 24 HOUR 'NON MEDICAL' CARE **DRUG**, AND ALCOHOL RECOVERY CENTER ON A ONE ACRE SITE IS ABSOLUTELY INSANE.

PLEASE CONSIDER THE FACT THAT YOU ARE ALLOWING IN EXCESS OF (50) FIFTY, INDIVIDUAL MALES, TO GATHER, HANG OUT, AND LIVE, IN AN AREA THAT IS SURROUNDED BY RESIDENTS OF A SENIOR COMMUNITY, SMALL RENTAL UNIT'S, CLOSE BY WITH MANY SINGLE WOMEN, A MONTESSORI SCHOOL WITH MINOR CHILDREN WITHIN 100 FEET, ANOTHER COUPLE OF COMMUNITIES POPULATED BY FAMILIES AND YES MANY MINOR CHILDREN, AND A VERY BUSY ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH WITH PEOPLE WALKING BY AT ALL HOURS OF NIGHT AND DAY TO ATTEND A MASS.

THESE INDIVIDUALS, FOR THE MOST PART ADDICTS, WILL BRING ALL THEIR BAD HABITS WITH THEM, THE RATE OF RECIDIVISM IS EXTREMELY HIGH, THE CRIME AND DRUG USE IN THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY WILL INCREASE IN DISPROPORTIONATE TERMS. IT TAKES A VERY LONG TIME FOR ONE DRUG ADDICT TO REJECT HIS PREVIOUS LIFE STYLE, AND CONSIDER ADOPTING A NEW LIFE STYLE, THE RECOVERY RATE IS LESS THAN 15%.

THIS LOCATION IS NOT SUITABLE FOR THIS TYPE OF OF PROJECT, IF APPROVED IT WILL COMPLETELY DESTROY THE STABILITY OF THE SURROUNDING AREA.

THESE INDIVIDUALS MANY COERCED INTO A RECOVERY CENTER IN LIEU OF FURTHER JAIL OR PRISON TIME, ARE STILL PRACTICING ADDICTS, AND WILL HAVE PROVIDERS OF THEIR WARES ATTEMPTING TO CONTACT THEIR CLIENTS, THOSE WITH LITTLE OR NO CASH WILL SOON FIND A WAY TO SATISFY THEIR NEEDS BY PREYING ON THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD.

MANY OF THESE SO CALLED RECOVERY DRUG ADDICTS, HAVE SERIOUS CRIMINAL RECORDS, YES EVEN SEXUAL CRIMES, AND TO INSERT THEM INTO THIS TYPE OF COMMUNITY COULD BE DEVASTATING TO THE SECURITY AND SAFETY OF THE POPULOUS.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO POINT OUT, THAT THIS IS A NOT FOR PROFIT VENTURE, AND WILL **NOT** HELP THE TAX BASE, OF COURSE YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THE OWNER PAUL SAVO, "IS HANDSOMELY COMPENSATED", AS HE HIMSELF STATED.

THIS IS STRICTLY A BUSINESS VENTURE AND GIANT INCOME STREAM AND PROFIT VENTURE FOR THE OWNERS AND INVESTORS THAT PARTICIPATE. THEY SHOULD SEEK OUT AN INDUSTRIAL PARK OR AN EMPTY COMMERCIAL STRIP CENTER, OUTSIDE OF THE PROXIMITY OF THE GENERAL POPULATION TO PLACE THE RECOVERY CENTER.

THE PRIVATE ALANO CLUB, CLOSE BY, WHERE PARTICIPANTS ATTEND MEETINGS ONLY, FOR ONE AND A HALF HOURS, THEY LEAVE AFTER THE MEETING, THEY DO NOT HANG OUT, OTHER THAN THE FEW THAT PAY THEIR CLUB DUES, USUALLY FOLK'S WITH SOME GOOD SOBRIETY UNDER THEIR BELT.

IF THE FELLOWSHIP CENTER IS PERMITTED TO BUILD, THEY WILL SOON TAKE OVER THE VERY LOOSELY WRITTEN BY LAWS OF THE ALANO CLUB, AND TURN THAT WHOLE PIECE OF LAND FROM A A "59" BED FACILITY INTO A "590" BED FACILITY FOR MALES IN A DRUG RECOVERY CENTER.

A CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT SHOULD BE OF CONCERN, IS THAT PAUL SABO THE APPLICANT (principal) FOR THE FELLOWSHIP CENTER RECENTLY APPLIED AND WAS GRANTED A LIFETIME MEMBERSHIP WITH THE OCEANSIDE ALANO CLUB, AFTER PAYING A FEE OF \$1200.00, AND OF COURSE HE IS ALSO THE DIRECTOR OF THE ESCONDIDO FRIENDSHIP CENTER.

I AM WRITING YOU WITH WITH A HEAVY HEART, BECAUSE YES I AM A RESIDENT OF SAN LUIS REY HOMES, AS WELL AS A SOBER MEMBER OF ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS WITH (22) YEARS OF CONTINUOUS SOBRIETY, AND A MEMBER IN GOOD STANDING OF THE OCEANSIDE ALANO CLUB.

I AM A REAL ESTATE BROKER/ REALTOR. DRE #01314634 AND A CALIFORNIA LICENSED #0288639, Life, Accident and Health and Fire and Casualty - Agent for (40) forty plus years.

I REQUEST, PLEASE DO NOT PERMIT THE REZONING TO TAKE PLACE,

SINCERELY, WILLIAM H. ORR, 22 ORIOLE LN, OCEANSIDE, CA 92057 - PHONE 760 231-9571

Richard Greenbauer

From: Shirley McClune [smcclune@att.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 12:42 PM
To: Richard Greenbauer
Subject: Fw: Fellowship Center

Richard Greenbauer - City of Oceanside Planning Commission

I am writing in opposition of this center being built at this location.

The site plan and physical design of the proposed project are not consistent with Section 1.24 and 1.25 of the General Plan Land Use Element as it has not been designed to be sensitive to the existing constraints of the site. The requirement of infill exceeding two thousand (2,000) cubic yards of fill dirt is excessive. The need for excessive in fill violates the current use and historical integrity of the existing terrain; including existing native tribe, historic, cultural and archeological site requirements.

Why does the Center need a new building? Tri-City Hospital, schools, medical centers, etc need new buildings but are unable to have them even tho they serve more people. Many proponents for this project are undoubtedly making money from this Rehabilitation Project. I do not believe any of them live within the neighborhoods that would be affected. NOT in their neighborhood - put it in someone elses. THIS location is the worse with children attending the immediate schools and the Senior Home Park directly behind the proposed new building

If your elderly parents lived in the Mobile Home Park or your children attended the Mission schools how would you feel with the building of this Center????? I strongly urge your to think about it thoughtly before making your decision about allowing it to pass.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Richard/Shirley McClune
San Luis Rey Homes, Inc.

Received

APR 19 2010

Planning Division

April 18, 2010

To: Planning Commission Members:

First of all, I would like to thank you for all you do for our City.

I am opposed to the Fellowship Rehabilitation Center being located at this site.

As you are aware, the City has received an overwhelming number of negative letters and comments regarding the inappropriate proposed use, petitions with over 200 names of Oceanside city residents, who live within 1,000 feet of this site who object to the proposed use.

Who spoke in favor of the Project? Paul Savo, his architect, another one of his business associates and a couple of people who do not even live near this area.

The City has already expended enormous amounts of time and money on this project, how much more is the City expected to do? I believe Mr. Savo still has many outstanding issues to deal with, including easements, storm drains, and numerous other critical requirements. Shouldn't Mr. Savo have to obtain approval of the outstanding requirements before the City spends any more time or money? Are other property owners afforded the same treatment Mr. Savo has received in regard to the amount of time and money expended on this Project?

The changes in the land use that Paul Savo requests are not consistent with the Mission San Luis Rey Historic Area goals and objectives as identified in the City of Oceanside's "Mission San Luis Rey Historic Area Development Program and Design Guidelines".

It is also inconsistent with the General Plan Land Use Element and would negatively impact the area, including the Historic Mission San Luis Rey, which is a National Historic Landmark. In addition, the Mission brings tourists and much needed income to the City.

The City staff has found that typical facilities of this nature are in predominately urbanized areas within close proximity to major transportation corridors and public transit facilities. Examples of these areas are near Brother Benno's Center on Production Avenue, which is located much closer to the city center or another area that is north of Oceanside Boulevard and west of College Avenue. Both of these areas are zoned more appropriately for such a use.

The overall land use would be a benefit to the community but not the current proposed location.

Sincerely,



Clara Douglas, 5 Oriole Lane, Oceanside, Ca

re: 4152 Mission April 16, 2010

Dear Sis,

This Center needs to be built at a different site, or area, where the zoning is compatible. Certainly, not next to the Mission San Luis Rey, the Montessori School, and Senior Community. It is without the approval of the PD Plan and the Mission San Luis Rey Historic Area Development Program and Design Guidelines, and Historic Overlay. Please stop it!

A. Gough
159 Roadrunner Lane
Oceanside, California

Received
APR 19 2010
Planning Division

THE UNDERSIGNED, RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA HEREBY *OBJECT* TO THE PROPOSED 2-STORY 59 BED MEN'S RESIDENTIAL DRUG AND ALCOHOL REHABILITATION CENTER TO BE LOCATED AT 4152 MISSION AVENUE-APN 158-070-08-00 KNOWN AS THE FELLOWSHIP CENTER.

WE RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR REHABILITATION PROJECTS SUCH AS THIS HOWEVER; BEING LOCATED WITHIN LESS THAN 200 FEET OF THE MONTESSARI DAYCARE CENTER, MONTESSARI SCHOOL, ATHLETIC FIELD AND IN-LINE SKATING FACILITY IS THE WRONG LOCATION.

1.	Dawn Barge	<i>Dawn Barge</i>	374 River Ranch Way	18 Jan 2009
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
2.	OSICR GUANG	<i>Osicr Guang</i>	4314 VISTA VERDE WAY	1-17-2010
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
3.	<i>Dawn Barge</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	4322 Vista Verde Way	1-17-2010
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
4.	MYRNA GUIANG	<i>Myrna</i>	4314 Vista Verde Way	1/17/2010
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
5.	Garold B. Kistley	<i>Garold B. Kistley</i>	4318 Vista Verde Way	1/16/2010
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
6.	Laura Sebastian	<i>Laura</i>	368 Spring Canyon Way	1-18-10
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
7.	Hezekiah Barge Jr.	<i>H. Barge</i>	374 RIVER RANCH	1-18-10
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
8.	Katherine Blume	<i>K Blume</i>	364 SPRING CANYON WAY	1-18-2010
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE
9.	Maurice Mitchell	<i>M. Mitchell</i>	4314 DEER CREEK WAY	1-16-10
	PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	DATE