

PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
MINUTES OF  
JUNE 28, 1990  
AT 9:00 A.M.  
IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM - 12TH FLOOR

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Pesqueira at 9:15 a.m. The Planning Commission adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

Chairman Karl ZoBell-not present  
Commissioner Tom La Vaut-present  
Commissioner Ralph Pesqueira-present  
Commissioner Edward Reynolds-present  
Commissioner Scott Bernet-present  
Commissioner Lynn Benn-present  
Commissioner Chris Calkins-present  
Planning Director Robert P. Spaulding-present  
Fred Conrad, Chief Deputy City Attorney-present  
Joe Flynn, Deputy Director, Neighborhood  
Services-present  
Mary Lee Balko, Deputy Director, Long Range  
Planning-present  
Jeff Strohming, Engineering and Development-present  
Tom Salgado, Principal Planner-present  
Janet Fairbanks, Principal Planner-present  
Janet MacFarlane, Recorder-present

ITEM-1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 31 AND JUNE 7, 1990.

On motion of EDWARD REYNOLDS, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 5-0 (BERNET abstaining with ZOBELL not present) to approve the minutes of May 31 and June 7, 1990.

ITEM-2 GROWTH MANAGEMENT - PUBLIC FACILITY AND TRANSPORTATION URGENCY ORDINANCE

ROBERT SPAULDING explained the Commission would be reviewing two draft ordinances dealing with transportation congestion management and a 20-year capital facility plan.

DR. ROBERT FREILICH, consultant, reviewed the proposed ordinances as well as presented a history of the City's growth management effort.

GAIL MacLEOD, representing Rancho Santa Fe Association, stated road improvements identified in the capital facilities plan were not premature but needed today.

HARRY MATHIS stated the documents presented were too rigid. He questioned how these ordinances would affect local FBAs.

LARRY WILKIN, representing MV Associates, questioned how pipeline projects and projects with vesting tentative maps would be treated under the proposed ordinances.

COMMISSION ACTION

No action was required for this workshop item.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 11:10 a.m. and reconvened at 11:15 a.m.

MISCELLANEOUS TENTATIVE MAP NO. 89-1255, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO. 89-1255; RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE NO. 89-1255. BEECROFT CONDOMINIUMS

Staff indicated these items had been noticed for June 28, 1990 at 10:30 a.m., and because the environmental document was not final, staff requested a continuance to July 12, 1990, at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM-3 APPEAL OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR'S DENIAL OF CARL'S JR. DRIVE-THROUGH RESTAURANT, MID-CITY DEVELOPMENT (MCD) PERMIT NO. 89-1131. LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF EL CAJON BOULEVARD AND MARCELLENA ROAD IN THE CN-1 ZONE IN THE MID-CITY COMMUNITY AND ADDRESSED AS 5322 EL CAJON BOULEVARD. DEP NO. 89-1131. OWNER/APPLICANT: CARL KARCHER ENTERPRISES, INC.

DENNI SHEFRIN presented Planning Department Report No. 90-181.

JOHN MURRAY, representing Carl's Jr. Restaurant, spoke in support of the appeal explaining the only area of disagreement was the provision of a driveway on El Cajon Boulevard.

LOUIS WOLFSHEIMER spoke in support of the permit explaining the driveway onto El Cajon Boulevard currently existed and they proposed to reduce the curb cut from 32 to 22 feet.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 4-2 (BERNET and CALKINS voting in the negative with ZOBELL not present) to certify the negative declaration and approve the appeal and approve the permit.

ITEM-4 UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO "BOOKSTORE" ADDITION AND PERIMETER ROAD EXTENSION, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 90-0172. THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO CAMPUS, SOUTH OF MARIAN WAY IN THE R1-5000 ZONE IN THE LINDA VISTA COMMUNITY. DEP NO. 90-0172. OWNER/APPLICANT: UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO.

KEVIN MCGEE presented Planning Department Report No. 90-163.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of EDWARD REYNOLDS, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 6-0 (ZOBELL not present) to certify the negative declaration and approve the permit as recommended by staff.

ITEM-5 THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA.

ITEM-6 THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 11:55 a.m. and reconvened at 1:40 p.m.

ITEM-7 PLANNING DEPARTMENT FEE/DEPOSIT REVISIONS.

CHARLES WOOLEVER presented Planning Department Report No. 90-200.

No one appeared to speak on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of TOM LA VAUT, seconded by SCOTT BERNET, the Commission voted 5-0 (ZOBELL and CALKINS not present) to recommend approval of the revised Planning Department fee and deposit schedule.

ITEM-8 APPEAL OF THE LA JOLLA BOULEVARD CONDOMINIUM PROJECT COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 90-0154. LOCATED 5445 LA JOLLA BOULEVARD IN THE R-1000 ZONE IN THE LA JOLLA COMMUNITY. DEP NO. 90-0154. OWNER/APPLICANT: BRAMKO, INC. APPELLANTS: DAVID NIGHTINGALE.

SHELLY KILBOURN presented Planning Department Report No. 90-190.

GEORGE ANDERSON, representing Birdwatchers' Neighborhood Association, stated they were opposed to the project as presented.

JOYCE DROZDA, area resident, stated she was opposed to the project because traffic would be routed through their neighborhood. She recommended curb cuts be installed on La Jolla Boulevard rather than the alley as proposed.

ROBERT HENKEL, area resident, stated he was opposed to the project based on traffic that would be generated by those residing in the project. He also questioned whether sufficient parking was being provided.

MARJI NIGHTINGALE stated the neighbors were strongly opposed to the project. SHE said there was a school nearby and was concerned about safety for the children. She felt the mitigated negative declaration prepared for the project was inadequate as a full environmental impact report should be prepared.

CONSTANCE TODD, area resident, spoke in opposition because the ocean breeze would be cut off to her home.

DAVID NIGHTINGALE spoke in opposition to the project. He said the proposed project would restrict visitors to the area in that an existing motel would be removed; the project was incompatible with the neighborhood; and the project would wall off the rest of La Jolla from the ocean.

REVEREND JOHN HUBER spoke in opposition to the project. He stated the family environment should be preserved in this area.

MOLLY HAERR stated she was opposed to the project because of her concern for the safety of the neighborhood children associated with the projected traffic from the project.

JOHN WEST, area resident, stated he was opposed to the project and felt the height of the proposed condominiums was excessive.

NEAL JENSON, area resident, spoke in opposition to the project.

GEORGE ANDERSON spoke in opposition to the project. He stated the structures did not fit in with the rest of the community. He further suggested a one-way alley and speed humps should be considered if the project was approved.

#### RECESS/RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 2:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:50 p.m.

Vice Chairman PESQUEIRA explained that because of the large number of people in attendance at the Council meeting, it would be necessary to terminate the Planning Commission meeting and reschedule the items not concluded.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of TOM LA VAUT, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 5-0 (ZOBELL and CALKINS not present) to continue Item 8, Coastal Development Permit No. 90-0154 to Thursday, July 5, 1990, at 8:30 a.m.

ITEMS-9 POINT LOMA NAZARENE COLLEGE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND 9A AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 87-0142 (AMENDMENT TO CUP NO. 82-0205). LOCATED AT 3900 LOMALAND DRIVE IN THE R1-5000/HR ZONE IN THE PENINSULA COMMUNITY. DEP NO. 87-0142. OWNER/APPLICANT: POINT LOMA NAZARENE COLLEGE.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of SCOTT BERNET, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 5-0 (ZOBELL and CALKINS not present) to continue these items to July 26, 1990 at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM-10 ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT - ITEMS OF INTEREST WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION NOT PREVIOUSLY HEARD.

Not considered.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.