

PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MINUTES OF
JUNE 7, 1990
AT 9:30 A.M.
IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM - 12TH FLOOR

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Pesqueira at 9:40 a.m. The Planning Commission adjourned at 5:40 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-not present
Commissioner Lynn Benn-present
Commissioner Chris Calkins-present
Fred Conrad, Chief Deputy City Attorney-present
Mary Lee Balko, Deputy Director, Long Range
Planning-present
Tom Story, Deputy Director, Development and
Environmental Services-present
Jeff Strohminger, Engineering and Development-present
Rachael Hurst, Principal Planner-present
Janet MacFarlane, Recorder-present

ITEM-1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 17, 1990

This item was trailed to 1:30 p.m.

ITEM-2 REVIEW OF COUNTY LEASE SITE FOR GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY. 2667 CAMINO DEL RIO SOUTH. APPLICANT: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of TOM LA VAUT, seconded by CHRIS CALKINS, the Commission voted 4-0 (ZOBELL, BERNET and BENN not present) to find the County lease site at 2667 Camino Del Rio South in conformance with the City's General Plan.

ITEM-3 APPEAL OF THE REGENTS CLUB, PROPOSED PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (AMENDMENT) NO. 89-1403. THE PROJECT SITE IS BOUNDED BY LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE, GENESEE AVENUE, NOBEL DRIVE AND REGENTS ROAD IN THE R-1500 ZONE IN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY (DEP NO. 89-1403). OWNER/APPLICANT: GSC REALTY CORPORATION. APPELLANT: PAUL E. ROBINSON, REPRESENTING GSC REALTY CORPORATION.

PAUL ROBINSON, attorney representing the applicant, requested a continuance on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 4-0 (ZOBELL, BERNET and BENN not present) to continue this item to August 2, 1990 at 9:00 a.m.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 9:45 a.m. and reconvened at 10:00 a.m.

ITEM-4 MISSION VALLEY/CALMAT COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT (NORTH-CENTRAL SECTOR CONSOLIDATED PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING). THIS IS A REQUEST BY CALMAT PROPERTIES COMPANY TO REDESIGNATE A 4.88-ACRE SITE FROM COMMERCIAL-OFFICE TO MULTIPLE USE IN THE MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN. NO OTHER PLAN AMENDMENTS ARE PROPOSED FOR THIS SECTOR OF THE CITY. OWNER: RUSSELL V. GRANT. APPLICANT: CALMAT PROPERTIES COMPANY.

MARY WRIGHT reviewed Planning Department Report No. 90-164.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of EDWARD REYNOLDS, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 4-0 (ZOBELL, BERNET and BENN voting in the negative) to approve and recommend City Council approval of the proposed Mission Valley Community Plan Amendment.

ITEMS-5 AND 6 RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, (AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 5545), CASE NO. 89-1065, FOR THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING SDG&E ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION FACILITY. LOCATED NORTHEAST OF THE INTERSTATE 5/805 SPLIT AND NORTH OF THE FUTURE SORRENTO HILLS BOULEVARD IN THE A-1-10 ZONE IN THE SORRENTO HILLS COMMUNITY. DEP NO. 89-1065. NW1/4 OF SECTION 32, T145, R3W, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN. OWNER/APPLICANT: SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY.

GEORGIA SPARKMAN presented Planning Department Report No. 90-171.

DAVE SIINO, representing SDG&E, explained the proposal to expand the existing substation facility. He reviewed the need for the facility and stated the project was designed in the most sensitive manner that could be developed.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, representing the Torrey Pines Community Planning Group, spoke in opposition to the project based on the destruction of habitat. She further felt the environmental impact report was incomplete because answers to comments received were not in writing. She felt that the mitigation should be on-site, not off-site, and was opposed to the inclusion that donation to a fund be an acceptable form of mitigation.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of EDWARD REYNOLDS, seconded by CHRIS CALKINS, the Commission voted 3-1 (LA VAUT voting in the negative with ZOBELL, BERNET and BENN not present) to certify the environmental impact report, approve the permits, adopt findings and statements of overriding consideration, and approve the off-site dedication as the first option for mitigation, and if this option could not be achieved, on-site revegetation/enhancement should be implemented.

This motion failed for lack of four affirmative votes; therefore, this item was trailed to the Commission meeting of June 14, as unfinished business.

ITEM-7 CLASSIFICATION OF PROTECTED SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS WITHIN THE "NORMAL HEIGHTS" PORTIONS OF THE GREATER NORTH PARK AND MID-CITY COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS. ON OCTOBER 19, AND NOVEMBER 16, 1989 THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUED THE CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE-FAMILY RECLASSIFICATION IN TWO AREAS OF THE GREATER NORTH PARK AND THE MID-CITY COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS. THIS REPORT IDENTIFIES THE ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO SINGLE-FAMILY PRESERVATION FOR AN AREA COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS NORMAL HEIGHTS. OWNER/APPLICANT: CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

JULIE HUDDLE presented Planning Department Report No. 90-151.

GARY TAYLOR spoke in support of the Department's recommendation. He stated that he was opposed to the community group's recommendation that Area 11 be zoned single-family.

JIM SEIBERT stated that he was in support of staff's recommendation.

CHARLES SLOAN indicated his support for staff recommendation.

PAULA SLOAN stated that they had owned property in the Normal Heights area and were in favor of staff's recommendation and opposed to the recommendation of the Normal Heights Community Association.

CYNTHIA MEINHARDT stated she was in favor of staff's recommendation and opposed to the planning group's recommendation. She stated that she owned property on Monroe and she and her neighbors were in support of maintaining the multi-family zoning for their area.

SUSAN HOEKENGA, Chair of the Greater North Park Community Planning Committee, stated that the Planning Department did not have a definition of single-family. She stated the area of Meade, Madison and Monroe were single-family in character and should be zoned as such.

JUDY ELLIOT, representing the Normal Heights Community Association, stated that their land use recommendations were contained on a map dated May 10, 1990. She stated that they supported Areas 11 and 9 as they were single-family in character.

JAMES GUTHRIE, representing the Normal Heights Community Development Corporation, stated that the goal of the ordinance was to protect single-family character of neighborhoods.

MELISSA HARTLEY, representing the Normal Heights Community Association, recommended that Area 11 be zoned single-family.

DIANE GEORGE stated that she was in support of staff's recommendation. She said she owned property on Arizona Street which was developed multi-family. She said she did not want the property rezoned.

ROBERT POWERS stated that he was opposed to any downzoning of his properties on Madison Street. He felt that the use of architectural control was preferable over rezoning to obtain the single-family character.

MARY LEE LESLIE stated that she was speaking for a property owner who was opposed to downzoning of his property.

JOHN COSTIGAN spoke in support of the staff's recommendation and in opposition to any rezoning of his property.

ANN McCAULL, Bancroft Street property owner, stated that she was in favor of staff's recommendation as it related to Area 11.

COLE SINCLAIR, representing Eunice Reidner, spoke in opposition to downzoning in Normal Heights.

PHILIP STAHL stated that he was in favor of Planning Department's recommendation and opposed to downzoning of his property. He explained that the area was not single-family as it was across from a Von's supermarket which was a 24-hour operation, as well as apartment buildings along with the heavy traffic congestion in the area.

JOHN MERFELD spoke in opposition to any downzoning stating it was multi-family in character.

GEORGE MAHLMEISTER stated he owned property on 38th Street which he felt was multi-family. He stated he was against any downzoning of his property.

JIM WILSHIRE spoke in opposition to downzoning of his property between Madison and Monroe on the west side of Texas Street. He questioned whether the Planning Department had any interface with the Traffic Control Division.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 4-0 (ZOBELL, BENN and BERNET not present) to approve adoption of the Greater North Park Protected Single-family Neighborhood Map for the northeast portion of the community as recommended by the Planning Department, to release the northeast portion of Greater North Park which are not classified as protected from the provisions of the Single-Family Protection Ordinance, to approve the adoption of the Mid-City Protected Single-Family Neighborhood Map as recommended by the Planning Department, approve and recommend that the City Council rezone Area 1 from MR-3000 to MR-5000 as recommended by the Department, and to further recommend the release of those portions of the northwest portion of Mid-City which are not classified as single-family neighborhoods from the provisions from the Single-Family Protection Ordinance.

ITEM-8 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1991.

BOB BROCATO presented Planning Department Report and City Department Memorandum Nos. 90-158 and 90-159.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 4-0 (ZOBELL, BERNET and BENN not present) that the projects listed on page 3 of the report did not conform with the Progress Guide and General Plan and that Council should require amendments to the appropriate plans prior to implementation; that the scope and design of the San Ysidro Boulevard project should be required to conform with the recommendations of the San Ysidro Community Plan update now in progress; and the remaining projects in the proposed FY 90 CIP were in conformance with the Progress Guide and General Plan.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m.

ITEM-1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 17, 1990

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of TOM LA VAUT, seconded by LYNN BENN, the Commission voted 4-0 (CALKINS abstaining with BERNET and ZOBELL not present) to approve the minutes of May 17, 1990.

ITEM-9 REVISION OF FUTURE URBANIZING AREA POLICIES AND REGULATIONS AND OTHER CITY-WIDE DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.

BOB BROCATO presented Planning Department Report No. 90-158.

LINDA MICHAEL, representing the Sierra Club, stated they were in support of Alternative A of staff's recommendation.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, Chair of the Torrey Pines Community Planning Group, stated they were opposed to urban uses in the future urbanizing area and were in favor of staff's recommendation under Alternative A.

KAREN SCARBOROUGH, representing C3, stated she was in favor of staff's recommendation and would urge that a comprehensive plan be developed for the area.

KEVIN McNAMARA, representing the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Group, stated they were opposed to the staff's recommendation because it would prohibit schools from being constructed in the future urbanizing area. He explained that the Peñasquitos area had an elementary and secondary school proposed for property that was included in the future urbanizing as there were no other alternative sites available.

DAVID MULLIKEN, representing the Alliance of Property Owners, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation. He questioned whether CEQA compliance was met and whether it would be exempt because the impact of this policy would affect surrounding areas. He said it made good economic sense to use the development process consistent with the current policy to allow some development in this area, noting open space would then be available to the City.

DAVID GOODELL, representing Alliance of Property Owners, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation. He said by allowing rural development through the PRD process, sensitive clustering could be developed with much of the property going into permanent open space.

JIM FISK, representing the Joe Crowder Partners, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation and in support of the ability to cluster development with the remaining being dedicated as open space.

JIM MILCH spoke in opposition to staff's opposition.

LANCE BURRIS, representing Potomac Investment, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation. He stated that there was a scarcity of developable land and agricultural use was no longer viable economically. He stated that Potomac concurred with the Alliance of Property Owners and felt that one dwelling unit per four acres was appropriate type of development for this area.

RUTH BREWER, representing the Emmanuel Baptist Church, spoke in opposition to the recommendation that churches be excluded from an allowable use in the future urbanizing area.

LLOYD BROWN stated he was not in support of prohibiting the construction of churches in future urbanizing areas as he felt they were not growth inducing.

LAWRENCE BENTLEY, representing Emmanuel Baptist Church, spoke in opposition to the recommendation that churches not be allowed in the future urbanizing area.

WILLIAM POTTER, representing Braemer Farms, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

JOHN RECHT requested an exemption for his property, the All Creatures Hospital as well as Mary's Tack Shop.

ROGER LINCOLN, resident of Black Mountain Road, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 3:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.

MARK BRUNETE, representing the Living Water Lutheran Church, explained they had been looking two years for a church site and were opposed to the prohibition that would exclude their locating their church in the future urbanizing area.

TIM SPILKER, representing the Lutheran church, spoke in opposition to the proposed exclusion of churches being located in the future urbanizing area.

OLGA MAY, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation. She explained she owned a small 30-acre parcel which would be impossible to subdivide should the current policy be changed.

LUCILLE HEDGES stated that against many property owner wishes, their property was annexed to the City in 1966. She said they had been paying taxes all these years and have not been able to enjoy any of the benefits.

FRANK KONYN stated he owned 380 acres adjacent to City property in San Pasqual Valley. He said he was opposed to the proposed amendments.

RUTH GUNTHER, representing the Carmel Valley Community Church, spoke in opposition to the proposed conditional use requirement for churches in the agricultural zone.

GEORGE GEISSINGER spoke in opposition to the proposed permit requirement for churches in the agricultural zone. He explained they had to compete with commercial sites and because of high land costs, many churches had to be located in areas where land was less costly.

DAVE LUCIANI, representing U.S. Savings Corporation, stated they own 52 acres in San Ysidro and were opposed to staff's recommendation.

JOHN DE BEVOISE spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

FRANK PIERSON asked that his property be removed from the future urbanizing and included in the planned urbanizing area.

JANET RASCHKE said they were paying taxes in the future urbanizing area but yet they were not receiving services. She said she would like to be able to use her land.

DANIEL BRUMFIELD spoke in opposition to the downzoning of his property.

ALLEN HAYNIE asked for clarification of the map.

RANDY COOPERSMITH, representing PDC, spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

JIM WHEYLAND spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

FRANK KNECHTEL spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation with respect to development in the future urbanizing.

RICHARD FLETCHER spoke against staff's recommendation.

JERRY McCAW stated he was against any change in the current zoning in the future urbanizing area and was against Alternative A but would consider Alternative B as an alternative. He explained he owned property zoned A-1-1.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by LYNN BENN, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the recommendation of Alternative A, modified to allow clustering at A-1-10 density, noting that the vote of Commissioners Benn and La Vaut was conditional on the understanding that urban services would not be provided for these developments.

Regarding conditional uses, the Commission took the following votes with respect to allowing certain uses in the Future Urbanizing Area under the Conditional Use Permit process, provided that the specific use proposed is rural in character, service and use:

Voted 3-2: To allow churches;

Voted 5-0: To allow tennis court lighting and similar lighting;

Voted 4-1: To allow nursery and elementary schools and day care facilities;

Voted 4-1: To allow private clubs, lodges and fraternal organizations;

Voted 5-0: To allow veterinary clinics and hospitals;

Voted 4-1: To allow educational institutions other than nursery and elementary schools;

Voted 3-2: To allow both public and private golf courses, golf practice tees or ranges, pitch and putt golf courses, and miniature golf courses;

Voted 3-2: To allow hospitals, intermediate care facilities, and nursing homes;

Voted 4-1: To allow research, development and testing laboratories and facilities;

Voted 3-2: To allow fairgrounds;

Voted 4-1: To allow race tracks;

Voted 5-0: To allow major stationary communication relay or transmission facilities;

Voted 3-2: To allow hazardous waste facilities;

Voted 3-2: To allow hazardous waste research, development and demonstration facilities.

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 2-3 (REYNOLDS, PESQUEIRA and CALKINS voting in the negative, with BERNET and ZOBELL not present) on a motion that any development in the future urbanizing area not be provided with urban levels of service including water and sewer. This motion failed for lack for four affirmative votes.

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

No one appeared to speak at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Commission adjourned at 5:40 p.m.