

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MINUTES OF
MARCH 12, 1992
AT 9:00 A.M.
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 12TH FLOOR**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman ZoBell at 9:20 a.m.
The Planning Commission adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

Chairman Karl ZoBell-present
Commissioner Tom La Vaut-not present
Commissioner Ralph Pesqueira-present
Commissioner Edward Reynolds-present
Commissioner Scott Bernet-present
Commissioner Lynn Benn-present
Commissioner Chris Calkins-not present
Severo Esquivel, Deputy Manager/Acting Planning
Director-present
George Arimes-Assistant Planning Director-present
Hal Valderhaugh, Chief Deputy City Attorney-present
Tom Story, Deputy Planning Director, Development and
Environmental Services-present
Mary Lee Balko, Deputy Planning Director,
Community Planning-present
Betsy McCullough, Principal Planner-present
Jeff Strohming, Engineering and Development-present
Jeannette Santos, Recorder-present
Catherine Meyer, Recorder-present

ITEM-1 ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT - ISSUES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION NOT PREVIOUSLY HEARD.

DENNIS M. GRIFFIN, representing the Property Owners Association of La Jolla Shores discussed the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance taken off the March 12, 1992 agenda.

JEAN CAMERON of the Planning Department said this item was continued indefinitely and will be renoticed. She stated that someone from staff will come back on March 26, 1992.

COMMISSION ACTION

No action taken by the Commission. This item to be continued to March 26, 1992 as Information Only.

ITEM-2 This item removed from the agenda and will be heard on March 19, 1992 at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM-4 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 84-0526. VIETNAM VETERANS/THE LANDING ZONE. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 24 UNIT HOUSING FOR VETS/ALCOHOLICS. LEGAL: HORTON ADDITION LOT B, BLOCK 76. LOCATION: 757 11TH AVENUE BETWEEN: F STREET AND: G STREET. APPLICANT: VIETNAM VETERANS OF SAN DIEGO.**

PAUL Mc NEIL of Centre City Development Corporation requested a continuation of this item to April 23, 1992 at 9:00 a.m.

No one spoke in opposition to a continuation.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of **LYNN BENN**, seconded by **KARL ZOBELL**, the Commission voted 5-0 (**CALKINS** and **La VAUT** not present) to continue this item to April 23, 1992 at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM-6 **NORTH CITY FUTURE URBANIZING AREA FRAMEWORK PLAN. APRIL 2, 1992 CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP. INFORMATION ONLY.**

MARY LEE BALKO, Deputy Planning Director, Community Planning discussed the Memorandum dated March 6, 1992 and to answer any questions prior to the joint workshop.

BETSY McCULLOUGH of the Planning Department, informed the Commissioners, that is one of the background reports that our Citizen Advisory Committee and City Council did receive, and there will be another report prior to the joint workshop.

ITEM-3 INITIATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN (TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT) FOR THE LEVI-CUSHMAN (RIVER WALK) SPECIFIC PLAN.

MARY WRIGHT presented Planning Department Report No. P-92-069.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of **LYNN BENN**, seconded by **KARL ZOBELL**, the Commission voted 5-0 (**CALKINS** and **La VAUT** not present) adoption of a resolution to initiate the Planning Process and exemption from the public hearing consolidation requirement.

ITEM-5 ZONING CODE UPDATE

SEVERO ESQUIVEL, Deputy City Manager/Acting Planning Director stated that this has been ongoing about a year, and gave a brief background on the Zoning Code Update. Mr. Esquivel thanked **Karl ZoBell** and his committee, thanks to **George Arimes**, **Betsy Weisman** and their staff, and City Attorney staff, **Janis Sammartino** and **Ann Moore**.

BETSY WEISMAN presented Planning Department Report No. P-92-066.

STEPHEN SILVERMAN stated he spent about 13 months on the Zoning Code Update Committee, and the American Planning Association Representative for the update committee. He gave a brief overview of the process to standardize the regulations, to establish a consistency in the system, to make the regulations in the process easier to use. A product that is reasonable, understandable and deep politicized.

REBECCA MICHAEL, Bar Association Representative on the Advisory Committee. She spoke on the process of a permit, how a permit is sorted and categorized.

LINDA MICHAEL, representing the Serra Club. She stated did work with the committee on some key issues, those issues were a recommendation for the 5 decision process and one appeal. We believe it will simplify the process, that it can be a fair process and will be a more efficient process.

Catherine Meyer continued recordation of minutes.

Discussion continued between Planning Department staff; Betsy Weisman, George Arimes, and Tom Story and Commissioner Lynn Benn about Administration and Procedures and establishing how the future code would be setup, the framework, procedures, number of permits and looking into the regulations in a systematic manner and simplify and streamline the filing and noticing process.

Jeannette Santos continued recordation of minutes.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Planning Commission recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m.

Continuation of Item 5, Zoning Code Update.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, Vice Chair of Community Planners Chairmen Committee. She discussed Resolution No. 261 from CPC regarding the Zoning Code Update on March 10, 1992. That CPC is not prepared to make a recommendation regarding the decision levels and Attachment 4 of this report at this time. Ms. Trueblood stated that this issue be subject to further revisions with experience and in conjunction with development of the code revisions.

MATT PETERSON, representing US West Cellular. He presented a photo showing cellular communication facilities, divided into 2 categories, major versus minor. To consider adding two new categories into the matrix, one for cellular facilities (major which deals with the mono poles-level 3 division CUP); for cellular communication facilities (minor which would be permitted by right, a level 1 which administrative review). This will expedite the processing of these types of facilities and still give the Planning Commission the jurisdiction to look at the major facility to the large TV and radio broadcasting antennas like the one on top of Mt. Soledad.

DICK SMITH, he stated he appeared before the La Jolla Community Planning Association briefing on Phase 1 of the ordinance. That the current appeal process not a tool of good government.

BARBARA GREEN lives in the College area and speaking for herself. She stated the College area is not happy with the decision making that goes to the Planning Commission without consulting everyone in the community. When a person gets a permit and goes through the ministerial processing. People still do things without permits. **DAVE ODELL** spoke in favor of the Zoning Code Update, that it needed to be update.

VICTOR JAMES DOMINELLI, an architect in the City of San Diego. He spoke in favor to the Zoning Code Update with the appropriate modifications presented and forward to City Council.

JANICE BROWN, representing Board of Zoning Appeals spoke in partially in favor because of the things is proposed is to eliminate the Board of Zoning. The Board of Zoning Appeals currently handles the project. She presented an overview of the Board of Zoning Appeals. We are an effective and efficient Board.

FRANCIE UGORETZ, Chair of the Board of Zoning Appeals. She expressed the Board concerns about the neighborhood person, that the Zoning Code Update will simplify alot of issues, but feel that the Planning commission maybe overwhelm with their new duties to hear the cases that the Board of Zoning Appeal now hear. She requested that the Planning commission reconsider the aspect of the Zoning Code Update.

LINCOLN PICKARD, Chair Otay-Mesa Nestor Planning Committee. He indicated that one of the problems we seem to have with the new ordinance that we feel we are loosing some access in the process. For example Planning Commission members do not live south of 94 or south Highway 8. They are not familiar with the problems in our area and feel should have members of the PC who live in our area. Appeals to Council we feel do not get good ones decisions. If Planning Commission wants to have final say in alot of issues should also be elected like City Council.

VERNA QUINN, representing the Southeast San Diego Development Committee. She spoke in support of the

ordinance, except for 3 items, the committee supports the CPC position of retaining the Rule 4 Appeal process for Tract 3 projects and their other recommendations. What happens to the environmental review in the new process? It is our understanding that ministerial projects are exempted under CEQA by definition. Our concern is that with more ministerial projects and no environmental review many significant problems will be overlooked. Lastly and this phase of the update will have little effect in speeding up the process until Phase 2 and 3 are completed. Adoption of the process before the revisions is premature. The entire Zoning Code Update is necessary and reasonable that a logical approach is essential.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD indicated that the report was February 28, 1992 and did not receive it in time the Torrey Pines Community Planning Group not able to take a position on it. However, our subcommittee did review, we do have a major concern regarding the Sort, Attachment 4, page 4, Under Resource Overlays moved those to Process 4 except for Coastal development. Our coastal resources are very important to the future of the this city and particular important to the Torrey Pines Community Planning Group, we have 2 Title Estuary, 2 state parks and a city park within that area. We have more resources to protect. That this part of the City be protected for the benefit of everyone. To move the Coastal Development Permits up to the Process 4 is vital.

AL STROHLEIN spoke in opposition to the ordinance. The appeal process may be the citizens only avenue to bring concerns and irregularities to the attention of government bodies to uphold the public trust. Why update the zoning code when you all you have to do is to enforce the existing code.

MERRIAM LEWIS lives in the College area. She spoke in opposition to the Zoning Code Update that there has not been sufficient researched and reviewed. In an area that is impacted by a large university, who does not care about the community. Ms. Lewis stated she made complaints to the Planning Department and City Attorney.

JOHN DEAN, Chairman of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board. He spoke in opposition to the ordinance and that the Planning board had its meeting and felt we did not have an opportunity to review this document and received it late. Also the issue on the Coastal Development Permit.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of **SCOTT BERNET**, seconded by **RALPH PESQUEIRA**, the Commission voted 4-0 (**ZOBELL** abstaining with **CALKINS** and **La VAUT** not present) to amend, the retention of The Board of Zoning Appeals.

On motion of **SCOTT BERNET**, seconded by **RALPH PESQUEIRA**, the Commission Voted 4-1 (**BENN** voting in the negative with **CALKINS** and **La VAUT** not present) to recommend the balance of the Planning Department staff recommendation to City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission adjourned at 11:55 a.m.