

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MINUTES OF
SEPTEMBER 26, 1991
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 9:00 a.m.
The Planning Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

Chairman Karl ZoBell-present
Commissioner Tom La Vaut-present
Commissioner Ralph Pesqueira-not present
Commissioner Edward Reynolds-present
Commissioner Scott Bernet-present
Commissioner Lynn Benn-present
Commissioner Chris Calkins-present
Severo Esquivel, Deputy Manager/Acting Planning
Director-present
Michael J. Stepner, City Architect-present
Fred Conrad, Chief Deputy City Attorney-present
George Arimes, Assistant Planning Director-present
Hal Valderhaug, Deputy City Attorney-present
Tom Story, Deputy Director, Development and
Environmental Services-present
Joe Flynn, Deputy Director, Neighborhood Services-present
Mary Lee Balko, Deputy Director, Long Range
Planning-present
Jeff Strohminger, Engineering and Development
Department-present
Larry Monserrate, Principal Planner-present
Linda Johnson, Principal Planner-present
Janet MacFarlane, Recorder-present

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

No one appeared to speak at this time.

ITEM-2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 29, 1991.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of SCOTT BERNET, seconded by CHRIS CALKINS, the commission voted 4 to 0 (ZOBELL and REYNOLDS not voting with RALPH PESQUEIRA not present) to approve the minutes of August 29, 1991.

ITEM-3 BALBOA PARK - CENTRAL MESA PRECISE PLAN.

LARRY MONSERRATE explained the Department was requesting an indefinite continuance on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 6 to 0 (PESQUEIRA not present) to continue this item indefinitely.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 9:05 and reconvened at 9:10 in the Mayor's Closed Session Conference Room.

ITEM-2A PLANNING DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT AUDIT

The Commission held a general discussion of the information contained in the audit. They also discussed the issue of advancement for Planners and career paths.

The Commission further discussed the role of the Transportation and Land Use Committee and the impact on the Department. The Commission further reviewed the role of the City Architect.

WALT HALL spoke to the advantage of the Transportation Land Use Committee.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened in the Council Chambers at 10:20 a.m.

ITEM-2A PLANNING DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT AUDIT

The Commission continued discussion of this item.

Responding to a question from the Commission, City Attorney FRED CONRAD advised it would be appropriate for the Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council with respect to the Department's management audit.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by KARL ZOBELL, the Commission voted 4 to 0 (BENN and LA VAUT abstaining with PESQUEIRA not present) that as a result of issues raised in the audit report, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego recommends to the City Council that serious consideration be given to placing the consultant position to the Transportation and Land Use Committee or the consultant position to any council committee dealing with planning and land use issues under the direction of the City Manager or Planning Director. That the Planning Commission finds serious implications for staff morale and the process under current operations.

ITEM-4 CATELLUS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION. THE PROPOSED REQUEST IS FOR A THIRD AMENDMENT TO A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CATELLUS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (FORMERLY SANTA FE LAND IMPROVEMENT COMPANY) AND THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. THE PROJECT SITE IS BOUNDED APPROXIMATELY BY ASH STREET, KETTNER BOULEVARD, "E" STREET AND PACIFIC HIGHWAY.

No one appeared in opposition to this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by TOM LA VAUT, the Commission voted 6 to 0 (PESQUEIRA not present) to approve the third amendment to the development agreement with Catellus Development Corporation as recommended by staff.

ITEM-5 MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS. THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO IS PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE MULTIFAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS TO UPDATE AND SIMPLIFY THE REGULATIONS AND RESPOND TO CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION TO ELIMINATE THE TANDEM PARKING OPTION CITYWIDE.

JUAN BALIGAD presented Planning Department Report No. 91-291.

DAVE ODELL stated he was opposed to staff recommendation and was in support of Community Planners Committee recommendation of denial.

RICHARD HANSON stated he supported Planning Department's recommendation. He stated this helped development of small lot properties.

JOHN SETTER spoke in support of continuing the allowance of tandem parking.

MATT PETERSON, attorney, stated he was in favor of the supplemental parking reduction but was opposed to the change in parking requirements with respect to tandem parking.

JANE FLETCHER stated she was in support of Planning Department's recommendation. She stated the La Jolla Community Planning Association voted to support tandem parking in all areas of La Jolla.

MARK SPITZER, representing the San Diego Apartment Association, stated they supported the continued use of tandem parking in the ordinance.

IAN EPLEY stated the issue of tandem parking should be decided by each community.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by KARL ZOBELL, the Commission voted 6 to 0 (PESQUEIRA not present) to amend the Municipal Code to give projects that qualify for supplemental parking reduction special consideration for further reductions under the administrative review section of the ordinance.

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by SCOTT BERNET, the Commission voted 4 to 2 (BENN and LA VAUT voting in

the negative) not to adopt amendments to the multi-family parking requirements that would require tandem parking be counted as only one parking space instead of two.

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by KARL ZOBELL, the Commission voted 6 to 0 (PESQUEIRA not present) to recommend adoption of Map No. C-846, modified to bring back to the Planning Commission any change in transit corridors affecting the map, and to delete reference to bus service every 15 minutes as part of staff review.

ITEMS-6 TENTATIVE MAP NO. 90-0897; REZONING 90-0897 AND A STREET VACATION. THE TENTATIVE MAP PROPOSES A ONE-LOT, 8.80-ACRE SUBDIVISION FOR MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, WITH A PORTION OF OLD MISSION GORGE ROAD TO BE VACATED. THE R1-5000, R-1000 AND A1-10 ZONE SITE IS PROPOSED TO BE REZONED TO R-1500. LOCATION: SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION GORGE ROAD, BETWEEN CONESTOGA WAY ON THE WEST AND MARGERUM AVENUE ON THE EAST, NAVAJO COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA, COUNCIL DISTRICT 7. STREET ACTION SA 85-550 - EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE VACATION OF A PORTION OF OLD MISSION GORGE ROAD AND ROAD SURVEY 627. APPLICANT: MISSION GORGE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

BILL TRIPP presented Planning Department Report No. 90-089.

DIXON GOEN, representing Mission Gorge Development Company, spoke in support of the extension of time for the map and permit. He explained that the property was part of the VR Dennis original holdings in the area and had been identified as multi-family residential in the community plan. MR. GOEN stated that the map was a one-lot subdivision containing a paper street. He explained the extension of time was being requested because of the imposition IDO and of subsequent economic conditions.

NELS ESQUIVEL spoke in opposition to the extension of time. He was concerned about development blocking noise from the busily traveled street and the additional traffic that would use Margarim as an access.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by LYNN BENN, the Commission voted 6 to 0 (PESQUEIRA not present) to deny the requested extension of time for the street vacation, rezoning and map based on the findings that could not be met contained in staff report as Items 4, 5 and 6.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 12:00 noon and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

ITEM-7 AMENDMENT TO SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE - SIGN CODE.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-302.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by SCOTT BERNET, the Commission voted 5 to 0 (LA VAUT and PESQUEIRA not present) to amend the sign code to allow secondary directory signs for industrial uses as recommended by the Department.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-301.

DON WOOD, representing C-3, stated they were opposed to this particular change to the sign ordinance.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, representing the Community Planners Committee and the Torrey Pines Planning Group, stated they were opposed to allowing the increase in signage in multi-family residential zones. She stated this would allow more visual pollution and they were distracting to motorists.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 4 to 1 (BERNET voting in the negative with LA VAUT and PESQUEIRA not present) to deny the proposed amendment.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-302.

DON WOOD, representing C-3, spoke in opposition to the sign code amendment with respect to banners. He stated the banner violated the City's own regulations with respect to off premises signs and he further felt that commercial logos should be prohibited from banners.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, representing the Community Planners Committee and the Torrey Pines Planning Group, stated they were in support of staff's recommendation for the reasons cited in their report.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 4 to 1 (BERNET voting in the negative with LA VAUT and PESQUEIRA not present) to deny the amendments to the banner program according to staff recommendation.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-304. He further explained that the condition of approval contained the deletion of Section 101.1101.51 which would be brought back at a late date.

DON WOOD, representing C-3, noted that a number of the changes conflicted with action just taken by the Commission.

SYLVIA CEGALIS, representing the small business association, stated they were in support of staff recommendation.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of SCOTT BERNET, seconded by CHRIS CALKINS, the Commission voted 5 to 0 (PESQUEIRA and LA VAUT not present) to approve the amendment to the Municipal Code to modify various sections to reflect appropriate language and standards and signage as recommended and modified by staff.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-300.

DON WOOD, representing C-3, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment. He stated it was an accommodation to a small group of businesses.

LEE SANDER, representing PLAN, stated he wished to reaffirm their position in opposition to the proposed amendment.

JOSEPH HERTEL spoke in support of the proposed amendment and stated the issue was one of equity.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of LYNN BENN, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 3 to 2 (BERNET and CALKINS voting in the negative (with PESQUEIRA and LA VAUT not present) to deny the amendment and recommend no change to the existing ordinance. This motion failed for lack of four affirmative votes.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by LYNN BENN, the Commission voted 5 to 0 (PESQUEIRA AND LA VAUT not present) to indicate the Commission had reviewed and considered the proposed amendment to the Municipal Code.

ITEM-8 AMENDMENTS TO THE R-1 ZONES PARKING REGULATIONS AND TO THE R ZONES MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES REGARDING RECREATIONAL VEHICLE STORAGE. CONSIDER AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER X, ARTICLE 1, DIVISION 4, SECTION 101.0407, R-1 ZONES, PARKING AND OUTDOOR STORAGE AND PLACEMENT REGULATIONS; AND SECTION 101.0410, R ZONES (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) PARKING AND OUTDOOR STORAGE AND PLACEMENT REGULATIONS.

BOB DIDION presented Planning Department Report No. 91-310.

JAMES SPERBECK stated he was representing the Sierra Mesa Planning Group. He stated they were in agreement with the Planning Department recommendation. He stated their group was concerned about parking on private property and their concern was based on safety and visual pollution.

CLIFF ESKEW stated he was the owner of an RV and was in favor of parking his RV on his property as long as it did not obstruct foot traffic or blocked visibility for traffic.

RICHARD HALL stated he would like to be able to park his boat in his front yard and was in favor of amending the ordinance.

TRISHA BENNETT spoke in support of allowing recreational vehicles to be parked on one's private property. She cited an example where a person's only vehicle could be a recreational vehicle.

O.B. RUTLAND stated there was a problem with being able to park their vehicles in their neighborhoods. He stated he would like to put a cement pad in the front setback to park his recreational vehicle.

MERLE HAMBLBY explained he had been cited for parking his camper in his front yard. He felt he should be allowed to park his vehicle on his property.

MAE JO SLAGER, representing RV's United for Fair Play, spoke in support of allowing recreational vehicles to be parked in the front driveways. She stated parking these vehicles in the street was very dangerous.

DAVE ODELL spoke in opposition to allowing vehicles to park in front yards. He stated this proposal would impact many neighborhoods. He cited the city's desire to increase landscaping in front yards.

OPAL TRUEBLOOD, representing the Torrey Pines Planning Group, stated she was opposed to any change in this ordinance. As an alternative, she suggested perhaps some modification could be applied as an overlay zone. She stated the visual impact would be very negative if people were be allowed to park vehicles in their front yards.

HARRY MATHIS, Chairman of Community Planner Committee, stated at their meeting they voted 13 to 0 with

two abstentions to support staff's recommendation. He stated it was their concern that by allowing parking in front yards it would open Pandora's box.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by EDWARD REYNOLDS, the Commission voted 4 to 0 (BENN, LA VAUT and PESQUEIRA not present) to continue this item to December 5, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. for additional staff review.

RECESS, RECONVENE

The Commission recessed at 3:05 p.m. and reconvened at 3:10 p.m.

ITEM-9

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/RESOURCE PROTECTION OVERLAY ZONE PERMIT NO. 91-0491 "TOUSSANT TEEN CENTER." THE PROPOSED PROJECT, "TOUSSANT TEEN CENTER," IS A REQUEST FROM THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF SAN DIEGO, EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION, DBA ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, TO OPERATE A TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FACILITY FOR THIRTY (30) HOMELESS BOYS AND GIRLS IN A HISTORIC SITE LISTED ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES. THE TEENAGERS WOULD BE HOUSED IN EAGLES HALL, LOCATED AT 733 EIGHTH AVENUE, BETWEEN "E" AND "F" STREETS; APPLICANT: ST. VINCENT DE PAUL.

Chairman ZOBELL noted only four commissioners were present to consider and vote on this item. He asked if anyone wished to request a continuance.

HARRY MATHIS stated he was in opposition and would not be opposed to a continuance.

FATHER JOE CARROLL stated he would prefer that the Commission consider the item today.

MARIANNE MUNSELL presented Planning Department Report No. 91-491.

FATHER JOE CARROLL spoke in support of the permit. He explained this was an identical use and same project that the Commission previously approved several months ago. He explained the City Council had directed that a permanent location be determined and as a result, they were proposing the current location.

MARIA LIA spoke in support of the permits. She explained that the building was on the National Register. She stated that the Council could authorize an institutional use based on discretionary review for uses located in historic sites.

HARVEY MANDELL explained the program funding from HUD. He explained it was a five-year grant.

HARRY MATHIS explained that he represented a number of property owners that would be affected by this use. He explained that this was not a permitted use in the area.

JIM ENGELKE, representing the Center Arts Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed use. He noted this teen center would be located adjacent to the Rachel's Women Center.

BOB SINCLAIR stated he owned and operated the Panikin in the area. He stated he was opposed to a residential care facility in the area.

JAMES HUGHES stated he had a property management company. He stated it was not a good location for this program and not a good location for teenagers as this was an adult neighborhood.

STEVEN SCARVELIS stated he was one of the owners of the building immediately adjacent to the Eagle's Hall. He was opposed to the permit.

CAROLYN DeMOSS spoke in opposition to the permits.

STANLEY FRIED spoke in opposition to the permit. He stated the area was being developed with commercial uses and this would take a business out of the area.

DARLA CASH stated this was not an appropriate place for children and she was opposed to the permit at this location.

DENNIS JONES spoke in opposition to the permit. He explained that it was an area with heavy drug dealing activity in the area.

SUSAN TOTTY stated she had recently located a business in the area and wanted the City to stand by their ordinances and help to make the area a better place for cultural activities.

PETER JACKSON spoke in opposition to the permit.

HARRY MATHIS noted that the teen center did have an approved location in another area downtown.

Public testimony was closed on this item.

COMMISSION ACTION

On motion of CHRIS CALKINS, seconded by SCOTT BERNET, the Commission voted 4 to 0 (BENN, LA VAUT and PESQUEIRA not present) to continue this item to October 3, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. Staff was instructed to investigate the ordinance with respect to non-permitted uses in historic structures. Further, staff was directed to review the one-quarter mile rule for residential care facilities.

ADJOURNMENT

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m.