



## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**February 11, 2013**

*The meeting of the El Cajon Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.*

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & MOMENT OF SILENCE

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Darrin J. MROZ, Chairman  
Star BALES  
Paul CIRCO, Vice Chairman  
Adel DANKHA  
Anthony SOTTILE

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Manjeet RANU, Planning Manager / Planning  
Commission Secretary  
Dennis DAVIES, Deputy Director – Public Works  
Noah ALVEY, Associate Planner  
Eric CRAIG, Assistant Planner  
David HARDY, Administrative Intern  
Tony SHUTE, Senior Planner  
Michael REID, Staff Attorney  
Ron Luis VALLES, Administrative Secretary

MROZ explained the mission of the Planning Commission.

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by CIRCO, to adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on December 10, 2012; carried 5-0.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

#### **AGENDA ITEM NO. 2 – BMW EL CAJON - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2179 AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 648**

This was a public hearing on a request for a new automobile dealership, freeway-oriented sign, and consolidation of lots into one parcel and the adjustment of certain easements.

The subject property is addressed as 720 El Cajon Boulevard. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 487-490-07 and 487-490-19  
General Plan: El Cajon Blvd/Johnson Av-GC (SDA 10) / General Commercial (CG)  
Zoning: General Commercial (C-G)  
Applicant: BMW South County (Tom Story) / 858.362.8500  
Project Planner: Tony Shute / 619.441.1705  
Email: tonys@cityofelcajon.us and include "CUP 2179/TPM 648" in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, SHUTE summarized the staff report.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Tom STORY, applicant, approached the podium and expressed excitement about the project and added that they would be implementing BMW's new design standards.

MROZ asked the applicant if studies had been completed on the size design for the sign.

STORY replied that after evaluating the costs, they may only proceed with one sign. He appreciated the flexibility allotted them by staff in order to accommodate the freeway-oriented sign subject to further staff review.

SOTTILE thanked the applicant for wanting to do business in El Cajon and increasing employment opportunities. He added that in reviewing the plans, the design of the building was very attractive.

Motion was made by BALES, seconded by CIRCO, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by SOTTILE, to adopt the proposed Resolution Nos. 10720, 10721 and 10725, as presented recommending City Council approval of CEQA Categorical Exemptions 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction), 15305 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations), and 15311 (Accessory Structures), Conditional Use Permit No. 2179 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 648, respectively, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on February 26, 2013, at 7 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 3 – LORNA AVENUE RESIDENTIAL – ZONE RECLASSIFICATION NO. 2309, PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT NO. 67 AND TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP NO. 655**

This was a public hearing on a request to rezone property from the RS-40 (Residential, Single-family, 40,000 square foot) zone to the PRD-Low and PRD-Low Low (Planned Residential Development-Low Low, respectively) zones, for development of 21 single-family residences within a common interest development. The subject property is located at

the terminus of Lorna Avenue south of East Chase Avenue. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 493-391-10  
General Plan: Low Density Residential (LR) / Low Low Density Residential (LLR)  
Zoning: Residential, Single-family, 40,000 square foot (RS-40)  
Applicant: Dean Wilson Living Trust / 619.295.9449  
Project Planner: Tony Shute / 619.441.1705  
Email: tonys@cityofelcajon.us and include "ZR 2309/PRD 655/TSM 67" in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, SHUTE summarized the staff report.

SOTTILE asked staff if the average length of the driveway was less than 20 feet.

SHUTE answered that the driveways that do not meet the 20 foot development standard setback from the garage to its means of access are those that front on private driveways. These driveways are not long enough for visitor parking, therefore, the visitor parking spaces are satisfied in the proposed area next to the private park and the private street.

In answer to BALES, SHUTE advised that staff had worked extensively with the applicant through two cycle reviews to end up with an aesthetically pleasing design for the proposed project.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Kellen MINARD, approached the podium and handed out a diagram of the area delineating the current parking conditions on Lorna Avenue which showed 3.2 cars for every resident on Lorna Avenue. He stated the proposed development is allowing for two cars per house whereby most homes have three vehicles. Lorna Avenue is currently a crowded street and half of the units do not have a drive-way for parking. The street indicating where additional parking would be is of sub-standard width. It should be 40 feet from curb to curb. The proposed plan only provides 32 feet, so when parked it reduces the width by eight feet on either side. Currently the two-way traffic can only maneuver in a 16 foot wide area; 8 feet narrower than a street providing private drives that have no garages. The proposed plan has a couple more units than it should have which creates not enough parking for visitors. Once units are established, vehicles which won't fit on the project site and will park on existing Lorna Avenue. Planning on future residents using their garages for parking only is unlikely.

MINARD added that it is also hard to exit Lorna Avenue onto Chase Avenue because of the two street lights and the number of vehicles using Chase daily. He suggested a traffic study be performed since this project will be doubling trips onto Lorna Avenue. Currently, during busy times, only one car per light change can exit, which causes a back-up of cars attempting to enter Chase Avenue.

SOTTILE asked staff if the Fire Department needed 40 feet on the street in order to turn around and would this be at the hammerhead.

SHUTE answered the hammerhead design was approved by the Fire Department. In terms of parking, he added that the project is proposing 3.4 parking spaces per unit. All houses will have a two-car garage and the development standards for a planned residential development (PRD) specify that the garage be solely used for parking of two vehicles. This is a unique condition for PRDs that garages must be used for parking.

In answer to MROZ's inquiry, SHUTE mentioned that shortened driveways are for ten of the units with private driveways. Their visitor parking is made up elsewhere on the site. The other unit's visitor parking is accommodated in drive-ways of their two-car garages. This doesn't apply to Lorna Avenue; only on the private drive-ways. He added that Lorna Avenue public is 18 feet from center line; therefore it is 36 feet from curb to curb. This development will result in a width of 32'. Also, since the private driveway and parking that's available on the private street is staggered, parking will not be opposite each other on either side of the street along Lorna Avenue.

Dean WILSON, applicant, addressed the Commission next. He advised that he grew up in the area and was pleased to bring the project before the Commission for their consideration and was available for any questions.

BALES asked if there would be an impact if the project was reduced by one unit.

WILSON responded that the site is capable of accommodating 28 units, so the current design is the optimal use of the property without too much density. By changing at this point to remove one unit could affect the overall design. He believes this property is very well parked and his marketing study showed several units would likely go to single occupants, so there is a good possibility some units may only have one car.

Ed SATLOWSKI, spoke next. He agreed that the parking situation is bad and further problematic by the Homeowner's Association not allowing motorhomes, trailers, etc. to park on the street. He handed out a letter outlining his concerns involving the environmental issues.

He asked that these issues be addressed, with one major concern relative to any clean-up efforts on the existing soil where animals had been housed for years.

DAVIES addressed this issue and other storm water concerns advising that these issues are highly regulated with a number of treatment controls that are required of the project. Also, during grading operations there will be erosion control to keep all sediment on site. Adequate water will be on site to control dust during construction. Additionally, inspectors will be present to monitor all activities. He added that traffic and oversized loads are governed by state law and permits are required in order to travel on public streets.

SATLOWSKI advised that he received the study relative to the increase for sewer and water and was fine with it and thanked staff for providing answers to all his concerns.

Mark BOWLING, longtime resident of the area approached the podium next. He was not in favor of the project due to the current traffic conditions, especially with the school in such close proximity to Lorna Avenue. He has a hard time exiting his residence when school is excused because parents park in his driveway waiting to pick up their kids in the afternoon. He has reported the situation to the Police, who refer him to the school, who in turn, refer him back to the Police. Additionally, any late night events either at the school or at the ranch up the street take up all the street parking on Lorna Avenue. Currently, emergency vehicles must back out down the street to exit and anyone with a tractor trailer is required to have a person stand on Chase Avenue to stop traffic before backing out into the street.

Dennis BIRKBECK, Lorna resident, spoke next. He asked if an environmental impact report (EIR) had been performed for the development. He recalled that west of the site a study had been performed some time back for a different proposed development.

SHUTE responded that CEQA offers numerous exemptions and that this project does not warrant an EIR. The project the speaker was referring to was eight to nine years ago and known as South Magnolia Subdivision. An EIR was performed for that project and some mitigation was necessary because it indicated some low value of coastal sage scrub which is habitat for the natcatcher.

John CASSELMAN, spoke next. His concerns were regarding animals which had been kept on the property and the accumulation of their waste over the years. He believes there are pathogens in the soil which could cause sickness. He also mentioned there are numerous rodent holes throughout the property, and once grading commences will disturb the rodent population and bring them to the surface. He asked that a study be performed to address these potential issues and he is not in support of the density proposed.

Joel WAYMEIR, civil engineer for the property, spoke next. He addressed the neighbors' concerns on the parking and street widths as follows:

- The parking proposed is consistent with the City code.
- The street width proposal of 32' is less than originally proposed. The Engineering Department asked for the developer to reduce to minimum width in order to decrease the amount of impervious surface to decrease the amount of run-off and amount of storm water treatment.
- The street width reduction has been approved by the Fire Department, as well as its turn around.
- Density for the project is less than the density of the neighborhood to the north.

He confirmed that the PRD conditions and regulations regarding the garages do state they cannot be converted to additional living space or storage. They must be used for parking only.

SOTTILE asked staff if the street were 40 feet wide, if it would change anything as far as storm water.

SHUTE addressed the issue of the street width by advising that the reduced street width meets the minimum standards in the zoning code. It also provides more pedestrian scale development and satisfies multiple modes of transportation, including pedestrian.

DAVIES noted the developer will have to provide additional treatment for additional hardscape or possibly consider impervious pavement or some other tool. From a storm water perspective, less impervious pavement is better.

SOTTILE asked if it would make a difference, financially or otherwise, if there was a 36 foot street vs. a 32 foot street, and if so; would it possibly solve the issue of parking and appease some of the residents on Lorna Avenue.

RANU answered that all that would be accomplished by widening the street is to make traffic move faster. It will not affect the ability to park or affect the ability for two cars to go by. It would diminish the quality of the pedestrian amenities. The option to increase to a wider street is there, however there would be trade-offs.

CIRCO agreed that from his perspective, narrower streets do tend to have slower traffic. If this fed into another street, it would be another issue.

Mark BOWLING returned to the podium to add that he believes people increase their speed vs. decrease their speed when they come off of a 32 foot wide street onto a 36 foot wide street. He was in favor of a wider street and asked for reconsideration.

Janis BROOKS, resident, spoke next. She mentioned there are currently no street lights on Lorna Avenue, and people do tend to drive fast. She asked if the developer had considered moving the driveway, blocking Lorna Avenue as an exit, and using Avocado Boulevard instead.

SHUTE answered that the applicant's initial proposal was for the logical extension of Lorna Avenue, but because of the grade difference to Avocado Boulevard, as well as the existing frontage road, it didn't make good circulation sense to the applicant.

WAYMEIR added that using Avocado Boulevard was considered when they first designed the layout of the project, but were advised the access from the frontage road would probably not be supported by the Engineering Department.

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by SOTTILE, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

SOTTILE assumed that street lighting would be installed as part of the new development and lighting from the new homes would create better visibility at night. Also, since garage parking is associated with the HOA regulations, this is a compliance issue, which would be handled by the HOA or on to the city for enforcement. He added that he believes the project would be a benefit to the community.

BALES stated that the study performed showed this would be a good addition to the neighborhood and raises the values in the area. She hoped they could reach a solution to please the current residents as well as provide needed housing in the community. She has seen nothing but success when HOAs are involved.

Motion was made by BALES, seconded by MROZ, to reopen the public hearing; carried 5-0.

A speaker asked and received confirmation that a barrier wall would be provided for sound along Avocado. She also asked why the number of homes could not be reduced to 15 instead of 21.

MROZ responded that the reduction of homes further down to 15 would probably not pencil out, therefore would not be feasible. He continued by thanking the residents for attending the meeting and engaging in the process.

A speaker summarized by advocating for five to eight custom homes at the site with an additional access road and more parking. She believes this would improve the property values vs. the number of homes currently proposed.

Dennis BIRKBECK approached the podium again and asked if the proposed street lights would be installed on Lorna Avenue or at the new development and what would be the asking price for the new homes. He had an issue with the architecture because two-story homes do not fit into the area of mostly single story homes and was still not satisfied with the issue of using Avocado Boulevard instead of Lorna Avenue or why another entrance off Avocado couldn't be established.

Inez CESENA spoke next. She also asked if the issue was initially addressed to block off Lorna Avenue and consideration made to create another opening.

SHUTE responded that as indicated by the applicant, their initial plan to use the Avocado frontage road was not acceptable for ingress and egress, therefore not a viable option.

WAYMEIR added that he was not sure it was ever presented as an alternative. The width of the frontage road that meets the property is very narrow so access might not be possible from all the sites. The proposed layout is the only one he was aware of.

Cheryl KISSINGER, spoke next. She said, by looking at the map, she sees there is access for ten homes from Avocado Avenue to exit. She asked why Avocado for these homes could not be used as the way out. It seems to be a more viable way for access vs. using Lorna Avenue with the traffic problems they are dealing with now.

WAYMEIER stated since Avocado Avenue is a high speed road, it is not good location to establish additional driveways. When the lots to the north were developed in the past, the frontage road was a requirement for that development.

RANU added the purpose of the frontage street is so single family homes developed in that era would not have their driveways access the arterial roadway. This was the reason for the frontage road. An alternative would be to extend onto this property in similar fashion yet still would have units accessing Lorna to meet development density as envisioned by the General Plan. So staff believes this is a more efficient and appropriate site plan and circulation than replicating what is already there.

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by BALES, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

MROZ advised the audience that this item would be forwarded on to the City Council along with the minutes of this meeting for their consideration. The Planning Commission is not in a position to redesign the proposed project.

CIRCO stated that a few of the concerns expressed by the public were unrelated to this development. Their inherent problems would exist whether or not the property remains a ranch or becomes a PRD. There are:

- Traffic on the street consists of residents as well as people using the street for school drop off. This is an issue the school needs to address, not the Planning Commission.
- Regarding the density issue, this property has already been reduced by 7 units. He personally likes to see lower density within the City, however they do have pressure from California and the San Diego Association of Govenors (SANDAG) to provide more housing.
- No street lights on Lorna will not be addressed by this development. The street lights added will be on the new development. The street lighting issue can be addressed to the City as a separate issue.
- Speed limit issues can also be addressed with the City separately.

BALES added that she would like to see additional parking within the project, however, all applications on proposed developments are reviewed in accordance with the City Code.

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by MROZ, to adopt the proposed Resolution Nos. 10717, 10718, 10719, and 10724, as presented recommending City Council approval of CEQA Categorical Exemption 15332 (In-fill development), Zone Reclassification No. 2309, Planned Residential Development No. 67 and Tentative Subdivision Map No. 655, respectively, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on March 12, 2013, at 7 p.m.

#### **AGENDA ITEM NO. 4 - CARD ROOMS SECOND AMENDMENT – STUDY SESSION**

This was a workshop to discuss a potential second amendment to Title 17 (Zoning) of the El Cajon Municipal Code pertaining to the playing of cards and similar games. The City Council initiated this potential second amendment with the intent of making the regulations in downtown more flexible to accommodate the reasonable needs of clubs and restaurants,

but still ensure that there is not an over-concentration of card rooms in or near downtown. No final action was taken at this meeting.

Applicant: City of El Cajon  
Project Planner: Manjeet Ranu / 619.441.1742  
Email: [mrnu@cityofelcajon.us](mailto:mrnu@cityofelcajon.us)

In a PowerPoint presentation, RANU presented the possible changes to the El Cajon Municipal Code pertaining to card playing. He suggested that after public testimony, the Commissioners could provide feedback to staff to either draft an ordinance and bring back to the Commission or continue the meeting for more study. He also acknowledged that Chief Redman of the Police Department was in attendance for any questions.

SOTTILE asked if the two card rooms in the downtown area were not feasible because of numerous card room requests or because of the conditional use permit requirement.

RANU answered that the issue is the Crystal Ballroom not being recognized as a non-profit under IRS rules and the VFW is not in the Specific Plan 182 area.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Dr. Nori BARKA, representing the Chaldean American Association, Crystal Ballroom, spoke first. He advised that they are a non-profit organization since 1982, but are not tax exempt. Legally, they are a "mutual benefit organization" where only dues paying members can utilize the club. Therefore, they meet the requirements for a non-profit, but are not tax exempt. He stated the proposed alternatives worked for them and was available for any questions.

Christopher SHAMOON spoke next. He said with the restrictions currently within Specific Plan 182, it makes it virtually impossible to obtain a card playing permit. He agreed that both alternatives to limit locations to two in the downtown area and increase the building size to 5,000 square feet are an improvement. It would eliminate the possibility for smaller locations to play cards in the downtown area.

MROZ asked Chief Redman to approach the podium for questions relating to the Police Department.

Bruno CIRELLO, Police Department Captain, approached the podium in his place.

MROZ mentioned that when the ordinance was passed, they did not know how it would affect the community when it went into effect. He asked if the Police Department had any issues with the four approved clubs or any other issues over the last 12 months relating to card playing.

CIRELLO answered the only issues in the past with card playing were because of mixed usage, i.e., restaurants playing cards and not serving food. Some were licensed as restaurants, but the kitchens were not in operation. He added that there were issues a couple of years ago with a men's club where gambling with the card playing was

discovered. However, these issues would not preclude what the Commission is trying to accomplish. The Police Department's job is enforcement and the ordinance would give the right to inspect periodically for code compliance purposes. He agreed that what is being proposed is in line with what would be manageable for the Police to enforce.

BALES asked if a large number of card rooms would be difficult to enforce.

CIRELLO answered that high density is a Planning concern, but the final number could be an issue for the Police Department. For example, if twenty locations are established, they would need to hire more people. The maximum of eight locations appear to be manageable based on current staffing.

SOTTILE asked which was easier for code enforcement to monitor; the 5,000 square foot limitation or the 900 foot buffer with the 2,500 square foot location limitation.

CIRELLO answered that from an enforcement perspective it didn't matter. But without the 900 foot buffer there could be the possibility of too much congregation in one area, possibly causing potential pedestrian and vehicle issues.

CIRELLO responded to BALES that the profit versus non-profit status was not an issue for them.

After deliberations and listening to public testimony, the Commissioners supported the recommended changes as indicated below:

- 5,000 square foot minimum facility size in Specific Plan (SP) 182 versus 2,500 square feet elsewhere
- Allow for any business model (profit or non-profit) and organization as a secondary use to the principal use operating at same hours with principal use with no restriction on frequency of play
- Remove restriction of two licenses downtown and the 900-foot downtown buffer and instead rely on 900-foot separation between card rooms
- Maintain maximum of eight card room licenses in City

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by SOTTILE, requesting staff to draft an ordinance for their consideration and continue to the Planning Commission hearing on March 11, 2013; carried 5-0.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5 – CENTRO MEDICO EL CAJON - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2172**

This was a public hearing on a request for a building expansion of 1,848 square feet and a parking reduction of six spaces. The subject property is addressed as 396 North Magnolia Avenue. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 487-172-49  
General Plan: Downtown Redevelopment (SDA 9)  
Zoning: General Commercial (C-G)

Applicant: Michael G. and Helen M. Collins, Collins Family Trust dated 13 May 1993 / 619.440.7778  
Project Planner: David Hardy / 619.441.1656  
Email: dhardy@cityofelcajon.us and include "CUP 2172" in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, HARDY summarized the staff report.

CIRCO confirmed with HARDY that with Centro Medico entering into a private parking agreement with Crystal Ballroom some employee parking may be created across the street.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Mike COLLINS, owner, approached the podium and thanked staff for working with him on this project. He added that the Crystal Ballroom has been a great neighbor and most helpful in allowing the Centro Medico employees to park in their lot.

BALES commended the applicant for the great services being provided to the community.

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by DANKHA, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by BALES, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10713, as presented recommending City Council approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 2172, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on March 12, 2013, at 7 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 6 – PARKWAY PLAZA USED CAR SALES – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2178**

This was a public hearing on a request for nine off-site, short duration used car sales. The subject property is addressed as 415 Parkway Plaza. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 482-270-33 thru 37, 41, 42, 48, and 50 thru 57  
General Plan: Regional Commercial (RC) / Parkway Plaza (SDA 8)  
Zoning: Regional Commercial (C-R)  
Applicant: Westfield Parkway LLP (Eric Howard) / 619.579.9974  
Project Planner: Noah Alvey / 619.441.1773  
Email: nalvey@cityofelcajon.us and include "CUP 2178" in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, ALVEY summarized the staff report.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium. No one came forward to speak.

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by MROZ, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by BALES, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10716, granting Conditional Use Permit No. 2178, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

The appeal for this item ends at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, February 21, 2013.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 7 – BROADWAY CORNER RETAIL CENTER – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2175**

This was a public hearing on a request to construct a 3,800 square foot commercial development, including a 1,700 square foot drive-through restaurant with an outdoor dining area (Starbuck’s). The subject property is addressed as 380 Broadway. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 483-110-155 and 483-090-39  
General Plan: Regional Commercial (RC)  
Zoning: Regional Commercial (C-R)  
Applicant: Cedar Broadway & Ballantyne L.P. (Javier Serhan)  
619.232.5577  
Project Planner: Eric Craig / 619.441.1782  
Email: ecraig@cityofelcajon.us and include “CUP 2175” in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, CRAIG summarized the staff report.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Gabriella MARKS, architect for the project, approached the podium to answer any questions.

CIRCO liked the fiber cement cedar siding on the west elevation and asked if it could be added to the drive-thru side.

MARKS answered that the drive-thru lane is quite narrow, so they would be planting vines to grow and spread up the wall instead.

The Commissioners praised the building design and proposed landscaping.

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by BALES, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by BALES, seconded by CIRCO, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10714, granting Conditional Use Permit No. 2175, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

The appeal for this item ends at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, February 21, 2013.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8 – VIETRI ACCESSORY STRUCTURES – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2157**

This was a public hearing on a request to add detached accessory structures in excess of 800 square feet at an existing single-family residence. The subject property is addressed as 1175 East Lexington Avenue. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

APN: 489-242-02  
General Plan: Low Density Residential (LR)  
Zoning: Residential, Single-family, 6,000 square foot (RS-6)  
Applicant: Alfred Vietri Jr. / 619.244.6495  
Project Planner: Eric Craig / 619.441.1782  
Email: ecrait@cityofelcajon.us and include “CUP 2157” in Subject Line.

In a PowerPoint presentation, CRAIG summarized the staff report.

CIRCO asked if the same requirement for the three foot street dedication and to designate the property legal non-confirming would be applied to other properties on Lexington Avenue if they were to pull building permits in the future.

DAVIES responded this would not be an issue for other properties, but if a home would be destroyed, then there would be the requirement to rebuild three feet back.

MROZ opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium.

Alfred VIETRI, owner, thanked staff for their help in the processing of his application and added he was in agreement with all conditions of approval.

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by CIRCO, to close the public hearing; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by BALES, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10712, granting Conditional Use Permit No. 2157, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

The appeal for this item ends at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, February 21, 2013.

**OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9 – ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by CIRCO, to nominate Commissioner Sottile as Chairperson for the upcoming 2013-14 year; carried 5-0.

Motion was made by BALES, seconded by MROZ, to nominate Commissioner Circo as Vice-Chairperson for the upcoming 2013-14 year; carried 5-0.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 10 – PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ACADEMY LEAGUE OF CITIES  
CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE – MROZ’S REPORT**

MROZ selected BALES, DANKHA and SOTTILE to attend this year’s conference in Pasadena, California. He added that the City Manager may include as a budgeted item annually, so all would have an opportunity to attend in the future.

**COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS**

RANU reminded the Commissioners that the Form 700s were due soon.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by SOTTILE, to adjourn the meeting of the El Cajon Planning Commission at 10:22 p.m. this 11th day of February 11, 2013 until February 25, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.; carried 5-0.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony SOTTILE, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Manjeet RANU, AICP, Secretary