



## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**August 12, 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:** Anthony SOTTILE, Chairman  
Star BALES  
Paul CIRCO, Vice Chairman  
Adel DANKHA  
Darrin J. MROZ

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Manjeet RANU, Planning Manager / Planning  
Commission Secretary  
Dennis DAVIES, Deputy Director – Public Works  
Jim REDMAN, Chief of Police  
Michael REID, Assistant City Attorney  
Noah ALVEY, Associate Planner  
Tony SHUTE, Senior Planner  
Patricia HAMILTON, Secretary

SOTTILE explained the mission of the Planning Commission.

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by BALES, to adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of July 8, 2013; carried 4-0 – MROZ abstained).

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

#### **AGENDA ITEM NO. 2 – SHADOW MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY CHURCH – SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 523**

This was a public hearing on a request to remove seven existing two-story buildings, construct a three-story multi-use building and add additional parking spaces on the church's East Campus; inclusion of previously entitle master plan into this specific plan; the deletion of Specific Plan No. 301; and the revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 1985. The subject properties are addressed as 2000 and 2075 East Madison Avenue, and 2100

Greenfield Drive. This project is subject to environmental review and includes a proposed addendum to certified Final Environmental Impact Report No. 77.

APNs: 512-140-05, 512-130-34, 512-130-35, 508-120-18

General Plan: School Playground/Playfield (SP/P)

Zoning: Residential, Single-family, 20,000 square foot (RS-20) and Residential, Single-family, 20,000 square foot (RS-20-H)

Applicant: Shadow Mountain Community Church (Bryan Snow)  
619.440.1802

Project Planner: Tony Shute / 619.441.1705

Email: [tonys@cityofelcajon.us](mailto:tonys@cityofelcajon.us) and include "SP 523" in Subject Line.

CIRCO recused himself due to economic conflict of interest and left Council Chambers.

In a PowerPoint presentation, SHUTE summarized the staff report.

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

Bryan SNOW, representative for Shadow Mountain, approached the podium and advised he was there to answer any questions and did agree to all conditions of approval.

BALES mentioned that she was pleased with the architectural aspects of the project, especially the grace of the arches, and that it suited the environment of the school.

Ken SMITH, architect for the project, spoke next and said he was also there to answer any questions.

Devin MUTO, who prepared the environmental documents, also advised that he was there to answer any questions.

Steve PHARR, resident to the south of the church, spoke next and was in favor of the project.

Brian DETTWEILER, resident directly to the south of the proposed construction site on the east campus, approached the podium. He advised that he purchased his home in March, 2013 and did not object to the project overall, but did have a couple of points he wanted to bring up. He was concerned with the noise and traffic during the construction since his property abuts the church property line. He was encouraged to see the proposed wall to be put in place to create a barrier between the two properties; however, the six foot height was not adequate due to future increase in vehicle traffic and the number of new parking spaces to be added. He suggested consideration of a higher barrier. The view from his backyard is directly in line with the new proposed building and it appears he will be looking at a 49' high, three-story structure directly outside his backdoor. Currently his view is of a single story building. Another issue he shared had to do with the lighting. He noticed on the plans where lighting is to be turned off at 10:00 p.m., however, there are three light standards by the property line directly on the other side of the fence that do not shut off at night and shine directly into his backyard all night. In summary, noise, traffic, and construction were his concerns. He also added that losing the existing baseball field to

establish a parking lot would be detrimental to the kids in the neighborhood that use that facility.

SOTTILE asked staff if the height of the wall is in accordance with the City's zoning code.

SHUTE responded that six feet is the height maximum, but there is language that allows for greater height where conditions warrant it and when approved by administrative zoning permit, or it could be included in this specific plan with concurrence of the applicant as well as affected property owners.

SOTTILE advised DETTWEILER that this might be an appropriate time to talk to the Shadow Mountain applicant because this item will also be heard by the City Council in the future.

RANU added that there would need to be justification to increase the height of the wall; such as some impact that would be mitigated in order to justify raising the wall beyond six feet.

Motion was made by MROZ, seconded by DANKHA, to close the public hearing; carried 4-0.

SOTTILE summarized that the new buildings were beautiful and the overall project would be a great improvement. From the environmental report it appeared that the traffic situation was handled and would be controlled.

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by DANKHA, to adopt the proposed Resolution Nos. 10729, 10730, 10731, and 10732 as presented recommending City Council approval of the Addendum to Final Environmental Impact Report No. 77, Specific Plan No. 523, deletion of Specific Plan No. 301 and revocation of Conditional use Permit No.1985, subject to conditions; carried 4-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on September 10, 2013, at 7 p.m.

Commissioner CIRCO returned to Chambers.

### **AGENDA ITEM NO. 3 – 2012-2021 EL CAJON HOUSING ELEMENT**

The Planning Commission was presented with the Final Draft 2013-2021 Housing Element which represents El Cajon's effort in fulfilling the requirements under the State Housing Element law. This is also an amendment to the City's General Plan. The Housing Element update is subject to environmental review and includes a proposed Negative Declaration.

RANU explained that this was an important project for the City because of the State mandate that we must abide by and recommended action on the item. He also mentioned that Veronica Tam, the consultant for the Housing Element, was present to answer any technical questions that might arise.

In a PowerPoint presentation, ALVEY summarized the staff report.

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

Bill CHOPYK, spoke first. He complimented staff for a good job compiling the data for the project since it is very important for the City to adopt the updated Housing Element because it is required by state law, and if not adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council it would need to be created again in four years versus eight years. He added that Redevelopment Agencies have been eliminated in the entire state and this has not helped cities since funds have been taken away for the low and moderate income housing trust fund, therefore cities no longer have the tools to subsidize and provide affordable housing in the community. It is difficult to provide an additional 3,800 housing units when the State has taken away the funds. Other creative ways must be put in place to provide the housing. He was pleased to see the City will be taking another look at the second dwelling ordinance and possibly reduce certain restrictions which are a detriment to certain residents wanting to get a granny flat on their property. He objected to the \$200 filing fee for an administrative zoning permit when the approval should be ministerial. Also, all fees associated with single-family construction are too high, especially the water capacity fee of \$10,000. It is a huge disincentive for adding a second unit. If there is no regulation fee for a second water meter for a second unit, the City may get more applicants to add these additional units. He was in support of the Housing Element, however, felt we could provide a lot of additional housing in the community if we would reduce some of the constraints to adding second units.

SOTTILE asked staff if the City charged the \$10,000 water meter fee or if it was imposed by the water district.

ALVEY responded water fees are paid to the water district involved. He wanted to emphasize that staff has identified that the construction of second family units in the City has slowed down, so one way to encourage additional housing opportunities was to take a look at ways to make it easier for people to build these types of units. What's in the current Housing Element is a program for the Planning Commission to come back and look at all these regulations, so all the comments heard tonight will be addressed in the future when they take a real specific look at all regulations associated with second family units.

One other point he wanted to make is that the Housing Element is just about accommodating additional growth through the zoning regulations and the General Plan. No mandate for the City to build housing units and no mandate for any property owners to build housing units is included. It only sets up the regulatory framework that allows those units to be built should the market change.

Luis HERNANDEZ spoke next and advised that he has been a property owner in El Cajon since 1950. There has been limitations on building out his property which is zoned single-family with a height limit of one-story. To make development feasible and provide affordable housing for the community we need to develop regulations so property owners can create additional housing. Lifting some of the regulations and raising the quality of the apartments or housing that could be built in the City would be a good solution. He mentioned units in the Billings Street area are high density and asked for inclusion of his property on Billings Street in the sites inventory.

Humbert CABRERA, resident and business owner, spoke next. He commended staff for a great job, but asked the Commission to look at the overburdening regulations and consider changing the height requirements to help make it easier to establish additional units. He asked that development standards and review processes be more clear and streamlined.

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

MROZ asked staff once the Housing Element was approved, would the Commission then get an opportunity to look at these areas brought up by the residents in order to be more creative on design, height of buildings, etc. and work to update the regulations.

ALVEY responded there will be additional flexibility and they are looking at where additional housing can be accommodated and what changes can be made to place additional housing on the current sites inventory, and in the future staff would come back and look at specific proposals and how those units could be accommodated. Fletcher Hills is a good example of providing mixed use of opportunities. In this case, staff would most likely come back to propose a specific plan to come up with standards possibly similar to downtown. But first is the need to reach out to the community and figure out what would work best in each area and come up with standards that work best for that location. There should then be the ability to put in as much flexibility as the Commission desires.

BALES asked about the 3,800 housing units and if we only have eight years to accomplish.

ALVEY reiterated that the Housing Element does not mandate construction; it is a process to make sure zoning regulations are in place to accommodate the housing should it be developed. The City is not mandating to build housing units and property owners are not mandated to build housing units. It's just making sure zoning regulations are in place to accommodate that growth should it happen.

All Commissioners understood the Housing Element and all the work that it took to gain community input and were in agreement to approve.

SOTTILE did want to make a statement that he had objections to some of the wording that the State has been imposing on the City which staff tried to concur with as best they could. However, because of the State law, some of the wording and terminology could not be changed. So he was not in 100% agreement with the terminology that the State of California has imposed upon the City, but will comply with the State's mandated regulations.

Motion was made by BALES, seconded by CIRCO, to adopt the proposed Resolution Nos. 10734 and 10735 as presented recommending City Council approval of the 2013-2021 El Cajon Housing Element, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on August 27, 2013, at 7 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 4 – ALCOHOL SALES – AMENDMENT OF ZONING CODE NO. 423**

The Planning Commission was presented with a proposed *Alcohol Sales and Deemed Approved Alcohol Sales Regulations Ordinance*, which was structured to require land use permits for newly established alcoholic beverage sales activities, confers deemed approved status for permitted, conditionally permitted, and legal nonconforming existing off-sale alcoholic beverage sales activities and provides standards and a hearing process to review violations of those standards in order to protect the general health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the City of El Cajon and to prevent nuisance activities where alcoholic beverage sales occur. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.

RANU advised that this would be a joint presentation with staff, including City Attorney's Office REID and Police Chief REDMAN, who was in the audience to answer any questions and that the City Council provided the Commission direction in initiating this effort and provided very specific scope of work to create a detailed alcohol ordinance dealing with off-sale alcohol sales. So staff prepared an ordinance consistent with this direction and based on feedback received from the joint workshop. This ordinance is intended to be pro-business in terms of making a healthy business environment for all businesses in the community and a safe environment for all residents.

In a PowerPoint presentation, SHUTE summarized the staff report.

MROZ asked staff if the two-year timeframe was final, or was there a maximum time limit to return to the Commission with feedback.

SHUTE responded that it would take at least two years to obtain data and could take longer, however, staff would return to the Commission within two years with information on where they are in the process and how the ordinance is performing.

MROZ mentioned that there is a moratorium in the City and asked if staff was expecting a lot of new applicants that would fall under this new ordinance and conditional use permit process.

SHUTE answered that the proposed ordinance does have a condition that a license be transferred for any new proposed establishment, but only in those areas where there is capacity.

RANU added that the Commission recently saw the 7-Eleven application for a CUP at Chase and Avocado, which they denied, and was appealed to the City Council and approved with the condition that a license be transferred within the City. It is staff's understanding a license was acquired in the City in an over-concentrated area and transferred over to the new 7-Eleven site.

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

Eric LUND, General Manager of the San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the ordinance. He advised he represents 650 businesses in the region and 34 board members. They had submitted in writing their recommendations to the City Manager and staff for adjustments to the proposed alcohol ordinance. The passing of this ordinance will set a precedent in that El Cajon will be the first City in the County to establish an overlay of rules on top of the existing State law. They do support the desire to improve the quality of life for all businesses and citizens in the community, and wanted to emphasize the items from their recommended list as follows:

- 1) The deemed approved section of the ordinance to include a review in two years.
- 2) Possible suspension of the conditional use permit be reduced from one year to a maximum of 30 days.
- 3) The revocation language relating to the conditional use permit be removed from the ordinance, since this process already exists within State law.

He also asked that the Commission consider either waiving or minimizing the regulatory fee to be established in the future for the businesses, and summed up by thanking staff for all their hard work.

Mark ARABO, representing the Neighborhood Market Association, approached the podium and advised that he was representing many store owners in the City and asked those present in the audience to stand and be recognized. Using a PowerPoint presentation, he outlined how they have worked with the City to fix the issues associated with alcohol sales and highlighted three areas the association has accomplished so far:

- 1) They sent representatives to every store to remove all unwanted advertisements in their stores and deter advertisement of alcohol sales to minors and transients.
- 2) They alerted and recommended to all to install brighter lighting and heighten security.
- 3) They produced and provided “no loitering” and “keep the change” signs to all stores.

He said their priority is to make El Cajon a safer and more business friendly place and added that they submitted a revised ordinance to staff and did agree with the San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce in that they strongly disagree with any revocation or suspension language and to change the time limit to 30 days. He also asked that the fee of \$1,000 per day per violation be changed to a one-time \$1,000 fee per violation only. He asked the Commission to consider a continuance in order for all to work together to improve the ordinance language that all can support to establish a level playing field for all.

ARABO answered MROZ that of all the 59 stores surveyed, approximately 38 plus are a part of the Neighborhood Market Association. He subsequently asked if the exemption discussed only applies to stores over 10,000 square feet.

RANU clarified the basic difference in that new stores above 10,000 square feet would not require a CUP, but all other aspects of the proposed ordinance would apply.

SHUTE added the ordinance is applicable to all retailers regardless of size. The deemed approved status would also be applied to permitted and conditionally permitted legal non-conforming outlets, which include Vons, Target, Wal-Mart, etc. All are subject to deemed

approved status and performance standards included in that portion of the ordinance. The exemption is only to meet the distance requirement and obtain a CUP. All new outlets, regardless of size are subject to operational standards for off-sale compliance.

MROZ asked if an outlet has less than 10% dedicated to alcohol sales if they could be located next door to an existing liquor store.

SHUTE answered that if a convenience market has less than 10% dedicated to alcohol sales, they still would need to obtain a CUP because those establishments with less than 10,000 square feet are not subject to distance requirements of sensitive uses, but can only locate in those areas where there is capacity.

Chris DUGGAN, representing the California Restaurant Association, spoke next and said when the Board of Directors first reviewed the proposed ordinance they were alarmed to see on-sale establishments were included in the guidelines, i.e., revocation and suspension of on-sale licensing. They had serious issues with the language on performance standards. He asked that the Commission pause and work with all who have been a part of the preparation of the ordinance and delay going to Council until all the industry partners are on the same page.

BALES interjected that she felt these control stipulations were helpful in keeping things on a fair and equitable basis for all establishments and that the City needs a tool in case there are any problems that might arise.

DUGGAN agreed that there are laws on the books already for enforcement, that the restaurants in San Diego County take their liquor licenses very seriously and the licenses can be removed by the State of California. With these tools already in place, the proposed ordinance is overarching and very vague.

SOTTILE mentioned the proposed ordinance was not addressing any restaurants, and asked DUGGAN for clarification of his concerns.

DUGGAN responded the performance standards were of concern where the City would have control and a CUP could be suspended or revoked.

SHUTE added that language in the proposed ordinance included language in the existing alcohol sales ordinance for on-sale establishments. The only change in the proposed ordinance is to clarify language that would be found in other parts of the code or addressed in the CUP conditions of approval. Operational standards are the public nuisance operational standards and this language brings clarity in the alcohol sales ordinance which is not included now for on-sale.

REID expanded that the performance standards listed in the ordinance are those specifically applicable of off-sale establishments. Conditions of approval for new restaurants were already in place as standard conditions of approval for any CUP.

RANU added the ordinance is affecting off-sale. The on-sale is included for mechanical reasons to carry forward existing on-sale regulations. There is no intent to make policy changes to on-sale other than making some technical clean-up for consistency.

Helen RIFFEL, resident spoke next in support of the proposed ordinance and felt the clauses on suspension and revocation were a great addition to allow the City control of possible abuse and help to make the community a safe place for all.

Joe PRECIADO mentioned he also was at the last hearing and again voiced his concern over the regulations which he felt do not provide an opportunity for investment in the community. He did not like the policy of what administrative fee would be imposed on an annual basis and how it could evolve. He was also not in agreement with the revocation policy as worded and felt the City is trying to regulate through the zoning ordinance what is already regulated through the State. He suggested that more time should be allowed for improvement of the ordinance in order to make it acceptable to more people.

Kaherine WEBB, resident, also spoke at the first hearing. She urged the Commission to pass the ordinance and felt it was important to the citizens and businesses of El Cajon plus any businesses we are hoping to attract in the future. She added the revocation language was strong and much needed.

Ninus MALAN was surprised that this item has made it this far. He felt the ordinance was ridiculous by directly affecting the economy and attacking small businesses. He believes that the ordinance would violate the U.S. Constitution by taking our freedom to become capitalists; pro-business. He asked why the City is only targeting small businesses and no other establishments that also sell liquor. El Cajon has the highest driving under the influence rate in the County, so why target one national origin. If the ordinance is passed, he does not waive his right to sue.

Humbert CABRERA stated he is a business owner for 25 years and has served the Chaldean community very well and has worked very intimately with the Planning Division. He was in support of the ordinance, but wanted to ask for a balanced approach. During his PowerPoint presentation he reviewed violations throughout the City that are not part of the groups represented at the meeting and noted that a few will ruin it for all. He believes the current process is very burdensome. Applicants are sent from one entity to another in the City with each adding another condition or layer in order to gain approval on simple requests. He showed an example of a site which has had violation upon violation imposed upon it and nothing changed. He said these examples are why the power to revoke needed to be in the ordinance. If anyone on this same street were to request a change they would be required to come into compliance, where this site does not. The existing codes in effect can handle most of these violations. He summed up by stating the Code Section 17.210.040c should exclude breweries and full service restaurants and will make himself available to the Planning Division and Commission to explain why these should be excluded.

Erik SCHRÖNER, attorney and second representative for the Neighborhood Market Association approached the podium next. They are opposed to the ordinance as currently

drafted and have been working with the City and Chamber to develop an ordinance which they submitted that would be acceptable to the Neighborhood Market Association. They do support the changes proposed by the East County Chamber of Commerce, including moving the suspension to a maximum of 30 days, removing the relocation language and support the two year review process with insertion of a sunset provision. The CUP requirements for new stores do not apply equally. All markets should be placed on equal footing. Also, operational standards are too vague. It also makes an individual market liable for activities beyond its property, where they have no control. Also, a better definition of what it means to modify any market is needed to be defined in the ordinance. The revocation clause gives the City authority to go directly to the Planning Commission without warning to a property owner first. There are not enough due process rights for market owners.

CIRCO pointed out that before they opened up for public comment, due process was specifically addressed. The Commission has no ability to revoke anyone's license before a warning is issued, and after the warning there is a due process public hearing where they investigate. If the warning is substantiated, then they have the possibility of suspension and after suspension, if the problem still in existence at another public hearing they have the ability to revoke. The Commission cannot automatically revoke.

REID added that State law protects existing businesses. They cannot just revoke without hearings. It would violate the Land Use Planning Law to not follow due process.

MROZ confirmed with SHUTE that every off-sale alcohol outlet is subject to deemed approved status, but not every new store would be subject to obtaining a CUP. He also added that in the last 18 years that he has been with the City there was only one CUP pulled and it was for a towing operation.

William ADAMS representing 7-Eleven Inc. took a neutral position. 7-Eleven concerned itself only with the new store portion and had no comment on the operational part. The ordinance gives the Commission and Council maximum discretion based on facts before it with respect to new applications and not be bound by arbitrary mandates that may not be appropriate in every situation. They believe this has been accomplished. He emphasized with the El Cajon Chamber of Commerce and Neighborhood Market Association and hoped the Commission would give their concerns of operational conditions consideration, however, the modifications in the ordinance do resolve most of the important issues concerning the process for new stores and they support the Commission's acceptance of the new store modifications.

Dana STEVENS, Citizens Against Substance Abuse (CASA), spoke next. CASA supported the revised ordinance and thanked all who worked so hard to come up with the final draft. She advised they are comfortable in accepting the modifications offered in the draft ordinance. Improvements in business practices are usually short lived, so this ordinance with a control tool inserted will help El Cajon become a vibrant, safer community. It's time for local control.

Kals Joseph CHARRY, showed his three masters degree certificates to all because he said he was questioned by the Police in the past. He shared that he was not well known in El Cajon, but brought a message from the White House that we need to work together as a team to improve our community. He added we are living in an integrated culture and need to work as a family for a better society. He knows these people well and they are denied jobs and good business opportunities. Too much regulation kills their businesses. Also, we need to educate the consumers.

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

DANKHA said it is important to see everyone working together, but he only sees the retailers at the public hearing meetings.

BALES noted that the suspension and revocation words are scary, but there needs to be a shared sacrifice by all in order to make this work to everyone's advantage. It is not easy for a license to be revoked and the City does not want to lose any businesses in El Cajon. She reminded all that the only thing they are targeting is the crime rate and the Council will have more power to possibly make some changes in their upcoming public hearing meeting on this item.

MROZ felt there should be a two-year review deadline to report on the status as well as any unintended consequences of the ordinance versus some arbitrary date. He was concerned about the proposed regulatory fee which would be set by Council at a future date and wanted to encourage more retailers to join the Neighborhood Market Association who are not the problem and are playing by the rules and have been a big part in the preparation of the ordinance.

CIRCO noted there were two groups who were very interested in improving the community; industry and the citizens in the community. They did have differences regarding the ordinance in that the store owners were requesting more time to fine tune it and the citizens were saying there is a need to pass this ordinance now. The City does need to be able to enforce the laws on businesses which are currently outside the City's jurisdiction. The City needs to have the ability to go into these establishments not following the rules and say they cannot operate like this anymore. We do not have these problems with the businesses within the Neighborhood Market Association. This is not adding new rules, but will give the City the ability to shut down the problem sites in our community. He was also concerned that the due process might be too short, but has not seen that in practice.

SOTTILE thanked the Commissioners and added that this ordinance will be an improvement to the community and businesses operating within.

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by BALES, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10733 as presented recommending City Council approval of Amendment of Zoning Code No. 423, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on August 27, 2013, at 7 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5 – EL CAJON VALLEY OF CARS SALES EVENTS SERIES  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2188**

This was a public hearing requesting to allow multiple off-site automobile sales events on City property. The subject property is located on the east side of North Magnolia Avenue between East Park and Rea Avenues, and is addressed as 100 and 200 Civic Center Way. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

RANU advised he was available to answer any questions.

CIRCO asked if this was being proposed by a specific dealership or a chain of dealerships and if it was in addition to the sales going on at Parkway Plaza.

RANU responded there are twelve new car dealers in the City and they have organized to promote their businesses and this is the first Valley of Cars sales event. It will be heavily publicized in the media and the intent is to draw people from outside the region to buy cars here in El Cajon. Another benefit is getting people to come from outside El Cajon to the heart of downtown to see our City and the downtown businesses we have to offer. Parkway Plaza car sales events are primarily for used cars. This event is a focus on new car dealers.

SOTTILE opened the public hearing and invited any speakers to the podium and no one approached to speak on this item.

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

Motion was made by CIRCO, seconded by SOTTILE, to adopt the proposed Resolution No. 10736 as presented recommending City Council approval of the Conditional Use Permit No. 2188, subject to conditions; carried 5-0.

This item is tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting on August 27, 2013, at 3 p.m.

**OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

None

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

RANU advised the Commissioners that the next public hearing is scheduled for August 26, 2013 with one item on the agenda being the Foothills Christian Church proposed playground.

**COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by SOTTILE, seconded by MROZ, to adjourn the meeting of the El Cajon Planning Commission at p.m. this 12th day of August, 2013 until August 26, 2013, at p.m.; carried 5-0.

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

ATTEST:

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