

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

MARCH 24, 2003

The meeting of the El Cajon City Planning Commission is called to order at 7:00 PM.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: TURNER, HANSON-COX, BURGERT, AGURS, AMBROSE

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: NONE

OTHERS PRESENT: GRIFFIN, Director of Community Development  
LOUGH, Assistant City Attorney  
MOSSAY, Minutes Clerk

MINUTES OF 3/10/03: Motion by TURNER, second by AGURS to approve the Minutes of March 10, 2003 pro forma. Motion carries 5-0.

#### **AMENDMENT OF SPECIFIC PLAN 238 – Cal-American Corporation for W.P. Properties**

(public hearing) Resolution No. 9777  
P.C. Meeting 3/24/03

The subject property is located on the south side of Fletcher Parkway between North Marshall Avenue and Jackman Street, and addressed as 802-890 Jackman Street; APN 482-240-38, -39 & -48; LUC 5310E; General Plan Designation: Regional Retail Commercial.

Request expansion of an existing commercial building, in the C-R (Regional Commercial) zone.

GRIFFIN states the subject property is a shopping center that consists of six commercial buildings, one of which is the subject building which is currently occupied by Michael's. Michael's is asking to expand their building by adding on the front side, which would reduce the number of parking spaces that are currently up against the front of the building and to shift the driveway that runs in an east/west direction, also to the north. The net effect is to reduce the number of onsite parking spaces down to 388, but that is still 48 spaces more than the 340 spaces required for this entire center. The consequence of the addition does not affect the parking requirement.

The plan proposes maintaining the same architectural features of the existing building, which are displayed on the posted materials board and color elevations. One point on the elevations, however, that staff wants the Commission to be aware of is a small section of the east elevation where the applicant is not proposing to continue the same arch/design as on the front and the west side. There are a series of arches that are shown and that disappears on that one elevation.

Griffin identifies the area on the mounted elevation. Staff is recommending that the arch treatment be carried all the way around ---about another 30 feet or so on the building.

There are some parallel parking spaces indicated along Jackman that because of their location, actually reduce the width of the driveway to less than 24 feet, which does not meet the City's standards. As Griffin mentioned earlier, the site is 48 parking spaces over the minimum requirement and those parallel spaces are not needed, so staff is recommending that those parallel spaces not be included in the plan.

Staff has identified two other issues. There are trash dumpsters behind Michael's that are not in enclosures, which is a City requirement. Staff is asking that that be taken care of. Regarding the planter along Petree and Jackman, the very western part of it next to the driveway, it appears that because this is a loading area, some of the trucks are having a hard time making that turn and instead of going out the driveway, they are driving over the landscaping. In staff's opinion, this doesn't improve the appearance of the center. Staff is recommending that either the landscaping be restored or that the planter area be shortened.

Staff's recommendation is that the Commission recommend approval of the addition of about 8,000 square feet to the existing 16,000 square foot Michael's store in accordance with the conditions in the staff report. This is a recommendation to the City Council because this is a specific plan, which will require City Council approval as well.

AMBROSE asks if the arches staff wants the applicant to put on the east side of the building are identical to the west elevation and if it is not a canopy or porch area?

GRIFFIN answers that it is identical to the west elevation and it is a slight extension of the building. You can't actually walk underneath it, but it is an architectural feature that staff believes should be continued around the corner at least at that spot.

AGURS says on Petree Street there is a driveway along the west side of Michael's. Is there any impact to that driveway from this project?

GRIFFIN answers that there should not be a traffic problem. The only difference is that moving the building out changes the location of the intersection within the shopping center. It may actually create a better situation because several driveways will come together onsite and this should add more stability to that intersection.

BURGERT questions if the landscaping being run over in the back is addressed in Condition 6? Griffin had mentioned either replace the landscaping or cut it back.

GRIFFIN answers that the Condition 6 does not include the shortening of the planter. That is something the applicant's representative can discuss with the Commission tonight, if the Commission feels that is a better solution. The other choice is to have the applicant get their drivers to pay more attention to where they are going.

BURGERT adds there is currently a crosswalk between the credit union and Michael's. Is that going to be readdressed or will it still be satisfactory with the addition?

GRIFFIN thinks they will just have to cross at approximately the same location, but walk farther to the north to get to the front of the enlarged store. Staff was not aware that there was a problem.

BURGERT asks Griffin if he said the driveway adjacent to Michael's was going to be made for only one-way traffic?

GRIFFIN answers that it will still be two-way.

BURGERT questions if that will still give enough room for a pedestrian to walk parallel along the side of Michael's?

GRIFFIN thinks there should be enough room along the side of the building for a walkway with the driveway.

The public hearing is now open.

**Thomas ADAM** represents James Leary Architecture and Planning. They have no problem with and agree to put the arches on the east elevations. He thinks providing the architectural continuity would give a lot to the center. The five parallel parking spaces will be eliminated.

Adam has a question regarding the changes recommended at the back of the building. The shopping center owner, Michael's and he are aware the landscaped area constantly gets driven over, mainly by the trucks accessing the dock in back of Michael's. They would like to work with the Planning staff to come up with a viable solution regarding the trash enclosure, the loading dock and landscape area.

AMBROSE asks how staff feels about a condition that allows the applicant to work with staff on a solution to this area.

GRIFFIN says that is fine with the staff. If the Commission agrees with that, staff would be more than happy to work something out with the applicant.

HANSON-COX says she looked at the site today and noticed the sidewalk in the back is all broken up. That means that very heavy trucks are driving over it. Are the majority of vehicles that go back there semis?

ADAM answers to his understanding they are.

HANSON-COX says there is no way a semi can easily pull in there and back up into that pull up door. That is probably why the trucks are going over the planter. The loading area is something that needs to be addressed.

ADAM says Hanson-Cox is absolutely right. He thinks once they work with the Planning staff regarding re-angling the dock so that the trucks aren't coming in and having to make a 90-degree turn, that will clean up that area and prevent them from having to go across that planter area.

HANSON-COX is concerned that if the building is expanded, there will be more deliveries and it will become an even more serious problem. She suggests a driveway coming directly off of Jackman so they can back right up to the loading dock. There is a company called Advanced Coatings in the adjacent building and to the left is another overhead door. Is that the door Michael's uses?

ADAM says that Michael's delivery door is on the east wall. He thinks there might be a problem with slopes coming down from the property to Jackman to have a driveway on Jackman.

No one else comes forward on this item.

Motion by AGURS, second by TURNER to close the public hearing. Motion carries 5-0.

Under discussion, AMBROSE states this looks straightforward and thinks the applicant is willing to work with staff even on the issues of a loading dock. He visited the site and the back area looks like it is in pretty bad shape and needs some attention. He prefers to have the applicant work that out with the Planning staff to come up with a solution.

BURGERT agrees with AMBROSE. He feels all parties are amicable to resolving the issues.

AMBROSE asks if staff has a proposed condition of approval to address the loading dock and dumpster and the planter area?

GRIFFIN thinks the words "to be worked out with staff" can be added to Conditions 5 and 6. And on Condition 6 to add or "shorten the planter". He thinks that will give in writing the discretion for the applicant and the staff to work on it.

Motion by TURNER, second by AGURS, to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Amendment of Specific Plan 238 in accordance with the staff report and adding to Conditions 5 and

6 “to be worked out with staff” and to Condition 6 “or shorten the planter”. Motion carries 5-0.

This item will go on to the City Council.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 1951 – Schreck**

(public hearing) Resolution No. 9778

P.C. Meeting 3/24/03

The subject property is located on the west side of South Magnolia Avenue between West Douglas and West Lexington Avenues, and addressed as 240 S. Magnolia Avenue; APN 488-162-18; LUC 6815 (proposed); General Plan Designation: Office Non-Retail / Special Development Area #9.

Request day care center for more than 12 adults in the O-P (Office Professional) zone.

GRIFFIN states this is a request to use the existing building that was most recently used by the Challenge Center as a facility for adult day care. That means adults will be brought there to undergo the different kinds of programs that the applicant would provide at the center. Some of these patients might be Alzheimer’s patients, and others that need the kinds of programs that the applicant is proposing to conduct. The planning issues that the staff identified were parking, landscaping and compatibility.

The applicant has indicated that none of their clients will be driving their own vehicles. They will either be brought to the facility in the vans that the applicant provides or by the families of the adults who will be brought for the care program.

There is no landscaping on this property. It is occupied 100% by building and paving and parking spaces. Staff is proposing some landscaping be provided. At one time, this building was the post office. It was most recently used, as he indicated, by the Challenge Center, which used it for a similar kind of service in that they dealt with people that were handicapped or disabled and they provided similar kinds of care programs. It was not a facility where people actually lived on the property. It is not a board and care—it is a day care.

In terms of compatibility, as he stated, this building was previously used as a similar facility. There is a homeless facility two properties to the south and there was a similar adult day care approved to the southwest of this property about 1-½ years ago that has not actually opened. It is the staff’s opinion that this location and this use will be compatible with the surrounding uses, because everything will be conducted indoors.

As far as parking is concerned, there are five spaces directly off the alley, which is located to the west of this property. The alley actually forms an important part of the circulation around this building as far as the clients being dropped off or picked up, because the alley will be used to access the door on the north side of the building or on the west side, which will be used for either the employees or the clients as they are brought to the site. There are only five spaces that meet City standards. Those are the ones directly off the alley. There are some parallel spaces on the north side of the building, which are not counted as required parking and they don't affect the driveway on that side, but there are also parallel spaces shown on the south side of the building. Those parallel spaces actually would be located in the driveway and so, if someone parked there, that would affect circulation. Staff is not recommending that the Commission acknowledge those parallel spaces on the south side.

The applicant has indicated that they have talked to the owner of the property to the south who has indicated a willingness to share some of his parking, although he does not have a significant excess on his property. Apparently, he is willing to work with the applicant, but they are not proposing any formal joint use agreement. The applicant has also talked with the County, which owns the property to the north and is now the County Assessor's Office. They own the large parking lot on the west side of the alley. Apparently, the applicant has also talked to them about using some of their parking when it is needed. Staff has not received any conformation that anything has been worked out with the County.

The staff is convinced that this use will not create a parking problem for that particular neighborhood. Staff is recommending a three-month review if the Commission grants this request just to make sure that there aren't any issues that have been discussed tonight that need to be fine-tuned. The Commission did receive a letter from the El Cajon Community Development Corporation (formerly Downtown El Cajon) which has recommended that this use is not consistent with the goals and plans of what they would like to see in the downtown area; that is, a more retail or cultural-type use. The staff believes that this type of use is compatible and is recommending that the Commission grant this conditional use permit. Since this location is within the boundaries of Specific Plan 182, the Commission's decision will go on to the City Council for a second hearing in about 30 days.

AGURS refers to pertinent case CUP 1080 on page 2 of the staff report, where it says: "Retain the short-term homeless shelter", and asks if that ties in to this particular property, or is that the property two doors down?

GRIFFIN says that is the property two doors down at the corner of Lexington and Magnolia where Volunteers of America is currently located. Nothing has been approved on the subject property. This is the first request staff has had since the Challenge Center has left. Staff has received a number of other proposals for this property but none of them has actually submitted applications. Several churches have called about going onto this property. There would be a more serious parking problem here with a church, in his opinion, than with this use, because there are less than 15 parking spaces

for this entire property. A church would need all of those spaces and more and would definitely have to come up with some kind of a parking agreement in order to not have a affect on the neighborhood. Staff believes the subject request will be a compatible use and since everything is indoors, there is really no reason, in staff's opinion, that it shouldn't be approved.

AMBROSE states staff recommended a five-year time period on this. Is that because staff sees this as a temporary use and not a permanent long-term use of this site?

GRIFFIN responds it is a combination of things. That is an area where the Commission can exercise its judgment on the life of the CUP. One of the bases for determining the life or the term of a conditional use permit is the investment in the property. If there is a greater investment, then the term should reflect that. In this case, the building already exists so the applicant's investment will be the tenant improvements. The potential for problems can also be a reason to limit the term of a CUP. Staff doesn't see any serious problems with this but recommends a five-year term. If the applicant believes that a longer term is justified, then tonight is the time to convince the Commission of that. He thinks a five-year term was approved for the other adult day care that he mentioned.

The public hearing is now open.

**Darlene WADE**, 6540 Jackson Drive, San Diego 92119, the applicant's representative, states this will be an adult day health care center. They are required to go through two formal and extensive certifications by both the State Department of Aging and the State Department of Health. For them, this is a long-term commitment. The licensing process will take them a better part of a year to consummate. Once they get it, they are going to hold onto it for dear life and they would like to be able to know they have 10 years at this location to develop this program. She requests a longer term than recommended by the staff.

She has information that is further clarification of their programs. She submits a one-page document to the City Attorney for distribution to the commissioners. She is here to answer any questions.

In response to AMBROSE, WADE agrees with staff's recommendations and the conditions except for the five-year time frame.

TURNER asks what the staff-to-client ratio is for their program and the ages of the clients.

WADE responds that when they are at maximum program occupancy of about 100 people, there will be about 20 staff. They can accept anyone over 18 years of age depending on their disability and if they fit with the senior clientele.

TURNER asks if they plan to have Alzheimer's patients.

WADE says they are set up to take the first stages of Alzheimer's. But not when they get farther along the line. It would not be a good fit for them.

TURNER is concerned that Magnolia is busy and asks if there are going to be safety and security measures.

WADE answers there will be two alarms and a "wander guard" on any of the residents that are assessed with a particular problem to keep them from leaving the property.

AGURS asks if there is a drug rehab planned?

WADE answers "no".

AGURS reads from the report: "Bring them back to the highest level of independence function both physical and mental" and asks about the mental aspect?

WADE explains seniors have lapses in memory as they age. There is deterioration in cognitive awareness, memory, being able to balance a checkbook; things like that—not diagnosis of mental illness.

AGURS confirms that it is nothing the Police Department needs to be concerned about.

WADE answers "no". Just the natural aging process that causes our physical bodies and our mental capabilities to decline a bit. One of the things their program will work on is giving people skills so if they have memory loss they can still navigate the streets of El Cajon and do their own shopping and what not.

AGURS reads there is an "extensive screening process of applicants" and asks what type of screening?

WADE states a physician would refer them to their center because they have a decline in some kind of a function and need. This will be a therapeutic intervention. That process of assessment would take three days for the staff which is composed of a program director, a physical therapist, occupational therapist and speech therapist. They do a home visit and they review the medical conditions of the participant, talk with the referring physician, staff and friends to get a composite of what that individual looks like to make sure that they are suitable for their therapeutic interventions. It is mostly like your "Great Aunt Sally" who is living at home now, but is starting to have problems when she walks, potentials for falls, can't exactly remember when to take her meds, and has lost her ability to provide nutritious meals. They work with them on drug and diet interventions. They are just helping them in an outpatient daily setting to live their lives to the maximum of their physical and mental functions.

BURGERT says the applicant has explained in detail that they are looking more toward the elderly who may have various debilitating illnesses that come about because of old age, but in addition, would she be accepting any clients or patients that could have

sustained a serious head injury where there is debilitating life-long issues where they have impaired judgment?

WADE answers absolutely. It needs to be a fit with the 100 people that are there. There needs to be something that keeps them unified in some capacity. If someone has a brain injury, they are acting many times like a senior stroke patient would.

AMBROSE asks if the center will have a capacity of 105 people, what would be the maximum number of individuals that might be served at one time?

WADE says they might have all 105 at the absolute maximum. They all come with a physician's order. That order might say they are eligible to come one day a week, three days a week, five days a week, and then they have the choice of accepting or rejecting the van when it comes to their door to be taken to the center. 105 is not a magic number that they chose. The licensing at the State level by both agencies, gives them a requirement that sets forward criteria for determining how many bathrooms they have to have per individual and how many square feet they have to have per individual, how many exit doors, etc. Some days they may have 50 clients.

BURGERT asks their times of operation.

WADE answers the center will be open from about 8am to 5pm five days a week. The first and last hours of each day will mostly be used for transporting patients.

No one else comes forward to speak.

Motion by TURNER, second by AGURS to close the public hearing. Motion carries 5-0.

Under discussion, AMBROSE thinks this item is straightforward and agrees with the staff recommendation at this point. He was concerned with the letter from the ECCDC stating their opposition to this proposal, but he thinks overall this can be made compatible in the downtown area. He thinks the five-year time limit is preferable and the use can be reevaluated in five years if they are going to continue to operate here.

AGURS concurs with AMBROSE.

Motion by AGURS, second by BURGERT to GRANT Conditional Use Permit 1951 in accordance with the staff report, with it going to the City Council for concurrence.

Under discussion, GRIFFIN clarifies that just because there is a "term" doesn't mean that the conditional use permit necessarily expires on that date. The applicant will have an opportunity to extend the term by coming back to the Commission for renewal before the five years are up. The applicant's record will be taken into consideration in a renewal request. Staff usually notifies the applicants/operators a minimum of 60 days before their CUPs are due to expire, so that will allow them to request renewal before the CUP expires.

The votes are now cast. Motion carries 5-0.

This is a recommendation to City Council. There will be another noticed public hearing at that level.

### **PREDRAFTED RESOLUTIONS**

To reflect the actions of the Planning Commission on tonight's agenda items.

Motion by TURNER, second by AGURS to adopt Resolution No. 9777 and 9778 pro forma. Motion carries 5-0.

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

There are no oral communications.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

There is no correspondence.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting of the El Cajon City Planning Commission is adjourned at 7:43 PM this 24th day of March 2003.

---

Anthony AMBROSE, Chair

ATTEST:

---

James S. GRIFFIN, Secretary