



## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**JULY 24, 2006**

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** SOTTILE, WELLS, WOODS, AMBROSE, BLACK

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** NONE

**OTHERS PRESENT:** RAMIREZ , Principal Planner  
FOLEY, City Attorney  
KRULIKOWSKI, City Traffic Engineer  
VALLES, Administrative Secretary

**MINUTES OF 7/10/06:** Motion by AMBROSE, second by WOODS, to approve the Minutes of July 10, 2006 pro forma. Motion carries 5-0.

BLACK explains the mission of the Planning Commission and the proper procedure for speaking before the Commission and asks for proper decorum during the meeting. He advises that the appeal period for the items on this Agenda will end on Monday, August 7, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON**

#### **AMENDMENT OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 194 – Foothills Christian Church**

*(public hearing) Resolution No. 10344*

*PC mtg 7-24-06*

The subject property is located on south side of Dryden Road between Garfield Avenue and Falmouth Drive, and addressed as 2321 Dryden Road; APN: 486-103-26-00; General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential

Request to add a 350-student secondary school to an existing religious facility in the R-1-6 (Residential, One-Family) zone.

**RAMIREZ** informs audience that there are extra staff reports on this item on the front counter, if they didn't already get one. Also this meeting is being videotaped.

**RAMIREZ** informs the Commissioners that with the staff report and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, they have also received the following additional information:

- An update to the acoustical study
- Public comments in response to the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Copies of correspondence in opposition to the proposed high school

The following additional items have been provided to Commissioners since the original distribution of information:

- A letter in favor of the project from Scott Penwell – 2201 Chatham St.
- A letter in opposition of the project from Laura Penwell – 2201 Chatham St.
- An email in opposition to the project from Warren Roper – 2197 Dryden Rd.
- Emails and a phone call in opposition to the project with an indication that these residents cannot attend the public hearing:
  - Mr. & Mrs. Daryll Barham – 2316 Chatham St.
  - Lora Markham – 2231 Chatham St.
  - Elizabeth Massman – 2206 Dryden Rd.
  - Mr. & Mrs. Gene McCluan – 2381 Dryden Rd.

In addition, Commissioners have been provided with a letter from Pacific Justice Institute, dated July 24, 2006, which speaks in support of the City granting the applicant's request for a 350-student enrollment.

**RAMIREZ** gives a recap of the main points contained in the staff report. She explains that this is a proposal to relocate an existing high school to the subject property, using existing buildings that were originally constructed to house a church. The proposed school, known as Venture Christian High School, would hold classes on this site five days a week, with the majority of students attending on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. Mondays and Fridays are home school days, with fewer students being on campus.

In staff's initial review of this application in August of 2005, it was determined that additional information would be needed in order to assess whether locating a 350-student high school on this property would have any significant environmental effects. At staff's direction, the applicant submitted an acoustical study, an asbestos survey, and a traffic study. These reports were incorporated into the environmental review document for this project, known as a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or MND. The MND was made available for public review and comments on the document have been included in the record. The acoustical study for this project shows that the proposed school can operate with typical outdoor activities with the noise associated with those activities, and still meet the noise performance standards. The acoustical study indicates that the planned renovation will not disturb the few asbestos-containing building materials that are present on the site.

The traffic study concludes that the additional traffic added to the neighboring streets will not cause the ability of those roadway segments and the associated intersections to deteriorate to an unacceptable level of service. The study indicates, however, that the limited on-site parking would not adequately support 350 students. The report, therefore recommends that the enrollment be limited to 300. The report also acknowledges that the school will increase traffic in the project area, and further recommends that the school stagger the starting and ending times for Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. Other recommendations include having a flexible lane configuration at the school's entrance and the installation of a two-way stop control for the northbound and southbound approaches to Dryden at Brockton Street and Center Place.

On behalf of the applicant, John Gibson, an authorized agent, has indicated that the school will implement the following mitigation:

1. Operate the school according to the approved site plan.
2. Limit enrollment to 300 students.
3. Create a schedule whereby no more than 50% of the students start at the same time, and whereby the earlier arriving students are on campus prior to 7:45 AM.

**RAMIREZ** further states that there has been substantial public interest in this proposal indicating that the traffic and noise will be disruptive and is unacceptable. Staff recognizes that any attempt to address the neighbors' concerns about traffic must somehow involve a reduction in the total number of trips generated by the school, and thus has included in the staff report a Staff Exhibit "A" which looks at how the use of bussing can reduce traffic. Staff's recommendation to support the school is based upon mandatory use of bussing, beginning with the first year of operation, and for enrollment not to exceed 275 students for a maximum of 10 years.

**RAMIREZ** continues, stating that during the months preceding this hearing, a core group of neighbors participated in mediation suggestions with project representatives at the City's suggestion. The outcome of these meetings is a document that represents the items to which the school is willing to commit itself in order to address the compatibility of the school operation on this property. Staff believes that parties representing both sides understand that this list of commitments, (or "private agreement" as it is called in the staff report), will depend upon both sides being accountable to each other in order to be effective. The City of El Cajon is not a party to the agreement, and therefore will not enforce it.

**RAMIREZ** states that staff understands there are spokespersons waiting to speak both in favor and against this project. Staff suggests that the applicant begin with his presentation, to be followed by the neighbors' representatives to present opposing viewpoints.

**BLACK** announces that the public hearing is now open. He asks for the applicant to approach the podium and allows him 15 minutes to address the Commissioners.

**Mr. Loren NAFFZIGER**, 1663 Buckeye Drive, El Cajon, is the Principal and Administrator of Venture Christian High School. He leads off his statement with a video presentation. He indicates that they are a non-profit school, part of Foothills Christian Church, and they

would like to continue to make a positive impact in the community by student-led outreaches. He has met with the Principal of Fletcher Hills Elementary about how the High School could be a benefit to the Elementary School by having the high school students volunteer at the Elementary School. He believes that the issues of traffic and sound have already been addressed by their consultants. He introduces the Pastor of Foothills Christian Church and states that he has been answering questions and will continue to be available to address any and all concerns. He indicates that he'd like to turn over the podium to Mr. Bill Darnell to speak on the traffic issue.

**Mr. Bill DARNELL**, Darnell & Associates, 1446 Front Street, Suite 300, San Diego, CA. His company has done the traffic study for this project. They have worked with quite a few schools in the past, so they have experience in this area. In the process of this study, they also surveyed two other schools with similar student enrollment size to determine the trip rates for each student to the school. He then shows a computer-generated simulation to show what traffic would look like in the area, based on putting stop signs at Dryden and Brockton. The pick-ups and drop-offs will be in the back of the building and they feel it will be managed very well with the two lanes designated. They did pedestrian surveys and speed surveys. He states that there will be an increase in traffic, but they believe the intersections and roadway segments will operate effectively.

**WOODS** asks how long it is that they're proposing the 300- student limit. What is the time limitation that they're proposing?

**Mr. John GIBSON**, 1000 Pioneer Way, El Cajon, is the project's representative. He states that the traffic study was predicated on a conflict that they needed to resolve after a year of study, then come back with a performance review of how much traffic and how much parking they have. That's not how the staff report reads tonight, however, so he would like to follow up with a discussion on that in a few minutes.

**Mr. Andre ESTRADA**, 3636 North Cuyamaca Street, El Cajon, is the Acoustical Engineer that overlooked this project. He states that they looked at various issues for this proposed project. They did a traffic noise segment analysis in which they saw that the project would not exceed the City's noise element. They also looked at onsite noise issues and saw that even with kids and activities, it would not exceed the noise ordinance for the City of El Cajon. In addition the applicant has indicated that they will build a nice fence on the northern property line to mitigate any additional noise, although ESTRADA feels that the fence is not even needed in regard to the noise issue.

**WELLS** asks ESTRADA if the fence will make any kind of difference in the noise factor. ESTRADA indicates that the fence will lower some of the noise, however, he reiterates that there is no need to lower the noise, as it does not exceed the City's limitations.

**GIBSON** returns to the podium. He states that the use of non-profit facilities is very important to the community. In a community where property is scarce and the price is high, non-profits must share facilities. They find the staff recommendation acceptable. However, there are two items they would like to be considered. He submits a written

request for exceptions from conditions #2 and #3. Regarding item #2, he would like to make the recommendation that they reduce the number of students to 250 in the first year, 275 in the second year and 295 in the third year. Secondly, regarding the average daily trip account on Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday, they would offer carpooling, vanpooling and bussing to help alleviate the issue. The church presently has two vans and would agree to add more. They believe that vanpooling would be much more appropriate for this school rather than bussing.

Chairman **BLACK** indicates that the opposition will be granted additional time to match the time allotted to the applicant.

**RAMIREZ** states that she has questions for Mr. Darnell. Chairman **BLACK** re-calls **DARNELL** to the podium.

**RAMIREZ** asks Mr. Darnell if the simulation that was shown was for the initial year of the school's operation or for a future year. **DARNELL** states that it is for the existing traffic plus 275 students.

**Mr. Anthony TALAMANTEZ**, 2273 Dryden Road, El Cajon, a property owner. He states that he and his wife live next door to the church property. The core group that he is representing is a group of people who live around the area. They are the individuals who met with the mediator and the church group. Mr. Talamantez shows a Power Point presentation which summarizes the concerns of neighbors who oppose the project. They don't understand what the net benefits of the project will be. The core group sees only negatives (noise, traffic, etc.) and no net positives. One of their big issues is with the traffic. They don't believe that one driveway for entrance and exit will be sufficient, and think it will cause massive traffic build-up. They also think there is insufficient data in the noise report to make an accurate determination of what the noise will be. The group also feels that communication has been a problem issue with this project and they believe they've been that last to know on many aspects of the project.

Other issues of concern in **TALAMANTEZ'S** presentation include the following points:

- Lack of follow-up after the January neighborhood meeting.
- Insufficient discussion in mediation sessions prior to the Planning Commission hearing.
- Many neighbors would be less concerned about traffic if all students were to be bussed in.
- If the project is compatible, why is over 90% of the surrounding neighborhood against it?

**TALAMANTEZ** concludes his remarks by stating that the Planning Commission disapprove the project. They are asking the Commission to do the following if the project is approved:

- Revise the acoustical study.
- Pursue more aggressive reductions in traffic volume and noise.
- Hold additional meetings until neighborhood opposition is reduced to 50% or less.

- Provide enforcement mechanisms in the CUP.

**WELLS** asks if there is a point of compromise for the neighborhood to accept or is the core group opposed completely to a school on this property? **TALAMANTEZ** says there are some that would agree if some issues were dealt with, but there are many that would disagree entirely.

**AMBROSE** asks **TALAMANTEZ** what he thinks should be done to the noise model to make it more realistic since he didn't think the previous study was sufficient. **TALAMANTEZ** says to use a reference sound and take measurements on neighbors' property.

**WELLS** asks **TALAMANTEZ** if they've had noise from the elementary school in the neighborhood. **TALAMANTEZ** states that they don't live too close and there is some open space around the school. He doesn't know of anyone complaining about noise from the elementary school.

**Mr. Max NEWBOLD**, 548 North Westwind Drive, El Cajon, is a property owner about two blocks away from the proposed school site. His concern is kids hanging around the school at night with their friends. He thinks there should be traffic lights on Westwind and Chatham to deal with traffic problems.

**Mr. Jeff STRATTON**, 2332 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He wants to know what the limit is set at for traffic in this residential service. He states that the information that he has coming from the Public Works office states 1,500 as a limit per day and he believes with a school added to the property, it will exceed this limit.

**KRULIKOWSKI** states that number is not identified in their report or the staff work that has been done.

**Ms. Shelly MCCARTY**, 2075 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner and has lived there for twenty years. She is extremely disappointed with the City of El Cajon. One of the reasons they moved there was for a quiet neighborhood. She can't comprehend how noisy it will be if hundreds of students begin to attend school in this area. She believes a school in the neighborhood will devalue her property.

**Mr. Wayne CLARK**, 317 Comet Lane, El Cajon, is a father of a student at Venture Christian School. Venture Christian has a code of conduct for students that's enforced every day and it is taken by students and parents. He works as a coach with Venture and states that he can attest to the fact that the kids he's worked with conduct themselves above reproach at all times.

**Mr. Eric KNOWLES**, 1044 Pioneer Way, El Cajon, would like to speak on behalf of the school. He states that a community is not just homes, but also schools and churches. He has been a real estate agent for 25 years and he specializes in placing non-profit groups. In this market, locations to place non-profit, private schools are practically non-existent.

He states that he has never seen a study showing that a school in the neighborhood would lower property values.

**Ms. Arlene MOREAU**, 461 Garfield Ave., El Cajon, is a property owner against this project. She believes the traffic in the neighborhood is already bad and would get worse.

**Ms. Georgia BEST**, 2196 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner who believes that this project would interrupt the character of her neighborhood. She believes that noise and pollution will be a big factor. She wants to preserve and enhance the neighborhood and thinks this project will destroy it.

**Mr. Rick BEST**, 2196 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He thinks that placing a high school in the area will devalue his property. He doesn't believe that opposition to a project like this is very unusual.

**Ms. Betty CALKINS**, 1725 Manfred Ct., El Cajon, does not live in the neighborhood. She's a former member of Grace Baptist Church of Fletcher Hills that closed their doors on Dryden Road in March 2004. She believes that having a high school group learning, playing and laughing should be a welcome noise.

**Ms. Connie COLEMAN**, 715 North Broadway, Escondido is the Community Services Director for Kids Club Christian Theatre and has been associated with the Dryden Road property for twenty-six years. She believes that the positive impact having children and teens in the area is a great thing.

**Mr. Mark HOFFMAN**, 350 Cypress Lane, El Cajon, is one of the pastors at Foothills Christian Fellowship. They have searched tirelessly for three years for a new facility. This is the only one that they can find. Their lease is up and they need to leave their current facilities.

**Ms. Lynn WIDENMANN**, 2070 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is the property owner. Her home has been in her family for about fifty years. She is opposed to the project and wants to protect the value of her property.

**Mr. William ROSA**, 2107 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He has two young children that attend Fletcher Hills Elementary School that he walks to school each day. He opposes the school because of the increase in traffic.

**Mr. Bill NIGH**, 12209 Rockstream Road, Lakeside, is a father of four boys who have all attended Venture Christian High School. He is in favor of the project and believes the school will be a great addition to the neighborhood.

**Mr. Andrew DAVY**, 2343 Dryden Road, El Cajon, lives right next door to the property. He believes that if the project is approved, traffic will be a big problem.

**Mr. Jonathan MACINTYRE**, 1348 Hillcrest Drive, Alpine, is a student of Venture Christian High School. He sees a great need for a new location for the school. They (the students) seek to be in a safer environment. He states that as a school, they want to be a positive impact on the neighborhood.

**Ms. Brenda CURTIS**, 4933 Havenwood Ave., San Diego, has a son at Venture Christian High School. She believes that moving the students to this location will be for the greater good of the community.

**Mr. Dave LABAHN**, 4616 Calavo Drive, La Mesa, will be a senior at Venture this upcoming year. He apologizes to the neighbors if they are an inconvenience. He has been part of many outreaches and believes that they could continue to do great outreaches in this new neighborhood.

**Mr. Richard CRUMLISH**, 1572 Fair Glen Road, El Cajon, would like to represent Venture Christian High School. He does not agree that the property value of the neighborhood would decrease with the addition of the school. He believes they would be good neighbors and an asset to the community.

**Mr. Warren ROPER**, 2197 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a high school teacher who believes that this usage of the property is not compatible with the community. He doesn't foresee that this location would be big enough to house the school and provide all the sports and activities that they host.

**Mr. John STANKO**, 2223 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He has had past complaints with the noise from the church and states that there have many accidents on the streets.

**Ms. Jennifer BIGBEY**, 10636 Healy Court, Santee, is a student at Venture Christian High School. She states that all sports and activities will be off-site, so it won't be an issue at this location. She states that the students really want to be a blessing to the neighborhood and not cause problems.

**Mr. Vince HUNDLEY**, 384 North Westwind Drive, El Cajon, is concerned about the speed on the street. He had a recent appraisal on his house and it was lessened because of the noise and speed on the street.

**Mr. Vince PASTORELLI**, 2210 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He is concerned about the issue of safety if this project is approved. They've had numerous traffic incidents and he believes adding more students will add to the problem.

**Mr. Dan PICHLER**, 454 Brockton, El Cajon, is a property owner. He would be the closest house to the cars that would come and go for the high school. He asks the Commission if it is in the record that there are 256 names in the area who are opposed to this project. BLACK affirms that it is in the record.

**Ms. Kathy GRIFFIN**, 2275 Chatham Street, El Cajon, is a property owner. Traffic from the elementary school already ties her up at certain times of the day and she believes adding a high school will increase the problem. She states that if there were busses that the school is required to use, then she wouldn't have a problem with the school being there.

**Ms. Nichole SEROCKI**, 2397 Dryden Road, El Cajon is a property owner. She thinks that pollution will be a problem due to the vast amount of cars that the school will bring. She thinks that there will be an overload of traffic that will cause accidents.

**Mr. Patrick FLANAGAN**, 2428 Charles Way, El Cajon, is a property owner. He lives directly across from the location. He wants them to put the school somewhere else and not in his neighborhood.

**Ms. Janice WAKEFIELD**, 2357 Louise Court, El Cajon, is a property owner for over twenty-three years. She thinks that if this project is approved, a precedent has been set. She does not want the high school in her backyard. She wants to keep the neighborhood nice and quiet.

**Ms. Wendy BIGBEY**, 10636 Healy Court, Santee, has two children going into Venture Christian High School. She states past instances where the community has had problems with changes and yet the results ended up being blessings. She thinks the controversy over this issue will yield the same result.

**Mr. Rusty FILTER**, 479 North Westwind Drive, El Cajon, is a property owner. He bought the property to be near the elementary school, however, he believes that the addition of this new school would add too much traffic to an already busy street.

**Mr. Brandon HABEL**, 2663 Dryden Road, El Cajon is a property owner. He wants to know what the school would do if/when they need to expand with more students wanting to join.

**Mr. Chris ALLEY**, 10199 Duncan Drive, Lakeside. He is a student at Venture Christian High and he believes it is the best school he's ever seen. Their lease is up and they need a place to go. They're willing to build a fence and work with the community on any issues.

**Mr. Daryl HUYSER**, 12105 Gabriel Way, Lakeside. He states that this property was already designated as a church and if it had truly prospered, its attendance would have surpassed what the school is proposing. He thinks these students at this location could make a positive impact.

**Ms. Amber SOUER**, 2107 Dryden Road, El Cajon. She believes that if the students are only on campus three days a week, they won't be helpful to the community as they're promising.

**Ms. Erica BJORNEBOE**, 456 Silvery Lane, El Cajon. She states that this isn't an issue about religion. It's about impacting an area that is already impacted. She suggests they move the school to another area such as the old Sharp hospital on Main and Broadway.

**Ms. Tamara MCCABE**, 2097 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. She's amazed at the amount of increased traffic in this area just in the last five years. She believes the traffic reports are incorrect.

**Mr. Chris PEDERSEN**, 2232 Dryden Road, El Cajon, is a property owner. He's had two cars smashed up on Dryden Road and has seen numerous other accidents.

Chairman **BLACK** asks if there is a motion to close public hearing.

**FOLEY** states that the Chairman should ask if there are any questions before public hearing is closed.

**WELLS** asks GIBSON about his prospect of reducing trips to the school and how he would enforce it.

**GIBSON** replies that they would have a condition to report back with a traffic count in the fall and spring that would account for an average daily trip during an average week and confirm that the numbers we talked about would be achieved. If those numbers haven't been achieved then they would not be able to increase the number of students above the initial 250 suggested. They will provide incentives and carpooling to reach numbers.

**BLACK** asks GIBSON if they would use any off-street parking. GIBSON states that they would require that their students and faculty park onsite only.

**AMBROSE** asks GIBSON about a bell ringing in between class periods and how would the noise issue be affected.

**NAFFZIGER** states that a bell system is indeed used.

**AMBROSE** asks GIBSON if they would be willing to do a follow-up noise analysis to see how the noise actually is after school is in session.

**GIBSON** believes that the noise study is sufficient and indicates that there is not a problem with noise, however, they are looking into adding more measures to alleviate the noise even further by putting in double-paned windows and such.

**AMBROSE** asks GIBSON about their offer to do vanpooling and carpooling and asks if any details have been hashed out in regards to such.

**GIBSON** states that they have two church vans that can be put into use immediately and they are not opposed to buy additional equipment, but they will wait to see what the needs may be.

**WOODS** states that there have been numerous mentions about the traffic accidents on Dryden Road and asks if there have been significant or higher amounts of traffic accidents

on this street more than any other street.

**KRULIKOWSKI** states that this issue is covered in the traffic report that was done by Darnell & Associates and also reviewed by Public Works and there is not a higher rate of incidents on this street.

**SOTTILE** asks GIBSON about staggered pick-ups and drop-offs as initially reported in the Mitigation Report.

**GIBSON** states that they will definitely utilize this feature. They will split the entry of the students into two periods, so there will never be more than 50% of students entering or exiting the facility at one time.

**WOODS** asks staff about the traffic and parking issue at a cap of 275 to 295.

**KRULIKOWSKI** states that there are two levels of concern: traffic and parking. The traffic will increase but can be handled by the existing streets. The parking is a more significant concern and they will have to limit attendance to 300 in order to accommodate. **WOODS** states that the parking issue may then force students to carpool.

**WELLS** asks **FOLEY** to comment on the letter they all received from the Pacific Justice Foundation stating that they would be in violation of RLUIPA if they don't approve the project.

**FOLEY** states that he is very familiar with this issue and is surprised by the letter, because it is not a complete analysis. The crux of this matter is whether the City is treating a church or religious organization differently than they would a secular organization. He is confident this is not the case. He is not concerned about the letter from this Foundation.

**SOTTILE** asks staff about GIBSON'S exceptions #2 and #3 and wants to know staff's opinion.

**RAMIREZ** states that the staff doesn't agree with these proposed exceptions. It is staff's opinion that it would be difficult for City staff to enforce these issues, (limitation on vehicle trips).

**BLACK** states that if there aren't any other questions, there should be a move to close the public hearing.

Motion by WELLS, second by SOTTILE to close the public hearing; carries 5-0.

**WOODS** states that GIBSON is offering a significant compromise by agreeing to reduce the initial amount of attendance. He would like to see condition #2 be replaced with the addendum. [Exception asking for phased enrollment: 250, 275, 295.] He is concerned with condition #3 as he believes that we need a way to monitor this.

**WELLS** states that a property owner has the right to do what they want to do with their property. In a community you have to have compromise, and he's glad that GIBSON is willing to compromise to meet the needs of the community that he's moving into.

**SOTTILE** states that it is a difficult decision and he understands the neighbors concern. He, however, agrees with WELLS that a property owner does have the right to use their property as they see fit, within the law. This Conditional Use Permit when initially granted was for both a church and a school, it just hasn't been utilized as a school previously.

**AMBROSE** agrees with fellow Commissioners that the owner does have property rights. He hopes the community will come together to work out their differences.

**BLACK** states that he believes the school is very good at relations and will be a good neighbor.

**RAMIREZ** asks BLACK if staff might comment on some issues.

**RAMIREZ** states that there was a question from a speaker about whether the existing church has a limit on its attendance. The answer is no. The existing church operates on a conditional use permit and has no restriction on the limit, but is expected to operate in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding area. The church could technically operate with an attendance higher than the proposed enrollment by the school, however, that doesn't seem likely since the church is a small operation. Also, staff objects to the student enrollment phasing from a lower number of 250 to something higher. Staff firmly believes it is appropriate to give a one-time number and then review that number after the first year of monitoring.

**WELLS** asks RAMIREZ for clarification on staff's recommendation on student enrollment. RAMIREZ states that staff recommends enrollment of 250 for the first year and through ten years, subject to review after the first year, with bussing a minimum of 100 students, when the enrollment exceeds 200.

**WOODS** asks staff if condition #3 were to be utilized, would staff have recommendations on the correct wording?

**RAMIREZ** asks WOODS for clarification on what he would like to accomplish in changing condition #3. WOODS states that he would like to give them an option for carpooling and vanpooling in addition to, or in place of, bussing.

**RAMIREZ** replies that we can change the wording: "alternative methods of transportation including but no limited to bus, carpooling and vanpooling."

**RAMIREZ** states that perhaps we should add a condition that would address having the applicant submit an transportation program to the City to review so that we will understand how it will work, and how the City will be able to monitor and know that the maximum hasn't been exceeded. WOODS agrees.

Motion by WOODS, second by WELLS to adopt the Mitigated Negation Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; carries 5-0.

Motion by WOODS, second by SOTTILE to grant the Amendment of Conditional Use Permit 194 to operate a high school, modifying Condition #2 increasing the maximum enrollment from 275 to 295 students, and modifying Condition #3 to read: "Alternative methods of transportation, including but not limited to, bus, carpool and vanpool from an off-site location shall be provided for a minimum of 100 students when the daily enrollment exceeds 250"; carries 5-0.

**RAMIREZ** reiterates to the audience that any appeals of this decision must be filed with the City Clerk's office with fees paid, by **5:00 PM, Monday, August 7, 2006.**

## **PREDRAFTED RESOLUTIONS**

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

Motion by WELLS, second by AMBROSE to adopt Resolution No. 10344 pro forma; carries 5-0.

## **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

AMBROSE inquired if staff received invitation to the next Ad Hoc Committee meeting for the SP182 workshop. Ramirez responded affirmatively, but indicated she will not be attending.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by WELLS, second by AMBROSE, to adjourn the meeting of the El Cajon City Planning Commission at 10:35 PM this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July 2006; carries 5-0.

---

Thomas BLACK, Chair

ATTEST:

---

James S. GRIFFIN, Secretary