



# MINUTES

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**NOVEMBER 19, 2007**

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** William D. WELLS, Chairman  
Tom BLACK  
Anthony SOTTILE  
Gary WOODS

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Anthony AMBROSE

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Tony SHUTE, Acting Principal Planner  
Eric CRAIG, Assistant Planner  
Lisa FOSTER, Assistant City Attorney  
Dennis DAVIES, Deputy Director, Engineering  
Public Works  
Ron Luis VALLES, Administrative Secretary

WELLS explains the mission of the Planning Commission and the proper procedure for speaking before the Commission and asks for proper decorum during the meeting.

**MINUTES OF 11-05-07**                      Motion by WOODS, second by SOTTILE to approve the Minutes of November 5, 2007, pro forma. Motion carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

SHUTE states that the appeal date is Monday, December 3, 2007 and not Wednesday, December 5, 2007, as erroneously listed in the Planning Commission Agenda.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ON**  
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 2055 – Seitel (dba RV Super Center) for Fabulous 7**  
**Partners L.P.**

*(continued public hearing) Resolution No. 10458*  
*P.C. mtg. 11-19-07*

The subject property is located on the east side of East Main Street between North Third Street and Broadway, and addressed as 1523-1527 East Main Street; APNs: 507-310-28 & -29; General Plan Designation: General Retail Commercial.

Request R.V. sales and rentals in the C-2 (General Commercial) zone. ***(Continued from the Planning Commission meeting of October 22, 2007).***

SHUTE reminds that this request was before the Commission on October 22, when staff recommended denial because the requested use was not compatible with the existing transition service center on the same property. He also submits other concerns included: it combined incompatible uses and contributed to site overcrowding; the proposal does not contribute to, enhance, or promote the general welfare and convenience of the subject property; and granting the request would establish a new standard by which other development in the immediate area would be measured in the future.

The Commission asked staff to attempt to work through the issues with the applicant. The staff met with the applicant and a new proposed site plan was submitted. The applicant proposed to relocate the main entrance to the sales yard so that prospective buyers and circulation will enter at the southerly driveway on East Main Street and then maneuver behind the restaurant and then into the R.V. lot. This requires using a portion of the Caltrans right of way, since only 12 feet separate the corner of the existing conference center and the Caltrans right of way.

A trash enclosure is now shown in a different location, and the installation of a wall is proposed to redirect pedestrian traffic between the "motel" and the "conference center," which will be outside the access driveway to the R.V. sales yard. Once the sales lot is in operation, the applicant proposes to take additional steps to inform the occupants in order to eliminate pedestrian traffic behind the fenced area by the staff of the Fab 7. According to the applicant, this will minimize the vehicle traffic between the two structures at times people are present, it will give more separation for the two occupancies occupying the subject properties.

Although the staff appreciates the proposed changes by the applicant that detail proper protocol between the uses to ensure compatibility, the staff is still of the opinion that the proposed use should be denied for the reasons mentioned earlier.

If the Planning Commission disagrees with the staff's assessment of the proposal, SHUTE notes that some possible conditions of approval were included in the staff report; however, he emphasizes that the Planning Commission will have to formulate "reasons for their decision," focusing on land-use issues.

WELLS announces the public hearing is now open.

**Mr. John GIBSON**, Hamann Companies, 1000 Pioneer Way, El Cajon, CA 92020, is the applicant's representative. He mentions that the applicant, David Seitel is also present to answer any questions. He informs that the Fab 7 was initially a difficult project, but to date, there have been no complaints. The R.V. project will provide benefits in that the subject site would be cleaned up, jobs will be created and additional funding will be provided for Set Free Ministries.

He requests that the Planning Commission eliminate conditions 1b. and 2a. from the conditions of approval as this would place the transitional housing out of business, negating the need for an R.V. sales lot. He also recommends a change to condition 2b. that requires approval from Caltrans as there are usually long delays in dealing with the agency. He notes that the third concern is the Public Works requirements of storm water compliance and to pave the property. [The three-minute speaking time expires and GIBSON requests additional time that is granted by Chairman WELLS.] GIBSON requests that since this is an interim use, he recommends that gravel be substituted for asphalt paving.

In response to WELLS request, SHUTE clarifies the speaker's points: 1b., remove the existing conference center and food preparation building; 2a., physically removing the building and 2b., obtain written Caltrans authorization. Regarding the Public Works conditions, SHUTE informs that the requirement of two inches of asphalted concrete on a prepared base is a Zoning Ordinance requirement.

WELLS asks if the interim use would change the conditions of approval pertaining to gravel, and SHUTE replies that requests would still need to comply with the city's Zoning Ordinance and the area would need to be paved.

WELLS informs that in a recent visit to the property, he noticed a lot of junk. Additionally, he mentioned that another recent applicant for R.V. sales was providing increased security to the area.

BLACK asks if increasing the term from three to five years, would help the applicant in recouping costs. GIBSON replies affirmative, especially if they have to comply with the paving requirements.

SOTTILE wonders about a lot split, and GIBSON notes that the subject property is on two tax parcels; but it has always been one legal lot. SHUTE adds that that possibility of a lot split was discussed with the applicant in order to separate the R.V. sales and the transition service center activities. He notes that the building is located in the center and creates a wedge between the two R.V. sales display areas.

SOTTILE asks if there is a possibility of vandalism from the homeless people on the R.V. center. GIBSON replies that the property is well managed and emphasizes that the crime rate is down in the area. However, they will continue to take extra efforts to ensure that vandalism does not occur, and he doesn't foresee any problems.

SOTTILE asks staff if they were to grant this request, would they would be setting a precedent, SHUTE maintains that the businesses should be kept separate and that if it is approved, future development will be judged based by this standard.

WELLS invites any additional speakers. No one else comes forward to be heard.

Motion by WELLS, second by BLACK to close the public hearing; carries 3-0 (AMBROSE – absent; WOODS - abstain).

SOTTILE asks FOSTER if the project could be approved without setting a precedent, since they would be mixing commercial and community service uses. FOSTER informs that if this is granted, this project would become one of the “pertinent cases” in future staff reports. She notes that even if a statement is included in the record that it would not set a precedent, FOSTER believes that it would, as it would be listed as a pertinent case. She believes it would be more difficult for staff to take a position on incompatible uses because this precedent was set.

BLACK mentions that whether or not the building would cause a problem, market conditions would warrant success. He emphasizes that the caveat is the area would be improved significantly.

WELLS notes about the issues of the proposed conditions, 1b. and 2a. regarding the removal of the building and especially, 2b. the Caltrans requirement. SHUTE informs that if the Planning Commission were to grant this, that the applicant would need to notify Caltrans and obtain permission to use the right-of-way in order to maneuver R.V.'s in and around the conference center and food prep building. He believes that the Planning Commission should require the applicant to obtain permission to use the Caltrans right-of-way. FOSTER concurs with SHUTE.

WELLS recommends to re-open the public hearing so that they can ask the applicant.

Motion by BLACK, second by SOTTILE to re-open the public hearing; carries 3-0 (AMBROSE – absent; WOODS – abstain).

In a reply to WELLS' question regarding notification to Caltrans, GIBSON replies that they recently had an A.L.T.A. survey completed, and the distance is greater than depicted in the original site plan that was submitted. He notes that a motor home, which is slightly less than eight-feet wide, would be able to maneuver within the 12 feet of the diagonal corner.

The applicant is willing to write a letter notifying Caltrans, but notes that past dealings have met with delays. He emphasizes that they would not need to encroach on the property.

BLACK reflects that when he went to the restaurant in the past, he noticed that there were many potholes. He recommends that the property be paved with asphalt.

Motion by WELLS, second by BLACK to close the public hearing; carries 3-0 (AMBROSE – absent; WOODS – abstain).

WELLS reasons that even though this is an unusual request, he feels that it is the best land use for the city as the property will be cleaned up, plus drug dealers would have one less place to congregate. Regarding pavement of the property, he feels that it is out of the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission and recommends that the applicant bring it up to the City Council. BLACK concurs with the Chairman. He also notes that there are already existing R.V. sales in the area. SOTTILE concurs with BLACK and notes that it is a temporary situation for three to four years. He also encourages that the record reflect that this action is not setting a precedent for future applications.

WELLS suggests that if the applicant's attorney write a letter to Caltrans informing them of the right-of-way, and provide a copy to the Planning Commission and staff.

SHUTE conveys that since the Commission is leaning towards granting CUP 2055; he adds that some conditions were included in the staff report; however, land-use reasons for recommendation must be made by the Commission. FOSTER concurs with SHUTE.

Motion by BLACK, second by SOTTILE to GRANT Conditional Use Permit 2055, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report and for reasons stated by the Planning Commission, including: "A. The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area; and B. With compliance with the conditions of approval, the proposed use will adhere to the C-2 development standards"; and striking conditions 1b. and 2a.; changing condition #2b. from "Obtain written Caltrans authorization" to "Provide notification to Caltrans"; increasing the life of the term from three to five years in condition #4; and granting this CUP does not set a precedent; carries 3-0 (AMBROSE - absent; WOODS – abstain).

WOODS returns to the Council Chambers at 7:58 p.m.

The appeal period for this item ends at 5 p.m. on Monday, December 3, 2007.

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON**

### **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 2056 – Arroyo (Extra Space Storage) for Mikolajewski**

*(public hearing) Resolution No. 10464*

*(joint-noticed C.C. mtg. 12-18-97)*

*P.C. mtg. 11-19-07*

The subject property is located on the southeast side of East Main Street between Interstate 8 and Broadway, and addressed as 1539 East Main Street; APN: 507-310-20; General Plan Designation: General Retail Commercial.

Request self-storage in the C-2 (General Commercial) zone. ***(Continued from the Planning Commission meeting of November 5, 2007).***

AND

**PUBLIC HEARING ON  
SPECIFIC PLAN 512 – Arroyo (Extra Space Storage) for Mikolajewski**

*(public hearing) Resolution No. 10465*

*(joint-noticed C.C. mtg. 12-18-07)*

*P.C. mtg. 11-19-07*

The subject property is located on the southeast side of East Main Street between Interstate 8 and Broadway, and addressed as 1539 East Main Street; APN: 507-310-20; General Plan Designation: General Retail Commercial.

Request increased building and sign height in the C-2 (General Commercial) zone.  
***(Continued from the Planning Commission meeting of November 5, 2007).***

CRAIG notes that this is a two-part proposal for a conditional use permit and specific plan, where the applicant proposes to establish a self-storage warehouse facility with freeway oriented signs, and exceed the maximum building height limit in the C-2 zone. The subject property is vacant and is located on the southeast side of East Main Street between Broadway to the north, and the East Main Street I-8 overpass to the south.

The proposed self-storage warehouse facility would be four-stories tall, and would include over 103,000 square feet of storage space, in 747 individual storage units. The proposal includes a 1,375 square foot business office with a 1,375 square foot caretaker's unit located above the office. Six parking spaces are proposed outside of the business office and caretakers unit, with four more parking spaces proposed near the two elevators that provide access to the upper level of the warehouse. Landscaping is proposed along the East Main Street frontage, and in the parking area near the business office, and in a 4 1/2 –foot planter along the southern property line.

CRAIG notes that one of the proposed signs projects above the roofline and is 68 feet high with an architectural projection that is 76 feet high. The Zoning Ordinance authorizes the Planning Commission to grant approval of signs above 65-feet, but requires a finding that the additional height is necessary for identification of the subject property. Staff analyzed the proposal and was unable to make this finding because the entire upper half of the proposed building will be visible from the freeway, even without the proposed sign. Therefore, staff recommends that the proposed sign be lowered to 65 feet.

The building height limit in the C-2 zone is 35 feet; however, the proposed building would be approximately 54 feet tall. In analyzing the specific plan request for increased building height, staff considered the visual and physical setting of the project site as well as the nature and scale of surrounding development. In staff's opinion, the site's proximity to Interstate 8, and the fact that East Main Street is 100' wide in the vicinity of the subject property, are both factors that will act to soften the proposed 54-foot-high building. Furthermore, there are two-story motel structures on either side of the proposed four-story building, and these structures will act to further moderate the proposed warehouse.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit 2056 and Specific Plan 512 subject to the conditions and for the reasons listed in the staff report.

WELLS announces the public hearings are now open.

**Ms. Nancy BANE**, Extra Space Storage, 1319 Maraciolo Court, San Marcos, California, is the applicant's representative. [She presents a large rendering that illustrates the sign feature to the City Attorney who circulates it to staff and Commission.] She agrees with most of the conditions of the staff report. She notes that the sign tower is an architectural feature and is proportionate with the design of the building.

She notes that they saw an opportunity to upgrade the product in the market and notes that most of the storage facilities in El Cajon are full, up in the 90% range. They also plan to upgrade some of the storage units that will feature air conditioning.

**Mr. Ariel VALLI**, 81 Columbia, Aliso Viejo, California, is the architect for the project. He believes that the sign is proportionate to the building. In a reply to BLACK, VALLI notes that the sign will be externally illuminated through lights on the building. They will comply with the plans as approved by the Planning Commission.

No one else comes forward to be heard.

Motion by WELLS, second by SOTTILE to close the public hearings; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

WOODS notes that it is a beautiful project and will be an asset to the City, but he is troubled by the height of the sign. WELLS thinks that it wouldn't be a big deal as it is only a few feet higher than permitted. WELLS supports the staff recommendation; however, he wants the record to reflect that he supports having the City Council overturn the sign limitation requirement.

Motion by WOODS, second by SOTTILE to GRANT Conditional Use Permit 2056; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

Motion by WOODS, second by SOTTILE to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Specific Plan 512 to exceed the building height limit; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

These items are jointly-noticed for a City Council meeting on December 18, 2007.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON**  
**AMENDMENT TO SPECIFIC PLAN 51 - Paden**  
*(public hearing) Resolution No. 10466*  
*(joint-noticed C.C. mtg. 12-18-07)*  
*P.C. mtg. 11-19-07*

The subject property is located on the north side of Oakdale Avenue west of North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and addressed as 1278 Oakdale Avenue; APNs: 489-310-09, -18, -19, and -20; General Plan Designation: General Retail Commercial.

Request to remove the subject property from an existing plan for commercial development that currently includes a motel, restaurant and automotive service use in the C-2 (General Commercial) zone.

SHUTE conveys that Specific Plan 51 was originally approved by the City Council in 1962 and since has had five amendments for the block of property from North Second Street along Oakdale to the west where the block ends. The existing specific plan indicates a future 44-unit motel on the subject parcel. The applicant is requesting to remove the westerly parcel from this approved specific plan for commercial development. If the Planning Commission authorizes this amendment to Specific Plan 51, the westernmost parcel will be deleted. Removing this single parcel will enable it to be considered for development independent of the remaining SP 51 properties.

The staff has no objections to the removal of the subject site from SP 51. It is also staff's opinion that this will not create any compatibility problems as long as the property is properly maintained.

Currently, the site is being used for storage of modular buildings, trailers, R.V.'s construction equipment and trash. SHUTE emphasizes that the maintenance of the subject site is extremely poor. Staff recommends that, within 30 days and prior to the first ordinance reading for SP 51, the applicant remove everything from the subject site except for the modular buildings and caretaker's unit.

Staff received six inquires in response to the public hearing notice for this item. Four of the callers requested information and expressed no objections to the proposal. One caller indicated that parking was a problem in the area and wanted to verify that the applicant would be required to provide parking on the subject site when the property is developed. Staff also received a written response from the property owner of the adjacent commercially zoned properties expressing support for the applicants' request.

The staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Amendment of Specific Plan 51 to remove the subject property from the existing plan for commercial development that currently includes a motel, restaurant and automotive service use in the C-2 zone subject to conditions and for the reasons contained in the staff report.

WELLS announces the public hearing is now open.

**Mr. Tom PADEN**, 1512 Hawks Vista Lane, Alpine, California, is the current owner of 1278 Oakdale Avenue. He notes that he spoke with staff and is bothered about some aspects of the Site Development Plan. SHUTE interjects that the speaker is talking about an administrative item, a Site Development Plan 1459, and is not under consideration by

the Planning Commission. He requests that the speaker only address issues pertaining to the Amendment to Specific Plan 51. SHUTE reviews the three conditions pertaining to the specific plan project: 1. That the City Council concur with the Planning Commission's decision; 2. That there is a time limit that the applicant correct code violations and 3. A mylar of Specific Plan 51 must be provided.

PADEN notes that he was confused between the two applications; however, he requests additional time be allowed to correct the code violations. SHUTE replies that the 30 days referenced in condition #2 will be in effect after the City Council meeting on December 18. PADEN notes, after conferring with his father, that the recommended time is sufficient.

**Mr. Tom PADEN (Sr.)**, 1143 East Main Street, El Cajon, CA 92021, is the applicant. He is confused with the staff report and sought clarification on page 5 where it stated that "staff did not receive comments from other departments." SHUTE reiterates that the administrative site development plan was submitted to the staff for review for the development of this commercial property. Staff thought it was wise to inform the Planning Commission that since there are no development conditions associated with this planning document, the Amendment of Specific Plan 51, that there are conditions in SDP 1459.

WELLS asks if this makes sense to the speaker, who replies negative and refers that the staff report recommends that the applicant should review all the recommendations and be prepared to discuss it at the public hearing it.

WELLS seeks clarification from staff, SHUTE notes that there are only the three conditions associated with this request, the removal of the property from Specific Plan 51. PADEN emphasizes as long as that is what is related, If it is related to the SDP, there would be some problems.

No one else comes forward to be heard.

Motion by WELLS, second by SOTTILE to close the public hearing; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

Motion by SOTTILE, second by BLACK to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Amendment of Specific Plan 51 to remove the subject property from an existing plan for commercial development that currently includes a motel, restaurant, and automotive service use in the C-2 zone, subject to the conditions set forth by the staff; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

This item is jointly-noticed for a City Council meeting on December 18, 2007.

### **PRE-DRAFTED RESOLUTIONS**

Motion by BLACK, second by SOTTILE to adopt Resolution Nos. 10458, pro forma; carries 3-0 (AMBROSE – absent; WOODS – abstain); Resolution Numbers 10464 through 10466, pro forma; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

There was no oral communications.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by BLACK, second by SOTTILE to adjourn the meeting of the El Cajon City Planning Commission at 8:37 p.m. this 19th day of November, 2007 until Monday, December 10, 2007 at 7 p.m.; carries 4-0 (AMBROSE – absent).

---

William D. WELLS, Chair

ATTEST:

---

James S. GRIFFIN, Secretary