

CITY OF ESCONDIDO**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ESCONDIDO PLANNING COMMISSION****January 9, 2018**

The meeting of the Escondido Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Weber, in the City Council Chambers, 201 North Broadway, Escondido, California.

Commissioners present: Jeffery Weber, Chairman; Don Romo, Vice-chairman; Michael Cohen, Commissioner; James McNair, Commissioner; James Spann, Commissioner; and Stan Weiler, Commissioner.

Commissioners absent: Joe Garcia, Commissioner.

Staff present: Mike Strong, Assistant Planning Director; Owen Tunnell, Principal Engineer; Ann Dolmage, Associate Planner; Adam Phillips, Deputy City Attorney; and Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk.

MINUTES:

Moved by Commissioner Spann, seconded by Commissioner McNair, to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2017 meeting. Motion carried unanimously. (6-0)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – Received.

FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS – None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR AN EXPANSION OF THE CHALICE
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST CONGREGATION FACILITY –
PHG 15-0039 and ENV 17-0009:**

REQUEST: A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an expansion of the Chalice Unitarian Universalist Congregation facility. The property is currently developed with a two-story, 3,300-SF building containing a chapel, kitchen, meeting area,

restrooms, and offices. A detached 330-SF cottage also exists on the site and is used as meeting space. The property is served by a private septic system and has a parking lot with 39 spaces. The proposed expansion would occur across two phases. Phase 1 would construct a new 2,659-SF multipurpose building (to contain classrooms, office space, storage space, and restrooms), install two new stormwater detention basins, expand the parking lot from 39 to 49 spaces, and construct street improvements on Miller Avenue. Phase 2 would remodel the kitchen/restroom/office area on the first floor of the chapel building and add 422 SF of foyer space to that building. The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

PROPERTY SIZE AND LOCATION: The 2.34-acre project site is located at 2324 Miller Avenue, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Miller Avenue and Hamilton Lane.

Ann Dolmage, Associate Planner, referenced the staff report and noted staff issues were whether all of the components of the phased Conditional Use Permit were appropriate for the site, and whether the project would have any adverse visual, noise, and compatibility impacts to surrounding residential uses, whether sufficient parking is provided to accommodate the range of anticipated uses, and whether continued use of the septic system is appropriate for the project (as an alternative to connecting to City sewer). Staff recommended approval based on the following:

1) The 2.34-acre project site had sufficient area to accommodate both of the proposed phases, including parking and setbacks from residential uses. The site was zoned RE-20 and church uses were allowed in this zone with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The site had been occupied by Chalice Unitarian Universalist Congregation for over ten years. The proposed multipurpose building had been designed to be visually compatible with the existing chapel building, and located to address any potential visual, noise, or compatibility impacts to surrounding uses. The project would expand and improve its parking area to increase its capacity from 39 to 49 spaces, in the same general location as the existing parking. Construction noise was expected to occur during project implementation, but mitigation measures have been proposed in the project's Mitigated Negative Declaration to minimize these impacts to a less than significant level;

2) Currently, the facility has 39 parking spaces to accommodate its congregation. Upon completion of the project, the church would have a new 2,569-SF multipurpose building (containing classrooms and offices) and an additional 422 SF of foyer space in the chapel building. A conservative parking calculation (i.e., the worst-case scenario) for this site would assume that all buildings are in use at the same time. Off-street parking standards require one parking space for every

100 SF of church assembly space when non-fixed seating is used. The facility would have 3,446 SF of assembly space at full buildout (1,416 SF in the chapel building, 1,700 SF in the multipurpose building, and 330 SF in the accessory building), for an assembly parking requirement of 34 spaces. The parking standards require one parking space for every 300 SF of office space, and since the site would have 1,170 SF of offices (966 SF in the chapel building and 204 SF in the multipurpose building), the office parking requirement would be three spaces. Therefore, the total parking requirement for the site would be 37 spaces, and the site would have a surplus of 12 spaces; and

3) The original County-issued Major Use Permit for this facility assumed a congregation size of no more than 150 people (75 people for each of the two Sunday services). The project site is served by a septic system with a capacity of 875 gallons per day, which is adequate for a congregation of that size, with some extra space for at least 25 additional people (175 people total per day). According to the applicant's architect, the system most likely can accommodate even more people than this, since plumbing codes assume that each person flushes three times per day and include a 50% safety factor on top of that. The applicant has stated that there are no current plans to increase the size of the congregation, so the existing septic system would continue to be adequate once the project is implemented. The project has been conditioned to limit usage of the site to 175 people per day, and proposed increases in this number would require further review and approval from the Planning Division.

Chairman Weber asked if a provision was necessary to restrict outside public events. Ms. Dolmage noted the Commission could add this as a condition.

Peter Bussett, Architect for the project, noted he was available for questions.

Commissioner Weiler and Spann expressed their support for the project.

ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Weiler, seconded by Commissioner Spann, to approve staff's recommendation. Motion carried unanimously. (6-0)

2. **SOUTH CENTRE CITY SPECIFIC PLAN – A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, REZONE, ZONING CODE AMENDMENT, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW SPECIFIC PLAN – PHG 15-0003 / ENV 17-0005:**

REQUEST: The Project involves a series of actions to create and implement the South Centre City Specific Plan. The proposed Specific Plan contains guiding principles, goals, policies, implementation strategies, allowable land uses, zoning, development standards, and various supporting maps, including a land use plan map. These components outline a cohesive, long-term, community driven vision that will guide future decisions related to development and land use, natural resources, mobility, infrastructure, public services, and other issues of interest to the City within this planning area. The Project also involves a request to change the existing General Plan Land Use Designation on all properties within the planning area to Specific Planning Area No. 15 (SPA #15) to facilitate the Specific Plan process. A companion Rezone is proposed to change the existing Zoning to SP (Specific Plan). The proposed amendment to Article 44 would establish a Major Home Occupation Permit to allow residents to operate a small business in their homes, in areas defined by the new Specific Plan. The proposed amendment to Article 65 is to reconcile the geographic alignment of the Old Escondido Neighborhood. The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

PROPERTY SIZE AND LOCATION: The South Centre City planning area consists of about 420 acres of land in the neighborhoods surrounding Quince Street, South Escondido Boulevard, and Centre City Parkway in southwest Escondido.

Mike Strong, Assistant Planning Director, and Claudia Tedford, Principal at City Place Planning provided a presentation and overview of the Specific Plan planning process and referenced the staff report with the staff recommendation to have the Planning Commission review the draft plan and do the following:

- 1) Recommend City Council adoption of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration and make findings that the project, if approved by City Council, will not have significant effect on the environment; and
- 2) Recommend the City Council approve the proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Zoning Code Amendment to Article 44 and 65, and adopt the South Centre City Specific Plan.

Chairman Weber and staff discussed Page 9, Bullet Points 2 and 3 of the staff report.

Commissioner Spann referenced a property that was removed from the OEN and asked if it would now be allowed commercial uses. Mr. Strong replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Weiler and staff discussed the Build to Line Range (BTLR).

Commissioner Weiler and staff discussed Table 4.2 with regard to allowing self-storage facilities and the City Council action plan for these uses.

Vice-chairman Romo asked if the amount of mini storage facilities could be prohibited in the southern gateway to the City, feeling residential would be preferable. He also felt incentives might help promote residential. Mr. Strong replied the land use table is a component of the Planning Commission's review and that the body could make changes. Mr. Strong also responded in the affirmative that the draft plan proposes several incentives and also removes constraints to housing construction.

Discussion ensued regarding pre-designating parcels for hydro-modification.

Vice-chairman Romo did not feel mixed use projects were viable. Additional discussion ensued regarding reducing the requirement for mixed-use projects, and/or permitting standalone residential projects.

Chairman Weber referenced the Visual Preference Survey Results as outlined in the staff report, and noted that the facilities being built did not provide the amount of setbacks being visualized. He felt the regulatory standards for requiring larger setbacks and active open space needed to be addressed. Mr. Strong referenced 5.3.12.3 Residential Amenities in Multi-Family Residential as outlined in the staff report, feeling this would help provide streetscapes. He then referenced Section 3.9.4.1, Paragraph 1 (Development Standards) and Paragraph 5 of 3.9.4.2 (Design Guidelines) as outlined in the staff report. Mr. Strong stated that new projects would be evaluated for conformance with design guidelines and the ability for new projects to promote the goals and objections, rather than relying on development standards alone.

Don Steigerwald, Escondido, noted that he lived in the Quince Street area. He expressed concerned with the amount of vehicles parking on the streets on the east side of Quince between 9th and 13th Avenues. He questioned whether any streets in the subject area would be widened, such as 11th Avenue. He also felt there was a need for redevelopment.

Chairman Weber directed Mr. Steigerwald to staff, noting they would be able to provide him the requested information.

Mr. Steigerwald noted that the presentation shows large streetscapes, which the City did not have.

Michael Nonahal, Escondido, representing Anaheim Foundation, noted that they owned several properties off of 9th Avenue, noting they currently were considering a development project in the area of 9th and 10th Avenues. He stated that the current codes prevented meaningful projects for the area. He suggested revising the plan to include a mixed-use plan from 9th Avenue to 10th Avenue, ending at Quince along with increasing the building heights. They felt this would attract businesses conducive to the gateway of Escondido, reduce crime, and increase the City's tax base. He stated that cities across the globe were heading toward mixed-use projects, noting the need for retail was being reduced by ecommerce.

Ann Maioriello, Escondido, stated that several individuals in the impacted areas did not receive notice about the proposed changes, questioning whether they would have a chance to provide input.

Ivana Treuoce, Escondido, Member of the South Tulip Neighborhood Group, noted that they did not receive notice about the proposed plans. She questioned what impacts the plan would have on the residents from 9th Avenue to 13th Avenue to Quince. Mr. Strong referenced the neighborhood group meetings that had been held and noted that the only change for the Quince District was more flexibility for accessory dwelling units and home occupational permits.

ACTION:

Moved by Chairman Weber, seconded by Commissioner Cohen, to approve staff's recommendation. Motion carried unanimously. (6-0)

3. ZONING CODE AMENDMENT – AZ 17-0005:

REQUEST: A proposed amendment to Article 57 of the Escondido Zoning Code to reasonably regulate, certain medical and non-medical ("recreational") marijuana-based land uses and activities to the extent permitted by State law. The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

PROPERTY SIZE AND LOCATION: Citywide

Mike Strong, Assistant Planning Director, referenced the staff report and noted staff recommended approval of the proposed Zoning Code Amendment because the proposed Zoning Code Amendment brings the City's marijuana based land use controls into compliance with State Proposition 64, while continuing to exercise the



strictest levels of local control over marijuana cultivation, processing and sales, as appropriate under Federal law.

ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Spann, seconded by Commissioner McNair, to approve staff's recommendation. Motion carried unanimously. (6-0)

CURRENT BUSINESS ITEMS: None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:

Chairman Weber noted that commissioner term applications were due.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Weber adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for February 13, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 201 North Broadway, Escondido, California.



Mike Strong, Secretary to the Planning
Commission



Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk