

CITY OF ESCONDIDO**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ESCONDIDO PLANNING COMMISSION****August 9, 2016**

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; Bob McQuead, Vice-chairman; Michael Cohen, Commissioner; Don Romo, Commissioner; James Spann; Commissioner and Stan Weiler, Commissioner.

Commissioners absent: Gregory Johns, Commissioner.

Staff present: Bill Martin, Director of Community Development; Ann Dolmage, Associate Planner; Owen Tunnell, Principal Engineer; Adam Phillips, Deputy City Attorney; and Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk.

MINUTES:

Moved by Commissioner Spann, seconded by Commissioner Weiler, to approve the minutes of the July 12, 2016, meeting. Motion carried. Ayes: Weber, Spann, McQuead, Cohen, and Weiler. Noes: None. Abstained: Romo. (5-0-1)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – Received.

FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS – None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **MASTER AND PRECISE DEVELOPMENT PLAN; GENERAL PLAN
AMENDMENT AND ZONE CHANGE – PHG 16-0006; ENV 16-0002:**

REQUEST: A Master and Precise Development Plan for the construction of a four-story, 102,774 SF commercial building to include a self-storage facility (99,686 SF of storage units plus 1,565 SF of associated office and conference space) along with leasable retail/restaurant space (2,750 SF). The development includes 33 parking spaces, six loading spaces, landscaping and bioretention areas. Access

to the property would be provided from two driveways on West Mission Avenue. The project includes an Amendment to the General Plan to change the General Commercial (GC) land-use designation of the property to Planned Commercial (PC), along with a change to the maximum height of a building in the PC designation from three stories to four stories. A Zone Change also is requested to change the underlying zoning designation from General Commercial (CG) to Planned Development-Commercial (PD-C) to correspond with the proposed Planned Commercial General Plan land-use designation. The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

PROPERTY SIZE AND LOCATION: The 1.57-acre project site is located on the northern side of Mission Avenue, between North Escondido Boulevard and North Broadway, addressed as 222 West Mission Avenue (APN 229-120-76).

Bill Martin, Director of Community Development, referenced the staff report and noted staff issues were the appropriateness of the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone for the site, the appropriateness of the proposed uses (self-storage and retail/restaurant) for the site and compatibility with the neighborhood, and whether adequate parking had been provided for the proposed uses. Staff recommended approval based on the following: 1) The maximum FAR for a parcel in the General Commercial land use designation is 0.5, and buildings are intended to be no taller than three stories. The Tri-Ad building to the direct north was closest in scale to the proposed building, and conforms to General Commercial development standards, with a height of three stories and an FAR of 0.47. The proposed building would be larger than surrounding development in terms of both bulk and height, since it would have an FAR of 1.5, four stories, and a maximum height of 52'5". To address this issue, the proposal includes a request for a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the site from General Commercial to Planned Commercial (which allows an FAR up to 1.5), as well as a Rezone from General Commercial to Planned Development-Commercial. Because the Planned Commercial designation also limits building height to three stories, the General Plan Amendment includes a request to amend this limit to four stories, which would bring the proposed building into conformance with all of the Planned Commercial standards. Staff believed the proposed GPA and Rezone were appropriate to facilitate redevelopment of a long-vacant site with uses needed by the expanding residential population in the City's core; 2) Surrounding properties had the same General Plan designation and Zoning Code classification as the project site (General Commercial). The General Commercial land use designation and zoning classification were intended for a wide variety of retail and service activities to support the needs of the community. Restaurants and retail establishments were permitted uses within the General Commercial zone, requiring only an administrative Plot Plan when newly established or when an existing business is expanded. A mini-warehouse storage facility would also be

allowed with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Introduction of a self-storage facility and retail/restaurant uses to the neighborhood would not alter its already commercial nature, since nearby properties were already occupied by a wide range of businesses, including several restaurants, medical/dental offices, professional services such as tax preparation and insurance sales, a gas station and auto service center, and a tool rental center. The proposed building height was comparable to that of the three-story, 42'-tall Tri-Ad building to the north. Proposed setbacks for the project are 30' (each side), 39'4" (front), and 42'6" (rear), and are greater than those required on surrounding General Commercial properties (zero setbacks are allowed in the General Commercial zone, and the properties to the east and west of the project site both have buildings located on their side property lines); and 3) The project proposes 20 parking spaces in a lot at the front of the building, and an additional 13 spaces in a rear parking lot, for a total of 33 parking spaces. An additional six loading/unloading spaces (for moving trucks) would also be provided. Assuming the 2,750-SF leasable space at the front of the building was used only for retail purposes, this parking supply would be enough to conform to the off-street parking standards in the Zoning Code. However, the applicant has requested flexibility to locate restaurant uses within the leasable space. Since restaurant uses required more parking per square foot than retail, the applicant had provided a parking analysis that concludes that a supply of 32 parking spaces and six loading/unloading spaces should be adequate for the project, assuming no more than 50% of the leasable area was dedicated to restaurant use. The project had been conditioned to require the applicant to limit restaurant use to 50% of the leasable area, unless further analysis can be provided that demonstrates that adequate parking can be provided for additional restaurant space.

Commissioner Weiler questioned whether the parking standards for the project were excessive given its use. He and staff then discussed the proposed parking requirements as well as revisiting the current parking standards.

Commissioner Weiler asked if staff would object to reducing the parking standard for project. Mr. Martin noted that the proposed parking would be similar to another one of the applicant's projects in San Marcos.

Commissioner Weiler and staff discussed how the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) came about in the General Plan.

Vice-chairman McQuead questioned whether the project could be considered spot zoning. Mr. Martin noted that staff felt the project was appropriate for the subject location.

Vice-chairman McQuead asked if properties in the immediate area would be able to go through the same process as the subject project. Ms. Dolmage replied in the affirmative.

Chairman Weber asked if the subject facility would have elevators. Ms. Dolmage replied in the affirmative.

Chairman Weber and staff discussed the proposed employee parking.

Chairman Weber questioned why the facility needed a sign on the north side when it would be blocked by the building to the north. Staff deferred this question to the applicant.

Vice-chairman McQuead and Ms. Dolmage discussed the revision to Condition No. 19 on Page 35 of the staff report.

Commissioner Romo and staff discussed the proposed height of the facility.

Chairman Weber and staff discussed the proposed lien on the property.

Chairman Weber asked if the reason for requesting the 12-month extension on the permit was financially driven. Ms. Dolmage stated that her understanding was that this was to allow more time to apply for the building permits.

Nancy Bane, representing the William Warren Group, Inc., provided the background history for their company and noted that they owned and operated over 121 self-storage facilities with over 300 employees. She stated that they had worked closely with staff to bring a project that incorporated high-quality design and landscaping. She emphasized that the subject property had been vacant for a long period of time. She noted that their project was the next generation for self-storage facilities that incorporated a retail element. She elaborated that the retail component was requested by staff and City Council, which would be a supplement to the consumer. She concurred with the comments regarding the City revisiting its Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards in the General Plan. In conclusion, Ms. Bane indicated that they were well financed by a large equity partner. She then asked for Commission support.

Commissioner Weiler asked if the retail aspect had any perspective tenants. Ms. Bane noted that they had not marketed this yet, but felt it would lend itself to businesses like a sandwich shop.

Commissioner Spann asked if the employees of the self-storage facility would be employed by the William Warren Group. Ms. Bane replied in the affirmative, noting

that it would only be one to two employees. She also stated that they would be the property manager for the retail component.

Mark Hayden, Capstone Advisors, representing the owners of 250 Mission Avenue, stated that they were concerned with the magnitude of the project and the benefits being afforded to the project. They felt the four-story project would be imposing for the area and create island zoning. He was concerned with the FAR being 1.5 unless others in the area were able take advantage of this ratio. He expressed concern with the proposed buffering from adjacent properties and having limited landscaping on the interior property lines. He questioned what the building frontage setback was, noting that time constraints did not allow for them to obtain said information. He questioned whether the proposed use would promote business and commercial uses along its corridor. He felt that the viability of the commercial center at 250 Mission Avenue might be impacted by allowing a 1.5 FAR along with allowing retail uses for the subject facility. Mr. Hayden stated that they felt the proposed architecture lent itself to industrial versus commercial. He also stated that they could have supported a project that was three stories with its ancillary uses being tied to the storage facility.

Heather Riley, Attorney with Allen Matkins, representing the applicant, provided illustrations for StorQuest interiors and amenities. She noted that the security systems were extensive, very safe and provided a secure facility without the need for a night watchman. She stated that the actual lot coverage was only 30%, noting this was the reason for requesting the proposed height. She indicated that the project had extensive setbacks, noting that the front had over a 39-foot setback, plus a 9-foot dedication for Mission Avenue not including the sidewalk. She also noted that the rear setback was 42 feet with the side setback being at 30 feet. In conclusion, she asked for approval, noting that the project provided extensive setbacks, landscaping and screening

Willie Nelson, Escondido, supported the project feeling it would be beneficial to the community.

Commissioner Spann felt the project was the next generation for self-storage and would raise the bar for future facilities. He stated he was in favor of the design.

Commissioner Weiler felt the project was large and out of character for the area. He stated that he could support the project as long as the same opportunities were afforded to other properties in the area. He also felt the current FAR was restrictive and should be revisited.

Chairman Weber felt the size and scale of the building and signage was excessive for the site. He did not feel the proposed zone change was appropriate for the

subject commercial use since it would provide little sales taxes and have low employment opportunities.

ACTION:

Moved by Commissioner Weiler, seconded by Commissioner Spann, to approve staff's recommendation. Motion carried. Ayes: Spann, McQuead, Cohen, and Weiler. Noes: Weber, and Romo. (4-2)

**2. MASTER AND PRECISE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ZONE CHANGE
– PHG 15-0042:**

REQUEST: A Master and Precise Development Plan for the development of 91,000 square feet of light industrial uses in two new buildings on approximately 5.25 acres (4.87 acres on-site and 0.38 acre off-site). Building 1 would be a one-story building with a 51,400-square-foot ground floor and a 4,100-square-foot mezzanine for a total of 55,500 square feet. Building 2 would be a one-story building with a 32,900-square-foot ground floor and a 2,600-square-foot mezzanine for a total of 35,500 square feet. The project includes 184 surface parking spaces, landscaping, infrastructure and storm water-drainage improvements. A rezone will be required to change the zoning from existing single-family residential (R-1-6) to Planned Development-Industrial (PD-I) to be consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial (LI). A 20-foot-wide Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District easement (approximately 0.38-acre off-site area) along the western boundary is part of an adjacent industrial development and is proposed to be incorporated into the project site. A boundary adjustment would be required to modify the project boundaries. Off-site grading and street improvements also are proposed. The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

LOCATION: The project site is located along the southern side of Harmony Grove Road, south of Enterprise Street, east of Pacific Oaks Place, addressed as 2005 Harmony Grove Road (APN 235-050-15-00).

Bill Martin, Director of Community Development, referenced the staff report and noted staff issues were the appropriateness of the proposed Planned Development-Industrial zoning designation, and whether the proposed Planned Industrial project is compatible with adjacent industrial and residential development. Staff recommended approval based on the following: 1) The General Plan land-use designation for the project site was Light Industrial (LI), and the proposed industrial project and corresponding Planned Development Industrial zoning (PD-I) would be consistent with this land-use designation. The industrial development provisions

(Zoning Code Article 26) encouraged the planned development process for industrial park type development. The project would be subject to the Industrial Park (IP) land-use provisions and list of allowed uses as part of the Master Plan details and project conditions. Staff believed the Industrial Park zoning provisions and corresponding Planned Development-Industrial zoning was appropriate for the subject site due to the adjacent Specific Plan and Industrial Park zoning on the west and northwest. This Planned Development designation also would ensure compatibility with the quality of the surrounding industrial development and limited the site to lower intensity industrial and office type uses to avoid potential conflicts with nearby residential development; and 2) The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan industrial land use goal of providing "a variety of industrial uses located and designed to assure compatibility with adjoining land uses offering diverse jobs for the community." Staff believes the overall site design, building setbacks, landscaping and building architecture create a well-integrated and high quality planned industrial development that would be compatible with other industrial park development throughout the area.

Discussion ensued regarding a clarification of the allowable signage for the subject area.

Chairman Weber and staff discussed the undergrounding of utilities and in lieu fees for the subject project.

Commissioner Weiler and staff discussed height limits for the Sign Program.

Commissioner Weiler asked if the project had a limitation on the amount of office space allowed, noting his concern for on-street parking impacts. Mr. Martin noted that the project had more parking than required, noting staff felt it could accommodate future parking needs.

Scott Merry, Badiee Development, thanked staff for their help with the project with special emphasis being given to Jay Paul. He stated that they had incorporated many of staff's suggestions into the project. He noted that the power pole as referenced by Chairman Weber would be taken down. He also elaborated that the parking was really driven by the use and the marketplace. He then asked for Commission approval.

Commissioner Weiler was in favor of the project.

Chairman Weber felt the project was appropriate for the site.

ACTION:

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

3. **ZONING CODE AMENDMENT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – AZ 16-0003:**

REQUEST: An amendment to Article 26 of the Escondido Zoning Code to allow postsecondary vocational training schools as a Conditional Use within the industrial zones and a Conditional Use Permit to allow a postsecondary vocational training school in an existing 24,200 square foot industrial building located in the Industrial Park Zone (I-P). The proposal also includes the adoption of the environmental determination prepared for the project.

PROPERTY SIZE AND LOCATION: Citywide for the proposed Zoning Code Amendment; The proposed vocational training school would be located on an approximately 1.41-acre property generally located on the northern side of Aldergrove Avenue, west of Andreasen Drive, addressed as 2066 Aldergrove Avenue (APN 232-051-48).

Bill Martin, Director of Community Development, referenced the staff report and noted staff issues were the appropriateness of the proposed code amendment to allow postsecondary vocational training schools within the industrial zones (I-O, I-P, M1, and M2), and whether the subject industrial site was appropriate for the proposed vocational training school and whether the operation would impact adjacent uses. Staff recommended approval based on the following: 1) Staff felt industrial zones are appropriate for postsecondary vocational training schools, provided they are limited to training for uses allowed in the particular zone. Allowing the schools would expand economic opportunities for the workforce by making training and educational facilities more readily available to residents of Escondido and surrounding areas; and 2) Staff felt the subject site was appropriate for a postsecondary vocational training school because the operational characteristics of the proposed school would create negligible impacts on adjacent properties. Training would be in computer-related fields (allowed in the I-P zone as a business office), adequate parking would be provided based on the proposed student population, and all uses would be conducted inside the building.

Chairman Weber asked if the applicant owned or leased the property.

Kimberly Boone, Architect, representing the applicant, noted that they were the tenants. She also stated that they would be taking the entire building.

Commissioner Romo asked if a post-secondary use would require a CUP. Mr. Martin replied in the affirmative.

ACTION:

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

CURRENT BUSINESS: None.


ORAL COMMUNATIONS: None.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:

Chairman Weber suggested the Commission look at a housing report done by the London Group for the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Weber adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for August 23, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 201 North Broadway, Escondido, California.



Bill Martin, Secretary to the Escondido
Planning Commission



Ty Paulson, Minutes Clerk