

**County of San Diego
Valle De Oro Community Planning Group
P.O. Box 936
La Mesa, CA 91944-0936**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: April 17, 2012

LOCATION: Otay Water District Headquarters
Training Room, Lower Terrace
2554 Sweetwater Springs Blvd.
Spring Valley, California 91978-2004

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 PM Jack L. Phillips, Presiding Chair

Members present: Brownlee, Feathers, Fitchett, Manning, Mitrovich, Myers, Nichols, Phillips, Schuppert, Tierney

Absent: Forthun, Henderson, Hyatt, Reith, Wollitz

2. FINALIZE AGENDA: As shown

3. OPEN FORUM: None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 6, 2012 **VOTE: 9-0-1 to approve.**

Abstained: Feathers

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. POD11-005: Proposed amendments to the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance regarding community design review and parking regulations, revisions to the County's Off-Street Parking Design Manual, and creation of Design Compliance Checklists to implement the new procedure.

PHILLIPS presented. The Design Review Checklist and design review information included in the above POD11-005 do not apply to our Community Planning Group (CPG) because since 1985 this CPG was designated for this function. Our CPG review parameters are defined in our Community Plan.

Our CPG Sub-committee for this issue consisted of Schuppert, Myers, Phillips and Nichols who reviewed the parking changes and submitted the report below.

Subcommittee Report Re: POD11-005

PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Section 6760, Transient Habitation:

Lodging (Hotels, Motels, etc): Add additional spaces for the office and employee parking.

Section 6762, Commercial:

Eating and Drinking (excluding stand-alone fast food): Up to 3,000 sq. ft, 6 spaces per KSF is inadequate; should be 10 spaces per KSF.

Drugstore, Furniture & Appliance Store, Home Improvement Store, Building Supply: All should be considered Retail Sales & Services and require 4.5 per KSF (conversion problem).

Participant Sports & Recreation: Make separate requirement for “Health Club” at 10 per KSF.

Spectator Sports & Entertainment: Should be .4 spaces per seat (2½ people per car) and .05 bike spaces per car.

Veterinarian Clinic: Should be no less than 4.5 per KSF (conversion problem if in commercial zone.)

Commercial Equine Stable: Needs special parking for vehicles with trailers.

Section 6764, Civic:

Conference Center/Auditorium: Should be .5 per seat (2 per car) and .05 bike spaces per car space.

Private Club: Should be .5 per seat.

Section 6772, Industrial & Storage:

General Manufacturing and Light Manufacturing: Should be increased to 2 per KSF.

Section 6784, Reduction of Parking Spaces:

■ Once granted for shared parking, more spaces cannot be added later if conditions of a private agreement change.

A Minor Use Permit should be required so that the conditions allowing shared parking run with the property and not be based on private agreements between property owners. (See also comments on Section 6788, Collective Parking.)

■ Shared parking should be based only on directly adjacent properties (no intervening roads.)

■ The allowed walking distances to shared parking facilities are unreasonably high: the equivalent of 2 football fields for customers/visitors and 3 football fields for employees. Once again, shared parking reductions of parking requirements should only be allowed for directly adjacent uses/properties.

Section 6788, Collective Parking & Access:

■ As with shared parking allowances for reduced parking requirements, collective parking allowances must be based on controls and conditions that run with the property as currently established through a Major Use Permit. Controls established in the recommended property-owner agreement process will not be enforced by County Government and, therefore, all environmental considerations involved in allowing reduced parking are unenforceable and placed in high risk through property turnovers or civil actions between property owners.

■ **The minimum acceptable control over collective parking should be a Minor Use Permit.**

Section 6792, Design Standards:

c.6. Tandem Parking: This Planning Group is opposed to the use of tandem parking design to provide any required parking spaces.

Section 6795, Variances from Parking Regulations:

■ This Planning Group is opposed to the proposed change to this section which will allow administrative waiver or modification of design standards. To help preclude cumulative degradation of parking design requirements, a formal Variance Procedure must be maintained.

PHILLIPS **moves** to adopt comments as group position. (Mitrovich seconds). Discussion ensued. Myers thinks leaving motorcycles out of equation is a mistake. **VOTE 10-0-0 to approve.**

- b. San Diego County Board of Supervisors' meetings regarding the Red Tape Reduction Task Force Report.

Brownlee reported that 48 people spoke out against eliminating PG. Most speakers stated that the Planning Groups serve a benefit to the County that the County can't provide. The BOS voted 5-0 motion to preserve the CPGs with the stipulation that the Chair position of the CPG cannot serve more than 2 years. It will hurt our ability to have an effective leadership position. Who else has the time to attend all the meetings and take this leadership role? It will not be effective to do this. 55% of the PGs have chairs that have served more than 4 years.

6. LAND USE - None

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

8. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT – Damon Lane resurfacing has been removed from the County's list.

Senate Bill 244 was approved. From the LAFCO letter, all disadvantaged, unincorporated communities in our plan are not close to any city's sphere of influence.

There will be a LAFCO hearing on May 7th about the Rocky Hill Pointe project.

There will be an upcoming BOS meeting concerning approx. 8 cell sites in our planning area since the applicant appealed the PC decision to deny.

9. ADJOURNMENT at 8:05 PM

Submitted by: Jösan Feathers