

CITY OF EL CAJON
EL CAJON, CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY 1, 1971

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of El Cajon, California, held Monday, February 1, 1971, was called to order by Mayor James Snapp at 7:30 o'clock p.m. in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 150 East Lexington Avenue, El Cajon, California.

R O L L C A L L

Councilmen present	Cornett, Van Zanten, Quidort, Snapp
Councilmen absent	Brown
Other Officers present	Hensley, City Clerk; McDougal, City Attorney; Applegate, City Manager; Pizzato, City Engineer and Director of Public Works; Henson, Director of Planning.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG.

The invocation is offered by the Reverend Robert Coburn, First Baptist Church.

MINUTES Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van
Zanten to approve the minutes of the
January 25, 1971, meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

POSTING The order of adjournment of the
January 25, 1971, meeting was duly
posted as required by law.

ITEMS ADDED Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van
 Zanten to add the following items as
requested by Manager Applegate:

- 10A - Letter Anita Hensling of The Crown Room, requesting waiver of Special Officer requirements for Class B Dance and Cabaret License.
- 10B - Letter Martin H. Sweany regarding sewer hookup in the Ardell Acres area.
- 10C - Letter County of San Diego regarding public hearing to be held February 5, 1971, on proposed zoning in the Los Cochis-Blossom Valley area.
- 16A - Discussion on Pepper Villa 1911 Project.
- 19A - Resolution releasing lien contract - Jackman.
- 21A - Urgency Ordinance concerning Electrical Code.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

1. CONT'D HEARING Time has come for continued public
S.P.152-FREDRICKS hearing from the meeting of January 25,
DEVELOP. CORP. 1971, on Specific Plan No. 152 sub-
 mitted by Fredricks Development
Corporation for an apartment complex on the south side of Fletcher
Parkway on both sides of Petree Street, west of Marshall Avenue.

Planning Commission Resolution No. 2937 recommends approval subject to certain conditions.

By letter dated January 28, 1971, Chamber of Commerce advises their Economic Development Committee has expressed strong concern to the board relative to the proposed reduction in industrial usage property as contemplated by the high density apartment complex corner of Marshall and Fletcher Parkway west along Fletcher Parkway (Item 1 of agenda) and commercial development corner of Johnson and Fletcher Parkway to 300 feet east of Marshall Avenue, (Item 3 of agenda). Urge that Council's determination be made in accordance with the General Plan as now established.

Mr. Donald A. Severa, architect for Fredricks Development Corporation, states they requested continuance at the last public hearing to work out with the Staff a problem on the basic conflict in the design of the traffic solution. Last week arrived at a mutual conclusion and solution. Had previously requested signalization of the intersection of Cuyamaca and Fletcher Parkway; through their traffic analysis have abandoned that concept through various street sections and control of traffic for arrival at a mutual agreement. Will ask that their traffic consultant give details of this solution.

Mr. Martin Bauman, with the firm of Alan Voorhees, Transportation and Planning Consultants, 5252 Balboa, San Diego, states they have met on two occasions with members of the Staff and have arrived at a solution mutually satisfactory. In order to arrive at the true traffic impact on the streets surrounding this project, they analyzed not only the traffic generation occasioned by this development, but additionally several parcels of now vacant property to the west and south which would also have potential impact on streets in the vicinity; determined to the best of their ability the type of development on those parcels. They combined the projected traffic generation resulting from that type of housing density and the projected density resulting from the project at hand; in addition made a series of traffic counts during peak hours (morning and afternoons) at Fletcher Parkway and Marshall, where they feel the critical conditions would obtain. Superimposed what they have calculated to be the generation from all these land uses on the traffic existing on those streets today.

Points out on the map on the board the three possible alternatives which were presented to the Staff. First was the proposal originally submitted which would involve the opening of Cuyamaca across Fletcher Parkway, right turns in and out only at Petree and Fletcher Parkway, and whatever modification might be necessary to the intersection at Marshall and Fletcher Parkway. The second alternative involved retaining Cuyamaca much as is, open through the property, continuing to the south, but not across Fletcher Parkway. Again right and left turns only at Petree and modification of the intersection at Marshall. The third alternative was closing Cuyamaca entirely and eliminating it from the project, with the other two conditions the same. The worst condition they found was under alternate three, where there was a severe loading of Marshall between Fletcher Parkway and Petree. Alternate two is more satisfactory to the developers; it still pinpointed a very strong problem in this area, leading them to recommend a section on Marshall which

will accommodate four through traffic lanes, that is two in each direction, plus two additional left turn lanes from north on Marshall to west on Fletcher Parkway. The traffic volumes they found on some of the other streets in the development indicated they could be handled on high standard collector streets of two lanes. In that regard recommended this short piece of Petree be 40 foot curb to curb width on 60 foot right of way; the same for this short piece of Cuyamaca, with additional flaring at the intersection with Fletcher Parkway to increase visibility in both directions. The curb to curb width on Marshall would be 30 feet, all of which would have to come off the developer's property, because the railroad is on the other side. On Petree where a two lane section was dictated, but where there is the need for some widening and perhaps some provision for more turns, instead of 40-60, agreed the roadway should be 50 feet wide on 70 foot right of way. That will allow at some future date, should it be necessary, the ability to move four lanes with a parking prohibition.

Points out on the map the three areas which when developed will generate future traffic impact, and the subject property. Also worked with the Staff on the possible alignment of a new street that could serve these areas and provide a principle means of access to them, and also serve as a means of getting the traffic out to the south and to the north of Fletcher Parkway and east utilizing Wagner Drive.

Mr. Bauman agrees the reference to right and left turns on Petree means to close the median crossing on Fletcher Parkway; would be right turns in and right turns out, which is a change from the present condition. Cuyamaca would remain as it is now with the median closed, right turn in and right turn out, with some opening up of the visibility to create safer conditions at the intersection.

Points out the deceleration lane at Cuyamaca and the acceleration lane away from Cuyamaca; there is room on the public right of way for that kind of development. In regard to why they would want to leave Cuyamaca open, states from a traffic standpoint it definitely would provide an additional safety value. Will be very close to an overload situation on Marshall; recognizing the traffic from the three developments previously pointed out, plus what is there now and additional traffic growth in the total area which must be accommodated, they must take advantage of any traffic relief that can be given. Petree is proposed to be moved to the southerly limit of the property.

Mr. Severa states their reasons for wanting Cuyamaca to divide their property are basically what Mr. Bauman spoke of: does not have the figures on the traffic analysis of the number of vehicles per day that would go through this development, but it did indicate there is a general softening of the traffic demands at every intersection. Allows the tenants a little more freedom of ingress and egress to the project. Would be of no benefit to develop this as open space and they would not attempt to gain additional units. Have more than adequate open space on the project. There are some high tension lines to deal with at Cuyamaca: in general it is their feeling it probably would be an advantage to the project and to the people living to the south of the project to have Cuyamaca open.

Question is raised what effect the four lanes would have on the 50 foot setback on the east end of the project. Mr. Severa distributes to Council basically the same site plan which they

presented with their application, on which revisions in dimensions have been made for the right of way of each of the streets. Details on alignment, radii, etc. will be handled on their tentative map. Indicated an 80 foot curb to curb right of way on Marshall plus an additional 10 foot parkway, reduced the setback on Marshall to 25 feet to the property line or 35 feet to the curb face. Their original submittal indicated a 45 foot; were requested by one of the Planning Commission to provide additional setback in that area, the concern being the relationship of the parcel to the south which has a manufacturing zoned building on it. The relative distance of the building location would remain the same, in fact, it would pull back more than it was before. If Council so deems, have various spaces within the project in building separations, extra wide drive aisles, and some of the recreation areas where they could provide additional setbacks on to Marshall. The 25 feet exceeds the zoning requirements by 10 feet; that is a reduction in setback from the original plan.

Question is raised as to what sort of contribution the City will get in terms of street improvements, left turn signal phasing, etc. Mr. Severa states they had assumed they would provide and install all the widening on Marshall and Fletcher Parkway, the improvements on Petree and Cuyamaca and any signalization changes involved at Marshall and Fletcher Parkway.

Mr. Severa states the embankments at Cuyamaca will be reduced to on grade level; building pads on either side of Cuyamaca will be within a few feet of the street grade. Explains the distance it will be cut back easterly and westerly from Cuyamaca.

Question is raised as to the discussion between the developers and the Staff about the effect of this development on traffic using Cuyamaca through the existing Sunnyslopes area, where there is a narrow street right of way with cars parked on the street. Mr. Bauman states in their projections estimated a certain amount of traffic (30% of the potential total generated in that area) had the directional desire to travel to the south. There are two routes presently by which they could do that, either Marshall or Cuyamaca. Cuyamaca is attractive because it goes down to the freeway. This is one of the reasons why they were enthusiastic about the possibility of future street X, which because of the fact that it can be developed to good wide collector street standards (40 foot street on 60 foot right of way) would prove to be far more attractive to through traffic than to battle it out through residential areas. Cannot estimate when this street might be built: would have to be a part of the adjacent land development. At such time as it were constructed would be an attractive route and funnel away some of the traffic they deem not desirable.

As to alternative routes which are available to the City if it does become a problem (the large volume of traffic moving down Cuyamaca and El Monte prior to this street being built) Mr. Bauman states it was suggested where the street could be blocked off, which would force traffic to select another means; that could be done but there is a corresponding detrimental effect for the people living in the area, who now have a travel pattern to travel to the north on Cuyamaca. Another possibility is a widening of the street, but not in its present location; can understand what a costly and disrupting thing it would be to come through and effect widening. There is the possibility of swinging the street to the west and trying to get an alignment for

the most part behind the existing houses.

Mr. Severa will go on record as developing the entire street pattern with the first phase of development; their intention is to develop the project in two phases. Points out the first phase which will take approximately six months for construction. It is the developer's intent that within 30 to 90 days following the first phase development, he would proceed with phase two of the development. With the initial phase would be installing the entire street pattern.

Mr. Severa states they have submitted their revised site plan; one of the recommendations of the Planning Commission was abandonment of Cuyamaca through their development, and in order to proceed with the project would like to avoid the referral back to the Planning Commission. However, if that is required would go along with that.

Opinion is expressed this should be referred back to the Planning Commission to put down in writing the phase development proposed, who will pay for the solving of the traffic problems on Marshall and Fletcher Parkway and the other items.

Motion by Van Zanten, seconded by Quidort that the public hearing be closed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

Attorney McDougal does not believe the changing of the setback from 45 feet to 25 feet, a street from 66 to 70 foot right of way, 34 foot street to a 64 foot street and taking away condition about the vacation, could be considered minor changes, and thinks it would have to go back to the Planning Commission.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to refer Specific Plan No. 152 back to the Planning Commission with the Council's recommendations for consideration of changes in Item 1 which would eliminate Cuyamaca Street, change in Item 6 regarding setback line along Marshall, and the change to set down the agreement between the Staff and the developer as to phase development and street development on Marshall to handle the traffic generated by the project.

Discussion.

On clarification, there were several things stated about how wide Petree would be, etc. and it is hoped that some of these things can be put down in the specific plan. Have been agreed to apparently between the developer and the Staff and should be in writing.

Votes are now cast on motion by Cornett seconded by Quidort to refer Specific Plan No. 152 back to the Planning Commission with the Council's recommendations for consideration of changes in Item 1 which would eliminate Cuyamaca Street, change in Item 6 regarding setback line along Marshall, and the change to set down the agreement between the Staff and the developer as to phase development and street development on Marshall to handle the traffic generated by the project.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

2. HEARING-AMEND Time has come for public hearing on
S.P.140-HAMANN proposed amendment of Specific Plan
 No. 140 submitted by R. D. Hamann for
an apartment development on the north side of Needham Road
between Garfield Avenue and Brockton Street.

Planning Commission Resolution No. 2950 recommends approval
subject to certain conditions.

Division of Highways by letter dated January 21, 1971, advises
at the present time they have no route studies which would affect
this property.

Mr. R. D. Hamann, 2700 Navajo Road, states the only change under
this request is to move the center building from the front of
the property to the rear. He feels it is better utilization of
the land and the Planning Commission concurred.

Clarification is requested on the center group of apartments,
14 B units. Mr. Hamann states these are two story apartments;
is not an upstairs-downstairs split. There is a complete
apartment on the first floor and a complete apartment on the
second floor. The east and west buildings are upstairs-downstairs
buildings, with bedrooms and bathrooms upstairs, like a two-story
house. The only real difference between this layout and the
original one filed is the fact that the center building is to
the rear rather than to the street.

It is understood the original east-west buildings were one story.
Mr. Hamann states they were split, part were one story and part
were two story. Since these are two story it is questioned how
the relationship of the second story would be to the properties
to the east and west. Mr. Hamann states the finished grade
elevation will be approximately the same as the finished grade
elevation of the adjacent lots, so it would be the same as
having a two story house next door on a conventional City R-1-6
lot. To the north is some 40 feet of vertical separation to the
nearest floor elevation and some 75 feet of horizontal separ-
ation.

Councilman Van Zanten voices discouragement because there is
80 or 90 feet of building (is thinking of people on the west);
would have no air circulation behind their building. Would be
better if there were open spaces. Mr. Hamann states both parties
on the east and west have voiced the opinion to him they are
happy to see this development; the gentleman on the west is
tired of having the vacant field and is happy with the 10 foot
setback in lieu of the 6 foot setback on the original plan. He
is also happy there are only bedrooms upstairs. The gentleman
on the east appeared at the Planning Commission hearing and
expressed approval.

No further comments were offered.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett that the public hearing be
closed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van Zanten to refer the amendment of Specific Plan No. 140 to the City Attorney for preparation of an ordinance according to Planning Commission Resolution No. 2950.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

3. HEARING-Z.R.928 Time has come for public hearing on
PARKWAY PROPERTIES Zone Reclassification No. 928 submitted by Parkway Properties to reclassify property on the south side of Fletcher Parkway, between Johnson and Marshall Avenues, from the M and R-1-6 Zones to the C-2 Zone.

Planning Commission Resolution No. 2949 recommends approval of the C-M Zone for the westerly 300 feet, with the balance to Johnson Avenue to be zoned C-2, subject to the adoption of a specific plan of development for the entire property within one year of City Council action on the rezoning.

Chamber of Commerce has submitted a letter dated January 28, 1971, advising their Economic Development Committee has expressed strong concern to the Board relative to the proposed reduction in industrial usage property as contemplated by the commercial development corner of Johnson and Fletcher Parkway. Urge that Council's determination be made in accordance with the General Plan as now established.

Mr. Dwight Tolman, 8639 Navajo Road, hands out a map to Council with which he hopes to clarify the situation. The subject property is on Fletcher Parkway, between Marshall and Johnson, immediately east of the property on Item 1; to the east is Sears. With this project as planned, the southerly side of Fletcher Parkway would be fully developed in the immediate area. They requested C-M Zoning from the Planning Commission on the area adjacent to Marshall because they required that type of zoning to utilize the railroad and were asking for C-2 on the rest of the property in order to make a full complex subject to specific plan, so the whole thing could be looked at with one view. Asked for 240 foot depth because the San Diego aqueduct which is 60 feet wide is "murder" for developing the westerly portion of the property, and that was all they could utilize in their plans. The Planning Commission recommended 300 feet for the C-M and he does not believe 60 feet will make a big difference. The Planning Commission seemed to feel that the 300 foot depth was a fair sized depth for a C-M Zone. Does not take great issue with the difference but set it out in the map to show why they requested 240 feet. Realizes there are many problems that will have to be resolved on the specific plan and is ready to work with the staff.

Mr. Paul Kress, 1201 Broadway, states he is in complete agreement and sympathy with Mr. Tolman's plan. It is apparent he needed the commercial zone to make the proposed development successful. If this request is not granted, he may have to find another location for his clients and that probably will be someplace other than El Cajon because the General Plan makes no provision for additional regional shopping areas for the next 20 years. With the loss of this development the City stands to lose thousands of dollars in retail sales taxes as well as property taxes. Cannot understand why the Chamber of Commerce

came out against this request as he thought they were supposed to encourage new businesses in the area, not discourage them. States that last week the Council agreed to put a moratorium on building any additional service stations, which would be a blow to free enterprise. It would seem unlikely that the Council could condone the following statement in the staff report concerning this zone reclassification "Within the context of the General Plan document, the Planning Staff considers it in the City's interest to reinforce commercial areas by making adequate provisions for the growth of the existing centers and not allowing additional centers to spring up and decentralize and weaken these existing commercial magnets." This statement would appear to be obvious coddling of Sears-K-Mart development and a deterrent to any new center that may look with favor on El Cajon. Sears has been meeting competition for over seventy years and needs no protection from El Cajon. If other commercial groups can locate in this valley and be successful they should be encouraged to do so.

Mr. Kress continues that only the existing commercially zoned property has been covered on the General Plan, with the exception of a portion on Second and Broadway, which Council grudgingly gave in addition to the original plan. The only other commercial zoning allowed in this plan is the Parkway Plaza property, which will be controlled by larger capital groups. In the last six years Second Street has filled up commercially and Broadway has grown from about 15 commercial endeavors to over 70. The General Plan is saying there shall be no such growth in the next six years as he has observed in the last six years; in fact it is saying there shall be no such growth in the next 20 years, and has allocated no additional area for the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker. This lack of consideration for the small businessman does not seem to be upholding the free enterprise principle.

Mr. Kress is in favor of Mr. Tolman's requested zone reclassification, however, only a few weeks ago Council turned down Mr. Kress' request for a similar zone reclassification on the grounds it was contrary to the General Plan. There was another reason that it was too small for commercial use but this is not a valid reason in that the City has no ordinance regulating the size of commercial property. Therefore if his 95 by 95 foot commercial request was too much additional commercial zone for this valley, it follows the 300 by 620 foot additional commercial zone would be too much and contrary to the General Plan. With the denial of this request goes the loss of a fine means of tax revenue.

No further comments were offered.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van Zanten that the public hearing be closed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

Councilman Cornett is concerned that if the trackage that goes along Marshall is cut down to 300 feet, there will not be sufficient remaining industrially zoned property to support a good development there. They need all of the 600 feet. The map Mr. Tolman supplied shows in effect how if Jackman Street were cul-de-saced and an industrial type building placed where he shows

the widest building, the track probably could serve that building. The fact that San Diego aqueduct goes through the property means probably they cannot build a building over it, but parking can be utilized on top of the aqueduct, which is no particular problem. Feels with this proposal leaving 300 feet in the C-M Zone, with the expense of having a public crossing of the railroad track on Marshall being too prohibitive, the City will again be faced with another service station proposal with access off Fletcher Parkway. Then will have a narrow strip of 300 feet by whatever is left that won't be used for anything. Speaks against the proposal and suggests they send it back to the Planning Commission only because it renders an economically unusable other industrial lot.

It is pointed out that they do not have access rights to Fletcher Parkway, so it is not seen how they could get a service station there. It is felt this eventually would be requested, with the strip 300 feet deep and access blocked by the railroad track for its entire length. It is questioned whether access is actually blocked by the railroad. The Public Utilities Commission could give information as to what is necessary for a driveway crossing.

Mr. Pizzato believes a spur line could run across the aqueduct; thinks it could be adequately bridged. The problem would be to insure it can be excavated to get to the pipe. This is the City of San Diego El Monte Pipeline; Helix also has a line in there. Would have to verify this with the City of San Diego.

Councilman Quidort does not agree that a service station would be put at the corner of Marshall and Fletcher Parkway, with the railroad going along there and because they don't have access on to Fletcher Parkway.

Opinion is expressed there is no valid reason to allow any more extension of commercial zoning to the west of Jackman. The remaining industrial property will not be sufficient to attract large users that would like to have access to the railroad. Is the same as a subdivider who comes in and develops the easiest portion, leaving the rest for someone in the future to wrestle with. As time passes people forget, the City lessens its requirements and it is no longer used for the original purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. Henson states the approximate distance from Marshall to Jackman is 625 feet from property line to property line, and approximately 700 feet from centerline to centerline. It is questioned what the depth of some of the existing properties are that use the railroad track, to see whether 300 feet is adequate or inadequate.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Van Zanten to refer this matter back to the Planning Commission with Council's recommendation that the zoning be split at the extension of Jackman.

Discussion.

Councilman Van Zanten is not persuaded that 300 feet is enough nor that 600 feet is too much. The argument for 240 feet to move the line away from the aqueduct does not influence him, because the same amount of non parking on 240 feet would also be used for material storage if the land were deeper. Somewhere in there is enough land for good industrial usage. Second, this

rates one ingress and egress on Fletcher Parkway, and if Jackman went through this is their ingress and egress. Does not see more than one, no matter where they put it. If that is not the natural dividing line and should be shifted one way or another, will have a long expanse with no ingress or egress. Is not committed to opening any more.

Attorney McDougal is not sure that there are access rights in this property. Manager Applegate states the indication is there is a street opening, and the question is whether that is access to the property if the street is not built. Attorney McDougal is not indicating there is not access, but they have not researched it and does not have a definite answer tonight.

Opinion is expressed that this should certainly be clarified for the Planning Commission whether in fact there is this commitment for street opening; would have a bearing on the decision on the use of the land.

Manager Applegate states it should not be assumed because there is a street opening that there is ingress and egress to the property.

Mr. Henson advises the question was asked earlier about the depth of other properties with frontage along the railroad track; the Ceazan property scales out approximately 300 feet in depth and Montgomery-Ward approximately 600 feet in depth.

Votes are now cast on motion by Cornett seconded by Van Zanten to refer this matter back to the Planning Commission with Council's recommendation that the zoning be split at the extension of Jackman.

AYES	Cornett, Van Zanten, Snapp
NOES	Quidort
ABSENT	Brown

Motion carried.

4. LNG PRESENTATION The liquid natural gas presentation by San Diego Gas & Electric Company will commence about 9:30 in order to take care of some of the other items on the agenda.

Recess called at this time; meeting called back to order by Mayor Snapp at 8:50 o'clock p.m.

5. LTR.FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH By letter dated January 22, 1971, First Lutheran Church requests a full use permit of its new fellowship hall; are presently operating under a temporary use permit which terminated January 15, 1971, although they have complied with all the requirements of the City regarding the building proper. It is understood the permanent use permit is being withheld because of the proposed street improvements to the south.

Mr. Pizzato places a map on the board; there is a series of problems relating to the natural drainage course through the property, which affects the improvement district, the development of proposed Billings Street to the south, terminating the cul-de-sac short of the church property, the church property and the property immediately to the north. In connection with development of the church property, they had installed a corrugated metal pipe culvert through their property, discharging on the property to the north, or at their northerly property line, which is now

clearly understood and agreed inadequate in size. The property to the north has placed fill on their property which affects the discharge of the pipe. The property owner to the north is complaining because they have concentrated the discharge on his property. The City is placed in the position of developing the street to the south which will increase the discharge of water into a system which is already below proper capacity. Have come to the point the Staff has told the church as far as the improvement district is concerned they will advise the Engineer of Work to discharge the water from Billings Street in as much as possible in its natural condition along the southerly line of the church property, because they were unable to get any other agreement from the church or the property to the north. Have also instructed the church that in connection with the development of their property, they must provide for the drainage adequately through the property and discharging the water more or less in its natural condition on the north line of the property.

The plans for the improvement district are very nearly complete; the plans and the matter of adopting the Resolution of Intention should be before Council in about a month. Believes the pipe under the church drive is 12 inches or perhaps 18 inches. Understands they acquired a building permit from the County and the property was annexed while they were under construction, and the City had nothing to do with the size of the pipe.

Mr. Don Loomis, 234 South Westwind, Chairman of the Board of Elders of the church, states there is a natural swale through the property and when the church was constructed they got permits from the County and constructed the drainage to adequately take care of the drainage from that swale. Immediately after the property was annexed to the City; they did not realize there were different requirements. This is an 18 inch pipe and has been more than adequate; only a token amount of water crosses and has not caused any drainage problem. The property owner to the north thought it was advisable to improve his property and graded it up four or five years ago; there has been no damage to his property since that time. He now realizes that when this cul-de-sac street goes in there will be an increase in water coming across the church property through this pipe and he is pretty much afraid of it. Evidently the City Engineer is afraid of it too, because in connection with the engineering said they wanted a letter from the church which would make the City not liable for any damage to their property. Their attorney advised them if they signed something like that they might be liable to the property owner to the north if they dump more water on his property.

Mr. Loomis continues that the engineer that prepared the plans for the district believes the 18 inch pipe is adequate; according to requirements should be one size larger but felt it would be adequate and provided in the original plan for drainage at the end of the cul-de-sac to their pipe. If they did that the church would have to sign the non-liability letter to the City which would leave the church liable to the man to the north, who will not sign anything. The church feels it would be nice to get rid of this water, but if they can't get rid of it they don't want it.

They are being held up on final inspection of their fellowship hall because of the drainage situation which they don't know what to do with; don't know how to get rid of the water once they get it. The plans are to dump the water on the church

property and the way the property lies it will go through their property to the property to the north, which is fine as long as they don't have any legal commitment in between. Are being held up on final inspection which holds up the loan payment, the final payment to the contractor and is a problem on their insurance if they don't get final inspection.

In regard to whether the church is willing to put in a larger pipe, Mr. Loomis states they are but the City Engineer and Engineer of Work designing the project, felt this would not be necessary, as it is more than adequate and no water is going through there now. Mr. Pizzato does not believe this is what he said.

Question is raised where the water dumps in relation to the next cul-de-sac street, which goes north and south and then turns east; Mr. Loomis states that is at a higher level; the swale is to the left of that proposed street. Thinks the drainage could be brought out to Lincoln by their property and the property directly to the south.

Mr. Pizzato explains the District consists of a street running west from Mollison, then in a T with a double cul-de-sac running southerly and northerly. The north end would be 15 or 30 feet from the church's south property line. There is another street coming in opposite Merritt Drive, west of Mollison; about half of that street would be on the church property, and then run northerly to a cul-de-sac southerly of Washington. They are all in the same improvement district, so the church is in the improvement district.

It is questioned why they cannot then be given final building inspection, and whether the improvement district would not in fact resolve all this. Mr. Pizzato states when they originally negotiated with the Engineer of Work for the project, which is a lump sum agreement, he did not contemplate including that system through the church property. It is not a substantial thing but he did not contemplate including that in the plans. When they got into the development of the property and the drainage through the property to the north, almost went in parallel routes; one was how to build an improvement district with the main purpose in mind of the streets in the improvement district, and on the other hand dealing with the development of the church property itself and all necessary public improvements in connection with that. One process is to build the street to the south and discharge the water onto the church property and not care what happens to it, as long as it is put back in its natural condition as it enters the church property. The second process would be to connect to the church's pipe in such a manner that the overflow can sheet across the church's property; thought they were in agreement on that route to proceed, until it was found the church could not give that type of agreement because it had to go to Detroit for approval. Wanting to proceed with the improvement district, advised the church by letter they would have the engineer of work discharge the water on the southerly church property line. That is as far as the improvement district is concerned. As far as the development of the church property, when the City requires necessary facilities for drainage on or adjacent to the church property, that would require adequate pipe through the church property. That would mean a smooth 21 inch pipe, according to the engineer's design, which is more than twice the capacity of the existing pipe.

Question is raised what would be done with the water if a larger pipe were put in, and what would happen when they got to the north property line. Mr. Pizzato states the water would have to be dissipated, so that it would not tend to erode the property to the north. Discussed this with the Lusitana's (owners of the property to the north) as to whether they wanted to solve the problem in the proper way as a part of the improvement district, or if they wanted to put the problem off. They agreed they wanted to put it off for some future developer of their property. It is their choice and the property owner to the north of them, who is not in the proposed district; this complicates the problem because it will be difficult to fully solve the problem and tie into an existing underground system to the north on Lincoln. Can change the boundaries of the district or other things, but the Staff was following the most expeditious path by having the improvement district proceed in such a fashion that it can go on its own, and at the same time tell the church to solve its drainage problem to the ultimate requirements, to discharge the property to the north in a natural manner. If the church went first, modification could be made in the improvement district to tie into that system; if the improvement district were to go first, they could tie into the improvement district facility.

If the cul-de-sac street is built to the south, it is questioned whether there is any way the water could flow to the south. Mr. Pizzato states the low point of the swale is to the west of the church itself; would be collected in the street and would have to discharge it at that point as much as possible in the improvement district on the south side of the property. The swale is pretty much in the center of the property, but west of the church.

It is questioned whether the lien contract could be used to guarantee their future construction, if the plan is to run in through the pipeline in a larger capacity. Mr. Pizzato states they can use the lien contract if they want to waive the requirements of installing the pipe. It is pointed out that it had been stated earlier there were several alternatives, and it is assumed one might not require enlarging of the underground system. It is felt this could be used if there is faith that the lien contract would guarantee the installation if needed at a later date. They have a real problem in dealing with their money management problems in not being able to get final building inspection, and the way it is now a solution could be months off.

Mr. Pizzato sees some problems in that the way they have the pipe installed now the water cannot even get in there, so they should do something regardless. Even if the area has full utilization of the pipe it can cause a problem by the development of the street and just discharging on the church; could come back and complain because of the larger pipe installed in the improvement district. If it is recognized that they may have the problem and they have the lien contract, maybe that would be sufficient to provide for the ultimate solution.

It is questioned if it would work for some type of box to be put where the pipe is now, to get the water across the parking lot to the other end and spread it out. Mr. Pizzato states the original proposal was to provide that and execute a hold harmless agreement relieving the City of any liability of the discharge of the excess water over the surface of the church property. It is pointed out that the church does not want to do this because

the water could go on the property to the north, and this is the reason Mr. Pizzato wants them to sign it. Mr. Loomis states the church recognizes the fact that the City wants them to sign the hold harmless agreement, because they know there is going to be more water go through there and because they know it is going to damage the property to the north and because they know he will sue someone. The City wants the church to be the one who is sued, and that is why the church feels they cannot sign it.

Comment is made if this is a natural swale, the water has always had this natural bed and it is the responsibility of these people. The man who built his land up does not have the right to make a constriction in the water either; he must let it flow on. It is questioned if it would be possible to turn the pipe to exit it on Lincoln; Mr. Pizzato states there is too much water for that.

Mr. Loomis believes that the proposed street, unless it is cut down considerably, would be higher than Lincoln. The water that has come across this natural swale is a very token amount. However, they know that when the street is paved and the houses go in, will be a large quantity of water. It is pointed out this is a problem all over the City; with development of property it doubles the runoff with the same amount of rainfall. Mr. Loomis feels the engineer should have designed the drainage to get it out to Lincoln. Mr. Pizzato points out that one of the alternatives was to include the system through the church property in the improvement district and they could not agree to that. Now they are suggesting carrying it all the way, which seems to be conflicting with their own approach. They would have to bear their fair share, but if it is installed as part of the improvement district, the district would probably bear a portion of the cost. Mr. Loomis asks how much they are talking about; could never get an estimate of how much the church's fair share would be. Mr. Pizzato states that everytime he dealt with someone from the church, they sent someone else to deal with next. He did give some figures and talked in some detail about running the system through the church property and what he would guess as being their fair share. The Staff is not going to do the assessment or the design; it is being done by a private engineer. Advised them to hire their own engineer to make an analysis from their point of view to advise them of the wisest thing to do. Mr. Pizzato told them he intends to look at this from the City's point of view. Mr. Loomis states as a matter of record each of the people Mr. Pizzato spoke to are in the audience tonight.

It is felt there has to be a decision either to go with the improvement district as is, or if the church wishes to have it included in the improvement district, they should contact the engineer of work on the project.

Motion by Van Zanten, seconded by Cornett to postpone this matter one week to give the church the opportunity to find out which way they want to go.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

6. LTR.FIRST CHRIST.
CHURCH-CUL-DE-SAC

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort
to approve request dated January 21,
1971, from First Christian Church to
utilize the proposed cul-de-sac until future planned street is
constructed at their church property, 799 East Washington Avenue,
subject to Hold Harmless Agreement, and agreement to maintain
this area. (Conditional Use Permit No. 303).

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

7. WAIVER-KUERBIS Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to approve waiver of sidewalks adjacent to 1861 El Jardin Court, as requested by Lawrence Kuerbis.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

4. LNG DEMONSTRATION Mr. Kenneth Brown, district manager for San Diego Gas & Electric Company, introduces Mr. Paul Hathaway, Vice President of their Gas Division, who will provide a demonstration of liquefied natural gas.

Mr. Paul Hathaway states it will be his purpose to attempt to acquaint Council with liquefied natural gas, its properties, and what San Diego Gas & Electric has been able to do with it. Shows slides of various LNG sites, automobiles which have been converted using this fuel, storage tanks, etc. and conducts various experiments using LNG.

A recess is called for Council to inspect an automobile which has been converted to LNG. Meeting called back to order by Mayor Snapp at 10:20 o'clock p.m.

8. SLA 687-WILSON Split Lot Application No. 687 submitted by Shirley Wilson is a request to divide property on the north side of El Rey Court at the end of El Rey Street into three parcels.

By letter dated January 27, 1971, Planning Commission recommends approval subject to certain conditions.

By letter dated January 28, 1971, Mrs. Wilson requests a one year delay for accomplishment of Item 2 "Existing dwelling to be connected to the City sewer."

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to approve Split Lot Application No. 687 subject to Planning Commission recommendations, and that a separate lien contract be placed on each of the three parcels guaranteeing construction of sidewalks on El Rey Court and the sewer hookup.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

9
SLA 689-PIERCE Split Lot Application No. 689, submitted by the Estate of Arvilla Pierce, is a request to divide property on the east side of Mollison Avenue and west side of Anza Street, between Gray Drive and Chase Avenue, into two parcels.

By letter dated January 27, 1971, Planning Commission recommends approval subject to certain conditions.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to approve Split Lot Application No. 689 subject to Planning Commission letter dated January 27, 1971.

Discussion.

Attorney McDougal agrees that an application must be made through the Clerk's Office to split the 1911 improvement bonds on this property.

Mr. Henson advises one of the unusual matters in connection with this lot split is that R-3 Zoning has been approved subject to a specific plan. The lot split implies there will be two separate specific plans, one for each newly created parcel.

Votes are now cast on motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to approve Split Lot Application No. 689, subject to Planning Commission letter dated January 27, 1971.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

10. LTR.CUMMINGS,ET AL. By letter dated January 27, 1971,
TRANSIT SURVEY Daniel Cummings, Lantson S. Eldred
and Bradley K. Willardson advise that
when the survey of the busses of the San Diego Transit System
was first discussed, it was decided they would be commissioned
by the City to run the survey and analyze the results. Because
they have gained so much valuable experience, want the survey
to be made simply a civic project and do not wish to be com-
pensated further for their efforts.

Councilman Van Zanten suggests that a resolution be adopted by
Council commending these young people for what they have done.
Mayor Snapp has prepared a certificate of appreciation to
present to them.

10A. CROWN ROOM Motion by Cornett, seconded by
SPEC. OFFICER Quidort to approve request dated
January 29, 1971, to waive the
requirements of special officer for Class B Cabaret License
for The Crown Room, submitted by Anita Hensling.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

10B. LTR.SWEANY By letter dated January 26, 1971,
SEWER HOOKUP Martin H. Sweany, 1046 Aster Street,
advises he owns property at this
address which is connected to the City of El Cajon sewer lines,
although the property is in the County. Plans to build a
duplex on the property and requests permission to hook the new
dwelling to the City sewer line.

Manager Applegate explains that Mr. Sweany has received a lot
split from the County, contingent on the City sewerage the
new building. This is in the area in which the City was taken
to Court in 1946 and required to provide sewers. It is his
feeling that the City is not required to sewer new construction.
Suggests this be referred to the Attorney for further research.
Part of the hookups are covered by court action and part by
agreements signed with the various property owners.

Mr. Martin Sweany, 1046 Aster, states the plans for the duplex
have been checked by the County but he must obtain permission
from the City to hook to the sewer. Has checked into the
possibility of annexation, but he must pay so much to the County
for the necessary paper work and annexation fees to the City,
plus dedication and construct sidewalks at his expense. States
there are other buildings that have hooked to the sewer in this
area; all they did was to ask. He has a single family dwelling
and plans to build a duplex.

Motion by Van Zanten, seconded by Cornett to refer this matter
to the City Attorney for a report in one week.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

10C. LTR.CO.PLANNING By letter dated January 25, 1971, San
ZONE HEARING Diego County Planning Commission
advise they will hold a public hearing
on February 5, 1971, on a proposal to adopt a zoning plan for

a portion of the Los Coches-Blossom Valley area to replace the present LC Zone classification.

Mr. Henson advises that a portion of Lakeside Zoning District is also included in portion of the El Cajon Planning area; the solid color on the map indicates the portion within the El Cajon Planning area which is low density and the striped color indicates low low density land classification. In his opinion the zoning categories indicated are in substantial conformance with the kind of land use anticipated in El Cajon's General Plan. The County has requested the City to make comments on the proposed rezoning. The T (2) proposed, which is a temporary zone, does accomodate very limited kinds of development on large lots.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to express concurrence with the County's proposal of T (2) Zoning for this area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

11. LTR.SULLIVAN At the meeting of January 18, 1971,
SEWER REFUND Council discussed a letter from Mr.
 James P. Sullivan requesting refund
of \$165.00 for a sewer lateral at 1244 Camillo Way, which Mr.
Sullivan contends collapsed when a tree was removed by the
Parks Department.

Staff was requested to contact the San Diego Gas & Electric Company regarding possible liability due to a gas line in this area.

Director of Parks and Recreation Mazzola has submitted reports dated January 21, 1971, on their procedure for tree removal and dated January 25, 1971, regarding the manner in which the Parks Department notified people of an impending tree removal.

Mr. Pizzato contacted Mr. Brown of the Gas Company, who indicated that since the gas line was installed so long ago they did not feel they had any obligation and did not recognize this as a problem created by them.

Councilman Cornett points out Mr. Mazzola indicates they have pulled approximately 150 trees in a like manner with two water lines and one sewer line rupture. Feels the position on this request should be that since they cannot pinpoint the fault exactly, should refund the \$165.00 and close the matter.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Snapp that \$165.00 be refunded to Mr. Sullivan.

Discussion.

Mr. Pizzato advises the tree was nine feet in one direction and 12 feet in the other direction from the lateral. Council examines pictures showing the problem.

Councilman Van Zanten would be in favor of the City sharing 50% the cost of the lateral with the property owner, since it was so far away. Councilman Quidort also does not think this is the City's full responsibility, because of the distance of the tree from the sewer.

Speaking in favor of the motion, Councilman Cornett feels that the City has some responsibility because of trees that were planted when the property was subdivided, which are not acceptable today, and feels this is why they can make an exception.

Votes are now cast on motion by Cornett seconded by Snapp that \$165.00 be refunded to Mr. Sullivan

AYES	Cornett, Snapp
NOES	Van Zanten, Quidort
ABSENT	Brown

Motion not carried.

This matter will automatically be continued one week.

Concern is voiced about the method of notification in Mr. Mazzola's letter of January 25, 1971, "....this department uses the tagging method, specifying the date on which the tree is to be removed. This is done because of the emotions that have been met in the field, and we do not go out of our way to knock on the door and invite owner comment." It is felt that the owners should be contacted personally and given the choice of trying to save the trees.

Mr. Sullivan is advised to present pictures which he has taken to Council at the next meeting.

12. LTR. MIDDLETON At the meeting of January 25, 1971,
SEWER HOOKUP Council discussed a letter from Mr.
 Charles L. Middleton, 1346 Windmill
Road, requesting temporary sewer hookup for property in the
County to a sewer in Granite Hills Drive.

Attorney cDougal states it is against the ordinance to sewer property outside the City, however, if the Council decides it is an emergency situation where ealth is in danger, can order the Staff to allow the hookup. Other people have made the same request and were required to put in holding tanks until sewers were available. Does not know whether a septic tank would constitute a holding tank.

Councilman Van Zanten realizes this is a tremendous hardship on Mr. Middleton, but in order to be equitable he would have to deny the request, just as they have done to others who have had sewer problems and were unable to use their land. Once the property is annexed the City is protected.

Councilman Cornett states there may be a health hazard as the City lies downhill from the area; would be in favor of an agreement for a sewer hookup on a temporary basis, which could be terminated after a reasonable period.

Manager Applegate states when this item was added last week he had not had a chance to look at the area; they will be confronted with real problems there. The Health Department operates off complaints; Mr. Middleton's neighbors are complaining and there are a lot of other complaints in this area. It is ironic that when the City finishes a sewer in an area the Health Department starts filing notices. There is a problem in the total area and

some of the other people who have the same problem cannot necessarily get to the sewer line. There has to be a permanent solution; if a temporary hookup is permitted, does not know how they could cut him off, because then it would be a critical problem. The Health Department normally goes along with the using of a septic tank or holding tank, but the property owner is out the cost of pumping it. Council had a similar request on Gustavo Way, and that person was forced to move out of his house, and it took a year to solve that problem. The County is handling the improvement district on Bermuda Lane; it has been under way for two years and they are not expediting it. Even if Mr. Middleton's single lot is annexed there are many problems in the area which will have to be solved. The sewers will have to be put in very deep and will be expensive.

Mr. Pizzato estimates Mr. Middleton would have to go about 270 feet plus a lateral to hook to the sewer in Granite Hills; also there would be a problem in excavating the street as it has not yet been accepted by the City.

Manager Applegate states that the people in the County who face this street indicated they would annex and hook up to the sewer, but only one lot has annexed. There is now the problem of splitting assessments. The people cannot be charged until they annex, in the meantime the City is financing the line.

Mr. C. L. Middleton, 1346 Windmill Road, states he has an annexation petition signed by all except two of the property owners on Granite Hills Drive; also the entire north side of Middleton Road signed. It was explained to these people that the City would require street improvements which they would have to pay for.

The possibility of annexing only a portion of the property on which 100% consent has been received is discussed. Manager Applegate believes that type of annexation will still present problems; if Windmill Road is constructed will be faced with not being able to assess the other side. Attorney McDougal states one answer might be to get a 60% waiver of the 1931 Act.

Mr. Henson advises the Staff was working on the assumption that if the entire annexation does not proceed, the annexation would be reduced to a single lot annexation (Mr. Middleton's property). Each potential Yes vote that is annexed would reduce the chances of the entire area being annexed. An election will probably be required if the large area annexes.

Mr. Middleton estimates he will have to have the septic tank pumped every thirty days if he is to use it as a holding tank. Mr. Pizzato estimates the cost of the sewer to Granite Hills at over \$1,500.00; in addition, he would be assessed for the sewer in Windmill Road because it is in front of his property.

Manager Applegate feels Mr. Middleton would be better off to use the septic tank as a holding tank and encourage the annexation. Mr. Pizzato states the County Health Department is not trying to push him into the City; they told him he could alleviate the problem by putting in more leach lines, but this might not solve the problem if there is a heavy rain. They have had other complaints in the area -- he is not the only one.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Van Zanten that Council not allow the temporary sewer hookup, but encourage Mr. Middleton to proceed with the annexation, and have him advise the Public Health

Department he will attempt to use the septic tank as a holding facility until annexation is completed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

13. DR. RAGLAND At the meeting of January 11, 1971,
EASEMENT Council discussed a letter from Dr.
 Ragland requesting a mutual easement
across the City park at Park and Magnolia Avenues.

Manager Applegate states he has been unable to contact Mr. Richard R. Judson; he is represented by Mr. Herbert Rose, Attorney, who was not very helpful. Suggests that if an alternate solution is reached perhaps Dr. Ragland can contact Mr. Judson or his attorney.

In regard to the possibility of working out a mutual easement, Attorney McDougal thinks they have a problem in granting some rights in that property to an individual. If Council wants to enter into an agreement that in exchange for Dr. Ragland building the street, driveway and parking, that the property would be used only for public ingress and egress and public parking for the next 30 or 40 years, could probably do that, and would be enforceable on both sides. Does not know if they want to commit the future City to that kind of use on that park property. That would preclude them from changing the use in the future. Does not think they can deed it out and record it. Believes the agreement to keep it open as park property would not violate the grant under which they got the property. In effect they would be making a finding that it is necessary to have a driveway and parking in a park in order to utilize it for park purposes.

It is questioned whether these comments apply only to the driveway access from Park, and to the parking places near Park, or also to a driveway through the rear at the westerly boundary. Attorney McDougal is referring only to the drive from Park, and six or seven spaces just at this entrance. Comment is made that there was a space left so that cars would go into the park. Council examines the map showing the drive and parking spaces. Another matter discussed at the last meeting was a driveway from the Moore property on Magnolia, to serve as an exit through Dr. Ragland's property to Park. Manager Applegate does not think they can do anything about an exit through Mr. Moore's property, as they do not have any control over that. It is felt in the parking lot layout, could not allow parking credit for several spaces which would be located where the driveway would go through to the Moore property. This is a larger problem than just getting enough frontage for Dr. Ragland to build his building.

Mr. J. Richard Wilson states their application had nothing to do with that; it was suggested by Council; Dr. Ragland may want to discuss that. Mr. Wilson points out three parking spaces and portion of a fourth which would permit ingress.

Councilman Cornett states that eventually Magnolia will be red-curbed between intersections: to reduce the number of turning movements leaving the area of the Norge Village dry cleaners, etc. they should be provided with a way to get out the back portion of that property. Feels that at this time, in exchange for Dr. Ragland gaining access, some agreement could be reached by eliminating a couple of parking spaces, to provide the access

on the adjacent property. Mr. Wilson feels they may end up with a worse situation plus the problem of policing the area. It is suggested this portion be referred to the Traffic Committee for recommendations. One of the proposals on Magnolia was to build a solid barrier down the middle to prevent left turns; should think about that now while the property owner wants something from the City.

Attorney McDougal states the basic problem is whether Council wishes to commit future Councils for 40 years for this type of use. The City's records indicate Dr. Ragland has 7½ feet of frontage and his records indicate he has 14 feet.

Dr. Fred Ragland, 1025 Jamacha Road, states the plan he received from the former owner, Mr. Martin, indicated there was 35 feet of frontage, and when Park is realigned there will only be 14 feet of frontage. He understood there was 35 feet of frontage, but has no proof. Mentions the problems there might be with policing the area if the drive is opened through to Magnolia, as cars race through there now.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to refer this matter to the City Attorney to prepare an agreement with Dr. Ragland for provision for access and public parking on the Judson park site.

Discussion.

Attorney McDougal states Dr. Ragland indicated they were ready to improve the frontage, put in the driveway and parking spaces on the City property if they could reach something satisfactory on the access. Mr. Wilson states the discussion with the Staff was along that line, that Dr. Ragland would make the improvements to City standards and the City would maintain the portion committed as common easement.

Councilman Van Zanten points out on the map the portion he understands Dr. Ragland will improve. Questions why the City should maintain a green area which is adjacent to a green area already maintained. Mr. Wilson states the City Staff said they would maintain the green area left there. As Councilman Van Zanten sees the division of labor involved, it would be much more difficult for the City to maintain this piece; would be more compatible if Dr. Ragland would maintain this and put it under one concept and one continuity, rather than having two different agencies down an imaginary line. If he wants the City committed for 40 years, the City can ask maintenance for 40 years. This should be in the minutes so it is understood.

Attorney McDougal will bring back a proposed agreement for Council's review.

Votes are now cast on motion by Cornett seconded by Quidort to refer this matter to the City Attorney to prepare an agreement with Dr. Ragland for provision for access and public parking on the Judson park site.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

14. LTR.PLAN.COMM.	By letter dated January 19, 1971, Planning
TRAFFIC-ALLEY	Commission advise that in connection with
W. OF MOLLISON	the hearing on Zone Reclassification
No. 930 (property on the west side of Mollison Avenue, between	

Broadway and Sandalwood), several persons spoke of parking problems and traffic safety along the north-south alley located between Mollison and Applewood. Request that the Traffic Committee be apprised of these problems and make a study to see how the problems might be solved.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort to refer this matter to the Traffic Committee.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

15. PARKWAY PLAZA
PLAN. AREA

By letter dated January 15, 1971,
Planning Commission advise that as
the result of discussions on Zone

Reclassification No. 928, the following recommendations were made:

1. That the Council adopt by resolution the requirement that all future developments within the area identified as Parkway Plaza Planning Area be subject to submittal and approval of specific plans of development.
2. That within 60 days the City initiate public hearings to consider the rezoning of all properties within the Parkway Plaza Planning Area to those zones which in the City's determination will best reflect the objectives and intent of the General Plan.

Mr. Henson states the intent is to break out an important area in the General Plan and look at the entire area. Up to this point have been handling these items on a zone reclassification to zone reclassification basis, without relationship to the entire area. The germ of this idea came upon referral of Zone Reclassification No. 928 to the Industrial Development Commission, and in examining the proposed rezoning they saw all kinds of problems, which related to the larger area, rather than to the particular zone reclassification. When this came to the Planning Commission they put forth their recommendations on the zone reclassification, plus the above two items for Council's consideration. Feels there is nothing radical in the first item, in that they have been doing this on a piece by piece basis: the proposal is that an area be designated by resolution, so that anyone coming in would know a specific plan would be required. In regard to the second recommendation, there is only one piece of property within the entire area which has anything resembling the kind of zoning recommended by the General Plan, which is the Parkway Plaza Shopping Center itself. All other properties have an M Zone, which is not necessarily the zone which was intended by the General Plan. If Council sees merit in the idea that the zoning in the entire area should be reviewed, could so inform the Planning Commission and within 60 days would set the entire area for consideration of rezoning. It is questioned whether this would include the properties which have just been rezoned.

Attorney McDougal states one matter that bothers him is that in the C-M and M Zones can still get commercial uses by conditional use permit. It occurred to him in several actions tonight that if they are going to continue that way, fine. If they are going to change that so that they cannot get a commercial use by conditional use permit, and if they have zoned some of the property C-M, are in effect taking away an integral part of C-M and M Zoning at that point. It seems to him that before they try to get some of the questions solved which may end up C-M and M, should address themselves to that problem.

It is questioned how they can judge this area, when the Staff is in the process of rewriting the M Zone, and they do not now know what the new zone will contain. Mr. Henson states that currently they can have commercial uses in the M Zone with a conditional use permit, and the zoning would not change that fact. The recommendations in the discussion stage of the M Zone are along the line of excluding commercial uses in the M Zone completely.

Opinion is expressed that anything that would be discussed would be an enlargement of commercial uses in this area. Mr. Henson agrees they run this risk; no one has figured out what the Highway Oriented Category in the General Plan means. Believes this is the kind of decision that the Planning Commission is asking for, to look at it on an area basis to try to solve some of these problems; the alternative is to do it on a piecemeal basis.

Attorney McDougal is convinced that the first step is to get the zone classifications, so they know what they are changing something to when they are considering it. Councilman Cornett is still willing to look at each zone change as it relates to the General Plan: is not opposed to continuing that until they have the change in the ordinance as respects manufacturing.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort that no action be taken at the present time.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

16. FIRE BATTALION
CHIEF

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett to approve the job specifications and salary range 53 for Fire Battalion Chief, as recommended in letter dated January 26, 1971, from Administrative Analyst Odle, and refer same to the City Attorney for the necessary resolutions.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

16A. PEPPER VILLA
CONTRACT

Attorney McDougal advises the Staff has done everything they possibly can in regard to getting the contractor to finish the Pepper Villa 1911 Project: are still about \$2,700. away to finish it. Requests that Council authorize giving the contractor the same notice given previously.

Motion by Cornett, seconded by Quidort authorizing this action.

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

17. RESOLUTION 35-71

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett to adopt Resolution No. 35-71, approving Planned Residential Development No. 2 on portion of Lots 1, 2 and 5, Block 25, "S" Tract, Rancho El Cajon. (McKeon Construction Co.)

Motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

18. RESOLUTION 36-71 Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett
 to adopt Resolution No. 36-71,
approving Tentative Subdivision Map No. 177, and fixing improve-
ments to be required therein. (Jamacha Greens).

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

19. RESOLUTION 37-71 Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett
 to adopt Resolution No. 37-71,
approving the annexation to the City of El Cajon of South Orange
Annexation No. 4.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

19A. RESOLUTION 38-71 Motion by Quidort, seconded by Cornett
 to adopt Resolution No. 38-71,
releasing lien contract. (Jackman - Resolution No. 7018).

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

20. S.P.20-PLAN. COMM. Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van
 FIRST READING Zanten to have first reading of Item
 20, Amendment of Specific Plan No. 20 -
Planning Commission.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

City Clerk reads heading of an ordinance amending Specific Plan
No. 20, moving the curved portion of proposed Lexington Avenue
to the western side of the block between Mollison Avenue and
Lincoln Avenue.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van Zanten to waive first reading
of above ordinance.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

21. ORDINANCE 2333 City Clerk reads heading of an ordinance
 amending portions of Chapter 25A of
the Code of the City of El Cajon with reference to requirements
for undergrounding of utilities.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van Zanten to waive second
reading of above ordinance, and to adopt Ordinance No. 2333,
amending portions of Chapter 25A of the Code of the City of
El Cajon with reference to requirements for undergrounding of
utilities.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

21A. ORDINANCE 2334 Attorney McDougal states he has had sev-
 eral inquiries from Councilmen, contr-
actors and other people wanting to know what they are going to
do to handle the Romex problem. Evidently all of the other
cities in the County except El Cajon have changed to that, and
on the theory there is no opposition and that Council will
probably pass this with the other changes on which they have
had the first reading (adoption of 1968 Electrical Code as amended),

has prepared an urgency ordinance, which changes two sections only to permit the use of Romex, so that they can get final inspection. Would not change any other portion of the Electrical Code. This is the only satisfactory solution he could find.

Motin by Van Zanten, seconded by Quidort to have reading of an urgency ordinance amending Sections 10-35 and 10-74 of Chapter 10 of the Code of the City of El Cajon pertaining to certain requirements for electrical installations.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

City Clerk reads the above ordinance in full.

Motion by Van Zanten, seconded by Quidort to adopt Ordinance No. 2334, an urgency ordinance amending Sections 10-35 and 10-74 of Chapter 10 of the Code of the City of El Cajon pertaining to certain requirements for electrical installations.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

22. WARRANTS

Motion by Cornett, seconded by
Van Zanten, to approve Commercial
Warrants No. 28,140 through No. 28,205 in the amount of
\$246,983.81.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

23. REPORTS OF
COUNCILMEN
PLAN.COMM.APPT.

Mayor Snapp advises that Carl Miller
has submitted his resignation from the
Planning Commission, and he would
like to appoint Mr. Howard Reinheimer
to this vacancy.

Motion by Quidort, seconded by Van Zanten to approve Mayor
Snapp's appointment of Mr. Howard Reinheimer on the Planning
Commission.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

HUMAN RELATIONS COMM.

Mayor Snapp states he conveyed Council's
feelings to the City of La Mesa in
regard to their nomination of Councilman Cosgriff as the El Cajon-
La Mesa appointee on the Human Relations Commission. Explained
that it was not the individual involved, but that as a Councilman
might get himself or the two Cities involved in an embarrassing
position. La Mesa discussed this and felt there was no problem
and that Councilman Cosgriff will be capable of handling it.

Motion by Van Zanten, seconded by Quidort to concur with the
appointment of Council Cosgriff to the Human Relations Commission.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.

24. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Elizabeth Harvison, 308 Taft Avenue,
reads a letter to Council stating that
some of the cost of improvements in the City, such as widening

of streets, traffic lights installed, cement sidewalks and parking lots has been too high. Too many trees have been up-rooted and destroyed. Instead of planning the widening of street and installation or alteration of sidewalks with the thought of keeping the trees, Council has sanctioned their removal. Suggests they start demanding of the staff a more intelligent and conservationist approach to the "improvements" being made in El Cajon now and in the future.

Miss Harvison states she would like to have some time on an agenda to get people involved and to do more than just present a letter; wants answer or justifications on some of the actions in the past on removal of the trees. Feels many of the improvements were made arbitrarily and can see no intelligent set of priorities. Would like to have answers as to what the City plan is; for example, how many trees in the future will be torn down.

It is pointed out that if she has questions on certain street or on certain improvement districts, could be referred to the Staff for the answers. Manager Applegate could give some of the answers to the questions she has. It is also pointed out that if she really digs into this, will find that the City is as concerned as she is about the problem.

Miss Harvison noted a tremendous paradox in the action tonight; Council had the people from the Gas Company give a presentation on LNG and yet for reason, perhaps with some justification, they have torn down a natural source for preventing pollution. Knows Mr. Sullivan, but advised she would not work directly with him, because this is larger than just that one problem.

Comment is made that it has been a long time since there has been a campaign in El Cajon to encourage people to plant trees on private property, away from the public improvements.

Councilman Van Zan Zanten states in the area of Second, Madison and Oakdale there are a number of pepper trees that will have to be removed because of a large apartment complex that is going in and the streets will have to be widened. Perhaps when they know long in advance it could be staked so that people could plant trees to replace others that would have to come out.

Manager Applegate advises that this area has very few natural trees: some trees are undesirable and need to be removed because they are not suitable for close contact. Secondly, trees do have a useful life and do outlive it, and need to be replaced. The City has a pretty fair record of replacing trees, but this does not mean they cannot do better.

ORDER OF ADJOURNMENT Motion by Quidort, seconded by Snapp
that the regular meeting of the City
Council of the City of El Cajon, California, held this 1st
day of February, 1971, is adjourned at 12:02 o'clock a.m.,
Tuesday, February 2, 1971, to Thursday, February 4, 1971, at 7:30
o'clock p.m. in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 150 East
Lexington Avenue, California.

Motion carried by unanimous vote
of those present.


City Clerk