



# A G E N D A

## IMPERIAL BEACH CITY COUNCIL REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY



JULY 13, 2010

Council Chambers  
825 Imperial Beach Boulevard  
Imperial Beach, CA 91932

**SPECIAL MEETING – 6:00 P.M.**

**THE CITY COUNCIL ALSO SITS AS THE CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PLANNING COMMISSION, AND PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY**

The City of Imperial Beach is endeavoring to be in total compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you require assistance or auxiliary aids in order to participate at City Council meetings, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (619) 423-8301, as far in advance of the meeting as possible.

### **SPECIAL MEETING CALL TO ORDER BY MAYOR**

### **ROLL CALL BY CITY CLERK**

### **AGENDA CHANGES**

### **MAYOR/COUNCIL REIMBURSEMENT DISCLOSURE/COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS/REPORTS ON ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMITTEES**

### **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY STAFF**

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - *Each person wishing to address the City Council regarding items not on the posted agenda may do so at this time. In accordance with State law, Council may not take action on an item not scheduled on the agenda. If appropriate, the item will be referred to the City Manager or placed on a future agenda.*

### **REPORTS (1)**

#### **1. COMMERCIAL ZONING REVIEW. (0610-95)**

City Manager's Recommendation: Conduct the Special Meeting and provide staff with direction on the following topics:

- Content of the Matrix of Recommendations (Attachment 1)
- Community Outreach/Input (how, when, where and who)
- Involvement of the Design Review Board (DRB)
- Decision Timeframe

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Imperial Beach City Council welcomes you and encourages your continued interest and involvement in the City's decision-making process.

FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE, A COPY OF THE AGENDA AND COUNCIL MEETING PACKET MAY BE VIEWED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK AT CITY HALL OR ON OUR WEBSITE AT [www.cityofib.com](http://www.cityofib.com).

---

Jacqueline M. Hald, CMC  
City Clerk

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council/RDA/Planning Commission/Public Financing Authority regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the office of the City Clerk located at 825 Imperial Beach Blvd., Imperial Beach, CA 91932 during normal business hours.





**STAFF REPORT  
CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH**

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL/CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

**FROM:** GARY BROWN, CITY MANAGER/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MEETING DATE:** JULY 13, 2010

**ORIGINATING DEPT.:** COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
GREG WADE, DIRECTOR *GW*

**SUBJECT:** COMMERCIAL ZONING REVIEW – SPECIAL MEETING

---

**BACKGROUND:**

The City Council has been holding regular focused discussion on the recommended amendments to the City's Commercial Zoning. These focused discussions are nearing completion and a Special Meeting is scheduled on July 13, 2010, to discuss remaining steps for review of the proposed zoning amendments.

**DISCUSSION:**

At the meeting on July 13, 2010, the City Council will discuss the following topics related to the Commercial Zoning Review:

- Content of the Matrix of Recommendations (Attachment 1)
- Community Outreach/Input (how, when, where and who)
- Involvement of the Design Review Board (DRB)
- Decision Timeframe

Additionally, due to time constraints, the focused discussion on the Design Guidelines for Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones scheduled for July 7, 2010, was continued to the meeting on July 13, 2010.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA):**

This discussion of the recommended design guidelines and other zoning amendments is not, in itself, subject to CEQA.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None with this item.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council conduct the Special Meeting and provide staff with direction on the above topics.

**CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve Department recommendation.



---

Gary Brown, City Manager

Attachments:            1. Matrix of Recommendations

**Summary of Recommendations from Commercial Zoning Review Working Paper #2 and Subsequent Council Direction**

*Includes direction from Council at the following meetings: February 17<sup>th</sup>, March 17<sup>th</sup>, May 4<sup>th</sup>, and June 2<sup>nd</sup>. Updates in red from June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting.*

Topic	Area	Proposed Recommendation	Council Direction	Staff Notes
<b>Building Height</b>	C/MU-1	4 story/40' (no change in standard)	No change; At June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, recommended requiring 15-foot ground floor commercial/retail ceiling height	Presented at October meetings. Remaining recommendations to be comprehensively discussed at future Council Meeting.  Council supported imposing the same development standards for the C/MU2 and C/MU3 zones.
		5 story/60' within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone with develop. Incentive	Removed from Consideration at October Council Meeting	
	C/MU-2	3 story/36' W. side of Seacoast	At October meeting, Council did <i>not</i> support this recommendation	
		3 story/40' E. side of Seacoast with develop. incentive	Action taken at October Council Meeting: Up to 35' to be considered on east side of Seacoast with incentives	
	C/MU-3	2 story/28'	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported 3 story/30', and up to 35' with development incentives.	
		4 story/40' with develop. incentive	At February 2010 meeting, removed from consideration (see above).	
<b>New Overlay Zone</b>	C/MU-1	Create Palm Avenue Height Overlay Zone	Removed from Consideration at October Council Meeting	
<b>Parking</b>	C/MU-1	1 space/500 sf of comm'l	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation	Per Council comments at November meeting, a study of existing parking counts along Seacoast Drive may need to occur to facilitate approval of any changes to parking requirements, particularly during Coastal Commission review and certification.
		25% reduction for vertical mixed use	At November meeting, Council supported revisiting this item	
		Waiver for comm'l uses under 1,000 sf	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation	
		Development of shared parking code; add'l reduction for shared parking	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation if a study was done	
		Increase distance to off-site or shared parking facility from 500 ft to 1000 ft	<b>At June 15, 2010 Council supported this recommendation.</b>	
	C/MU-2	1 space/1,000 sf of comm'l	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation.	
		Potential 25% reduction for vertical mixed use	At November meeting, Council supported revisiting this item	
		Potential waiver for comm'l uses under 1,000 sf	At November meeting, Council supported with recommendation.	
		Development of shared parking code; potential add'l reduction for shared parking	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation if a study was done	
		Increase distance to off-site or shared parking facility from 500 ft to 1000 ft	<b>At June 15, 2010 Council supported this recommendation.</b>	
	C/MU-3	1 space/500 sf of comm'l	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation	
		Potential 25% reduction for vertical mixed use	At November meeting, Council supported revisiting this item	
		Potential waiver for comm'l uses under 1,000 sf	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation	
		Development of shared parking code; potential add'l reduction for shared parking	At November meeting, Council supported recommendation if a study was done	
		Increase distance to off-site or shared parking facility from 500 ft to 1000 ft	<b>At June 15, 2010 Council supported this recommendation.</b>	
<b>Density</b>	C/MU-1	30 du/ac min.	Minimum densities removed from consideration at October Council Meeting	Maximum Densities presented at December meeting, but no action taken. Continuation expected at February Council Meeting.  Council supported imposing the same development standards for the C/MU2 and C/MU3 zones.  At June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, Council recommended incentives to achieve additional residential density; further discussion on June 15 <sup>th</sup> .
		43 du/ac max. (no change in standard)	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported recommendation.	
		52 du/ac max. with 10%-20% develop. incentive bonus within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone	Removed from consideration at October Council Meeting, as it does not apply without height increase	
	C/MU-2	30 du/ac min.	Minimum densities removed from consideration at October Council Meeting	
		36 du/ac max.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported maintaining current standard of 29 du/ac, and allowing 36 du/ac maximum only with development incentive.	
		43 du/ac max. with 10-20% develop. incentive bonus	At February 2010 meeting, removed from consideration.	
	C/MU-3	30 du/ac min.	Minimum densities removed from consideration at October	

Topic	Area	Proposed Recommendation	Council Direction	Staff Notes	
			Council Meeting		
		36 du/ac max.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported a standard of 29 du/ac (same as C/MU-2), and allowing 36 du/ac maximum only with development incentive.		
		43 du/ac max. with 10-20% develop. incentive bonus	At February 2010 meeting, removed from consideration.		
<b>FAR (Intensity)</b>	C/MU-1	3.0 max.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported revisiting this recommendation. Eliminated from consideration at March 17 <sup>th</sup> meeting.	Presented at December meeting, but no action taken. Continuation expected at February Council Meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A potential reduction to 2.5 FAR for east side of Seacoast Drive in C/MU-2, and C/MU-3, was presented at December meeting.</li> </ul> FAR's eliminated from consideration at March 17 <sup>th</sup> meeting; Too restrictive and/or difficult to apply and administer.	
	C/MU-2	2.0 max. W. side of Seacoast Dr.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported revisiting this recommendation. Eliminated from consideration at March 17 <sup>th</sup> meeting.		
		3.0 max. E. side of Seacoast Dr.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported revisiting this recommendation. Eliminated from consideration at March 17 <sup>th</sup> meeting.		
	C/MU-3	3.0 max.	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported revisiting this recommendation. Eliminated from consideration at March 17 <sup>th</sup> meeting.		
<b>Stepbacks</b>	C/MU-1	At 2 <sup>nd</sup> fl. and above, 5-10 ft. if abutting residential uses or zones	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported this recommendation.	Presented, but no action taken. Continuation expected at February Council Meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding the CMU-1 requirement to all locations within the C/MU-2 area was presented as an option at the December meeting.</li> </ul> Required stepbacks will again be discussed during prototype review.	
	C/MU-2	Fronting Seacoast Dr., 5-10 ft. upper stories, for min. of 50% of street facing facades	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported this recommendation.		
	C/MU-3	None	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported having the same stepbacks as the C/MU-2 zone (5-10 ft. upper stories, for min. of 50% of street facing facades).		
<b>Setbacks</b>	C/MU-1	General: 0' front, 10' rear, 5' side, 0' street side Exception: 15' props. facing Donax or Calla Avenues		Required setbacks will again be discussed during prototype review.	
	C/MU-2	0' all sides	At February 2010 meeting, Council supported imposing setbacks for property's abutting residential zones or uses.		
	C/MU-3	0' front, 10' rear, 5' side, 0' street side			
<b>Lot Consolidation Incentive</b>	C/MU-1	Lots 20-30k sf, 10% du bonus	Density bonus no longer applicable in C/MU-1.	Presented at December meeting, but no action taken. Continuation expected at February Council Meeting.  At the meeting on March 17 <sup>th</sup> , density percentages were eliminated.	
		Lots >30k sf, 20% du bonus	Density bonus no longer applicable in C/MU-1.		
	C/MU-2	Lots 20-30k sf, 10% du bonus	Percentages eliminated; maximum density up to 36 du allowed on lots ≥ 20,000 sf		
		Lots >30k sf, 20% du bonus	Percentages eliminated; maximum density up to 36 du allowed on lots ≥ 20,000 sf		
	C/MU-3	Lots 20-30k sf, 10% du bonus	Percentages eliminated; maximum density up to 36 du allowed on lots ≥ 20,000 sf		
		Lots >30k sf, 20% du bonus	Percentages eliminated; maximum density up to 36 du allowed on lots ≥ 20,000 sf		
<b>Exceptional Architectural Design Incentive</b>	C/MU-1	Height increase up to 60' in Palm Ave. height overlay zone and/or	Removed from Consideration	Presented at December meeting, but no action taken. Continuation expected at February Council Meeting.	
		10-20% density bonus up to 52 du/ac within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone	Removed from consideration, as it does not apply without height increase		
	C/MU-2	Height increase up to 40' (east side only)	Removed from consideration.		Action taken at October and December Council Meeting: Council proposed up to 35' to be considered on east side of Seacoast with incentives
	C/MU-3	Height increase up to 40'	Removed from consideration.		
<b>Green Building Incentive</b>	C/MU-1	Height increase up to 60' in Palm Ave. height overlay zone and/or	Removed from Consideration.	Discussed at December meeting; role of green incentives may also depend on City's approach to Cal. Green Building Code. No action	

Topic	Area	Proposed Recommendation	Council Direction	Staff Notes
		10-20% density bonus up to 52 du/ac within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone	Removed from Consideration, as it does not apply without height increase	taken, continuation expected at February Council Meeting. Green Building incentive included in menu per June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting.
	C/MU-2	Height increase up to 40' (east side only)	Removed from consideration.	Action taken at October and December Council Meeting: Council proposed up to 35' to be considered on east side of Seacoast with incentives; Green Building incentive included in menu per June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting.
	C/MU-3	Height increase up to 40'	Removed from consideration	Green Building incentive included in menu per June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting.
Active Commercial Use Incentive	C/MU-1	Height increase up to 60' in Palm Ave. height overlay zone and/or	Removed from Consideration	Discussion at December meeting indicated a desire to incorporate this incentive in other ways. No action taken, continuation expected at February Council Meeting. At June 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting, include on incentive menu. Discussed at June 15 <sup>th</sup> meeting, but no action taken.
		10-20% density bonus up to 52 du/ac within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone	Removed from Consideration, as it does not apply without height increase	
Additional Incentives	C/MU-1, C/MU-2, C/MU-3	Additional residential unit development up to a max. where add'l community infrastructure improvements provided	Community infrastructure, plaza space, etc. included in incentive menu on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	Discussion at December meeting regarding other incentives included provision of 3 bedroom units, provision of affordable for sale units, or provision of open space or other amenity. No action taken, continuation expected at February Council Meeting.
		Reduction of development processing or permit fees	Eliminated at meeting on March 17 <sup>th</sup> .	
		Reduction or expedited approval procedure timeline	Eliminated at meeting on March 17 <sup>th</sup> .	Incentives discussed on March 17 <sup>th</sup> ; On June 2 <sup>nd</sup> Council recommended 15-foot ground floor commercial/retail ceiling height be required and recommended achieving 2 of a list of other incentives to be eligible for height and density increases.
		Provision of 3 bedroom units	Included in incentive menu on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
		Provision of affordable for sale units	Eliminated at meeting on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
		Provision of open space, plaza space, or other amenities	Included in incentive menu on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
New Zones	C-1, R-1500/MU-1	Create C/MU-1	At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported proposed recommendation.	Presented, but no action taken. To be comprehensively presented at future Council Meeting. Council supported imposing the same development standards for the C/MU2 and C/MU3 zones.
	C-2, R-1500/MU-2	Create C/MU-2	Residential Overlay Zone to be included to allow free-standing single-family residential in old MU-2 Overlay Zone. At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported proposed recommendation.	
	C-3	Create C/MU-3	At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported proposed recommendation.	
Use Regulations (See attached table)	C/MU-1, C/MU-2, C/MU-3	Add 12 new land uses, address uses in all proposed zones (i.e. assign a use permission for every zone), change use permissions	Presented to Council at May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting; Council generally supportive but requested clarifications. At June 15, 2010 meeting, in conjunction with the active commercial use overlay on Palm Avenue, Council supported requiring all parcels fronting Palm Avenue in the C/MU-1 Zone to contain commercial uses at the ground floor for a minimum dimension of 25-50 feet from front property line. Specific dimension was not determined.	Concerns expressed about non-commercial development, multi-family development allowed in commercial zones; additional discussion during Active Commercial Use discussion at meeting on June 15, 2010.
Definitions	C/MU-1, C/MU-2, C/MU-3	Revise definition of measurement of height	Presented to Council at May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting; Council supportive.	Some clarification on definitions required.
	C/MU-1, C/MU-2, C/MU-3	Add 27 new definitions	Presented to Council at May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting; Council supportive.	
Min. Active Comm'l Use	C/MU-1	25% of frontage along Palm Ave.	Concerns expressed at May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting. At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported an active commercial use "overlay" from 7 <sup>th</sup> Street to Florida Street. Council also supported requiring all parcels fronting Palm Avenue in the C/MU-1 Zone to contain commercial uses at the ground floor for a minimum dimension of 25-50 feet from the front property line. Specific dimension was not determined.	Presented at October and December meetings. Remaining recommendations to be comprehensively discussed at future Council Meeting. Additional discussion at meeting on June 15 <sup>th</sup> .
		60% of frontage within Palm Ave. Height Overlay Zone with develop. incentive	Removed from consideration at October Council Meeting	
	C/MU-2	60% of frontage along Palm and Seacoast	Concerns expressed at May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting. At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported proposed	

Topic	Area	Proposed Recommendation	Council Direction	Staff Notes
	C/MU-3	25% of frontage along IB Blvd. and along 13 <sup>th</sup> St.	<p>recommendation.</p> <p>Concerns expressed at May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p> <p>At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported imposing the same development standard for C/MU-2 and C/MU-3, which is 60% of frontage.</p>	
First Floor Height Requirement	C/MU-1, C/MU-2 C/MU-3	15' min. for mixed-use project with active comm'l use requirement	<p>At December meeting, Council supported minimum floor heights ranging from 12' to 15'</p> <p>At June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, Council directed this to be required in all commercial zones.</p>	
		20' min. for single story buildings	<p>At June 15, 2010 meeting Council supported proposed recommendation.</p>	
Revised Design Guidelines	C/MU-1, C/MU-2, C/MU-3	Relationship of buildings to site and surrounding area		To be comprehensively presented at future Council Meeting.
		Commercial and mixed-use development		
		Ground floor uses and street-level design		
		Landscaping improvements, open space, and exterior lighting		
		Circulation and parking		

Note: New recommendations since Commercial Working Paper #2 include Residential Overlay Zone and Bikeway Village rezoning classification.