

M I N U T E S

GARDEN GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

COMMUNITY MEETING CENTER
11300 STANFORD AVENUE
GARDEN GROVE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY
JANUARY 15, 2004

CALL TO ORDER: The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Founders Room of the Community Meeting Center.

PRESENT: CHAIR BUTTERFIELD, VICE CHAIR JONES,
COMMISSIONERS BARRY, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, AND
NGUYEN

ABSENT: NONE

ALSO PRESENT: Doug Holland, Deputy City Attorney; Susan Emery, Planning Services Manager; Karl Hill, Senior Planner; Erin Webb, Senior Planner; Noemi Bass, Assistant Planner; Maria Parra, Planning Intern; George Skelton, Assistant to the City Manager; CityScape Consultants Franks Edwards and Susan Raybold; Investigator Rick Wagner; and Teresa Pomeroy, Recording Secretary.

CALL TO ORDER: The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Community Meeting Center.

PRESENT: CHAIR BUTTERFIELD, VICE CHAIR JONES,
COMMISSIONERS BARRY, CALLHAN, HUTCHINSON, AND
NGUYEN

ABSENT: NONE

ALSO PRESENT: Doug Holland, Deputy City Attorney; Susan Emery, Planning Services Manager; Karl Hill, Senior Planner; Erin Webb, Senior Planner; Noemi Bass, Assistant Planner; Maria Parra, Planning Intern; George Skelton, Assistant to the City Manager; CityScape Consultant Susan Raybold; Investigator Rick Wagner; and Teresa Pomeroy, Recording Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Chair Butterfield and recited by those present in the Chamber.

ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:

Commissioner Hutchinson moved to approve the Minutes of December 4, 2003, seconded by Commissioner Barry. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN,
HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

CONTINUED
PUBLIC
HEARING:

SITE PLAN NO. SP-334-03
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-120-03

APPLICANT:
LOCATION:

DE HUA JR.
WEST SIDE OF BROOKHURST STREET NORTH OF BIXBY AVENUE AT
12171 THROUGH 12181 BROOKHURST STREET

DATE:

JANUARY 15, 2004

REQUEST:

To allow an existing restaurant (Seafood Palace Chinese Restaurant) currently operating under a State Alcoholic Beverage Control Type "47" (On-Sale General, Eating Place) License to expand from 4,470 square feet to 15,190 square feet, and to have live entertainment and dancing. The site is in the Brookhurst Chapman Specific Plan (Light Commercial) zone.

Staff report was reviewed recommending approval of the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit, and recommended approval of the Development Agreement to City Council. Staff noted a letter from Johan Knor received and provided to the Planning Commission; it included a petition with five resident signatures in opposition to the request. Also, provided to the Planning Commission, a letter was received from Bob Thacker, Attorney, representing adjacent commercial property owners, that asked to postpone a decision in order to address parking concerns.

Commissioner Barry asked about the letter from Mr. Thacker, noting that he stated that there is no parking agreement. Staff stated that there is a parking agreement from the 1960's, which was revised in the 1980's.

Commissioner Barry questioned the need to restrict the business hours during the week. Staff responded that most wedding banquets are held on the weekends, and that the other businesses in the center would be least impacted by this schedule.

Commissioner Barry noted that most retail businesses close early during the week, and asked the reason for restricting the weekday hours. Staff responded that most events that would be utilizing the banquet facility would be scheduled on the weekend when there is more available parking.

Commissioner Barry stated that if the stores close at 9:00 p.m. then there is no conflict.

Chair Butterfield asked whether the applicant has asked for later hours during the week. Staff stated that the applicant has not asked for later weekday hours.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked whether the staff has a copy of the original parking agreement, and questioned whether it is still valid. Staff stated that it was originally prepared in 1961 and amended in 1987, and is good for 65 years.

Commissioner Barry asked if staff was making modifications to the parking agreement. Staff stated no, but have requested that the property owners provide a letter of agreement.

Vice Chair Jones noted that with a preexisting agreement, a letter of agreement might not be necessary. However, it would be helpful to find out what the issues are before making a decision.

Doug Holland commented that it is common for staff to attempt to ensure consensus between affected property owners. Staff had asked for a letter of agreement between the property owners in order to facilitate this request.

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Jimmy Tong Nguyen, representative for the applicant, approached the Commission. He stated that he has been working with the planning staff on this project for two years. He noted that there is a reciprocal parking agreement that has been recorded with the county, and it was submitted to the Public Works Department. He indicated that the expansion would be the only portion of the establishment that would be used for wedding banquets.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked whether he was aware of the dispute over the existence of a parking agreement.

Mr. Nguyen stated that Mr. Kamali, who represents the adjacent property owner, has met with them twice. He stated that they would like to renegotiate the parking agreement, and they are trying to work with the property owner.

Mr. Cy LaBree approached the Commission and described the history of this property, noting that his father had owned it. He commented that the parking lot is often full, and he expressed concern that once the restaurant expands, the parking will be heavily impacted. He complained about illegal activity at the Hawaii Cafeteria across the street from this establishment. He expressed his view that the noise and congestion will be overwhelming.

Mr. Norman Henninger approached the Commission and expressed his view that this project will negatively impact the value of his home. He noted that the floor plan for the expansion shows a removable partition, which indicates that more of the restaurant would be used for

banquets. He expressed concern that this expansion would increase the crime in the area.

Commissioner Barry asked why a partition would be allowed rather than a solid wall between the two sections. Staff stated that the partition gives the restaurant operation more flexibility.

Commissioner Barry thought that a solid wall would help to mitigate disruption for people who would be dining. She asked how "security" is defined. Doug Holland stated that the intent of the condition requiring security is for the applicant to provide private security guard service if there are problems.

Investigator Wagner noted that the crime count in this area is high; however, the shopping center has a low crime rate as the crime count is generated from the neighboring apartments and homes.

Mr. John Kamali approached the Commission and indicated that he has been involved with this property for seven years. He commented that the parking agreement has only now surfaced in November and they turned it over to the attorney, Mr. Thacker, who said that the agreement is very vague. He noted that they have spent a lot of money upgrading the shopping center. He commented that when the original parking agreement was made, the use was different and did not have the same impact as this restaurant. He asked that this request be continued in order to negotiate a new parking agreement. He noted that the center's occupancy has increased, and they need the parking spaces.

Vice Chair Jones asked whether Mr. Kamali has come up with any solutions for parking. Mr. Kamali indicated that he has thought of re-circulation; however, he is concerned about liability.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked Mr. Kamali if he has a copy of the parking agreement. Mr. Kamali stated that he only became aware of a parking agreement two months ago. He noted that the parking agreement is not listed on the title and that it is vague.

Mr. Jimmy Nguyen approached the Commission. He stated that the parking meets the code, and they are willing to work with everyone. He stated that their goal is to stay in business, and he invited anyone who wished to come by the restaurant to see what they are doing. They have hired a civil engineer and worked to satisfy the city's code. They have spent a lot of money and do not want to jeopardize the business or the safety of their customers. He noted that they plan to hire a security guard. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present this request.

Commissioner Barry asked if they would change the partition to a solid wall. Mr. Nguyen stated that he would ask the owner.

Commissioner Hutchinson commented that business must be allowed to expand, but he urged them to work with the adjacent property owner on a parking agreement.

Mr. Nguyen stated that they have extended themselves, and he will continue to work with Mr. Kamali and all of the neighbors in the center.

Commissioner Barry noted condition number 40 addresses the routine maintenance of the parking lot and sidewalks. She questioned how the parking issues would impact this condition.

Doug Holland stated that a parking agreement would not interfere with the responsibility for maintenance and only addresses ingress, egress, and customer parking.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Chair Butterfield suggested that this item be continued to February 5, 2004, in order for the applicant to reach an agreement for parking.

Commissioner Barry noted that condition number 41 has language that needs to be changed, and she also asked that the partition be replaced with a solid wall.

Commissioner Barry moved to continue the request to February 5, 2004, seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson. The motion received the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

CONTINUED
PUBLIC

HEARING: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-124-03
APPLICANT: FARIBORZ FARAHMAND
LOCATION: EAST SIDE OF MAIN STREET, NORTH OF GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD AT
12926 MAIN STREET
DATE: JANUARY 15, 2004

REQUEST: To allow open-air seating and to expand the floor area to an existing restaurant operating under an Alcoholic Beverage Control Type "41" (On-Sale General, Public Eating Place) License, located in the Community Center Specific Plan Mixed Use Area 33 (Main Street Historical Overlay) zone.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended approval.

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Mr. and Mrs. Fariborz Farahmand, the applicants, approached the Commission. Mrs. Farahmand requested that the business be allowed to stay open until 11:00 p.m.; have karaoke and a total of 12

amusement devices; and to utilize the counter for food service. Mr. Farahmand expressed his appreciation for how Main Street looks; however, he is concerned about slow business.

Chair Butterfield questioned why karaoke would not be allowed, as she thought that there are some businesses on Main Street that have karaoke. Staff noted that the zoning code does not allow any amplified sound as used with karaoke.

Vice Chair Jones asked what type of entertainment would be allowed. Staff stated that they could have an acoustic guitar player or a piano. Also, the zoning code does not allow any more than nine amusement devices. Twelve devices would be considered an arcade.

Commissioner Barry asked why they would not be allowed to use the counter for food service. Staff stated that the intent is to discourage people from sitting at the counter and ordering only alcohol.

Mr. Harry Krebs approached the Commission and asked that they approve the expansion. He expressed his view that the outdoor dining enhances the Main Street ambience, and everyone affected is working hard to bring business into this area. He commented that his family enjoys the pizza at this establishment, and he expressed his support for the request.

Mr. Angelo Tarlarides, owner of a neighboring business at 12942 Main Street, approached the Commission. He stated that he is opposed to the expansion because of the lack of parking. The sidewalk dining is a concern, as it will impede pedestrian traffic. He asked that the outdoor seating allow for foot traffic, and also be visually consistent with the other businesses that offer outdoor seating. There is a need for 43 parking spaces for this expansion, and if more businesses on Main Street would want to expand, the parking would be impacted. There is also a lot of illegal dumping and the additional trash is a concern for him. He stated that the applicant has already expanded his seating without approval. He is concerned about further violations, and because of the history of noncompliance, he does not think that this request should be approved.

Mr. Hooshang Farahmand, a family member of the applicant, approached and stated that they started the expansion, but stopped when they learned they were violating City code.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Chair Butterfield commented that they need to increase the number of times a week the trash is picked up. She asked whether there is enough parking for the expansion.

Staff stated that it has been determined that the parking district provides ample parking and the expansion of this business will not impact other businesses. There is street parking, as well as parking

located behind the businesses on Main Street on both sides of the street.

Chair Butterfield stated that she does not see anything wrong with the expansion; however, the amusement devices would have to be restricted to nine.

Vice Chair Jones commented that Main Street should be a destination spot, and that they should be able to have karaoke. He stated that he did not have any problem with the business closing at 11:00 p.m. He expressed his view that an amiable coexistence needs to be achieved, as well as a synergy between the businesses on Main Street, which would help to increase business.

Chair Butterfield noted that the conditions do require that the tables in the front not be a hindrance to foot traffic. Staff noted that the Parking and Main Street Commission could address the consistency and aesthetics of outdoor seating.

Commissioner Nguyen commented on her familiarity with this establishment. The people are friendly and have brought more business to Main Street. Several times she has eaten at the counter, and that the restaurant should be allowed to use it for service. There is a concern about the dumping, and she asked staff to address this situation. Staff stated that Code Enforcement would look into the dumping.

Commissioner Barry moved to approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-124-03, with an amendment to delete condition number 24 and allow food service at the counter; to amend condition 20 to allow a solo performer; to change the hours of operation to allow an 11:00 p.m. closure; to amend condition 35 to include the language "and/or notification"; seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson, pursuant to the facts and the reasons contained in Resolution No. 5394, and authorized the Chair to execute the Resolution. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

PUBLIC HEARING: NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 AMENDMENT NO. A-105-04
 APPLICANT: CITY OF GARDEN GROVE
 LOCATION: CITY WIDE
 DATE: JANUARY 15, 2004

REQUEST: The City of Garden Grove is proposing to amend Title 9 of the Garden Grove Municipal Code to create Section 9.08.100 Wireless Telecommunications Facilities. This amendment to Title 9 will establish a review process and specific development standards for telecommunication wireless facilities within the City of Garden Grove.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council.

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Ms. Barbara Saito of Nextel Communications approached the Commission. She stated that there are some parts of this proposed ordinance that are unenforceable.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hutchinson moved to adopt the Negative Declaration and recommend approval of Amendment No. A-105-04 to City Council, seconded by Vice Chair Jones, pursuant to the facts and the reasons contained in Resolution No. 5401, and authorized the Chair to execute the Resolution. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

PUBLIC HEARING:	NEGATIVE DECLARATION CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-111-03
APPLICANT:	NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS
LOCATION:	WEST SIDE OF HARBOR BOULEVARD, NORTH OF CHAPMAN AVENUE AT 11747 HARBOR BOULEVARD
DATE:	JANUARY 15, 2004
REQUEST:	To allow the installation and operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at an existing hotel (Hampton Inn & Suites). The proposed facility will consist of a new equipment room adjacent to the pool equipment room, and panel antennas mounted onto the façade of the hotel, disguised as architectural features. The site is in Planned Unit Development No. PUD-118-98 zone.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended approval. Staff noted amendments to the conditions of approval to add "upon notification" to condition number 6; and to replace "prepared by an independent third party, qualified to measure" with "with all applicable FCC regulations for" in condition 19 b. In addition, the Planning Services Manager and the City Attorney shall modify condition numbers 10 and 19 as they may reasonably determine appropriate to reflect the terms and provisions of a Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance the City Council may adopt prior to January 1, 2005.

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Ms. Barbara Saito, representing Nextel Communications, approached the Commission. She thanked staff and explained how the antennas will be placed on the façade of the hotel. She stated that they will be taking off part of the sign, and the antennas will be inset and will not be noticeable.

Mr. David Cornish, representing the owners of the Hampton Suites, approached the Commission. He asked for the Commission's support and expressed the view of the ownership that this will be a good project, and one that will be aesthetically pleasing.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hutchinson moved to adopt the Negative Declaration and approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-111-03, with the amendments proposed by staff, seconded by Commissioner Nguyen, pursuant to the facts and the reasons contained in Resolution No. 5370, and authorized the Chair to execute the Resolution. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

PUBLIC HEARING:	SITE PLAN NO. SP-337-03
APPLICANT:	CUONG NGUYEN
LOCATION:	EAST SIDE OF MONROE STREET, SOUTH OF GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD AT 13052 MONROE STREET
DATE:	JANUARY 15, 2004
REQUEST:	To allow the construction of a new two-story residential duplex with two detached garages on a 10,231 square foot lot. The site is in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) zone.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended approval. Staff noted the following requirements were to be added to the conditions of approval:

19. The Applicant shall submit a complete landscape plan governing the entire development. Said plan shall include type, size, location and quality of all plant material. This includes enhanced landscaping for the walkway areas. It shall include irrigation plans and staking and planting specification. The landscape plan is subject to the following:
 - a. A complete, permanent, automatic remote control irrigation system shall be provided for all common area landscaping shown on the plan. The sprinklers shall be of low flow/precipitation sprinkler heads for water conservation.
 - b. The plan shall provide a mixture of a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the trees at 48-inch box, ten percent (10%) of the trees at 36-inch box, fifteen percent (15%) of the trees at 24-inch box and sixty percent (60%) of the trees at 15-gallon, the remaining five

percent (5%) may be of any size. Trees shall be incorporated into the landscaped frontage along Monroe Street. Where clinging vines are considered for covering walls, Boston Ivy shall be used.

- c. The property owner shall be responsible for installing and maintaining the common area landscaping.
- d. No trees shall be planted closer than five feet (5') from any public right-of-way. Trees planted within ten feet (10') of any public right-of-way shall be planted in a root barrier shield. All landscaping along the street frontage adjacent to the driveway shall be of the low height variety to ensure safe sight clearance.
- e. The landscaping treatment along Monroe Street frontage, including the area designated as public right-of-way, shall incorporate mounding and berming with trees, shrubs and bushes, and ground cover that enhance the exterior appearance between the duplex and the street.

20. The applicant/property owner shall submit a signed letter acknowledging receipt of the decision approving SP-337-03 and their agreement with all conditions of approval.

21. Any new or required block walls and/or retaining wall (s) shall be shown on the grading plans. Block walls shall be developed to City Standards or designed by a Registered Engineer and shall be measured from on-site finished grade.

22. The building plans, site plans and all construction shall comply with the current editions of the C.B.C., U.P.C., U.M.C., and N.E.C. as amended by the City of Garden Grove and State of California handicap access, energy conservation and sound transmission control requirements, including the following:

- a. It is recommended that the developer obtain a copy of the above amended code sections before completing the final design.
- b. At no time shall any structure, fireplace, architectural feature, or otherwise, be closer than three feet to any property line. Any roof eaves or similar roof overhangs intruding into this three-foot setback requirement, shall comply with the U.B.C. concerning method of construction.

23. Construction activities shall adhere to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which includes dust minimization measures, use electricity from power poles rather than diesel or gasoline powered generators, and use methanol, natural gas, propane or butane vehicles instead of gasoline or diesel powered equipment, where feasible, use solar or low-emission water heaters, use low-sodium parking lot lights, and ensure compliance with Title 24.

Chair Butterfield asked where the laundry hook-ups are proposed. Staff stated the ground floor of the duplexes.

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Cuong Nguyen and Dan Nguyen approached the Commission. Mr Nguyen stated that they bought a house in bad repair and plan to make it better.

Chair Butterfield asked if he has read and agrees with the conditions of approval. Mr. Nguyen stated yes.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Barry moved to approve Site Plan No. SP-337-03, with the amendments to the conditions as stated by staff, seconded by Commissioner Nguyen, pursuant to the facts and the reasons contained in Resolution No. 5402, and authorized the Chair to execute the Resolution. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

PUBLIC HEARING:	SITE PLAN NO. SP-338-04 VARIANCE NO. V-107-04 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
APPLICANT:	ARCHITECTURE M INC.
LOCATION:	WEST SIDE OF HASTER STREET, NORTH OF GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD AT 12881 HASTER STREET
DATE:	JANUARY 15, 2004
REQUEST:	To allow the construction of an approximate 5,000 square foot multi-tenant commercial building, with a Variance to allow a drive-through aisle in the required rear and side yard landscape setbacks, located in the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) zone.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended approval of the Site Plan and Variance and recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Development Agreement to City Council. Staff noted an amendment to condition number 26 to remove the following: "A new driveway approach shall be constructed per Garden Grove Standard Plan B-120. The applicant shall provide wheelchair ramps at the proposed project entrance in accordance with City Standard Plan B-108"; and replace with "The new driveway approach shall be constructed with wheelchair ramps at the proposed project entrance in accordance with City Standard Plan B-108."

Chair Butterfield opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Mark Grisale, representative for the applicant, approached the Commission. He explained the architectural design of the proposed project, and stated that the building's tenants will be Starbucks Coffee and Subway Sandwich.

Vice Chair Jones noted that there are four tenant spaces and asked about other tenants.

Mr. Shawn Danish, property owner, approached the Commission. He stated that a phone company will be using the two other available spaces.

Chair Butterfield suggested that an evergreen tree be selected for the landscaping. Staff noted that the tree that has been suggested to the applicant is the Oak Leaf Pepper Bark, which is drought resistant and hardy.

Chair Butterfield questioned the applicant whether they have read and agree with the conditions of approval. Mr. Grisale stated yes.

Chair Butterfield asked when they plan to move forward. Mr. Danish stated that they hope to move forward as soon as possible.

Mr. Richard Tucker, representing the Moss Creek Apartments adjacent to the project, approached the Commission. He expressed his support for the project; however, he would like to see a detailed landscaping plan, and suggested the Canary Island Pine Tree. He also expressed concern about drainage.

Commissioner Barry noted that the grading plan has to be approved by Public Works Engineering staff.

Mr. Grisale approached the Commission and stated that the City reviewed the grading plan, and they still have to turn in a landscaping plan.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Barry moved to approve Site Plan No. SP-338-04 and Variance No. V-107-04, with the amendment to the conditions as stated by staff, and recommended approval of the Development Agreement to City Council, seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson, pursuant to the facts and the reasons contained in Resolution No. 5403, and authorized the Chair to execute the Resolution. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

ELECTION OF
CHAIR AND
VICE CHAIR:

Commissioner Callahan moved to elect Vice Chair Jones as Chair, seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson. The motion received the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

Chair Butterfield moved to elect Commissioner Callahan as Vice Chair, seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson. The motion received the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	BARRY, BUTTERFIELD, CALLAHAN, HUTCHINSON, JONES, NGUYEN
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

MATTERS
FROM

COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Nguyen thanked staff for providing a Project Status Report.

Chair Butterfield asked whether Code Enforcement could monitor the dumping problem behind Main Street. She asked why three street trees that were on Euclid Street, south of Chapman Avenue in front of the Jack in the Box restaurant, had been sawed down. She also requested that staff address resident concerns about the Hawaii Cafeteria located on Brookhurst Street. Police staff responded that they are aware of the concerns about the restaurant and are investigating. Planning staff responded that information would be obtained about the dumping and the trees.

MATTERS

FROM STAFF:

Staff noted that there are two new submittals for the Brookhurst Triangle, and all submittals are on display at City Hall.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

TERESA POMEROY
Recording Secretary