

M I N U T E S

GARDEN GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

COMMUNITY MEETING CENTER
11300 STANFORD AVENUE
GARDEN GROVE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 16, 2006

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 JONES, VICE CHAIR MARGOLIN,
COMMISSIONERS CALLAHAN, CHI, LECONG, PIERCE
ABSENT: None.
VACANCY: One.

ALSO PRESENT: Omar Sandoval, Assistant City Attorney; Susan Emery, Community Development Director; Karl Hill, Senior Planner; Maria Parra, Associate Planner; Judith Moore, Recording Secretary.

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

ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Vice Chair Margolin moved to approve the Minutes of February 2, 2006, with an amendment, seconded by Chair Jones. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: CALLAHAN, CHI, JONES, LECONG,
MARGOLIN, PIERCE
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

PUBLIC HEARING: SITE PLAN NO. SP-386-06
APPLICANT: YEN PHAM AND JOHNNY TRAN
LOCATION: EAST SIDE OF LUCILLE AVENUE, SOUTH OF LAMPSON AVENUE AT
12762 LUCILLE AVENUE
DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 2006

REQUEST: To construct two (2) detached, two-story multiple-family units with a combined living area of 4,997 square feet, with each unit having an attached two-car garage, on a 10,850 square foot lot improved with an existing single-family home. The site is in the R-2 (Limited Multiple Residential) zone.

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

Mr. Alan Nguyen, the applicant's representative, and Mr. Johnny Tran, the applicant, approached the Commission.

Chair Jones asked Mr. Nguyen if the applicant had read and agreed with the conditions of approval. Mr. Nguyen replied yes.

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

Vice Chair Margolin commented that the project is straight forward and Chair Jones agreed.

Chair Jones moved to approve Site Plan SP-386-06, seconded by Commissioner Lecong, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in Resolution No. 5534. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	CALLAHAN, CHI, JONES, LECONG, MARGOLIN, PIERCE
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

PUBLIC HEARING:
APPLICANT:
LOCATION:
DATE:
REQUEST:

SITE PLAN NO. SP-389-06
DZUNG (DENNIS) VO
SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LAMPSON AVENUE AND JOSEPHINE STREET AT 8752 LAMPSON AVENUE
FEBRUARY 16, 2006

To construct a two-story, 6,195 square foot residential duplex with two (2) attached, two-car enclosed garages on a 12,875 square foot lot. The site is in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) zone.

The case was continued to a date uncertain.

PUBLIC HEARING:
APPLICANT:
LOCATION:
DATE:
REQUEST:

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT NO. PUD-107-96 (REV. 05)
SIGNS & SERVICES COMPANY
SOUTH SIDE OF TRASK AVENUE, EAST OF MAGNOLIA STREET AT 9140 TRASK AVENUE
FEBRUARY 16, 2006

To modify the condition of approval for Planned Unit Development No. PUD-107-96 to modify the sign requirement to allow pole signs in the development.

Staff report was reviewed and recommended denial. One letter in support of the denial was written by Julia Araiza.

Commissioner Pierce asked staff to clarify the height of the pole sign. Staff explained that the pole sign would be 35'-0" tall.

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

Mr. Mike Silva, the property owner, his wife Denise Silva, and Mr. J. De Ruyter of Signs & Services Co., approached the Commission and handed out a one page memo with letters of support from Brodard Restaurant and Rancho Alamitos High School. Mr. Silva then continued, and explained his position with regard to the request for a pole sign for his Great Reunions business; that the sign would not put off light; and the sign would not be visible from the neighboring apartment complex.

Commissioner Chi asked Mr. Silva what percentage of drive-by traffic patronized his business. Mr. Silva did not know; however, he commented that with a pole sign more drivers would know about his business and go to the Great Reunions website for more information.

Commissioner Chi commented that the businesses with existing pole signs are service-based businesses such as service stations, auto dealerships, and restaurants, and that the signs seen from the freeway are integral to the success of those businesses.

Commissioner Lecong commented that due to the position and size of Mr. Silva's building, he has more advantages than the adjacent businesses.

Vice Chair Margolin asked Mr. Silva if he was aware of the PUD condition when he purchased the property. Mr. Silva replied yes, he was aware he would have to apply for a PUD amendment.

Ms. Julia Araiza approached the Commission and expressed her opposition to the pole sign citing that the sign would affect the residential areas.

Chair Jones asked staff to clarify the City's stance on pole signs.

Staff replied that in 1991 pole signs were allowed; however, the preponderance of signs throughout the community became a visual blight and that with so many competing signs, one might not notice any of them and the purpose is defeated. Staff commented that City Council gave direction to minimize pole signs by allowing only five-acre developments to have pole signs and those businesses adjacent to freeways that serviced motorists, such as gas stations.

Staff further explained that restaurants with existing pole signs pre-date the change in the 1991 code amendment and that they were 'grandfathered' in; in addition, a Council policy allowed the large 'City-owned' signs to be used to advertise Citywide activities and businesses that the City deemed important for the City's economic health. Staff added that a request for a pole sign has not been approved since 1991 unless certain the criteria was met, and that the goal is to remove as many pole signs as possible.

Chair Jones asked staff if there were alternatives to pole signs. Staff replied that roof-mounted signs or signs projecting above the roof were not allowed, and that new signs need to be wall-mounted; however, the window locations on the existing Great Reunions building pose certain limitations for a wall sign.

Commissioner Callahan asked staff to clarify why the City's pole signs were allowed. Staff replied that businesses important to the City's

economic health did not have the needed freeway exposure, such as the new hotels, and this was a way to provide advertisement for the entertainment district called International West.

Commissioner Lecong asked staff to clarify the City's sign requirements. Staff replied that under the current zoning code, with five acres or more, two monument signs and a pylon sign are allowed as applied to commercial properties; however, the auto mall, within a specific PUD, has a provision for pole signage. Staff further cited that if a business is not under a PUD, it is subject to the commercial designation for the zoning code, and that some PUD's do prohibit pole signs.

Commissioner Pierce asked staff if the pole signs on the adjacent properties would be removed. Staff replied that if the sign advertises a use that hasn't changed, the pole sign could remain in place. Staff reiterated that the goal for changing the code in 1991 was to remove existing pole signs when the use was changed, and to prevent new pole signs.

Chair Jones asked staff if Great Reunions could share sign space with Brodard Restaurant. Staff replied no.

Mr. Mike Silva approached the Commission and noted that all four parcels have pole signs; the businesses adjacent to Great Unions have no problem with his request for a new pole sign; that there are no five-acre areas along the freeways; and that a pole sign would be good for his business.

Chair Jones stated that the Commission is pro-business; however, there is the concern for setting a precedent with regard to pole signs.

Commissioner Lecong asked Mr. Silva to state his business hours. Mr. Silva stated Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Lecong noted that the Great Reunions building is darkish toward the evening hours and that the owner would need more than a pole sign for better marketing. Mr. Silva replied that a pole sign would be on a timer, and would be lit at night to be seen from the freeway.

Commissioner Chi asked Mr. Silva if his monument sign is visible on the off-ramp. Mr. Silva replied that the monument sign can only be viewed from Trask Avenue.

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

Chair Jones expressed that he is pro-business; that he is concerned with setting precedents; and urged staff to find a creative solution for the applicant's visibility. Commissioner Chi agreed.

Commissioner Lecong asked staff if a sign could be placed between the building's windows. Staff replied that a sign attached to the building would be the preference and would be looked into.

Commissioner Lecong commented that the law has to come first, and that for business owners a sacrifice to the community is required to keep the City beautiful.

Vice Chair Margolin commented that even though the existing pole signs would remain, pole signs do not appeal to him; that he understands the City having a pole sign for advertisements; that Great Reunions has good internet business and a pole sign would not impact the business; and that approving a pole sign would set a precedent.

Commissioners Pierce and Callahan agreed with staff.

Vice Chair Margolin moved to approve the denial of Planned Unit Development No. PUD-107-96, seconded by Commissioner Chi, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in Resolution No. 5536. The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS:	CALLAHAN, CHI, JONES, LECONG, MARGOLIN, PIERCE
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS:	NONE

MATTERS
FROM

COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Callahan commented to staff that the Pep Boys property at Euclid Avenue and Katella Avenue is still a problem with regard to dumping and trash; that apparently the corrective measure letters have not been reaching the property management; and that he would like the City to look into the problem more aggressively.

Chair Jones commented that the center is run down and blighted and that the illegal dumping is a burden to the property owner.

Staff commented that the owner needs constant trash pick-up and that the City has suggested trash pick-up two to three times a week; that when the community sees trash, they start to dump; and that more lighting is required.

Commissioner Lecong asked staff if there are redevelopment plans for the old market center at Katella Avenue and Magnolia Street. Staff replied that at one time, Northgate Market, a Hispanic grocery store, was interested in the former Lucky Supermarket site; however, in the end, they wanted a larger space.

Commissioner Lecong asked if a Lee's Sandwiches would be located at the Magnolia Street and Trask Avenue site. Staff replied that there would be a retail phone store instead.

MATTERS
FROM STAFF:

Staff read a brief description of future agenda items for the Planning Commission meeting on March 2, 2006, and informed the Commissioners of a Study Session on March 16, 2006, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, and that the session would cover ABC Licenses and Conditional Use Permits.

Commissioner Chi commented that he had plans to attend the Planners Institute 2006 and Mini Expo in Monterey, CA in March.

Staff informed Commissioners of another workshop, sponsored by the American Planning Association (APA); that the meeting would be held in San Antonio, Texas, in April of 2006; and that specific information would be forthcoming.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

JUDITH MOORE
Recording Secretary