



Placentia Planning Commission Agenda

Regular Meeting
October 11, 2016
6:30 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers
401 E. Chapman Avenue

Christine Schaefer
Chair

Frank Perez
Vice Chair

Dennis Lee
Commissioner

James Schenck
Commissioner

Thomas Solomonson
Commissioner

Vic Tomazic
Commissioner

Heather Francine
Commissioner

City of Placentia
401 E Chapman Avenue
Placentia, CA 92870

Phone: (714) 993-8124
Fax: (714) 528-4640
Website: www.placentia.org

Procedures for Addressing the Commission

Any person who wishes to speak regarding an item on the agenda or on a subject within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction during the "Oral Communications" portion of the agenda should fill out a "Speaker Request Form" and give it to the Commission Secretary BEFORE that portion of the agenda is called. Testimony for Public Hearings will only be taken at the time of the hearing. Any person who wishes to speak on a Public Hearing item should fill out a "Speaker Request Form" and give it to the Commission Secretary BEFORE the item is called.

The Commission encourages free expression of all points of view. To allow all persons the opportunity to speak, please keep your remarks brief. If others have already expressed your position, you may simply indicate that you agree with a previous speaker. If appropriate, a spokesperson may present the views of an entire group. To encourage all views, the Commission discourages clapping, booing or shouts of approval or disagreement from the audience.

**PLEASE SILENCE CELL PHONES AND OTHER ELECTRONIC
EQUIPMENT WHILE THE COMMISSION IS IN SESSION.**

Special Accommodations

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (714) 993-8231. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will generally enable City staff to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
(28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II)

Copies of all agenda materials are available for public review in the Office of the City Clerk, City Planning Division Counter, Placentia Library Reference Desk and the internet at www.placentia.org under the Planning Commission page. Persons who have questions concerning any agenda item may call the City Planning Division at (714) 993-8124 to make inquiry concerning the nature of the item described on the agenda.

In compliance California Government Code Section 54957.5, any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda that are not exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act will be made available for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office at City Hall, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, during normal business hours.

Study Sessions are open to the public and held in the City Council Chambers or City Hall Community Room.

REGULAR MEETING
6:30 p.m. – City Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: Commissioner Francine
Commissioner Lee
Commissioner Schenck
Commissioner Solomonson
Commissioner Tomazic
Vice Chair Perez
Chair Schaefer

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

At this time the public may address the Planning Commission concerning any agenda item, which is not a public hearing item, or on matters within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. There is a five (5) minute time limit for each individual addressing the Planning Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. **Minutes**
 - a. Planning Commission Meeting – February 9, 2016
 - b. Planning Commission Meeting – March 8, 2016
 - c. Planning Commission Meeting – April 12, 2016
 - d. Planning Commission Meeting – May 10, 2016

Recommended Action: Approve

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. **Applicant:** Bruce Kennedy
Project Location: 501 N. Bradford Avenue

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing concerning Use Permit 2016-12, receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and continue this item to the regular meeting of November 8, 2016.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- **Discussion of Vape products and sales**
- **Status of massage business ordinance compliance**

PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS

Commission members may make requests or ask questions of Staff. If a Commission member would like to have formal action taken on a requested matter, it will be placed on a future Commission Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commissioners ADJOURN to the next regular meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the Placentia City Hall City Council Chambers located at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia CA, 92870.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING

I, Joseph M. Lambert, Secretary to the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia, hereby certify that the Agenda for the October 11, 2016 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia was posted on October 6, 2016.



Joseph M. Lambert, Secretary

**PLACENTIA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

February 9, 2016

The regular meeting of the Placentia Planning Commission on February 9, 2016 was called to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Placentia Council Chambers, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, by Chair Schaefer.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Commissioner Francine, Schenck, Tomazic, Solomonson, Perez, Schaefer
ABSENT: Lee

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Francine

OTHERS PRESENT: Yolanda Summerhill, Assistant City Attorney
Charles Rangel, Senior Planner
Elsa Villagrana, Secretary

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. **Minutes**
Planning Commission Meeting - November 10, 2015.
Recommended Action: Approve

Motion by Schaefer, seconded by Tomazic and carried by a (3-2-2) vote to approve the November 10, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes.

Ayes: Tomazic, Perez, Schaefer
Noes:
Abstain: Francine, Schenck
Absent: Lee Solomonson

PUBLIC HEARING:

2. **Applicant: Remy Mendonca, DBA Step N Go**
Project Location: 110 N. Bradford Avenue, Placentia, CA 92870

Use Permit (UP) 2015-09 Modification:

Request to allow existing Step N Go convenience store with a Type 20 ABC License for Off-Sale Beer and Wine to permit the sale of alcoholic beverages Type 21 ABC (Off-Sale General) license for sale and Off-site general consumption located at 110 N. Bradford Avenue. The proposed use is not expected to create a negative impact

on the physical environment and is therefore categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guideline § 15061(b)(3) and City Environmental Guidelines.

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning Use Permit 2015-09, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing; and
- b. Adopt Resolution PC-2016-02, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia, Making Findings of Public Convenience or Necessity for Type 21 Off-Site General Consumption License and Approving Use Permit No. 2015-09 Modification for the Property located at 110 N. Bradford Avenue and Making Findings in Support Thereof; and
- c. Find that the project is categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA) set forth in Title 14 CCR §15301 and the City of Placentia Environmental Guidelines.

Chair Schaefer opened the Public Hearing at 6:35 p.m.

Senior Planner Rangel provided a brief report on the item noting that Step N Go is an existing business operating with a Type 20 ABC License and is applying for Type 21 ABC license. Rangel stated that the ownership of the convenience store was transferred to the applicant Remy Mendonca in November 2015. Rangel informed the Commission he conducted a site visit and had visited the commercial center in the past. He noted that in the past, the site had deferred maintenance and the new owners have cleaned up the site. Rangel stated that previously this particular convenience store had a history of higher than normal criminal activity. He stated that the Police Department informed him this was related to "snatch and run" incidents and they had concerns with this business holding a Type 21 license. Rangel noted that staff is recommending stringent Conditions of Approval to deter criminal activity. He stated that some of the conditions, such as installing surveillance cameras and an annual review of the business by staff

Commissioner Tomazic asked staff how many cameras will be required.

Senior Planner Rangel stated that a special investigator from the Police Department will need to make a recommendation on the number of cameras and placement. He noted that for this reason the number of cameras was not included in the Conditions of Approval for this item. Rangel stated a site visit with the applicant and special investigator will be conducted if the item is approved to verify the number of cameras installed.

Commissioner Schenck asked staff for the number of stores that sell alcohol nearby Step-N-Go.

Senior Planner Rangel responded that from the data available from the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) within a half-mile radius, only Sam's Club and Northgate are stores selling alcohol. He noted this data did not include restaurants because they are required to have a different type of license than retail stores.

Commissioner Schenck inquired about the type of crimes that were committed in the past at the convenience store.

Senior Planner Rangel responded that the crimes were considered petty theft crime.

Commissioner Schenck asked if they can put a condition if a change ownership that the new person will have to apply for a new use permit.

Senior Planner Rangel explained that in the Conditions Approval included in the staff report included a condition for staff to conduct an annual review of the location including criminal history.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill informed the Commission that use permit is a right that runs with the land and that removing such land use rights it will have to occur through a revocation process. She noted that use permit cannot instantly be taken away from an owner. The owner has a right to due process.

Commissioner James expressed concerns with delinquency in the nearby park associated with the proximity of Step N Go.

Senior Planner Rangel noted that the applicant needs to take the signed resolution for the Use Permit and submit it needs to ABC.

Commissioner James asked if they can stipulate the maximum percentage of sales that can be hard liquor to be sold.

Senior Planner Rangel noted that if the commission believes they need to stipulate a sales percentage. He noted that he has not recommended that stipulation in the past

Attorney City Attorney Summerhill informed the Commission that the stipulation of the percentage of sales is usually associated with restaurants. She stated she is not sure if under a Type 21 license if the commission can stipulate the percentage of sales.

Chair Schaefer inquired if any comments from the high school were received by staff.

Senior Planner Rangel stated he did not receive any comments from the high school. He noted that all property owners within a 300 foot radius were notified.

Chair Schaefer expressed concerns with the proximity of the convenience store with Valencia High School and stated that it would be valuable to seek their input. Schaefer stated she will be asking the applicant when he comes up to speak if they would have any issues with the commission continuing the item so the issues brought up by Commissioners can be researched by staff.

Senior Planner Rangel summarized the issues that need to be researched by staff.

Commissioner Francine requested additional information regarding the amount of students visiting the convenience store and would like some feedback from the School Resources Officer attached to the high school.

Chair Schaefer directed staff to check with the Community Services Department if there have been any problems in the nearby park.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill recommended that the Commission proceed forward and allow the applicant to speak and answer any of the questions raised by the commissioners.

Mr. Remy Mendonca thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak. He noted that liquor will be placed behind the counter. He stated there is a large number of students that visit the store after school. He stated he has made an effort to separate soft drinks and alcoholic beverages. He informed the Commission that it was his understanding that the past ownership was mean-spirited and that the criminal activity was retaliation against the owner.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the convenience store has a public restroom.

Mr. Mendonca commented that there is restroom in the store but it is not available to the public.

Schenck inquired the applicant about their ownership of a store in Anaheim.

Mr. Mendonca commented that he no longer owns the store and while he owned the store he maintained a good relationship with Anaheim Police Department.

Chair Schaefer close the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Motion to continue the Use Permit 2015-09 to the next commission meeting on March 8, 2016 by Schenck, seconded by Francine and carried a (4-1-0,) vote the recommended action.

Ayes: Francine, Schenck, Tomazic, Perez, Schaefer

Noes:

Abstain: Solomonson

Absent: Lee

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

3. City Attorney presentation on the Ralph M. Brown Act, Political Reform Act, Parliamentary Rules of Procedure and broad overview of land use issues.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill provided the Commission an overview of the Ralph M. Brown Act, Political Reform Act, Parliamentary Rules of Procedures and broad overview of land use issues.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Senior Planner Rangel noted in that the reorganization of the commission will be on the next Planning Commission Agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS:

Vice Chair Perez asked Rangel if the old Don-a-Vee sign on Orangethrope will be brought down once the digital billboards are installed.

Senior Planner Rangel said he will look into the matter and informed Commissioner Perez regarding if it will be brought down.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schaefer adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 7:45 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 8, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia.

Submitted by,

Charles L. Rangel,
Senior Planner

**PLACENTIA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

March 8, 2016

The regular meeting of the Placentia Planning Commission on March 8, 2016 was called to order at 6:31 p.m. in the Placentia Council Chambers, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, CA by Chair Schaefer.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Commissioner Francine, Lee, Schenck, Solomonson, Perez, Schaefer
ABSENT: Tomazic

OTHERS PRESENT: Yolanda Summerhill, Assistant City Attorney
Charles Rangel, Senior Planner
Elsa Villagrana, Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Schenck

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

PUBLIC HEARING: None

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **Applicant: Remy Mendonca, DBA Step N Go**
Project Location: 110 N. Bradford Avenue, Placentia, CA 92870
(Continued from meeting of February 9, 2016)

Use Permit (UP) 2015-09 Modification:

Request to allow existing Step N Go convenience store with a Type 20 ABC License for Off-Sale Beer and Wine to permit the sale of alcoholic beverages Type 21 ABC (Off-Sale General) license for sale and Off-site general consumption located at 110 N. Bradford Avenue. The proposed use is not expected to create a negative impact on the physical environment and is therefore categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines § 15061(b)(3) and City Environmental Guidelines.

(Approved 6-0)

Chair Schaefer opened the public hearing at 6:34 p.m. and called for the staff report.

Senior Planner Rangel stated this item is a continuation from the meeting held on February 9, 2016. He noted that the Commission directed staff to consult with the ABC, school district and Placentia Police Department.

Rangel summarized staff's findings. He stated that staff had amended the conditions of approval with the review of the Police Department. Staff contacted the school and school officials emailed staff stating that they did not approve of this Use Permit. Rangel stated he recommended the District to send an official representative to the public hearing to state their concerns with the item.

Rangel informed the Commission that the applicant has redrawn the site plan to indicate that all distilled liquor will be displayed behind the cashier's counter.

Rangel discussed with the Commission the process of a use permit including the revocation process as it relates to the conditions of approval for this item.

Rangel noted that since the item was continued, if the item is adopted and approved resolution needs to be revised to reflect today's date.

Schenck inquired if 75% of the items displayed are beer, liquor and wine, how is the convenience store not considered a liquor store.

Rangel commented that the staff added a condition that the applicant is required to have 25% of its products as healthy snacks and beverages. He stated that staff will work with the applicant to determine which items are considered healthy items. He noted that it is not uncommon for this type of convenience store to have a high amount of alcoholic beverage but offer a variety of other items including household. He commented that at the moment the City cannot impose restrictions on the amount of alcoholic beverages since there is no evidence that it has caused an undue burden to the public.

Schenck inquired if planning staff feels it is appropriate to have such a convenience store versus a 7 eleven store or a similar type of store.

Rangel noted he visited the convenience store to see how the products are on display.

Commissioner Lee inquired if adding a condition that requires healthy snacks and beverage is a common practice for this type of use and how it can be enforced.

Rangel noted that at the time the business was granted the Type 20 License did not include conditions regarding healthy snacks and beverages. He further discussed how similar conditions are not uncommon when a gas station with a convenience store has applied for a license. He commented that such applicants have been receptive to the condition of healthy snacks and beverages and has not received complaints from past applicants if it is affecting their business.

Commissioner Lee expressed concerns that the condition requiring a certain percentage of healthy snacks is not objective.

Senior Planner Rangel stated that the staff researched conditions of approval of other cities for similar uses and found that other cities have been including similar conditions stipulating a maximum percentage of healthy snacks.

Chair Schaefer inquired how staff will be measuring the type of products the applicant has in the convenience store.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that staff will be requesting an inventory list from the applicant.

Chair Schaefer asked for the applicant to provide testimony.

Mr. Mendonca thanked the Planning Commission for the opportunity to speak and answered any questions the commissions had

Chair Schaefer inquired if he had personally contacted the high school nearby his store regarding their opinion on obtaining a Type 21 license.

Mr. Mendonca commented that yes he spoke with Principal Hector Vasquez. Mr. Vasquez stated that he had no concerns with his convenience store and had coexisted with the store for the past 20 years.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the principal provided any comments regarding the situation with the previous owner.

Mr. Mendonca stated that the principal did not comment on the previous owners of the convenience store.

Chair Schaefer asked the applicant if he understood the revised conditions of approval.

Mr. Mendonca stated that he understands them and will be able to comply with the conditions. He noted he already installed a camera surveillance system and will be contacting the Police Department to review his system. He expressed concerns regarding being held responsible for any activity that may occur away from the store.

Commissioner Schenck commented he personally visited the business and observed an employee carefully checking ID's.

Chair Schaefer closed the public hearing at 6:45 p.m.

Motion by Schenck, seconded by Francine carried a (6-0) vote to approve the recommended actions.

Ayes: Francine, Lee, Solomonson, Schenck, Perez, Schaefer

Noes

Abstain:

Absent: Tomazic

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Applicant:** City of Placentia
Project Location: City-wide

Zone Code Amendment (ZCA) 2016-01:

A Zone Code Amendment pertaining to amending the City Municipal Code to conform to the State of California Model Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance. The proposed use is not expected to create a negative impact on the physical environment and is therefore categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the proposed project is considered to be categorically exempt (Class 7, Protection of Natural Resources) in that it consists of code revisions to conserve water resources.

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a) Open the Public Hearing, concerning Zoning Code Amendment 2016-01, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing; and
- b) Adopt Resolution PC-2016-03, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia, recommending to the City Council of the City of Placentia approval of Zoning Code Amendment No. 2016-01 Whereby Section 23.77 Of Title 23 Shall Be Repealed And Replaced With A Reference To The State Of California Model Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance; and
- c) Find that the project is categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed project is considered to be categorically exempt (Class 7, Protection of Natural Resources) in that it consists of code revisions to conserve water resources.

Chair Schaefer opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Senior Planner Rangel introduced Jennifer Davis as Interim Director of Development Services and presenter of the staff report.

Interim Director of Development Services, Jennifer Davis provided the Commission a summary of the revised State of California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo) and Zoning Code Amendment 2016-01. She noted that the revised state ordinance was approved by the California Water Commission on July 15, 2015 and required cities to either adopt local revised water efficient landscape ordinances by December 1, 2015 that are at least as restrictive as the MWELo, or become subject to MWELo. She stated that the City did not adopt a revised water efficient landscape ordinance and accompanying guidelines before December 1, 2015. Therefore, the City's current ordinance is superseded by the state MWELo and the City must enforce the new requirements found in MWELo. Davis stated that staff is recommending an ordinance to comply with the state mandate, amend the municipal code to removed the old ordinance and to adopt in reference the state's MWELo. Davis summarized to the commission some of the changes in the ordinance compare to the previous ordinance. She noted that staff is developing an application package to assist applicants on how to meet the requirements of ordinance.

Commissioner Schenck asked if they are any cities have not adopted this ordinance.

Interim Director Davis responded that other cities have adopted their own ordinance or the state ordinance.

Commissioner Schenck asked if our current ordinance was adopted before December 1, 2015.

Interim Director Davis noted that the City did not adopt the ordinance before December 1, 2015 and other cities were subjected to same regulations.

Commissioner Schenck inquired about the cost associated with implementing this ordinance.

Interim Director Davis noted that this is an unfunded State mandated and that staff is currently evaluating the cost of the audits and review of landscape plans required as part of the ordinance

Commissioner Schenck inquired if the city does not have funding to comply if they can receive assistance from the stated.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill noted that the cost will be placed on the applicant and is their responsibility to provide a landscape documentation package.

Commissioner Schenck inquired if the ordinance would negatively impact the golf course in the city.

Interim Director Davis stated that the golf course would be considered a special landscape area since it is a recreational use and will not be affected by the ordinance.

Commissioner Schenck inquired as to what type of businesses/industries in the City of Placentia will be affected by the ordinance.

Interim Director Davis stated it will affect every business who applies for a building permit or design review that have a landscape area of 500 square feet or more. This will include homeowners, business owners and industrial facilities.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the ordinance would affect the current water restrictions that limit watering to two days a week.

Interim Director Davis noted that this ordinance will not affect such restrictions.

Chair Schaefer inquired if there was strategy by the City to not implement the ordinance before December 1, 2015.

Interim Davis noted that there was no strategy and she had received a notice that the City had not adopted the ordinance. As a result, she proceeded with implementing the ordinance.

Chair Schaefer inquired about how staff and management feel about this ordinance.

Interim Director Davis stated there is a trend in the state of California to reduce water and this ordinance is another action related to the trend.

Commissioner Schenck expressed his concerns with imposing this ordinance on the end user and the efforts on the city to contact state officials.

Interim Director Davis informed the Commission that this is not a new ordinance and it is an update to an existing ordinance. She noted that the City has not been implementing the ordinance.

Commissioner Lee inquired about the role of the irrigation auditor.

Interim Director Davis stated the irrigation auditor will evaluate the efficiency of the irrigation system after the installation.

Chair Schaefer inquired who can be trained to be an auditor.

Interim Davis stated that there is a certification process.

Chair Schaefer asked the City Attorney to explain the process of unfunded mandates at the state level.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill commented that there are some laws are put in place by the legislature that are funded by the state but more often State mandates are unfunded and costs are imposed on the jurisdiction to enforce the laws.

Schaefer inquired if there are general guidelines is to when the State will be funding unfunded state mandates.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that legislature will explicitly state when an legislation has been enacted if there will be funding available.

Schaefer closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Motion to by Schaefer, second by Perez carried a (5-1-0) vote to approve the recommended actions.

Ayes: Francine, Lee, Solomonson, Perez, Schaefer

Noes:

Abstain: Schenck

Absent: Tomazic

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

DEVELOPMENT REPORT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Senior Planner Rangel noted that staff is working with a consultant to re tooled the Old Town Sante Fe District. The City will be soon hosting a community meeting to seek feedback from the local community on how to revitalizing the area. He also stated that Interim Director Jennifer Davis has been working with staff on developing a Transit Oriented Development zone to be located near the proposed Metrolink Station.

PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS:

Commissioner Solomonson stated for the record that Verizon has not complied with the conditions of approval for the cell tower at the Wagner Park.

Senior Planner Rangel stated staff will bring this item back to the commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schaefer adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 7:29 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia CA.

Submitted by,

Charles L. Rangel,
Senior Planner

**PLACENTIA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

April 12, 2016

The regular meeting of the Placentia Planning Commission on April 12, 2016 was called to order at 6:33 p.m. in the Placentia Council Chambers, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, CA by Chair Schaefer.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Commissioner Francine, Lee, Schenck, Solomonson, Tomazic, Schaefer

ABSENT: Commissioner Lee, Perez

OTHERS PRESENT: Yolanda Summerhill, Assistant City Attorney
Charles Rangel, Senior Planner
Elsa Villagrana, Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Schaefer

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

Chris Wissman provided public testimony. He expressed that he received notification for conditional use permit for Sit Means Sit Dog Training and had concerns with the item.

Chair Schaefer informed Mr. Wissman that the item he is referring to is a public hearing item and will be invited to speak at the appropriate time.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

PUBLIC HEARING: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

1. **Applicant: Cynthia Hunt, Dba as "Sit Means Sit Dog Training"**
Project Location: 510 Cameron Street , Placentia, CA 92870

Use Permit (UP) 2016-01:

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning Use Permit 2016-01, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and continue this item.

Chair Schaefer open the public hearing at 6:38 p.m.

Senior Planner Rangel provided a brief report regarding Use Permit 2016-01. He noted that he has not received the licensing requirements from Orange County Animal Care before preparing the staff report. Mr. Rangel requested the commission to continue the item to the next regular meeting in May in order to complete the staff analysis.

Chair Schaefer inquired to the Assistant City Attorney Summerhill if she could open the public hearing if the item will be continued.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill recommended to the commission to the close the public hearing and continue the item at next meeting in May.

Chair Schaefer asked Chris Wissman if he will able to attend the next meeting on May 10, 2016.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the applicant will be able to attend the meeting on May 10, 2016.

Cynthia Hunt, applicant noted that she will be able to attend the next meeting on May 10, 2016.

Chair Schaefer close the public hearing at 6:42 p.m.

Motion to continue this item to the next commission meeting on May 10 , 2016 by Schenck, seconded by Solomonson and carried a (5-0,) vote the recommended action.

Ayes: Francine, Schenck, Solomonson, Tomazic, , Schaefer

Noes

Abstain:

Absent: Lee, Perez

2. **Applicant: City of Placentia**
Project Location: City-wide

Zone Code Amendment (ZCA) 2016-02:

An Ordinance of the City of Placentia Repealing Chapter 8.42 of Title 8 of the Placentia Municipal Code Regarding Medical Marijuana Dispensaries, Enacting Title 12 and Chapter 23.85, Authorizing and Permitting the Establishment, Operation and Regulation of Certain Specified Cannabis-Related Businesses.

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning Zoning Code Amendment 2016-02, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing; and Adopt Resolution PC-2016-04, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia, California, Recommending that the City Council of the City of Placentia Approve an Amendment to Placentia Municipal Code Repealing Chapter 8.42 Regarding Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Adding Title 12 Entitled "Medical Marijuana Businesses and Activity," Adding Chapter 23.45 Entitled "Medical Marijuana Uses and Activity" and Amending Section 23.46.040 Pertaining to Medical Marijuana Cultivation; and
- b. Making Findings and Approving Resolution 2016-04 and Making Findings in Support Thereof; and
- c. Find that the adoption of the ordinance is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15061 (b)(3), there is no

possibility the activity in question will have a significant effect on the environment.

Chair Schaefer open the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill introduced Crystal Hodgson from the City Attorney's Office who provided answers to questions to the Planning Commission.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill provided a report on the Zone Code Amendment 2016-02 and the three ordinances the commission will be voting on. Summerhill provided the commission with a summary of the history of regulations related to medical marijuana in the state of California. She noted that in 2008, the Placentia City Council adopted an ordinance that prohibited marijuana dispensaries from operating within the City. Most recently, in 2016, the Placentia City Council adopted an additional ordinance prohibiting marijuana cultivation in the City to preserve local control over regulations relating medical marijuana. She noted that other cities took similar actions.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that the proposed city ordinance would effectively authorize a license for cultivation, manufacturing, testing, dispensaries, transport and distribution. The ordinance would expand upon the five permitted licenses under state law and allow one license for each of the respective uses.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill asked Attorney Hodgson to elaborate on the restriction on the number of licenses businesses can obtain for under state law.

Attorney Hodgson stated that the state is restricting the combination of licenses business will able to have. State law only allows having up to two licenses for licenses that are compatible with each other.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill noted that out of the 5 permitted licenses, businesses are only allowed to have one of the following 3 types of licenses: transporting, testing and distribution.

Commissioner Schenck inquired which types of licenses the ordinance will be permitting.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill noted that she is providing a broad picture of all the ordinances and therefore is providing information regarding the three ordinances related to Chapter 8 and 12. She noted that the ordinance related to entitlements and land use are being reviewed by to the Planning Commission.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill commented that the proposed ordinance would provide an option for expansion. Under the ordinance after 18 months, the City Council would have the opportunity to vote to grant a second permit in the categories of cultivation and dispensary businesses.

Chair Schaefer asked for clarification on the expansion option in the proposed ordinance.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill commented that one more cultivation permit may be issued to the permitted medical marijuana manufacturer business.

Commissioner Tomazic expressed he would like more information on the how the ordinance would be administered.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill provided a summary of the proposed locations for the permitted uses under the proposed ordinances. She noted dispensaries will be permitted in C-O (Commercial Office), C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial), and C-2 (Community Commercial) zones but will have to stay within 1,000 feet of the hospital and 600 feet away from any school, church, park, large daycare, library, or drug and alcohol rehabilitation center.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that other medical marijuana businesses will be permitted in M (Manufacturing) zones, subject to the distances requirements explained below. These business will be located a minimum of 200 feet from any residentially zoned property. They also must be 600 feet away from any school, church, park, large daycare, library, or drug and alcohol rehabilitation center.

Chair Schaefer inquired cultivation will be allowed outside or inside.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that the proposed ordinance will only allowed cultivation to be inside.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill explained the selection process of the applicants. She noted the City Administrator will conduct an initial review of the application and will bring forward three (3) applications for medical marijuana businesses to the City Council. The City Council will select the top candidates and these candidates will be provisionally approved, subject to review by planning staff through the Building and Zoning approval process and any environmental review as required. Attached to this report are illustrations mapping out the distancing requirements for both dispensaries in the designated commercial zones and other medical marijuana businesses permitted in the M zones. These maps show parks, schools, large daycare facilities located in the vicinity of the areas permitting the medical marijuana businesses.

Chair Schaefer asked if any of the businesses will be allowed to be located outside Placentia.

Chair Schaefer asked members of the public who wish to speak on the item.

Mr. Josh Correa, resident, provided public testimony. He stated he is neutral on this issue. He expressed concerns with businesses in the manufacturing zone but was pleased to see dispensaries being proposed near to the hospital. He stated to see distribution not be distributing into the neighborhood. Mr. Correa inquired if since the permit is for one year, will the property owner/lessor be able to revoke the permit if they do not want to renew.

Commissioner Francine commented that these will be dependent on the lease. She noted typically the lessee is the open with the option to renew the lease.

Chair Schaefer closed the second public hearing at 7:58 p.m.

Commissioner Solomonson stated for the record he would be inclined to not want to approve the item in the Commercial zone and table the item until staff has looked into allowing dispensaries in manufacturing zones.

Chair Schaefer stated if they wish to continue the item she has not heard any urgency on this item.

Senior Planner Ranged stated that they would encourage the Commission to take action on the item and include any recommendations.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill noted that based on the City Council Calendar the goal was to take the ordinance to City Council in the first meeting in May.

Chair Schaefer inquired if they approved the resolution with amendments is that equivalent to approving the resolution.

Commissioner Schenck express concerns with the commission voting against it four months ago and now they are approving it and with the sense of urgency. He noted that he is concerned that these actions will be misconstrued by the public and subject the city to lawsuits.

Chair Schaefer inquired to staff if they are aware of any particular reasons as to why the City Council is seeking to review this item soon.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that he is not aware of any specific reasons. He noted that there is still more work to be done in regards to approving the ordinance and it will take several months for implementation.

Commissioner Solomonson expressed concerns with dispensaries being located in the commercial zones due to the potential for criminal activity and should instead be located in the manufacturing zones.

Commission discussed recommendations and comments they would like to see included in their approval of the resolution and be presented to the City Council.

Commissioner Schenck expressed his desire for including language in the draft ordinance regarding the selection, should be changed where three (3) finalists there should ten (10) finalists and to compete for a permit and then the permit should be selected by a lottery instead of a point system.

Chair Schaefer reopened the public hearing at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Correa, resident commented that he would like to see this item continued if the commission is seeking to recommend the item to be changed to allow one zone only since it was publicized to the public in two zones.

Chair Schaefer commented that if staff is merely to note the sections they were concerned with it will not be the same if they amended the resolution.

Mr. Correa noted he would not be comfortable with the commission amending the ordinance.

Chair Schaefer noted that if the commission moved to approve the resolution they will be simply providing the green light for City Council to consider the item and include their comments as items to look into.

Commissioner Schenck inquired how they will include their comments in their motion.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill commented that the commission can include their comments in their motion.

Motion by Solomonson, seconded by Francine carried a (5-0) vote to approve the recommended actions with subject to inclusion of the Planning Commission's comments.

Ayes: Francine, Schenck, Solomonson, Tomazic, Schaefer

Noes

Abstain:

Absent: Lee, Perez

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Senior Planner Rangel provided the commission an update and report on Use Permit 2014-15 for a Verizon cell tower located in Wagner Park approved by the Planning Commission. He noted there is a disparity between the cell tower that was built and the renderings presented to the commission in the staff report when the item was approved. Rangel stated that he notified the applicant that staff will be bring the item for revocation and will required a notice of public hearing.

Matt Vigil, a representative from Verizon addressed the commission regarding the concerns surrounding their use permit. He stated that Verizon has been working with staff to remediate the issues since they were notified in December 2015. He noted that yesterday they completed the modifications to the cell tower and provided a summary of the changes made.

PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS

Commissioner Tomazic requested additional information regarding the financing and what the commission will be subject to approving in regards to the proposed Metrolink station and parking structure.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schaefer adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:47 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 10, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia CA.

Submitted by,

Charles L. Rangel,
Senior Planner

**PLACENTIA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

May 10, 2016

The regular meeting of the Placentia Planning Commission on May 10, 2016 was called to order at 6:31 p.m. in the Placentia Council Chambers, 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia, CA by Chair Schaefer.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Commissioner Lee, Schenck, Perez, Schaefer

ABSENT: Commissioner Francine, Tomazic

OTHERS PRESENT: Yolanda Summerhill, Assistant City Attorney
Charles Rangel, Senior Planner
Elsa Villagrana, Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Schenck

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

PUBLIC HEARING: None

1. **Applicant:** Continued - Cynthia Hunt, Dba as "Sit Means Sit Dog"
Project Location: 510 Cameron Street, Placentia, CA 92870
Use Permit (UP) 2016-01

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning Use Permit 2016-01, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony; and
- b. Adopt Resolution PC 2016-05 A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Placentia, Making Findings and Approving Use Permit No. 2016-01 for a dog training, board and kennel facility on Property located at 510 Cameron Street and Making Findings in Support Thereof; and
- c. Find that the project is categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA) set forth in Title 14 CCR § 15061(b)(3) and the City of Placentia Environmental Guidelines.

Chair Schaefer opened the public hearing at 6:33 p.m.

Senior Planner Rangel provided a brief overview on UP 2016-01, a permit for a dog training, board and kennel facility at 510 Cameron Street. He noted that the applicant has provided staff an operations management plan and noise control plan. He stated that the Sit Means Sit Dog is located in an industrial facility. Rangel also noted that in the conditions of approval, it is stated that the business should adhere to the City's noise control ordinance. Rangel stated that the applicant must also meet conditions set by Orange Animal Care.

Commissioner Schenck inquired about the potential traffic impacts associated with the business.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that the business will have a maximum of 40 dogs at the facility. He noted the traffic will be similar to another industrial business with drop off. He added that since this is the boarding facility, the owner drops off their dog and will pick them up later. Facility hours are from 11:00am – 8:00pm.

Cynthia Hunt, applicant, noted that their business has an active volunteer therapy team that performs volunteer work with the Red Cross, nursing homes, and hospitals.

Chair Schaefer inquired why the applicant chose the city of Placentia for their business.

Mrs. Hunt commented that her territory covers most of Orange County and determined Placentia is a great central area that is convenient to the county.

Commissioner Lee commented that the facility is an industrial manufacturing area. He inquired if the dogs will be located inside, or if any will be taken outside.

Mrs. Hunt noted that yes, the dogs will remain inside at the facility; however, part of their program involves using a van to transport the dogs to nearby parks and dog beaches.

Commissioner Tomazic inquired about any complaints the applicant may have experience at other facilities.

Mrs. Hunt commented that her facility in Colorado Springs, CO is located in a strip mall. She added that she has not received any complaints from surrounding business owners.

Commissioner Perez inquired if the applicant will be using exhaust fans for their ventilation.

Mrs. Hunt replied to Commissioner Perez that yes, she has already purchased exhaust fans for the facility and there is a garage door they can open for ventilation.

Chair Schaefer asked if the applicant will be providing grooming services.

Mrs. Hunt noted that there will be no grooming services at this facility.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the dog owners are required to participate in training

Yes they are required to participate. She noted they also provide in-home training.

Chair Schaefer inquired about the overnight fee for boarding.

Mrs. Hunt noted that boarding at her facility is done as packages and they will start \$2,600 for a 10 day boarding and training program.

Chair Schaefer commented that there are two types of training collars and asked the applicant what her preferred type is.

Mrs. Hunt noted that their facility's equipment choice is a remote control collar and that is primarily used for attention purposes.

Commissioner Lee asked the applicant if she had reviewed the conditions and approval and felt that she will be able to comply with them.

Mrs. Hunt responded that yes, she will be able to comply with the conditions.

Chair Schaefer closed the public hearing at 6:53 p.m.

Motion

Motion by Tomazic, seconded by Schenck carried a (4-0) vote to approve the recommended actions.

Ayes: Lee, Schenck, Tomazic, Perez, Schaefer

Noes

Abstain:

Absent: Francine, Solomonson

2. **Applicant: Verizon**
Project Location: 700 Trumpet Avenue, Placentia, CA 92870

Revocation of Use Permit (UP) 2014-05:

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning Revocation of UP 2014-05, Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing; and
- b. Making Findings and Approving Resolution 2016-06 and Making Findings in Support Thereof; and
- c. Find that the adoption of the ordinance is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15061 (b)(3), there is no possibility the activity in question will have a significant effect on the environment.

Before the start of the public hearing, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill explained the difference between an application for a use permit and a revocation of a use permit.

Chair Schaefer opened the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

Senior Planner Rangel provided the commission an overview of the revocation of Use Permit 2014-15. He stated that the commission approved Use Permit 2014-15 on January 13, 2015, and the applicant obtained a building permit for the wireless communication facility.

He noted that the applicant has failed to comply with the conditions of approval. He also noted that in October 2015, the City started receiving calls from the residents that the mechanical components were exposed and it was not camouflaged and that it did not resemble the facility presented at the Planning Commission meeting. Rangel stated that in November 2015, the City staff began to notify the Applicant representatives via email and later by phone about the reported complaints. He also noted that in December 2015, City staff met with Verizon representatives and they agreed to install a three foot crown. He also noted that since then staff has been working with Verizon for several months now to resolve the issues.

Commissioner Schenck inquired how the tree at Wagner Park is different than the one at Bradford Park.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that it is similar but when you look at the tree in Wagner Park it is not as dense and it does not hide the mechanical components.

Commissioner Tomazic inquired if it was staff's opinion that the design was not meeting the requirements for cell towers.

Senior Planner Rangel commented that there have been numerous attempts to address the concerns with the design of the cell tower and staff has been working with Verizon.

Senior Planner Rangel noted that every time the applicant does modifications to the cell tower it needs to be submitted to Building & Safety for review and approval. He also added that in addition to review by the city, it needs to be resubmitted to the California Public Utilities Commission for their review and approval.

Chair Schaefer inquired if the commission were to grant an extension to the applicant to remediate the issue, if there was a limit on the extension by the city.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that there is not a limit on the length of the extension.

Lesley Dagle, a representative of the applicant, Verizon Wireless addressed and presented their revised plans to the Commission to resolve the issue. Mrs. Dagle noted that Verizon is taking this issue seriously and agrees that appearance of the cell tower is not acceptable. She stated that they are committed to resolving the issue with the design. Mrs. Dagle summarized Verizon's efforts to address the issue at hand. She discussed the revised plans and how they will be changing the current tower design.

Ms. Dagle requested that the Commission provide direction to planning staff on how to address the issue and provide adequate time to remediate the issue.

Commissioner Schenck inquired why the product that was originally installed did not meet the renderings presented to the commission constructed at first.

Ms. Dagle noted that the two main issues with the current cell tower is 1) array of the antennas and 2) the need for more branches. She commented that Verizon attempted to fix the issues but they did not meet the standards requested by the staff.

Vice Chair Perez commented that the proposed plans indicate that the facility will look more like a tree. He inquired what the timeline for Verizon to address the issues is.

Ms. Dagle commented that a reasonable deadline to resolve the issue and allow sufficient time to go through the approval process will be October 2016.

Commissioner Lee inquired if the types of changes being made to the facility will require additional review at the federal level.

Ms. Dagle stated that no additional review will be required.

Chair Schaefer inquired if any of the proposed changes will result in the loss of any of the intended capacities of the facility.

Ms. Dagle noted that there will be no diminution in service.

Chair Schaefer thanked the applicant for the presentation.

Meredith Castillo, resident, expressed his concerns and experience with the issues regarding the proposed cell tower site located at Wagner Park. He noted that the issues with the light were resolve and that it was due to vandalism.

Ruth Arnold, resident, expressed her concerns with how long it has taken to resolve the issue since the first complaints.

Tom Hayes, resident, inquired if Verizon will compensate the City for staff time and meetings associated with this issue.

Chair Schaefer asked Ms. Dagle to return to the podium and addressed the questions raised by the public.

Ms. Dagle commented that the timeline established by Verizon is one that would be allow compliance with all the necessary procedures.

Assistant City Attorney noted that under state law cost recovery has to be preordained and she has to see if the city's fee schedule allows for that. She noted that cost recovery will have to come from the department instead of the applicant.

Chair Schaefer closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Assistant City Attorney recommended that if the commission's desired to extend the time for Verizon to meet the requirements, that the item should be re-noticed for public hearing.

Commissioner Tomazic expressed his concerns with the need to continue and re-notice the item.

Commissioner Schenck commented that if the item is re-noticed, it allows residents to voice their opinion.

Chair Schaefer reopened the public hearing at 7:49p.m.

Commissioner Tomazic inquired how a delay would affect the applicant.

Ms. Dagle stated that Verizon is support of the motion at hand.

Chair Schaefer closed the public hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Motion by Perez, seconded by Schenck carried a (5-0) vote to continue the item to October 11, 2016 to allow the applicant time to address the issues.

Ayes: Lee, Schenck, Tomazic, Perez, Schaefer

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent: Francine, Solomonson

3. GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE FINDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2023 SEVEN YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP)

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) serves as a single comprehensive plan of proposed capital improvement projects for the budget year Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 and the six (6) years thereafter. The CIP is a budgeting and strategic planning tool used to determine the extent of future needs and sources of funding. The CIP also serves as a guide for the efficient evaluation, prioritization and implementation of public improvements and facilities. The CIP identifies 114 funded and unfunded projects to undertake over the next seven (7) years. For FY 2016-17, the City has identified 34 projects in which it expects to continue, undertake and/or complete

Recommended Actions: It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

- a. Open the Public Hearing, concerning, the CIP Receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing; and
- b. Making Findings and Approving Resolution 2016-07 and Making Findings in Support Thereof; and
- c. Find that the adoption of the ordinance is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15061 (b)(3), there is no possibility the activity in question will have a significant effect on the environment.

Chair Schaefer opened the public hearing at 7:53 p.m.

Public Works Manager Luis Estevez provided an overview of the city's proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and conformity finding to the commission. He noted that this is an annual process conducted by the City to identify the number of projects in the CIP for the each fiscal year (FY).

He noted the proposed CIP identifies a total of 114 projects over the span of seven (7) years, with a total cost of \$75.1 million and for FY 16/17 there is a total of 32 funded projects with a total cost of \$12 million. He summarized the project categories and proposed projects for FY 16/17 and funding sources for them.

Commissioner Tomazic expressed concerns the location of the handicapped ramps installed as part of Pedestrian Accessibility Project.

Public Works Manager Estevez noted that he is not aware of how all of the locations were chosen. He also noted that some of the repairs associated with the project are part of lawsuits involving the City.

Commissioner Schenck expressed concerns with conditions of roads in the City.

Public Works Manager Estevez stated that the City recently completed a biannual pavement management plan and has developed a seven year CIP for pavement.

Chair Schaefer inquired in related to the Placentia Avenue Rehabilitations project if the division between Placentia and Fullerton is at the center median line.

Public Works Manager Estevez stated that the boundary lines between the cities of Fullerton and Placentia are not straight. He noted there is an agreement in place that states that any road projects on the boundaries the cost is split 50% between the cities.

Commissioner Tomazic inquired about the funding for the traffic synchronization projects

Public Works Manager Estevez noted that the traffic signal synchronization projects are multiagency projects with Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and surrounding cities. He noted that approximately 90% of the funding for the CIP projects derived from grant funding.

Public Works Manager Estevez continued to provide a summary on CIP projects proposed for FY 16/17 including the city's proposed Metrolink Station and parking structure.

Commissioner Schenck inquired about the funding for the purchase of city's electrical vehicle and charging stations.

Public Works Estevez noted that the city received AQMD grant funds and rebates from the state of California for the purchase of the vehicles.

Chair Schaefer inquired how the cost of CIP is divided over the 7 years.

Public Works Manager noted that projects are prioritized based on need and funding is determined by available funds.

Chair Schaefer closed the public hearing at 8:34 p.m.

Motion by Lee, seconded by Schenck carried a (5-0) vote to approve the recommended actions.

Ayes: Commissioner Lee, Schenck, Tomazic, Perez, Schaefer

Noes

Abstain:

Absent: Commissioner Francine, Solomonson

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

DEVELOPMENT REPORT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Senior Planner Rangel noted in the past months the commission adopted a new ordinance for massage establishments that required them to apply for conditional use permits. He stated that all massage establishments have a deadline of June 1, 2016 to submit applications. He noted that staff will bring conditional use permits of those applicants to the commission for their approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS: None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schaefer adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:41 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, June, 14 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 401 East Chapman Avenue, Placentia CA.

Submitted by,

Charles L. Rangel,
Senior Planner



Placentia Planning Commission

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: CONTRACT SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: OCTOBER 11, 2016
SUBJECT: **USE PERMIT 2016-12**

REQUEST:

The applicant, Bruce Kennedy, is requesting a Use Permit to re-build a garage which was destroyed by fire. Chapter 23.84.030 of the Placentia Municipal Code allows for non-conforming buildings which are destroyed or damaged and do not meet current Development Standards set forth by the Placentia Municipal Code to be re-built subject to approval of a Use Permit.

DISCUSSION:

Although this item was noticed in the newspaper, Notices of the Public Hearing were not circulated to property owners within a 300-foot radius of the project site. Staff is requesting that this item be continued to the regular Planning Commission meeting of November 8, 2016 to allow adequate time for project noticing pursuant to the Placentia Municipal Code.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission take the following action:

1. Open the Public Hearing concerning Use Permit 2016-12, receive the staff report and consider all Public Testimony, and continue this item to the regular meeting of November 8, 2016.

Prepared and submitted by:

Handwritten signature of Charles L. Rangel in blue ink.

Charles L. Rangel
Contract Senior Planner

Review and approved by:

Handwritten signature of Joseph M. Lambert in blue ink.

Joseph M. Lambert
Director of Development Services