

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF  
COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION**

**October 10, 2005**

The Planning Commission of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m., October 10, 2005 at City Hall, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, California. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Perkins, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL CALL:**

Commissioners Present:

Chairman Bill Perkins  
Vice Chair Donn Hall  
Eleanor Egan, James Fisler, and Bruce Garlich

Also Present: R. Michael Robinson, Secretary  
Costa Mesa Planning Commission  
Christian Bettenhausen, Deputy City Attorney  
Thomas Banks, Senior Engineer  
Lieutenant Karl Schuler, Police Department  
Corporal David Makiyama, Police Department  
Mel Lee, Senior Planner  
Wendy Shih, Associate Planner

**MINUTES:**

The minutes for the meeting of September 12, 2005 and September 26, 2005 were accepted as corrected.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

REZONE PETITION R-05-02

Jon K. Jenkins

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of Rezone Petition R-05-02 for Jon Jenkins to rezone property located at 124 Melody Lane from R2-HD (Multi-Family Residential District High-Density) to R3 (Multi-Family Residential District). Environmental determination: exempt.

Associate Planner Wendy Shih reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. Ms. Shih said staff was recommending to Planning Commission that they recommend approval to City Council, by adoption of Planning Commission resolution.

Commissioner Fisler confirmed with Ms. Shih that the square-footage of the lot is no greater for R3 than it is for R2-High Density. Further, she also confirmed the requirement for minimum lot size is the same for R2 or R3 and would not increase the nonconformity of the lot.

Jon Jenkins, 124 Melody Lane, Costa Mesa, displayed photographs showing the existing conditions and uniqueness of this area.

Commissioner Fisler stated that he is a realtor and showed this property a couple of months ago and he noticed today, that this property is still active. Mr. Jenkins confirmed and explained that this is not a project he will be undertaking. He said there are some developers interested in the property with the caveat that they could build multiple units on it. He said no one wants to take it as it is because it is the only "house" on that street, or in that neighborhood.

No one else wished to speak and the Chair closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:**

R-05-02

Recommended approval

A motion was made by Vice Chair Hall, seconded by Commissioner Fisler and carried 5-0 to recommend to City Council, approval of Rezone Petition R-05-02, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-65, based on analysis and information in the Planning Division staff report and findings contained in exhibit "A."

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of General

GP-05-04 AND REZONE  
PETITION R-05-03

Harbor Center Partners/Meldrum

Plan Amendment GP-05-04 and Rezone Petition R-05-03 for Mick Meldrum/ICI Development Company Inc., for Harbor Center Partners L.P., to operate a recreational vehicle storage facility on a 1.49-acre parcel, located at 2300 Harbor Boulevard/380 West Wilson Street, currently in a C1-S and R3 zone. Environmental determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

(a) GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GP-05-04/REZONE PETITION R-05-03 to change the General Plan land use designation from High Density Residential to General Commercial and to rezone from R3 (Multiple Family Residential District) to C1-S (Shopping Center District) for property located at 380 W. Wilson Street.

(b) PLANNING APPLICATION PA-05-22 for a master plan amendment and conditional use permit to operate a recreational vehicle storage facility with a variance from maximum wall height (6 feet maximum wall height allowed; 8-12 feet wall height proposed), for properties located at 2300 Harbor Boulevard in a C1-S zone and 380 W. Wilson Street in an R3 zone, (rezone request to C1-S pending).

Senior Planner Mel Lee said that staff was recommending a continuance of this item to the Planning Commission meeting of November 14, 2005 due to an error in the public notice and that the continuance would allow staff to provide proper notice.

MOTION  
GP-05-04/R-05-03/PA-05-22  
Continued

A motion was made by Chair Perkins, seconded by Commissioner Egan and carried 5-0 to continue this item to the Planning Commission meeting of November 14, 2005.

REVIEW OF PLANNING  
APPLICATIONS PA-95-10 AND  
PA-03-39

City

The Chair opened the public hearing for review of Planning Applications PA-95-10 and PA-03-39 for Eric Strauss/Duane Heldt and Stephanie Potter, authorized agent for Barbara & Roger Allensworth, for possible revocation and/or modification to the conditions of approval for an existing sports bar/restaurant (Corner Office Sports Bar & Grill), located at 580 Anton Boulevard, Suite 201, in an PDR-HD zone. Environmental determination: exempt.

Senior Planner Mel Lee reviewed the information in the staff report and made a presentation. He said staff was recommending revocation of Conditional Use Permit PA-03-39 and modifications of the conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit PA-95-10.

Lt. Karl Schuler of the Costa Mesa Police Department introduced Corporal David Makiyama who gave a brief history of police service at the Corner Office Sports Bar & Grill. He said that the Corner Office Sports Bar & Grill was a part of his response area during 2004. Corporal Makiyama described an increase in complaints for loud music and drunken patrons resulting in the need for extra patrols. More obtrusive calls for service were made for: vandalism and battery (2 victims injured and multiple arrests were made); there were numerous DUI arrests; assault with a deadly weapon (stabbing); patrons drinking or had alcoholic beverages on the patio in violation of the ABC license; a victim was raped at the bar; and a shooting which was the result of a birthday party celebration in the rear room that was pushed out into the parking lot and where numerous shots were fired.

Lt. Schuler stated that as the Area Commander for Area 2, when he determined through Corporal Makiyama's reports how much activity was taking place, he decided to meet with the co-owners of the business (Duane Heldt and Stephanie Potter). He said they told him the reason they were having problems at the restaurant was due to the fact that they had hired a promoter for parties and events and they were getting "unsavory" type people into their business. They assured Lt. Schuler that this promoter would no longer be working with the establishment and felt the problems would subside. They also discussed private security with Lt. Schuler and assured him that

this security would take care of any issues that could occur at that location. Lt. Schuler stated that there were also 4 additional fights, which occurred at that location and during that 13-month period all of the fights occurred after 11 p.m. In addition to the 16 municipal code violations in reference to drinking on the patio, he received noise complaints from both the Wyndham Gardens and Marriott Hotel personnel.

Lt. Schuler said he did a comparison study of these calls with 3 additional bars in the area to determine if these calls were excessive in activity. The results of the comparison showed that the Corner Office Bar & Grill had a higher count of activity with a more violent nature. For these reasons and others, he said Police staff agrees with Planning staff's recommendations regarding the permits.

Mr. Lee stated that staff's recommendation is based upon their review of the conditional use permit and the input provided by the Police Department, and is to initiate the revocation of Conditional Use Permit PA-03-39 and to modify the conditions of approval for PA-95-10 per exhibit "B", pages 8 and 9 of the Planning Division staff report.

At the Chair's request, there was discussion between the Chair, Lt. Schuler and Corporal Makiyama regarding the details of many of the calls for service and how they were handled over the past 13 months. There were no additional calls for service since May of 2005.

In response to Vice Chair Hall, Mr. Lee agreed that both permits could be revoked because of violations, if it is the desire of the Commission.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding the difference between criminal and non-criminal reports (as shown on page 14 of the staff report), Lt. Schuler explained that a criminal complaint would be a violation of state statute penal code such as drunk driving, assault with a deadly weapon, etc., and non-criminal would be an alarm for medical aide, etc.

Commissioner Garlich, referring to a letter sent to the Commission in which the applicants agree to eliminate live music, karaoke, mobile disc jockey, entertainment and dancing, but would like the Commission to continue to allow them to be open until 1 a.m. and are interested in continuing some form of private parties, did Lt. Schuler think that would result in a correction the of kinds of incidents previously reported this evening. Lt. Schuler did not agree because of the extensive meeting back in February of this year as previously explained where the applicants felt the problems would subside. He said they did subside for a short period of time but again the activity rose and most of the problems occurred after 11 p.m.

Commissioner Egan explained that there is no definition of "private party" in our municipal code and asked that Lt. Schuler give the Commission some idea of what specific event he would like them to prohibit at this location. He said without being event-specific, he believed any type of party that requires a private room where people are removed for the other activities going on in the facility, or where it's a paid event where people have to pay when they come in, i.e., a cover charge to get in. In further response to another question from Commissioner Egan, he agreed that if the parties were restricted to daytime and early evening hours, such as a Christmas party, he recommended that the cut-off hour should be around 9 or 10 p.m.

Robert Hawkins, attorney from Newport Beach representing the applicant (The Corner Office Bar & Grill) stated that they have reviewed the staff report, but he has not had an opportunity to review it in detail because he was just retained on this date, and they do not

accept the conditions or the action item that staff has proposed. He thanked the Commission for this opportunity to review the matter.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the Police Department supported the application (PA-03-39) for live entertainment noting, "no previous problems with the business." Based upon that notation, the Planning Commission made certain findings one of which said again, "the Police Department notes no previous problems with this business." He said what is being proposed in the revocation is to return the establishment to an earlier time.

Mr. Hawkins said he was not minimizing the seriousness of the security problems and they all understand that, but they are here to encourage the Commission's consideration of their proposal. Mr. Hawkins made the point that this a high-class sports bar which caters to professionals and is listed on various websites as one of the top 3 sports bars in Orange County. He proposed that: (1) they will surrender the "Live Entertainment Permit" because they believe this is what has created their problems. (2) They continue the hearing on Conditional Use Permit PA-95-10 for 6 months to allow time to evaluate how this situation will return to what they regard as normal; there will be no live entertainment during that six-month period. (3) They will return to the time when there were only 5 incidents during a year. The owners believe the live entertainment brought in an element, which conflicted with the business and it was a financial disaster for his clients.

Commissioner Garlich noted that the conditions of approval for PA-03-39 allowed the operation to be open until 2 a.m. and he heard earlier it was 1 a.m. Lt. Schuler said when he met with the applicants in February of 2005, they agreed to close at 1 a.m. as he requested.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding Mr. Hawkins' description of the sports bar clientele and the element of conflict in live entertainment, Mr. Hawkins said with respect to the private parties, that is a problem because of the ambiguity of private parties as Commissioner Garlich has mentioned. He said their concerns are that many of these parties are corporate parties and many of their competitors will not be having the security problems that the applicants have experienced. The problems he was referring to are the ones the officers are legitimately complaining about. He said these security problems are unacceptable for his clients and the proposal is to eliminate that live entertainment. Eating and drinking establishments often run promotions and that's not what creates these problems; it is the heavy marketing with a lot of people coming in from out of the area and there is no telling what will happen. He said from their perspective, the live entertainment "adventure" created problems for which they truly apologize.

The Chair and Corporal Makiyama discussed the birthday party shooting and whether it was considered a "private party", and whether those attending were corporate patrons.

Commissioner Egan proposed conditions to be added to the conditions of approval (shown below in the motion). These conditions were discussed between the members of the Commission.

Mr. Hawkins responded that he did not believe under normal operations outside of the live entertainment, there is a cover charge. He said with respect to the hours for private parties, which are in a separate banquet facility, her suggestions for restricted hours were good and a way to handle it. However, he felt to restrict the hours of the entire operation, it goes overboard. He agreed her suggestion to prohibit the use of the patio was understandable, but he would have to speak with his clients. Commissioner Egan thanked him for his

comments.

Commissioner Garlich said, to understand the applicant's proposal, they are willing to surrender PA-03-39 and would like to extend PA-95-10 for six months. He did not believe that these conditions would allow a disc jockey, which was confirmed by staff. Mr. Garlich also confirmed with staff that this CUP would close operations at 1 a.m.

Eric Strauss, America West Properties, 26302 LaPaz Road, Mission Viejo, said he is the property manager for the Allensworths who own the property. He said he has had no complaints from either of the general managers from the Wyndham or Marriott hotels, or The Lakes Retail Association about any complaints with Mr. Heldt's operation. He said prior to Mr. Heldt, they had 2 operators that were very shady and they went through some tough times with some evictions at that property. Mr. Heldt has come in and cleaned up the establishment considerably and he runs a fine operation and he's filling a need for sports enthusiasts in Costa Mesa. He is agreeing to make concessions to the Commission and he asked the Commission to be subjective on their decision because private parties is a broad term and Mr. Heldt is give up live entertainment and private parties. He felt this would eliminate many of the problems that he's been seeing as evidenced by "no major complaints since May 21<sup>st</sup>." He said both exit doors say, "No Alcohol Beyond This Point." He is doing his best to comply with the CUP. Restricting and giving up his licensing is difficult because his operation relies on groups such as alumni clubs for football, etc. and he asked the Commission for their consideration.

Susie Dedich, 1654 Iowa Street, Costa Mesa, stated that her concerns are that the Commission may be taking away her ability to be protected by the police force. She said this establishment has specific concerns that can't be addressed today. She also said she would appreciate having police officers available for things that are necessary to protect.

Commissioner Garlich stated that from all he has looked at, this establishment has never had an 11 p.m. closing condition. He confirmed with staff that it was initially 1 a.m. and subsequently 2 a.m. He stated that the issues the Police Department has been observing came about with PA-03-39 and prior to that, operating under the PA-95-10 CUP, the call for services were not out-of-line with other similar businesses. Lt. Schuler confirmed that Commissioner Garlich's understanding was correct. However, he said it was the feeling from the Police Department that if the CUP for the live entertainment was to be revoked, that because it's a sports related type bar/grill, there would be no need to be open passed 11 p.m. He said the Police Department staff also felt that with no live entertainment, the crime level would go down.

The Chair confirmed with Corporal Makiyama that most of the calls for service took place after 11 p.m.

Duane Heldt, operator for Corner Office Sports Bar & Grill, 580 Anton Boulevard, Costa Mesa, stated that contrary to what Lt. Schuler said about no need for business after 11 p.m., they host a lot of patrons from neighboring restaurants, and after each performance of a play or production, the people from Performing Arts Center (cast and crew) come this establishment. He said they need those operating hours because they also get a lot of customers from the hotels (the Marriott and Wyndham) and places like the Macaroni Bar & Grill. He said they do not advertise "happy hour" like their neighbors do and don't encourage people to drink after those hours, but they do want to be able to keep the place open.

Mr. Hawkins reiterated that the substantial clientele of the sports bar after 11 p.m. saying that those folks are going to go somewhere and from their perspective, given the fact that the earlier operation under

PA-95-10 was not problematic, he restated their proposal. He also pointed out there was only one public speaker this evening and there was not a substantial number of people that are aggrieved, or aggravated by the operation. He said they are concerned, and they believe returning the operation to the conditions set forth in PA-95-10 and continuing this matter for six months will work and is their proposal.

Commissioner Fidler asked when Mr. Heldt took over management of this property. Mr. Hawkins said it was his understanding that he began operations about 5 years ago.

No one else wished to speak and the Chair closed the public hearing.

MOTION 1:  
PA-95-10 AND PA-03-39  
Revoked PA-03-39  
Conditioned PA-95-10

A motion was made by Commissioner Egan, seconded by Chair Perkins and carried 5-0 to revoke Conditional Use Permit PA-03-39, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-66, based on public testimony, analysis and information and findings contained in exhibit "A."

During discussion on the motion, Commissioner Fidler asked if there was a difference between revoking the license and the applicants abandoning it as far as fines, or their standing with the City. The Chair said no.

Vice Chair Hall said that Commissioner Fidler brings up a point that he felt should be part of the record. The motion is to revoke that particular CUP and part of the record should be that the applicant has also offered to voluntarily abandon it.

In response to the Chair, Commissioner Egan said she was okay with that and said she would be willing to withdraw that motion and let the record reflect that PA-03-39 is voluntarily surrendered.

The Chair asked for clarification from Planning Commission Secretary R. Michael Robinson who said he was deferring to the City Attorney, but he believed that unless it is revoked, the CUP runs with the land so he preferred to have it revoked as staff recommended. Vice Chair Hall said that before the City Attorney even comments, he said the Commission should be positive on this and that he liked Commissioner Egan's original motion to revoke the permit.

The Chair stated that the original motion still stands and he is still the second; he then called for the question.

MOTION 2:  
PA-95-10  
Modified

A motion was made by Commissioner Egan, seconded by Commissioner Garlich and carried 3-2 (Perkins and Hall voted no), to modify the conditions for Conditional Use Permit PA-95-10, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-67, based on public testimony, analysis and information, and findings contained in exhibit "A", subject to conditions in exhibit "B" with the following modifications:

Conditions of Approval

- 8. ~~No~~ Private parties shall ~~be permitted~~ terminate no later than 10 p.m. (Private parties are defined as a group using a separate room for an event of their own).
- 9. There shall be no paid parties (where persons have to pay to get in).
- 2A. Daily hours of operation shall be restricted to the period between 9 a.m. and ~~11 p.m.~~ 1 a.m. with a review after 90 days and another after 90 additional days.
- 2B. There shall be no use of outdoor seating or tables in conjunction with this use; there shall be no service of alcoholic beverages outside the building.

During discussion on the motion, the Chair confirmed Commissioner Egan's proposed conditions.

Regarding the hours of operation and in response to the Chair, Commissioner Egan said her thought on this was that the hours should be set at 1 a.m. and see if it works with a 90-day review and another 90 days after that. If it is not working, shut it down at 11 p.m. The Chair said the conditions say their hours cannot exceed 11 p.m. and she said she has not included that condition in her motion. The Chair withdrew his second.

Commissioner Fisler seconded the motion. Commissioner Garlich said if he understands the motion, he supports it. He said the notion of making it 11 p.m. some period of time to see how it works and then deciding to make it 1 a.m. is illogical to him. He repeated the motion by Commissioner Egan and said he felt it was reasonable.

Vice Chair Hall questioned the constitutionality of condition of approval #2G regarding the prohibition of designated areas reserved for the exclusive use of designated persons or "Private Club Members." There was discussion by all members of the Commission on this subject. Deputy City Attorney Bettenhausen stated that this is a broad-based restriction and the Commission is entitled to restrict the uses, and further, he did not see that any particular group was being singled out and saw it as being enforceable.

The Chair said he believed the Commission still needed to modify the condition regarding seating outside to include, "no alcoholic beverages." Commissioner Egan said she is happy to add it as a reminder, but she did not believe the Commission should apply state law as a condition. Mr. Robinson said that staff had recommended that there be no outdoor seating because they are looking at an area specifically designated as outdoor seating, which may have parking implications and because use of the outdoor seating was created for all the uses there. In response, Mr. Lee confirmed that one of the provisions for PA-95-10 was the restriction for the outdoor seating area specifically related to parking for The Lakes Center because when the center was originally built, it was built with a parking variance for provisions that limited onsite parking and for valet parking.

There was discussion among Commissioners Egan, Garlich, the Chair, and Mr. Robinson regarding access to the seating area, and condition of approval "2J".

The Chair said from what he's heard from the Police Department, there are some serious issues that need to be resolved. He said the same property owner has owned this property for 5 years and these problems have occurred and they would still continue to occur unless the City did something about them. He said he is not going to support this motion for one reason. He said we ought to shut them down at 11 p.m. and give them 90 days and let them go back to 1 a.m. because when you involve alcohol, you involve dancing, and you need to involve security. If there's not enough security there, then there's a problem. He said when we have to involve our officers in shootings, rapes, or whatever, he has issue with that. Now if the business suffers, the business suffers; that's their fault for not securing their location. His concerns lie in the fact that we cannot secure this location.

Commissioner Hall commented that with indifference to the attorney's comment that we can't set aside a room for some friends to get together because it might be considered a private party is ludicrous. He also felt the same way about limiting outdoor seating.

Commissioner Hall said the Commission has revoked a CUP because figuratively speaking, the people didn't mow the lawn. He said here we have a problem that has gone on and on for some time with many

reasons to revoke the CUP, and yet we still try and help them out. He believed in 3 to 6 months they would be back, the police would be back and report again and the Commission would find a way to help again.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION:  
PA-95-10  
Failed

A substitute motion was made by Vice Chair Hall, seconded by Chair Perkins to revoke Conditional Use Permit PA-95-10. The motion failed to carry by a 2-3 vote (Egan, Garlich and Fisler voted no).

During discussion on the motion, Commissioner Fisler stated that he could not support that motion.

Commissioner Egan said she would like to make it very clear in the record that those of us who are not in favor of a total revocation, in essence, putting this person out of business entirely, are extremely concerned about the nuisance that it has become, and absolutely, our concern is to protect the public. She said that by not allowing live entertainment, not allowing dancing, not allowing the private parties after 10 p.m., and not allowing service out of doors, we are taking care of the problem. It is even more restrictive than the original conditional use permit under which there were few police problems. We are going back to that situation with some additional restrictions. The only thing left is what time do they close, or are they going to stay in business. If indeed, an 11 p.m. closing is called for, the Commission will know that, but with nothing there but a sports bar with some billiards and an after theatre crowd, it seems unlikely that the Commission has to go back to an 11 p.m. closing. If that's what's needed to protect public safety, that's what the Commission will do, but at this point she was not persuaded.

Commissioner Fisler said he goes to that area a lot and its unique and it does have a crowd afterwards at Jerry's Deli. He said definitely, as Commissioner Egan said, we recognize that there is a problem there and the applicant recognizes it and that it has not been handled well. He believed revoking PA-03-39 will handle that situation and it is why he supporting this motion. Further, he said by restricting their hours to 11 p.m., he believed it would be a fatal blow to that business. He was glad to see the applicant stopping the karaoke and live music. He was also glad to see the motion he supports from Commissioner Egan to allow them to operate until 1 a.m. with a review in 90 days.

Commissioner Garlich commented that Commissioner Egan said it well. From his own point of view, those who support this motion are just as concerned about battery, rape, shootings, and other criminal events as anyone else on the dais, and to suggest otherwise, he finds it offensive. Second, the notion of allowing them to operate until 11 p.m. for 90 days and then saying, okay now they can operate until 1 a.m. makes absolutely no sense. He felt they were doing the right thing and supported the motion.

Commissioner Egan said that regarding condition of approval #2G, she believed her reading of it is a little different than from Vice Chair Hall's reading of it. She said what we are telling them they can't do is simply, "have a room that nobody can go into except certain people." She said the Rotary Club can have their breakfast there every week, or whatever, or however the restaurant wants to use it. What we're prohibiting is a "special room" that is reserved all the time, only for a certain group chosen by the restaurant, generally on the basis of paying a fee.

The Chair reiterated testimony from his previous comments. He also said he did not intend to offend anyone with his previous dialogue. He believed the Commission was putting a band-aid on a problem. He said they will be back in 90 days and he looks forward to that, hopefully, with a more positive response, but if there is not a positive



response, he's going to be the first one to champion it. He then called for the question on the original motion as shown above.

The Chair explained the appeal process.

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PLANNING APPLICATION PA-04-17

Nguyen and /Duong General Partnership/LamTristan Nguyen

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of a one-year extension of time for Planning Application PA-04-17 for Nguyen & Duong, for a design review for an 822 square-foot, second-floor addition to a single-family residence; construct a new 2,734 square-foot, two-story duplex at the rear of the property; with a variance from driveway parkway landscaping (10 ft. required; 0 ft. proposed); and a minor modification to allow a 12 ft. wide driveway (16 ft. required), located at 1992 Anaheim Avenue, in an R2-HD zone. Environmental determination: exempt.

Planning Commission Secretary Michael Robinson reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. He said staff was recommending approval by adoption of Planning Commission resolution, subject to conditions.

No one else wished to speak and the Chair closed the public hearing.

MOTION:  
PA-04-17  
Approved

A motion was made by Commissioner Garlich, seconded by Chair Perkins, and carried by 5-0 to approve a one-year extension of time to expire on September 13, 2006, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-68, based on analysis and information contained in the Planning Division staff report, and findings contained in exhibit "A", subject to conditions in exhibit "B."

The Chair explained the appeal process.

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SVS. DEPARTMENT:**

None.

**REPORT OF THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairman Perkins adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m. to the Joint Study Session with City Council on Tuesday, October 11, 2005, beginning at 4:30 p.m. in Conference Room 1A.

Submitted by:

---

R. MICHAEL ROBINSON, SECRETARY  
COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION