

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

December 12, 2005

The Planning Commission of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m., December, 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

Tom Duarte, Deputy City Attorney

Ernesto Munoz, City Engineer

Willa Bouwens-Killeen, Principal Planner

Claire Flynn, Senior Planner

Mel Lee, Senior Planner

MINUTES:

The minutes for the meeting of November 28, 2005 were accepted as corrected.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow Lane, Costa Mesa, acknowledged he received a memo in answer to his request relating to the number of conditional use permits (CUP's) within the City. Based on this information, he felt the City should question whether there are too many. In response to a question from the Chair, Principal Planner Willa-Bouwens-Killeen explained that a Planning staff review and monitoring means that staff goes out and reviews the property on a regular basis to ensure that the conditions of approval are being complied with; staff also checks in-house records for active complaints. The Chair informed Mr. Berry of his willingness to speak with Mr. Berry in more detail about this information. Mr. Berry said he was only asking the Commission to consider whether those figures should be more or less.

Trudy O. Hall, 3080 Johnson Avenue, Costa Mesa, invited the Commissioners to the Mesa Consolidated Water District offices that conduct unique water education programs at no cost to the participants. She said the Water Issue Study Group is in its twentieth year and an award winning adult education program is available to members of the community who are interested in learning about local, regional, and statewide water issues. They have coordinated this effort to provide more information about water resources, water management, and related political issues such as: mesa service operation projects; legislation affecting drinking water; history of the water of issues in California; water availability; regional water issues; water conservation; water reclamation; color of water (Costa Mesa); water quality; water input and ground water. She said the study group begins in January on the 3rd Tuesday of each month from 7 p.m. to approximately 8:30 p.m. Ms. Hall submitted brochures to the Commission.

Judy Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, said in reference to Mike Berry's testimony regarding the amount of revenue the City generates from business license fees, it has not increased in the last 5 years. She asked if this is because we continually receive the same businesses over and over that do not generate increased revenues. She believed the City might want to look at how these projects benefit the City of Costa Mesa with such considerations as: did the businesses hire people that live in Costa Mesa; do they generate sales tax; and are they businesses owned by people outside the City.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:**

Commissioner Garlich wished the Commission, staff, and those in attendance, including those watching at home, a very happy holiday season. He thanked staff for a very productive year and for all their hard work.

Commissioner Fisler wished to relay that he has received comments and questions from the community surrounding the message he relayed in June of this year concerning Sergeant Craig Isham and how he is doing. He said that Sergeant Isham did return from Iraq on Thanksgiving eve and is in Fort Bragg, North Carolina with his wife Amy and his son John Riley Isham. He asked that Commissioner Fisler extend his warmest regards for the holidays to everyone. He noted his genuine appreciation for all the thoughts and prayers and asked if there was time during the busy holidays when making out cards, that those listening who know a service man or woman, would send them a card. Commissioner Fisler said that Sergeant Isham has been reassigned and it looks like he will be doing another tour of duty in Afghanistan next year.

Chair Perkins thanked his fellow Commissioners for wishing him well in his absence at the last meeting. He said Commissioner Garlich and Commissioner Fisler have expressed the Commission's feelings for the holidays in a wonderful way and he thanked them.

The Chair wished everyone a happy and safe holiday season. He said for the last 5 years he said he has had the pleasure and opportunity to sit on the dais as a Planning Commissioner and he said he is grateful to be on the Commission to serve the community. He said he is grateful for the things he has through his family; the education he has received; and the country that he lives in that allows him to deal with things as he pleases. He said staff has been wonderful to the Commission over the last 5 years. He said his fellow Commissioners are wonderful individuals, colleagues and friends. The Chair said he is the most grateful for his wife and the happiness she brings to his life.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

On a motion by Chair Perkins, seconded by Commissioner Garlich, and carried 5-0, the following item on the Consent Calendar received the action below.

2004 DEVELOPMENT PHASING
AND PERFORMANCE
MONITOR-ING REPORT
(DPPMP)

Annual report provides information regarding the City's development activity and overall performance of the circulation network. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Based on the evidence in the record, Planning Commission approved the 2004 Development Phasing and Performance Monitoring Report on a 5-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PLANNING APPLICATION
PA-05-29 AND VESTING
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP
VTT-16917

Oxbow 101 LLC

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of Planning Application PA-05-29 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map VTT-16917 for Oxbow 101 LLC for a design review to construct a 24-unit, two-story, common-interest development; with variances to consider Coronado Drive instead of Mendoza Drive as the front of the property; to reduce the common landscaped area along El Camino and Mendoza Drives from 10 feet to 5 feet (using 5 feet of public right-of-way to make up the difference); and a vesting tentative tract map to accommodate the project, located at 1011—1045 El Camino Drive in an R2-MD zone. Environmental determination: exempt.

Associate Planner Wendy Shih reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. She said staff was recommending approval, by adoption of Planning Commission resolution.

In response to a question from Commissioner Garlich regarding the tot lot area and inclusion of the emergency entrance, Ms. Shih explained that the triangular-shaped area is the official tot lot. The other area is an emergency egress pass that will be developed with turf block and can be used as a passive play area. Commissioner Garlich asked if the Fire Department has any concern about having to crash through there with kids possibly running around. Ms. Shih said the Fire Department has re-

viewed the design, and do not have a problem with this layout.

In response to another question from Commissioner Garlich regarding the vesting tentative tract map and whether the development standards and fees would remain in effect for this project even if the codes change, Ms. Shih explained that the project must comply with the standards and fees applicable at the time the applicant filed the application. She pointed out that there is still a time limitation to the map and the development. Mr. Robinson added for clarification that this is the first time there has actually been a project proposed on this property. He said previously, there was a General Plan Amendment and Rezone Petition, but a development plan was never submitted.

Commissioner Egan expressed a concern that if the Commission should grant the entitlement to have the front of the property on Coronado Drive instead of Mendoza Drive, then there is a side yard, which would have been a rear yard, and now it abuts existing homes. If the property acquires that entitlement and it falls through for some reason, the Commission may have created an entitlement to build 2-stories only 5 feet from the property line even though this project proposes 16 feet to the nearest structure. She asked Deputy City Attorney Tom Duarte, to avoid creating a permanent entitlement to that 5-foot setback, if there is a remedy that would give notice to a subsequent owner (the entitlement is not 5 feet but a greater setback). Mr. Duarte said a Land Use Restriction can be recorded against the property and would give notice to any future buyers of the property.

Commissioner Fislser confirmed with Ms. Shih that although the 5-foot deep landscape setback behind the El Camino and Mendoza Drive property lines (lots 1-12) would allow for more usable backyards for the individual lots, they could still meet code for lot size with 10-foot setbacks. He also suggested a minor correction to the applicant's plan regarding a misspelled street name on the map.

Bradley Barlow, 186 East 16th Street, Costa Mesa, agreed to the conditions of approval, but asked for clarification on Engineering Division condition of approval number 14 which he felt was vague and overreaching at this time because they are currently in discussions with the Engineering Division on the requirements for the site. He said the existing use on the site is a shopping center with asphalt and existing buildings, and they are proposing 40% open space which would actually reduce the runoff into the storm drain system and he wanted to make sure that when they are accepting these conditions, they are not agreeing to an onsite detention facility which the homeowners would be required to maintain as part of their dues and association fees. He said he understood their requirement to provide a study, but wanted clarification on the Engineering Division conditions of approval 14, 15 and 17 on page 17 of the staff report.

City Engineer Ernesto Munoz explained that condition #14 is a standard condition placed on developments that will essentially be out flowing to systems that are considered deficient in the City. One of the requirements is that those developments do reduce a considerable amount of water that's actually being put into the system to prevent flooding downstream and precluding liability on the part of the City and the developer in the future. As the applicant indicated, there are ongoing discussions to find the best solution for this particular tract in reducing the amount of water that's going to be drainage into the deficient system. Mr. Munoz explained that one of the possibilities is detention of water on site, which he said they've clearly indicated they are not amenable to. Other solutions are also being considered for possible installation to reduce flooding potential. This condition does not preclude the applicant from submitting something that will be workable and that can be approved to achieve that goal. The Chair confirmed that conditions 15 and 17 also relate to Mr. Munoz's testimony and that condition of approval #31 in exhibit "B" relates to the compliance of the conditions set forth by the Engineering Division.

Commissioner Garlich pointed out that the residential and industrial Home Ranch properties used some form of onsite retention solution or partial solution for NPDES and asked if there were similarities. Mr. Munoz explained that would be a similarity, but NPDES is a separate issue to the storm drainage requirements. Further, he said detention onsite essentially allows the developer to hold some of the water to allow the storm to subside to avoid overwhelming the existing system's deficiency. He said detention could be underground detention and/or many other possibilities. He said there is a development on 23rd Street that recently installed a large storm drain that snakes through the development, whereby, they provide some detention onsite. There is also a project on Fairview Road and Harbor Boulevard in the works that will be doing something similar. He said there are several projects in the City that have recently done this.

Commissioner Garlich asked if the manner by which Mr. Munoz determines the need to do onsite retention is based on analysis of how much water is going to be produced and what the system will tolerate. Mr. Munoz said that is true and explained that even when the developer removes a parking lot and provides open space area and reduces the outflow generated from the site, they still must find a solution to keep from overloading the storm drain.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Barlow said the explanation does clarify his questions and that he wanted to make sure they were on the record that there are still ongoing discussions with the Engineering Division regarding the ultimate resolution on the storm drain issue. He said they want to make sure there is a storm drain issue in the City; that no one particular development is impacted; and, that a solution can be created for everyone.

Mr. Barlow said this discussion is about the storm drain issue being a final map issue, but in discussions he is having with the Engineering Division, his preference would be to strike conditions 14, 15, and 17 as conditions of his tentative map when it's a final map issue, and if it's still in discussion, it is premature to have those conditions attached to his tentative map.

Mr. Robinson, in response to a question from the Chair regarding the map, stated that normally the final map goes directly to Council and is more of a technical matter to determine that the final map is in substantial compliance with the tentative map. There is no opportunity to apply any conditions at a later date. In further response to another question from the Chair, Mr. Robinson confirmed that as Mr. Munoz said, the studies would indicate what solution is available and what alternatives are available. He said it is just a matter of staff working with the applicant to come up with a mutually agreeable solution.

Commissioner Garlich confirmed that the final map has to be filed before building permits can be pulled so the resolution will be done prior to anyone having to move dirt.

Mr. Barlow thanked the Commission and staff for their time. The Chair asked what the time line would be for this project and Mr. Barlow felt the tenant issues would be completed in the first quarter of 2006 and he would be prepared for demolition to break ground.

In response to a question from Commissioner Egan regarding her concerns about the project and a Land Use Restriction (LUR), Mr. Barlow agreed to a condition regarding prohibition of any building or structure within 16 feet of the easterly property line (abuts homes on San Juan Lane). He asked for clarification of the LUR. He said it would be his understanding that the setback variance would run with the tentative map, and if for some reason the tentative map expires, as was the issue earlier, would that change the frontage of the site and disappear as well, and, would the variance run with the tentative map? Deputy City Attorney Tom Duarte confirmed that the variance runs with the land.

Mr. Robinson stated that he believed the intent of the LUR was not to

allow building encroachment, and that a patio cover might be acceptable to encroach. Commissioner Egan said she was concerned that after the project is constructed, somebody could build a 2-story building 5 feet from those homes.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, said this was a terrific project, although he did not see "single-family homes" mentioned in the report. He said a larger more global issue is that, as we improve our City and build better projects such as this one, consideration should be given to building the same on the Westside.

Judy Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, said that she saw nothing on parking in the staff report. The Chair responded that on page 2 of the staff report there is a discussion of parking and 2-car garages. In further response to Mrs. Berry, Ms. Shih explained that there is a condition included in exhibit 'B' of the staff report requiring language in the CC&R's regarding use of garages for parking. In further response to Mrs. Berry, Ms. Bouwens-Killeen offered that condition of approval #21 begins at the bottom of page 14. She said there is not only the 2-car garage, but each of the houses are provided with a minimum 19-foot long, two-car driveways leading to the garage, which by code, satisfies the 4 parking spaces requirement for each of the units.

Michelle Christiansen, 2782 Mendoza Drive, Costa Mesa, said she was very happy to see something happen over at this site. She questioned the new street as being very close to a confusing intersection. Mr. Munoz said he was not sure that this particular development was doing anything to address that situation. He believed that what is being proposed is not changing significantly from what is there presently. He said perhaps the developer has some suggestions he may offer regarding what the development will do to address some of those conditions.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, asked what type of common interest development this is and is it an incorporated development? The Chair responded the applicant would answer this question after public comment.

Lisa Riede, a Mesa del Mar community resident, Costa Mesa, said Mesa del Mar residents were excited about this project. She asked if there would be street parking on Coronado and Sierra Way, or parking for homeowners and their guests, and, if there would be any street parking at all. She was concerned about the time line and asked if there was a way to enforce some type of time line.

Maureen De Domenico also a resident of the Mesa del Mar area. She felt naming a street "Sierra" when they already have a street named "Serra" would be very confusing and asked if the applicant would reconsider. She also commented that the drainage conditions not be removed from the Engineering list because it would be unfortunate without a provision to manage that drainage. She also expressed concerns about parking. She said her hope was that these homes would be owner-occupied homes.

Mr. Barlow returned to the podium to address questions. He said with regard to getting out on Mendoza, they have reduced the wall heights to accommodate the movement through the stop sign. With regard to the type of common interest development this is, he said these are single-family, for sale homes, with a homeowners association that will be governed by the CC&R's for the project, and the association would be incorporated in the State of California. He said there is parking on El Camino Drive; however, Coronado is where the driveways are located. He also said there would be no problem changing the street currently named "Sierra." He said there is no parking on that street, but there is some open space in the center of the project and in the tot lot. They have been working with staff to accommodate the needs for the residents; he said they are really trying to get that tot lot in and create some open space for the residents to gather and walk their dogs, etc.

Mr. Barlow asked the Commission to condition the applicant to provide the Engineering Division with a storm drain run-off study, and look at the numbers and come to a conclusion that's best for the City, the project, the residents, and the entire area.

In response to a question from Commissioner Garlich concerning the language Mr. Barlow would use for this condition, he said the problem was that it includes onsite detention and they feel it is very vague and he would like to strike that language and delete conditions 15 and 17 because they also address an onsite detention basin and that would be a final map decision.

Commissioner Garlich asked Mr. Munoz to revisit this request to see if any of these are possible. Mr. Munoz said staff feels there is nothing vague about the condition and it is very specific that they detain some of the water. Whether they do it onsite or offsite, or mitigate that condition, staff is working with the developer to come up with a solution. The condition is specifically crafted to preclude any problems offsite that occur right now.

Commissioner Garlich commented that a previous speaker mentioned something about an "enforceable" time line and he responded that the Commission couldn't force someone to meet a time line.

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

MOTION:
PA-05-29/VTT-16917
Approved

A motion was made by Commissioner Garlich, seconded by Chair Perkins, and carried 5-0 to approve Planning Application PA-05-29 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map-16917, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-81, based on analysis and information in the Planning Division staff report and findings contained in exhibit "A", subject to conditions in exhibit "B", with the following addition:

Conditions of Approval

32. A land use restriction executed by and between the applicant and the City of Costa Mesa shall be recorded within 30 days of final approval of the project, to inform future property owners of the condition requiring a minimum 16-foot second story right (east) side setback as long as Coronado Drive instead of Mendoza Drive is considered the front property line. Applicant shall submit to the Planning Division a copy of the legal description for the property, and either a lot book report or current title report identifying the current legal property owner so that the document may be prepared.

During discussion on the motion, there was discussion by Commissioner Egan concerning Mr. Robinson's point regarding patio covers, etc., and she suggested that the Commission apply whatever the code provides for awnings, patio covers, etc., that may be allowed to the same extent that code allows them to encroach into any setback. Mr. Robinson felt that was fine and said he did not want to be in a position of totally precluding patio covers, or to have to come back to Planning Commission each time someone wants to add one.

Commissioner Fislser thanked the applicant for this project because he felt it would greatly improve the quality of life in our community. He said he liked the fact that the applicant is building 24 units when 32 are allowed because less density is better and the additional homeownership opportunities are also appreciated in the community. He said he was really glad to see this project come forward.

Commissioner Garlich said he remembered when the first project came forward and the issue with the automotive repair business and the discussions with the previous owner of the property. He recalled he stayed in touch with local developers for over a year encouraging them to continue to work with the previous owner and try to find a way to move things forward. He said although this applicant was not among those developers, he was glad someone finally stepped forward and is getting

it done.

The Chair explained the appeal process.

PLANNING APPLICATION
PA-05-35/TENTATIVE TRACT
MAP T-16926

2295 Pacific LLC/Calacci

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of Planning Application PA-05-35 and Tentative Tract Map T-16926 for Garrett Calacci of Waterpointe Development, authorized agent for 2295 Pacific LLC, consisting of a design review for a 10-unit residential common interest development project; a minor conditional use permit to allow a 3-foot encroachment of second-floor decks into the required 10-foot bluff setback area; and a tentative tract map for a one-lot airspace (condominium) subdivision, located at 2287—2295 Pacific Avenue in an R2-MD zone. Environmental determination: exempt.

Senior Planner Claire Flynn reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. She said staff was recommending approval by adoption of Planning Commission resolution, subject to conditions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Egan, Senior Planner Claire Flynn confirmed that the property line extends beyond the bluff crest, down to the toe of the slope. In further response to Commissioner Egan regarding conditions covering maintenance of the slope area, Ms. Flynn said there is a condition that requires native plants to be planted along the upper area of the slope to screen the proposed wrought iron fence and to also provide additional slope stability. She said no condition has been placed that requires landscaping for the entire slope area as not to introduce new plants that may compromise the slope.

Commissioner Egan said her question was directed to slope stability and she asked if any studies had been done. Ms. Flynn said she did not believe any slope stability study has been done as far as this application is concerned, however, she said 6 months ago the Building Division officials came out and inspected this property, as well as other properties along the slope; the slope was found to be stable.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fisler regarding the 3% vacancy rate, Mr. Robinson offered that the requirement Mr. Fisler was describing is related to the condominium conversion ordinance and does not apply to other types of developments.

Commissioner Fisler questioned the variance not to have a 10' setback from the bluffs but is a different situation on Swan Drive. Ms. Flynn explained that the encroachment strictly applies to the encroachment of structures along the bluff crest and does not refer to any encroachment of the private structures onto Fairview Park, as was the case for those properties along Swan Drive.

Commissioner Egan said she noticed as Mrs. Berry pointed out, that *this* project does not have a condition comparable to condition of approval #21 as the prior project regarding keeping garages available for parking and asked for a reason. In response, Ms. Flynn stated that condition of approval #27 on page 15 contains a requirement that the association contract with a towing service to enforce these parking regulations. Further, Ms. Flynn stated that these types of projects would now contain these conditions from this point forward.

Commissioner Garlich asked where in the staff report, and in her presentation she made provisions for working with the applicant, and perhaps in the conditions that go with it, relative to the view issues which he believed are commendable with regard to this location. He said the City has no “view ordinance”, but he recalls in previous years’ discussions about views on the Westside Bluffs, and he is concerned and wants to be sure we have it on record that we are not doing anything in here that would preclude a homeowner from building a patio cover, or putting in trees that the neighbor could say is violating their view because of all the things that were said in this staff report about maintaining views. He requested that Ms. Flynn address this issue.

Ms. Flynn said Commissioner Garlich was correct in that the City does not currently have a “view preservation ordinance.” She explained that

in working with the applicant, they wanted to take advantage of the existing views and maximize the design of these homes to showcase Fairview Park and the bluff crest. She said this project does not set a precedent that in the future, any homeowner cannot plant a tree, or a build a patio cover, etc., that might obstruct these views. This was more of an opportunity to take advantage of existing views.

Garrett Calacci, 190 Newport Center Drive, Newport Beach, agreed to the conditions of approval but wanted to make the same comment as the previous speaker regarding drainage. He felt that doing any type of detention on this site would be a bad idea because of slope issues already expressed here. He said they are proposing grading the site and draining it to get the water out of there and off the site as quickly as possible. Mr. Calacci said the Bay Street project (Daily Pilot), faced the same situation with wanting to keep the water on the site and perk it there. He said since they are working with the Engineering Division on this, he wanted it on record that detaining water on this site is not a good idea.

City Engineer Ernesto Munoz explained that this particular site is much more difficult as far as the drainage is concerned and as discussed earlier, the condition here is exacerbated by the fact that the site is adjacent to bluffs, so they don't want to saturate the ground to preclude slope failure. In addition, there is an existing drainage condition, which causes severe damage not only to the bluffs on Fairview Park, but also to some of the existing development adjacent to Fairview Park. The condition for detaining flows onsite actually precludes the ground from becoming saturated which is different from what the developer is indicating. Holding water on site and letting it perk into the ground would be detrimental to the slopes. The Engineering Division would never propose that to be done. He said they are working with the developer's engineer to find a solution to this particular site. They are coordinating the expertise of their soils engineer, as well as their civil engineer to achieve a workable solution.

Judy Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, asked if there was some kind of agreement in place to have the renters relocate. She asked who monitors and enforces the parking.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, felt that this project was also a terrific project. He also commented that if views were a factor here, he is not seeing large windows to take advantage of the views.

Nicole Lloyd, 2287 Pacific Avenue, Costa Mesa, said she has been a tenant at this address for about 14 years; however, she understands what the developer is doing and felt it would probably be a big improvement. She said most of the tenants cannot afford to buy in this market right now and this site will not be affordable housing.

Commissioner Fisler stated that there is a "First Time Home Buyers" program being offered by the City of Costa Mesa and explained how it works with a top purchase price of up to \$655,000. He said Ms. Lloyd should look into it.

Linda Neiberg, 2293 Pacific Avenue, Costa Mesa, said she has concerns with moderately priced rentals and the availability of units. She asked if there is any kind of help with relocation or anything that can be offered to current tenants. She also questioned the stability of the bluffs because when she moved into her rental 8 years ago, there was a trail where you could walk up from Talbert Preserve to this site but there has been so much erosion the trail is no longer acceptable. She said she hoped that all the surveys and necessary investigation would be done to be insure the slope is stable before demolition and building is approved. She said the Fire Department at one point, had to drive a hose truck into the parking lot now situated next to Fairview Park and extinguish some fires. She said she would also like to see a commitment made for communication with the current tenants.

Jim Calura, 2293 Pacific Avenue, a 13-year resident of Costa Mesa, said

the apartment building itself is very old and not in good condition but agreed with the previous speakers. He said that rents have skyrocketed.

There was discussion between the Chair and Mr. Duarte concerning relocation fees for renters and Mr. Duarte confirmed that this was a tenant/landlord issue.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Calucci noted that as soon as a project is torn down, there is a good 6 months before they break ground and they let the tenants know. The Chair said he suspected Mr. Calucci might already have a relocation idea for them, or some form of market research.

MOTION
PA-05-33/T-16926
Approved

A motion was made by Commissioner Garlich, seconded by Chair Perkins, and carried 5-0 to approve Planning Application PA-05-36 and Tentative Tract Map T-16926, by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC-05-82, based on analysis and information contained in the Planning Division staff report, and findings contained in exhibit "A", subject to conditions in exhibit "B."

During discussion on the motion, Chairman Perkins commented that this is a great project and long since needed. He commented that he is a renter because he can't afford to buy in Orange County. He is sympathetic to the renters, but putting aside his own personal situation, he finds that this is a great project and hoped that the applicant would work with the tenants.

Commissioner Garlich said he was glad Chair Perkins made those comments and commented that all of us at some point in our lives rented, and that he was also sympathetic with the comments and concerns of the folks renting there. He said our City is upside down in terms of home ownership and rental properties – this City is 40% ownership and 60% renters. He felt it would probably never get more affordable.

Commissioner Fisler said that he also feels for the renters and relayed that he rented for 22 years. He is a realtor by trade and he knows how hard it is to buy homes in this City and only about 11% of the population qualifies to buy a home. He said he knows of very few homes under \$680,000 in this City. He encouraged the renters to call the City regarding their program. He also discussed specifics of the First Time Home Buyers Program.

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 8:18 p.m. to the study session of Monday, January 9, 2006.

Submitted by:

R. MICHAEL ROBINSON, SECRETARY
COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION