

MINUTES – REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

18747 CLARKDALE AVENUE, ARTESIA, CA 90701

MARCH 22, 2005

Call to Order

The Regular Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Artesia was called to order on March 22, 2005, at the City of Artesia Council Chambers at 7:03 p.m.

Invocation

Commissioner Young led the invocation.

(In accordance with the court's decision in Rubin Vs. City of Burbank, only non-sectarian invocations are allowed).

Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman Da Veiga led the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call

Present: Commissioner Medina
Commissioner Young
Commissioner Oliver
Vice Chairman Da Veiga
Chairman Menezes

Absent: None

Also Present: Associate Planner Okina Dor
Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins
Deputy City Attorney Carrie Lee
Planning Clerk Barbara Di Iorio

Approval of the Planning Commission Agenda

The Planning Commission unanimously approved the Agenda.

Announcement of Speaker Cards

Commissioner Menezes announced that for recording purposes, if someone wishes to make a statement regarding any item on the agenda, to complete a speaker slip and deposit it with the planning clerk prior to the commencement of the meeting. Please note that there is a five-minute time limit per speaker imposed. Please stay within this time limit.

Commissioner Oliver abstained from the item.

Deputy City Attorney Carrie Lee presented Case No. 2004-62/Resolution No. 2004-62P, A request for approval of a Code Amendment to allow a warehouse use as a conditionally permitted use in the Commercial Transition (C-T) Zone; a Conditional Use Permit to operate a warehouse use in the Commercial Transition (C-T) Zone; and Design Review approval for the construction of a new 7,674.5 square foot warehouse building for the property located at 17330 Jersey Avenue, in the Commercial Transition (C-T) Zone.

Deputy City Attorney Lee explanation of the newly prepared Code Amendment that would reduce the depth of the commercial set-backs for lots fronting the northerly side of Artesia Boulevard, which are at least 130 feet in depth, but less than 250 feet in depth, in which case the commercial set-back would extend only for the depth of the lot.

Ms. Lee explained details regarding the request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, and reported that Staff found that the evidence reported does justify granting of the Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Lee also reported that the applicant submitted a request for Design Review to allow for the construction of a warehouse facility. She continued by describing the details of the design elements of the proposed warehouse. The project and architectural design will be similar to that of the adjacent commercial building to the south of the subject site.

Additionally, Ms. Lee reported that four (4) parking spaces will be provided on site in compliance with Artesia Municipal Code Section 9-2.1103C3.

Based on the consideration described in the Staff Report, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2004-62P, recommending that the City Council approve the Code Amendment to allow a warehouse use as a Conditionally Permitted Use in the Commercial Transition Zone, approving a Conditional Use Permit to operate a warehouse use in the Commercial Transition Zone, and approving Design Review for the construction of a new 7674.5 square foot warehouse building for the property located at 17330 Jersey Avenue in the Commercial Transition Zone subject to the conditions of approval set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 2004-62P.

Chairman Menezes opened public hearing. There was no one wishing to speak regarding this item.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked for clarification regarding the elevation plan, and the structure that looks like a carport structure. Associate Planner Okina Dor confirmed that the area on the elevation plan in question is part of the adjacent building.

Commissioner Medina made a motion to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

There was a very brief discussion in which the Commissioners simply commented that proposed project was very nice. There was no other discussion among the Commissioners.

MOTION by Commissioner Medina, second by Commissioner Young **TO APPROVE CASE NO. 2004-62/RESOLUTION NO.2004-62P.**

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Da Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: Oliver

**Item 4 Case No. 2005-02 Design Review
11746 South Street**

Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins presented Case No. 2005-02/Resolution No. 2005-01P. A request for Design Review approval to alter the façade of the existing restaurant, construct two (2) new wall signs, and replace the existing monument sign for the property located at 11746 South Street (Pine Hill 2 B.B.Q. Buffet and Banquet), in the Commercial Planned Development (C-P-D) Zone.

Mr. Harkins explained the details of the existing and proposed signs, including locations, dimensions, design, color and wording, as well as the rest of the details of the project as written in the staff report. Based on the consideration mentioned in the Staff Report, Staff recommends approval of Case No. 2005-02 subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Menezes opened public hearing.

David C. Lee of 11746 South Street spoke representing the owner. He read the letter submitted to the City of Artesia regarding this project, which proposes an alternate solution to the issue regarding relocation of the trash enclosure. Mr. Lee also reported that the owner of the business has informed him that the trash crew is scheduled to pick up the trash on Mondays, Wednesday, Fridays and Saturdays, and that the maintenance crew checks the area from the restaurant to the trash bin to make sure the area is maintained and cleaned daily. The owner also replaced the trash bin. Mr. Lee pointed out that the owner has made a commitment to the City to maintain the conditions outside the building. The owner's concern with the new location of the trash

bin as proposed by the City, is that it is right next to the main entrance of her business. Mr. Lee requested that this be taken into consideration along with the maintenance schedule commitment made by the owner.

Chairman Menezes asked Mr. Lee for clarification regarding the changing of the windows from solid fixed glass to jalousie windows. Mr. Lee clarified by explaining that they are operable window and that they will only be in the upstairs deck portion of the building, and they are covered by canvass. The reason for the opening windows is to allow cross ventilation in the deck area during the hot summer months. These windows are proposed on the east, west, and north elevations of the building. Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins mentioned that no additional window openings will be added to the building to provide for the jalousie windows. Chairman Menezes also expressed concern for surrounding properties being exposed to noise from events with live music taking place in that deck area if the windows are open. Mr. Lee pointed out that in that area there is already about a 12 inch opening around the perimeter from the awning to the fixed window that is covered only with mesh.

Commissioner Oliver questioned how the windows operate. Mr. Lee clarified by explaining that they are vertical louvered-type windows. Commissioner Oliver asked if screens would be placed on those windows. Mr. Lee responded by stating that he would look in to that with regard to County Health standards.

Commissioner Medina asked if the new windows would be non-glare. Mr. Lee responded by stating that he could attempt to find some type of tint for the new windows that would be similar to the tint on the existing windows.

Mr. Harkins pointed out that the issues regarding the screens and the tinting of the windows can be made as conditions.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked Staff if the trash enclosure could be relocated without impacting the existing drive isle widths. He requested explanation regarding the proposed new location for the trash enclosure. Mr. Harkins explained that proposed location for the trash enclosure is on the east side of the rear elevation of the existing restaurant. There is a possibility that the drive isle would be impacted. In this case we would consult with our traffic engineer to get the best location. Mr. Harkins also confirmed that there is existing reciprocal access to the east.

Chairman Menezes asked if Staff had taken into consideration that the entry to the building is at the back of the property near the proposed location for the trash enclosure, which would be undesirable for the applicant as well as customers. Mr. Harkins agreed however, added that if the proposed location is close to the building and kitchen facilities, possible impact of excess trash might be more quickly mitigated by the applicant since it is close to the entrance.

With no further questions, Chairman Menezes made a motion, and Commissioner Medina second that motion to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

During the discussion among the Commissioners, Commissioner Medina made mention of a community trash enclosure area in the back of the stores, as they saw on their tour of Rancho Cucamonga. There was also customer parking and an entrance which was dress up and did not look like a back entrance. It was an open and welcoming area. Commissioner Medina would like to see a little better design for project, involving the neighboring businesses with a community trash area for the benefit of all and beautification of the area.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga expressed his concern with the inability to relocate the trash enclosure behind the building because it will obstruct the drive isle. He suggested relocating to an existing parking space or two and lose those spaces, which the applicant may not be able to do. He further suggested incorporating a trash enclosure inside the building, which may also not be possible due to the floor area. Although he thinks it may be a good idea to move the trash enclosure as Staff has proposed, he does not understand how it can be done and still have the parking and circulation work.

Mr. Dor gave some background history regarding the previous approved entitlement. This entitlement was for 105 parking spaces, which the development does meet with the reciprocal ingress/egress. It may be possible for Staff to work with the developer to lose one parking space and some of the additional landscape. One ideal place would be either in back where the back entry would be. Another place would be in the back behind where the reciprocal ingress/egress driveway connecting the parking is. In either place, some existing landscape as well as parking would be lost. In these cases, the applicant would have to apply for a parking Variance. Another option is placing a condition requiring the applicant to adhere to a maintenance program that City Staff can monitor.

Commissioner Young would like to give this new owner a chance to prove due diligence.

Commissioner Oliver asked if it would be possible for us to incorporate into the condition, the applicant's plan for keeping the area clean. Mr. Harkins responded that the Commission may make that a condition.

Chairman Menezes stated, for clarification, that the applicant plans to have trash picked up on Mondays, Wednesday, Fridays, and Saturdays, and that they also will have their own maintenance staff keep the area clean. He further suggested that a possible condition could state; At no time shall the trash can be over filled above the top level of the trash can, at no time shall trash or debris be within the enclosure and not in the trash can; and at no time shall the parking lot have litter or debris. Chairman Menezes'

concern with setting up a community trash enclosure at this time is that we do not yet know the lay out of the future development on the vacant lot, although the concept is a great idea to keep in mind for the future. He expressed his opinion of keeping all the existing parking spaces and providing more parking spaces and leaving the trash can in its current location.

Commissioner Oliver requested clarification regarding the number of signs proposed. Mr. Dor responded by stating that the applicant is putting an additional sign on the side of the property that faces Pioneer Boulevard. The two existing palm trees are being relocated toward the front so that sign will be more visible. There will also be a new sign on the side of the building.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked if the applicant is within the allotted sign area. Mr. Harkins confirmed that this project does not exceed the sign area of one square foot of sign area per linear foot of business frontage.

Commissioner Oliver requested information regarding the colors of the signs. Mr. Dor and Mr. Harkins passed out color photos of the color conceptual designs for the Commissioners to view.

There were no other questions or comments from the Commission.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Da Veiga,
second by Commissioner Young **TO**
APPROVE CASE NO. 2005-02/RESOLUTION
NO. 2005-01P WITH THE TRASH ENCLOSURE
REMAINING AT ITS CURRENT LOCATION,
INCLUDING A CONDITION THAT STATES
THERE SHALL NOT BE ANY TRASH OUTSIDE
OF THE BINS WITHIN THE TRASH ENCLOSURE
AREA OR WITHIN THE PARKING LOT AT ANY
TIME; AND THE TRASH SHALL BE PICKED UP
A MINIMUM OF THREE TIMES PER WEEK; AND
THE PROPOSED WINDOWS SHALL NOT BE A
TYPE THAT WILL RESULT IN GLARE TO ANY
ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Menezes, Da Veiga, Medina, Oliver, Young
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Menezes, Da Veiga, Medina, Oliver, Young
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

**Item 6 Case No. 2005-10 Variance
11917 167th Street**

Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins present Case No. 2005-10/Resolution No. 2005-11P. A request for approval of a Variance for one (1) less enclosed parking space than required in connection with an addition for the property located at 11917 167th Street, in the Single-Family Residential (R-1) Zone. Mr. Harkins explained the details of the case as written in the staff report. Staff recommends approval of this case, subject to conditions of approval.

Commissioner Young asked if Staff had considered the possibility that by approval of cases such as this one, the 1-car garages may be turned in to bedrooms at a later date. Mr. Harkins explained that no alterations can be made prior to the final inspection, however after the final inspections has been made, it would be a Code Enforcement issue. Mr. Dor added that if a Code Enforcement case was opened on such a case, action would be taken much quicker due to the specific conditions that were previously set forth to get the entitlement.

Commissioner Oliver read number 13 of the conditions, regarding landscaping. The prints provided to the Commission do not show landscaping. While driving through that area, he has seen housing with 1-car garages in front with concrete across the entire frontage of the property, which looks unsightly. Commissioner Oliver asked if it is stated in projects like these that a certain amount of landscaping must be maintained at all times. Mr. Dor confirmed that part of approval for entitlements, a condition is included stating that prior to approval of final building inspection, the final is subject to planning approval. This is comprised of Planning Staff visiting the subject site with the list of conditions and checking that each item is satisfied. Release of the final inspection of the building is not done until all conditions are satisfied. This is to ensure that the landscape is in place. If the landscape is removed some time after the final approval, then a Code Enforcement case can be opened.

Chairman Menezes pointed out that without such a condition, a property owner can do whatever they want, and that a condition is the City's only safe guard for this.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga pointed out that there is landscape shown on the site plan.

A motion was made by Commissioner Young and second by Commissioner Oliver to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

MOTION by Commissioner Medina,
second by Commissioner Young **TO APPROVE**
CASE NO. 2005-10/RESOLUTION NO.
2005-11P.

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Menezes, Da Veiga, Medina, Oliver, Young
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

Item 7 Case No. 2005-11 Design Review
18521-18597 Pioneer Boulevard

Commissioner Young excused himself from the meeting, as he must abstain from this item.

Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins presented Case No. 2005-11/Resolution No. 2005-12P. A request for Design Review approval to establish a sign program for the property located at 18521-18597 Pioneer Boulevard, in the Commercial General (C-G) Zone. Mr. Harkins described details of the case as written in the staff report. Staff recommends approval of this case, subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Jonathan Matson, 13271 South Street, Cerritos, was sworn in by Deputy City Attorney Carrie Lee.

Mr. Matson, the architect for the project, stated that he put together the sign project which is before the Commission tonight. He explained that he tried to design it in a manner that would be consistent for the shopping center, and all the signs should blend well together.

Commissioner Oliver asked applicant to elaborate on what the Corporate Marketing Image Program is.

Mr. Matson explained that none of the tenants are franchises or corporate chains, but that the Corporate Marketing Image Program would allow for this in the future. This means that Taco Bell, for example, can use the sign they use at all of their locations.

7' for the entrance of the house, which would not allow space for windows. Mr. Levy and the applicant do not think the requirements imposed on their proposed project are reasonable.

Chairman Menezes asked Mr. Levy if Staff had every showed him other projects that had previously been approved with a 1-car garage. Mr. Levy said they had not. Chairman Menezes explained to Mr. Levy that the Planning Commission had just approved a project tonight with a 1-car garage on a lot the same size as this project. He further clarified that it is possible to have a 1-car garage on this size lot.

Silvia Trevino, 11858 166th Street, explained that a two-bedroom house is not big enough for her family, which includes three children. She would like to extend the house so they can live more comfortably.

Commissioner Medina asked if the paperwork the applicant provided to Staff clarified at all what the applicant is trying to convey to the Commission. Mr. Dor explained that one of the documents indicates the original house was constructed in 1954, and the other document reflects a room addition in 1990, which met the requirements at that time and was approved. All new cases are subject today's codes and requirements. Chairman Menezes asked when the code requiring a 1-car garage was adopted. Mr. Dor did not have that information with him at the meeting.

Commissioner Oliver inquired about the backyard set back requirement. Mr. Dor stated that the setback can be 5' as long as the property owner meets all the other requirements regarding the side yard, rear yard, and open space, and lot coverage area. Mr. Dor stated, for the record, that the representative of the applicant, who submitted the application and requested approval of the project, was made fully aware of the requirements. He clarified that it is the policy of Staff to give proper recommendations and proper suggestions to applicants, in an attempt to make the projects solid with the possibility of obtaining approval, as well as potential of modification if need be.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga requested clarification regarding the curb cut. Mr. Harkins confirmed that the property does not have a curb cut. Vice Chairman then asked for clarification regarding the off setting of front façades of manufacture design standards for single family homes. He wondered if that would be triggered in this case. Mr. Dor explained that the code amendment that was previously approved by the Planning Commission, and the City Council, and is currently in effect, indicates that façade recess and offset are required. This information was also provided to the applicant, but the applicant chose to leave the front as existing and simply add on to the back. Staff understands the hardship of the project and the site, and is not against it. It is important however, to bring the property into compliance with today's standards.

A motion to close public hearing was made by Commissioner Medina and second by Commissioner Young. There were no objections.

Chairman Menezes stated that although this is a small lot, others with small lots have found ways to include the garage, which makes a decision on this case difficult.

Commissioner Medina believes that the person coordinating this project failed to direct the applicant correctly as to how the project should have been presented. Staff tried to guide them in the direction of what the Commission does approve.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga is concerned that there is not even the ability to park on the driveway of this property. Vice Chairman Da Veiga indicated that if he was to support this proposal, he would want to see at least a curb cut for a 1-car parking space on a driveway in front of the house. He would also like to see more landscaping adjacent to that driveway. He would also like to see a better looking front design, which would incorporate an offset. The only way he could consider supporting the project is with these additions. He does not feel that there has been an attempt to provide any parking on the site.

Commissioner Oliver sees this project as an opportunity to rebuild or remodel the property with a 1-car garage, and would be in favor of it completed with a 1-car garage.

MOTION by Commissioner Medina, second
by Commissioner Oliver **TO APPROVE**
CASE NO. 2005-12/RESOLUTION NO.
2005-13P TO DENY THE VARIANCE.

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Oliver, De Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

**9. Case No. 2005-13 Determination of Unlisted Use and
Conditional Use Permit
17120 Alburtis Avenue**

Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins presented Case No. 2005-13/Resolution No. 2005-14P. A request for approval of a Determination of Unlisted Use in order to operate a hardwood floor inlay manufacturing and warehousing use for the property located at 17120 Alburtis Avenue, in the Light Manufacturing and Industrial (M-1) Zone.

Mr. Harkins described details of the case as written in the staff report. Staff recommends approval of this case, subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Medina requested that the applicant approach the podium. He then asked the applicant if he has an established business that is currently in operation. Mr. Terence McDonald explained that he has been in business for the past five years. He currently has three adjacent buildings in the City of Santa Fe Springs, which he has now outgrown. He is looking for a larger facility. Commissioner Medina asked about the glue used and how it is stored. Mr. McDonald explained that it is the typical wood glue, such that can be bought at Home Depot. He purchases 50-gallon drums and usually has 2 drums on site at a time. Commissioner Medina asked if the business uses saws. Mr. McDonald confirmed that they have a full range of wood working tools. Commissioner Medina asked how the noise from these tools is addressed. Mr. McDonald indicated that the employees wear ear protectors while in the shop. He stated that the noise is not a concern from outside the shop. He operates an office for the business adjacent to the shop and noise is not a problem there.

Commissioner Young asked if the AQMD enforces standards of this business with regard to anything being emitted into the atmosphere. Mr. McDonald explained that he has a dust collection system that sucks the dust off the machines, cycles through a bag house so that the air that comes out of bag house is free of particles.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked if Mr. McDonald has a show room for his products. Mr. McDonald indicated that he does not currently have a show room and hopes to get one with this building. Currently he only has very small working shops and he needs space for a show room.

Commissioner Oliver asked if this business will be retail or resale. Mr. McDonald indicated that it may possibly be both. He further clarified that it is not a store. It would only be considered retail because a homeowner may have purchased one item which would be sent to them.

Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked staff if every use requires a C. U. P. to occupy an industrial building. Mr. Dor clarified that every use does not require a C. U. P. and that certain uses are principally permitted by right. This specific item was under permitted use or principally permitted uses in this zone, therefore a Determination of Unlisted use must be filed. Staff felt that this business would be equivalent to a furniture business, which would be allowed in the M-1 Zone with a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Young asked if the applicant would be willing to screen the transformer. Mr. Matson, representative of Manfield Partnership No. 2, stated that he thinks the owner of the property would be agreeable to putting some shrubs around the transformer to screen it, since it is at the front of the property.

Commissioner Oliver indicated that a statement was made in documentation that no trucks or company vehicles are owned or maintained on site. Mr. McDonald stated that at this time he does not have a company vehicle, but that he does look forward to getting one some day. Mr. Harkins clarified that a condition can be included indicating that depending on business needs, one or two trucks may be permitted to be stored behind screening.

Motion was made by Commissioner Young and second by Commissioner Oliver to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

MOTION by Commissioner Young, second by Vice Chairman Da Veiga **TO APPROVE CASE NO. 2005-13/RESOLUTION NO. 2005-14P WITH RECOMMENDATION THAT LANDSCAPE SCREENING BE ADDED AROUND THE EXISTING ELECTRICAL TRANSFORMER.**

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Oliver, De Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

**10. Case No. 2005-14 Variance
17713 Pioneer Boulevard**

Associate Planner Okina Dor presented Case No. 2005-14/Resolution No. 2005-15P. A request for approval of a Variance to exceed the maximum number of signs allowed per business in order to construct two (2) new wall signs for the property located at 17713 Pioneer Boulevard, in the Pioneer Specific Plan, where a Variance was previously approved for the property to allow seven (7) signs in excess of the one (1) sign maximum per business. Mr. Dor described details of the case as written in the staff report.

A motion was made by Chairman Menezes and second by Vice Chairman Da Veiga to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

MOTION by Chairman Menezes, second by Commissioner Oliver **TO CONTINUE CASE NO. 2005-14/RESOLUTION NO. 2005/15P TO THE NEXT REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF APRIL 26, 2005.**

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Oliver, De Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

**11. Case No. 2005-15 Design Review
17708-14 Alburdis Avenue**

Assistant Planner Dennis Harkins presented Case No. 2005-15/Resolution No. 2005-16P. A request for Design Review approval for two (2) new detached units (each with an attached garage) in the rear of the properties and a proposed addition (garage and closet area) to each of the two existing duplexes in the front of the properties located at 17708-14 Alburdis Avenue, in the Multiple Residential (M-R) Zone. Mr. Harkins described details of the case as written in the staff report. Staff recommends approval of this case subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Young asked what the back of the property backs up to. Mr. Dor confirmed that there is another multi-residential apartment complex behind the subject site.

Commissioner Oliver requested clarification regarding the distribution of use for the garages. Mr. Harkins explained that the first duplex will use the 2-car garage located at the front of the property, and that the second duplex will use the 1-car garage as well as the 1-car garage that is attached to the multi-family unit.

A motion was made by Commissioner Young and second by Commissioner Da Veiga to close the public hearing. There were no objections.

Commissioner Young thanked the applicant for submitting such a nice project and including parking in the project.

MOTION by Commissioner Oliver, second
by Vice Chairman Da Veiga **TO APPROVE**
CASE NO. 2005-15/RESOLUTION NO. 2005-16P.

Said motion was carried in the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Oliver, De Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

Items from Staff-Discussion

Reminder that the Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council is scheduled Tuesday, March 29, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Commissioner Young apologized that he will not be able to attend this workshop.

The consultant for the City Wide Design Guideline has been selected. The consultant will start to prepare a City Wide Design Guideline for Commercial and Residential areas of the city. The plan is to start with a guideline and then pursue amendments to our Code in the future. Carrie Richardson is the consultant and is working on the draft at this time. It is hoped that the draft will be presented to the Planning Commission at the April 26, 2005, meeting for review and consideration. The Commission must elect two representatives from the Planning Commission to serve on an Ad Hoc Committee to provide input to staff and the consultant in the preparation of the guidelines. There will also be representatives from the City Council and the community on this Ad Hoc Committee. These Ad Hoc Committee members from the Planning Commission should be selected by the April 26, 2005, meeting. Vice Chairman Da Veiga asked if there was any type of workshop prior to the preparation of the Draft Design Guideline, since in the past, programs such as this were in their final stages before they were presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Dor explained that the draft being prepared by the consultant now is just going to be a starting point for the Ad Hoc Committee to provide additional input, if needed.

Additional Citizen Comments

There were no additional citizen comments.

Items from the Commission

Vice Chairman Da Veiga reported that there is a wall behind Taco Bell at the corner of Norwalk Boulevard and South Street that looks like it has been hit by a car. There is a monument sign that looks as though it has been damaged as well on the adjacent property. Please mention this to Code Enforcement so it can be repaired.

Commissioner Young re-stated that he will not be able to attend the Joint Planning Commission/City Council Meeting on March 29, 2005. He will submit any concerns in writing to the Planning Department at City Hall for distribution.

Commissioner Oliver indicated that he may be late for the March 29, 2005, Joint Planning Commission/City Council Meeting.

Chairman Menezes welcomed new Planning Clerk Barbara Di Iorio to the team.

Adjournment

Adjournment at 9:50 p.m. to the Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council to be held on Tuesday, March 29, 2005, at 6:30 p.m., in the City of Artesia City Council Chambers.

Attest

I, Barbara Di Iorio, Planning Clerk of the City of Artesia, do hereby certify that the Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of 22, 2005, were approved at the Regular Planning Commission Meeting held on the 26th of April, 2005 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Medina, Young, Oliver, Da Veiga, Menezes
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: None

Barbara Di Iorio, Planning Clerk