

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

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL**

**WEDNESDAY**

**AUGUST 8, 2007**

**7:00 P.M.**

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Francis at 7:07 p.m.
- PRESENT:** Chairman Francis, Vice Chairman Hart, Commissioners Bailey, Chaffee, Musante, Savage and Thompson
- ABSENT:** None
- STAFF PRESENT:** Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting Senior Planner Allen, Senior Civil Engineer Voronel, Assistant City Attorney Thomas Duarte, and Secretary Pasillas
- FLAG SALUTE:** Commissioner Chaffee
- MINUTES:** Approval of the Minutes from the July 25, 2007 meeting was continued.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PRJ06-00586 – ZON06-00100 – ZON07-00001. APPLICANT: ROBERT VARISCO; PROPERTY OWNER: HARBOR BLVD. MEDICAL INVESTORS, INC.**

A request for a major site plan to construct a 14,300-square-foot medical office building over a two-level, 75-space parking structure and a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the base Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .30 with a FAR of .40, on property located at 1555 North Harbor Blvd. Boulevard (west side of Harbor Blvd. Boulevard between approximately 1,180 feet and 1,360 feet north of Valley View Drive) (formerly 1601 North Harbor Blvd. Boulevard) (C-1 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL).

Acting Senior Planner Allen described the project and explained the requests. The proposal was for a three-story height building, with parking at the first and second levels, and office space on the third floor. The building, as proposed, would be forty-three feet in height, with an additional three foot parapet to screen the roof-top equipment.

The Major Site Plan request was explained and a site plan was shown. There would be one driveway entrance to the building on the north end of the site where clients would enter and park, either at grade level or take a ramp to the second level. Roof-mounted equipment would be screened with both vertical side pieces and louvers on top.

Acting Senior Planner Allen continued by explaining that the site would be made flat by the construction of an extensive retaining wall system. The wall would increase in height from Harbor Blvd., back to the western edge of the site. There would also be retaining wall on either side of the parking structure ramp. The retaining wall would range in height from thirty-eight feet to forty-six feet. The closest point between the retaining wall and the property line would be approximately

nine feet, and ranged up to twenty-two feet. Elevations were shown, and the retaining system explained.

Staff had reviewed the project based on the Scenic Corridor Guidelines, which included preservation of the view from the road of scenic hillsides and vegetation, and also preservation of the long distance "view shed". The site was devoid of dense landscaping of scenic value, and proposed to add twenty feet of landscaped setback and landscape buffer along Harbor Blvd. A buffer on the north side, which would screen the retaining wall as viewed by south bound traffic on Harbor Blvd., was also included in the proposal. Staff clarified that the project did not block any vistas

The Scenic Corridor Guidelines also recommend that the upper stories be tiered and that there be screening of conflicting uses. The project architect had chosen to step back the entire building twenty feet, and both the building and landscaping were designed to screen parking on both levels. The Zoning Code only required a ten-foot front setback.

The Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application was to evaluate the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) increase request. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the FAR was not an aesthetic measurement of mass or scale, but a basis for the City's traffic modeling. The base FAR for this zone (C-1) was 0.30, but Code allowed for conditional approval of an increase up to 200% of the base (therefore up to 0.60). The applicant had requested 0.40, which was supported by a traffic analysis that had been prepared. Any incremental roadway impacts were less than significant based on the traffic analysis, and therefore would be supported as being consistent with the General Plan.

Staff recommended approval of both applications based on the proposed conditions. Specifically, the following conditions were added based on the comments received; condition eight required a screening louver system for the roof-top equipment to provide screening from above, condition eleven required a geotechnical investigation report to address concerns with slope stability; and condition twelve required an off-site inspection of adjacent homes and structures for baseline assessment to address concerns with negative impacts on upslope homes.

Commissioner Bailey asked if there was parking on Harbor Blvd. at this location, and Acting Senior Planner Allen responded that there was not. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there was no parking or stopping on Harbor Blvd., and this area was recently re-stripped for three lanes. Commissioner Bailey asked if there were any plans for overflow parking, and Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the site was parked for medical office, which was more restrictive than general office or retail, and the project had the exact number of spaces required.

Chairman Francis left the room at 7:19 p.m.

Vice Chairman Hart asked the zoning on the properties to the north, and Acting Senior Planner Allen stated it was residential zoning. Vice Chairman Hart asked if those properties currently had access to Harbor Blvd., Acting Senior Planner Allen responded that they did not.

Chairman Francis returned to the room at 7:20 p.m.

Vice Chairman Hart asked if they were approving the ingress and egress of this property, and Acting Senior Planner Allen described the one driveway at northern end of site. Vice Chairman Hart asked if the lot to the north had access to Harbor Blvd., and Acting Senior Planner Allen responded it did not. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that the residential properties to the north were part of the residential lots accessed from Marelen. Because these properties were residential and had access on a collector street, they would typically not be allowed access on

Harbor Blvd. Vice Chairman Hart asked if it would be possible for the lots to the north to ingress and egress on Harbor Blvd., and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the property owner could file an application and go through the process for consideration, but currently they could not. Vice Chairman Hart commented that it was her understanding that the City was not allowing anymore access on Harbor Blvd. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that two driveways were proposed and staff had encouraged the applicant to have just one in order to limit the number of access points. If the property was a through lot, such as the lots to the north on Marelen, access onto Harbor Blvd. would not be allowed without consideration of an exception.

Commissioner Savage asked about the machinery that would be on the roof and what type of noise would be emitted. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that only concept plans had been submitted for consideration, and she was unaware of the specifics of the equipment, and suggested the applicant address this question.

Commissioner Savage asked about the retaining system as viewed from Harbor Blvd., and where the property lines would be located. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the retaining wall stopped eighty to ninety feet from Harbor Blvd., and went from zero to thirty eight feet in height as it went back. Commissioner Savage asked what the wall would be made of and how it would be landscaped, and Acting Senior Planner Allen responded that structural questions could be answered by the developer. There would be landscape planting in front of the wall, and a condition was included which required that the exterior wall be decorative.

Commissioner Savage asked if the offsite investigation would include inspection of any residential swimming pools to ensure there were no new cracks. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the condition required inspection of buildings and any accessory structures and confirmed that the swimming pool would be included, presuming authorization of the adjacent property owners.

Commissioner Savage asked about the six foot block wall that would be built above the retaining system to prevent falls, and Acting Senior Planner Allen clarified that the six foot wall that was identified was on the existing property line. There would be a non-retaining wall or fence on top of the retaining wall. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the building code required a wall or fence of forty-two inches to prevent people from falling over the retaining wall.

Commissioner Chaffee believed that a forty two inch mini-wall above the retaining wall could easily be stepped over. He would like to add a condition to make the additional wall at least six feet, although it was not necessary for it to be block.

Commissioner Chaffee asked about the condition for a geotechnical investigation report, and whether there would be City approval of the report or approval of the geotechnical engineer. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that both were required. The City would review the engineer's credentials and also his/her report. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the City was the final authority, and they would look at the report content to make sure it adequately addressed their concerns. This condition was included to address the concerns of the neighbors as well as Building Division requirements.

Commissioner Chaffee asked if this report would be available for public review, and Acting Senior Planner Allen confirmed it would be.

Commissioner Chaffee wanted to know what the consequences would be of the off-site inspection and if that report would also be public. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the report was to create a baseline so both the builder and the homeowners knew what the conditions were prior to any construction.

Commissioner Chaffee asked why the condition to prevent pile driving was included, and Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that pile driving caused both vibration and noise, and staff believed the wall could be done in other ways. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that the applicant had stated that they did not intend to use pile driving; there were other ways to construct this wall, and the project engineer would decide the method.

Commissioner Chaffee asked how the screening on the roof would work, and Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the sides would be solid, and the top would be louvered to allow ventilation. The louvers were designed to orient towards Harbor Blvd.

Commissioner Musante asked if any consideration had been given to adding an access road that would run parallel to Harbor Blvd. and allow access to the neighboring properties. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the properties to the north were currently zoned residential, and secondary access to an arterial highway would not be supported when there was another primary access.

Commissioner Savage asked, if the developer had cut out the hill and then experienced problems, and possibly bankruptcy, would bonds be available to protect the City and citizens. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that a grading bond would be required in an amount that would allow completion of the work if the developer failed to complete it.

Commissioner Thompson left the room at 7:44 p.m.

Commissioner Savage asked if the bond would cover the property owners, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the bond would cover the City. Commissioner Savage believed it was important to protect the homeowners as well as the City.

Public hearing opened.

Commissioner Thompson returned to the room at 7:46 p.m.

Mike Easton, project manager, addressed the concerns that had been brought up:

- Noise – Roof top screening was designed to deflect noise, with the vents pointing towards Harbor Blvd. The equipment was high efficiency, and was setback quite a distance from the lot lines.
- Retaining wall – Intended wall to be a reinforced concrete structure, possibly with exposed or introduced aggregate or staining, something that would go well with the proposed building finish. They wanted it to be attractive; the building had a lot of architectural detail and they wanted to continue the look with the wall.
- Top of wall – Not opposed to potentially adding a pipe cabling system, would like to avoid having the wall taller than needed to avoid seeing it from Harbor Blvd.
- Liability and protection – Construction completion bond would protect the City, and the various engineers, architects and contractor would carry liability insurance. They normally required between five and ten million dollars in coverage, with a coverage period during and after for a certain period of time as allowed by construction defect law. They did not intend to affect the neighbor's property, but understood it was extensive work. In meeting the Scenic Corridor requirements, they had moved the building back into the slope, which was very costly. Currently there was some slippage occurring now, and they were going

overboard to make sure there were no problems. This project would improve the stability of the slope, and be more attractive and safer.

Commissioner Chaffee asked how the wall would be constructed, and Mr. Easton explained that the method would be determined by the engineer. They would probably use hydraulics and drill core holes which would be reinforced. Prior to cutting away slope, each section would be anchored. The stability of the hillside must be maintained to Code standards, which included seismic events, even during construction.

Commissioner Savage asked how big the core holes would be, and Mr. Easton stated it would be specified by the engineers, but approximately eighteen to twenty four inch holes.

Victoria Dailey, 1460 Marelen Drive, expressed the following concerns:

- Owner of property above the site
- Pool was needed for health reasons and this project may damage it
- Did not want the frustrations of the project
- Emissions from this building would be unhealthy
- Project would devalue her property
- Bought this property because she was claustrophobic and this area was not closed in, this project will make her feel closed in
- Can hear the noise from the Automobile Club across the street, noise will carry from this parking lot
- Who will be around when retaining walls fall down in several years
- How long will construction last
- Taking away a pretty part of Harbor Blvd.
- Developer should have found a sound, stable property for this project

Commissioner Savage asked how long Ms. Dailey had lived at this address, and Ms. Dailey responded twenty years. Commissioner Savage asked if she had lived there when the property was subdivided and rezoned to commercial, and Ms. Dailey responded that she was, and explained how it had come about.

Vice Chairman Hart left the room at 8:11 p.m.

Vice Chairman Hart returned to the room at 8:12 p.m.

Marlene Cantrell, 1412 Marelen, expressed the following concerns:

- She enjoyed her home and street, and even though she did not live directly behind the site she was concerned about increased noise
- When the Red Onion Restaurant was across the street she heard noise from the business
- She was concerned with the developer cutting back hill
- Increased traffic
- Slowing down from 50 mph on Harbor Blvd. to turn in driveway will cause accidents
- Property values may decrease

Chairman Francis left the room at 8:12 p.m.

Chairman Francis returned to the room at 8:13 p.m.

Vice Chairman Hart asked Ms. Cantrell if her property backed up to Harbor Blvd., and Ms. Cantrell responded that it did not. Vice Chairman Hart asked if she heard noise from the Red Onion, and Ms. Cantrell stated that she had. Vice Chairman Hart asked if she heard noise from the Farmer Boys restaurant, and Ms. Cantrell responded that she did not but some of the other neighbors did.

Aaron Greg, 2840 Altivo Place (Ms. Dailey's son-in-law) expressed the following concerns:

- He traveled Harbor Blvd. daily and believed it would be difficult to work on this site
- Construction would have a negative impact on the traffic on Harbor Blvd.
- Traffic moved quickly on Harbor Blvd. and one entrance and exit to this facility would cause problems
- Retaining wall would be highest and closest next to his mother-in-law's swimming pool
- Any slippage on the hillside below his mother-in-law's home would have to be disclosed at the time she sold it, and this would decrease the property's value
- Retaining walls fail as the City has seen in other locations
- Cancellation of homeowner's insurance

Commissioner Savage explained that he had met with Mr. Greg today and went over the plans and Mr. Greg's concerns. He had received an email with these concerns, and asked Mr. Greg if they had been addressed. Mr. Greg responded that some concerns had been addressed, but not his concerns with liability five or ten years down the road. Commissioner Savage asked Mr. Greg if he had any indication from his insurance agent that there could be a change in coverage or cancellation of the policy, and Mr. Greg responded that he was afraid to call and find out.

Richard, who lived in the neighborhood, made the following statements:

- The project looked nice
- The ownership appeared to have changed since the community meeting (Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that he was not aware of any change; he verified that the City's public notices reflected applicant vs. owner)
- Concern with slippage, "nailing" may add additional stability to the slope
- If developed as a medical center now could it be developed later as another type of property
- Change in address number since community meeting (Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that address numbers were assigned by the Engineering Department, not the applicant)

Anant Desai, 1501 Harbor Blvd., south of the project, stated that the hill behind his commercial office building was constantly settling, and two years ago he had erected a small retaining wall. The rain caused slippage and he was in the process of repair to construct a higher wall. This proposed retaining wall on the adjacent property would help stabilize the neighboring properties, the homes above, and the pool.

Mike Easton, project manager, addressed the additional concerns that had been brought up:

- Use of property being changed – The design of the building does not lend itself to uses other than office or medical. They intended to be long-term owners of the property.
- Concerns of increased noise and traffic - This use, as opposed to other permitted uses, would have the least impact on the neighbors.
- "Stapling" was a machine that drove a barbed cable into the hillside; they were looking at this procedure, but the geotechnical engineers would determine the best method of construction.

- This building would be at the bottom of the hillside; if the retaining system failed they would be at risk, so they need to assure a quality wall.
- The retaining system would anchor a hillside that was already experiencing problems; with or without this project some type of retaining system was needed, and to justify the cost some type of project was needed.
- They had no intention of disrupting adjacent properties, but if something occurred there would be insurance in place to handle any problems.
- Site line issues – Top of the building would not be seen by neighbors above.
- Pollution/fumes – Building design ensures the parking area is well ventilated and the HVAC equipment was high efficiency. The proposed use would not create pollution or fumes
- Increase in amount of traffic - Tried to make this a “good neighbor” project.
- Traffic during construction - Intended to complete the project with the least amount of impact - talking with neighboring properties to address staging.

Vice Chairman Hart asked if a retaining wall was placed on a portion of the slope would it change the dynamics for other parts of the site that did not have a retaining wall. Mr. Easton explained that it would act like an anchor for the balance of the hillside.

Commissioner Savage asked the estimated time to build, and Mr. Easton responded approximately twelve months total. Commissioner Savage asked what a medical building’s normal hours were, and Mr. Easton responded usually 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with less on Fridays. There would also occasionally be emergency type calls outside of these hours. It would be a mixed type of offices, with the possibility of a dentist who may have Saturday hours.

Commissioner Musante asked what would happen if ten or fifteen years from now something happened with the slope and/or retaining wall; was there any assurance to the homeowners. Mr. Easton explained that past a certain point there were statutes in place relating to construction defects, and it would be a matter of civil recourse. Commissioner Musante asked if, as developers, they could purchase long-term insurance, and Mr. Easton explained that the extent of what the insurance covered was to the limit of what the law allowed. The over engineering that would occur to meet Code was estimated to withstand the maximum earthquake that would be expected, and there were no concerns with water runoff. Commissioner Musante asked Mr. Easton if he had experience with similar projects, and Mr. Easton responded that he had never had any experience with slippage or failure of a retaining wall. He took the project seriously, and would go well beyond what was required. He reiterated the investment the applicant was making below the wall.

Commissioner Bailey asked where this project would fall in the scale of other projects he had completed. Mr. Easton stated that on a scale of ten, maybe a four, compared with other engineering and retaining systems he had done.

Commissioner Chaffee asked who the “we” was that Mr. Easton had mentioned. Mr. Easton explained that his company, Eastern Pacific Construction Company (EPCC), had a background with civic and engineering projects. The team included Mr. Easton, the architects Ware Malcolm, and various sub-engineers and sub-contractors. Commissioner Chaffee asked if he would oversee the project to ensure it was done correctly, and Mr. Easton responded affirmatively. Commissioner Chaffee asked about the traffic on Harbor Blvd. and how they anticipated the slow down required to enter this site to work. Mr. Easton responded that there was no deceleration lane, but a third lane of traffic had been added to Harbor Blvd. Commissioner Chaffee asked if this wall would be similar to the Elks wall, and Mr. Easton stated it would not, it would probably be some type of anchoring system that would be determined by the engineers.

Ms. Dailey stated that with the high speed on Harbor Blvd., and the building having only one driveway, along with emergency vehicles going to St. Jude's Hospital, there would be traffic accidents.

Public hearing closed.

Commissioner Bailey and Commissioner Chaffee left the room at 8:53 p.m.

Commissioner Savage commented that the building constructed north of Bastanchury took longer than expected and caused many traffic problems. He wanted to know the potential for changes or delays during the construction of this project.

Commissioner Chaffee returned to the room at 8:54 p.m.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that there would be some lane closures, but this site was different. At the other site the retaining wall had to be constructed first, before they could move equipment onto the site

Chairman Francis left the room at 8:54 p.m.

Commissioner Savage asked what the City's engineer thought of this retaining wall, and Senior Civil Engineer Voronel responded that it would be designed and reviewed by a geotechnical engineer along with staff, and if it was designed properly there should be no problems.

Commissioner Bailey returned to the room at 8:55 p.m.

Senior Civil Engineer Voronel stated that this wall could benefit the stability of the slope. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that it was difficult to provide an opinion without reviewing construction drawings.

Chairman Francis returned to the room at 8:56 p.m.

Vice Chairman Hart asked how many traffic lanes there were at this location, and after discussion it was determined that there were three. Vice Chairman Hart asked if a car were making a right turn into this facility, could another car get around the turning vehicle. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the project had been reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer and he had determined that any issues had been adequately addressed. Senior Civil Engineer Voronel had spoken with Mark Miller, the Traffic Engineer, and a traffic analysis had been prepared for this project. His recommendation was that this project would not have any significant impact on traffic. She had asked him about a possible deceleration lane and the engineer felt that it was not needed.

Commissioner Chaffee asked if it would be possible to put in a deceleration lane, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it would be difficult to put in a deceleration lane with the current design, particularly since a deceleration lane would need to be on someone else's property.

Commissioner Savage stated that he liked the building design and believed it would be an asset to the City. He liked the idea of adding pipe and cable fencing to the top of the retaining wall. He understood the neighbors concerns, but did not believe emissions would be a problem. There were already cars driving by, and traffic had been evaluated by the City's Traffic Engineer. There would be some construction inconveniences, but the property owner had a right to develop his property. He would support the project.

Commissioner Musante would support the project. He believed the proposed use was the least impacting for what was allowed. The slope was not presently stable, and this retaining wall would act as an anchor for the slope, including the areas on the side of this project. His only concern was ingress and egress on Harbor Blvd., and he would rely on the experts to ensure it was safe.

Commissioner Chaffee would support the project with an additional condition that a minimum six foot fence be added on top of the retaining wall. The traffic analysis was only a capacity analysis and did not analyze deceleration. He believed the City needed to make certain it was safe. This project exceeded the setback requirements, he liked the design, there was ample parking, additional baffling had been added to prevent equipment noise and sight, and he believed this would provide stabilization for the slope. The property owner had a right to use his property, and he appreciated the good will the developer had demonstrated.

Vice Chairman Hart agreed with the other Commissioners. She thought it was an attractive design, and the homeowners would benefit from the retaining wall. She did have concerns with traffic going south on Harbor Blvd., but believed it was a problem for the City to analyze, and determine adequate deceleration needs.

Commissioner Bailey also agreed with the other Commissioners and would support the project. He liked the building design, it was properly parked, and he liked the parking set up, and believed it was a good use of this space. He liked the rooftop screening, and did not believe the developer would put his building in jeopardy and skimp on the retaining wall. He was concerned with traffic deceleration but would acquiesce to the City Traffic Engineer's opinion.

Commissioner Thompson understood the neighbors concerns, but believed the hill there now was not attractive. If he was purchasing a home there he would feel more secure having the retaining wall in place. He thought medical office space would be a benefit to the City. In regards to traffic on Harbor Blvd. he believed additional signage could help, but there was enough room to turn into the driveway if drivers were paying attention. He would support the project.

Chairman Francis believed the hill was not stable and had been grooved from water drainage. He stated that the developer was doing a big favor for the neighbors and the City by putting up this retaining wall, and he would support the project with an additional condition requiring a fence on top of the retaining wall to prevent someone from falling over the wall.

The title of RESOLUTION PC-07-18 APPROVING a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Fullerton recommending approval of a Major Site Plan to construct a 14,300-square-foot medical office building over a two-level, 75-space parking structure and a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the base Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.30 with a FAR of 0.40, on property located at 1555 North Harbor Blvd. Boulevard was read and further reading waived. MOTION by Commissioner Chaffee, SECONDED by Commissioner Bailey, and CARRIED 7-0, that said Resolution be ADOPTED AS AMENDED, by adding a condition that a minimum five foot high fence shall be constructed on top of the retaining wall to provide a safety barrier which cannot be climbed, and shall be architecturally compatible with the building, subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

None

## **COMMISSION STAFF COMMUNICATION**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the new Director of Community Development was John Godlewski, and he would be starting on September 4, 2007. Commissioner Savage knew Mr. Godlewski and looked forward to working with him.

Commissioner Savage asked about the retaining system being used around the Elks Club, and what exactly was a "blooming wall". Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that during the landscape approval process a decision was made to allow irrigation from the top and below, and landscaping from top and below, with the intent that eventually it would grow together. There had been an opinion expressed by the applicant that irrigating the wall could reduce the stability of the wall. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Interim Director and the City Manager had instructed him to get irrigation and landscaping installed. Commissioner Savage commented that the only reason he approved this wall was he had been assured by staff and the developer that this would be a growing wall, not merely a couple of vines. He wanted to know what he could do to make sure what was promised was done. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that if what was approved was not provided staff would bring the project back before the Planning Commission for review and interpretation. Commissioner Savage would like to have a copy of the minutes and staff reports relating to this project, along with examples of the "blooming wall" that they had been shown.

Chairman Francis stated that if the developer went against what was approved by the Planning Commission he would like to address the situation at a future meeting.

Commissioner Bailey asked if the developer was actively saying no or just waiting to plant the wall. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that there was a disagreement on what was approved. There was a correction comment during plan check, and the developer had gone up the chain of command and was told it was not necessary. The current top of the chain of command had indicated that landscaping was necessary. It could come before the City for a determination of conformity.

Commissioner Thompson commented that it appeared that staff approved landscape plans that were not what the Planning Commission and City Council approved.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated he would make it clear to the developer that the Planning Commission wanted to review the landscape plan to ensure it met their intent.

Commissioner Chaffee commented that there was no access to the staff reports online, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that staff would fax, email, or mail a copy upon request. Commissioner Thompson suggested that it would be fairly simple to post them on the City's website.

Commissioner Musante asked if the comments from this meeting would go to the City Council, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that they would be included in the staff report and draft or approved minutes.

Commissioner Savage would recuse himself on the La Mesa item coming up at the next meeting; therefore he would like it to be the second item on the agenda.

## **REVIEW OF COUNCIL ACTIONS**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief report on recent City Council meetings.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**AGENDA FORECAST**

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be August 22, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.