

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

August 9, 2004

The Planning Commission of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in regular session at 6:30 p.m., August 9, 2004 at City Hall, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, California. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Garlich, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present:

Chairman Bruce Garlich

Vice Chair Bill Perkins

Katrina Foley, Dennis DeMaio and Eric Bever

Also Present: Perry L. Valantine, Secretary

Costa Mesa Planning Commission

R. Michael Robinson, Plng. & Redevelopment Mgr.

Marianne Milligan, Senior Deputy City Attorney

Ernesto Munoz, City Engineer

Steve Hayman, Assistant City Manager

Marc Puckett, Director of Finance

Jana Ransom, Recreation Manager

Kimberly Brandt, Senior Planner

Mel Lee, Associate Planner

MINUTES:

The minutes for the meetings July 12, 2004 and July 26, 2004 were accepted as amended.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, spoke about the City's need to improve their housing element and that the "Bluffs" would make an excellent residential development of homes with a view, providing the City changes the zoning from industrial to residential.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, stated that he believed construction of the Instant Jungle housing development approved a few years ago, was encroaching into Canyon Park, and that someone from the City should intervene at this early stage to see if mistakes have occurred.

Tim Lewis, 2075 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, submitted photographs showing the progress of the implementation of the landscaping plan at the Beacon Bay/Robbins project site. He said the landscaping is almost finished with a nice appearance. He displayed a photograph of a sign in disrepair on the site that he felt was a safety problem. He said the sign was hit by a truck last February and has not been maintained. The last photograph was that of a City sign announcing a hearing date, which was actually situated inside the property fence line and cannot be seen by the public.

In response to a question from Commissioner Foley regarding the reason why the sign in disrepair was not removed, Mr. Lee explained that the City's sign code allows a legal sign to remain in place and the applicant indicated that once the new dealership moves in, they will refurbish the sign and provide new copy. He said the hazardous condition of the sign is a different issue and that staff would notify the applicant to make the necessary repairs, however, Commissioner Foley said she would like the sign repaired immediately. She also asked that the City sign announcing public notice of the hearing be posted in an appropriate area where it can be seen.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:**

Commissioner DeMaio congratulated and thanked the Costa Mesa Police Department, Costa Mesa Fire Department Emergency Services, the Orange County Sheriff's Department, and all those who managed the Fair, and especially the Fair's director, Becky Bailey-Finley for a job well done.

Commissioner Foley requested that Mr. Valantine provide an update at a future study session on the status of the sale of the Fairgrounds and what has been done to express the City's objection to that other than what was in the newspapers.

Vice Chair Perkins echoed Commissioner DeMaio's comments regarding the successful implementation of the 2004 Costa Mesa Fair. He announced the "Leukemia Society Light the Night Walk" on the 22nd of August at Anaheim Stadium, and another to be held on October 17th at the Newport Dunes Resort from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. with music, entertainment, and food. He said everyone is welcome to attend and the funds raised are used to fight against blood cancers, as well as patient services programs.

Chairman Garlich thanked and commended the Costa Mesa Police Department on their success of the "National Night Out" event last week. He said it was well attended with many volunteer organizations represented, several programs, and a lot of helpful information.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDING TEMPORARY SIGNS FOR CITY-SPONSORED EVENTS ON PUBLIC PROPERTY AND BANNERS ON PUBLIC BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL FIELDS

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of a draft ordinance of the City Council for the City of Costa Mesa amending the regulations contained in Title 13 of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code relating to the use of temporary signs for City-sponsored events on public property, and banners on public baseball and softball fields. Environmental determination: exempt.

City

Senior Planner Kimberly Brandt reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. She pointed out that both types of these temporary signs are not currently addressed in the City's sign regulations. She said staff is recommending Planning Commission recommend to the City Council, that they give first reading to the ordinance.

Vice Chair Perkins confirmed with Ms. Brandt, time periods (seasonal) for permits, including installation and banners. Ms. Brandt stated that it's important to remember temporary signs for sponsorship are for "Group I Users" only, as defined in the staff report.

The Chair inquired about the maximum 64 square-foot size under "Temporary Signs on Public Property", page 8 of the staff report, item (3). Ms. Brandt explained that code currently has a provision for construction of temporary signage when a project is being built. Staff felt it was a reasonable square footage because it is temporary in nature and is limited to one per street frontage. The Chair confirmed with Ms. Brandt that some discretion could be used in an instance where someone wanted a sign to be that big, just because it could be that big.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Perkins regarding regulation of sign content, Sr. Deputy City Attorney Marianne Milligan stated that both ordinances are "content neutral" in that the City does not regulate the content because of first amendment rights, etc.

In response to a request from Commissioner Foley, Ms. Brandt explained the permit process and what steps would be taken for the user groups to obtain permits. She added that once the ordinance is adopted, they would put together a handout outlining administrative procedures.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, felt there was over regulation without enforcement and that the City has become a giant billboard of advertising.

There was discussion between Vice Chair Perkins, Mike Berry, and

Commissioner Foley regarding current regulations, and responsibility for enforcement of those regulations.

In response to a question from Commissioner Foley, Ms. Brandt stated there is no adopted fee for this type of permit and therefore, no City revenues would be generated; when the City Council next reviews its fee schedule, it could be included.

Commissioner Foley confirmed with Ms. Brandt that if the sponsorship money obtained by the Little League (a nonprofit organization for which the City has no jurisdiction over) is in question, those concerns would have to be taken up with the little league board.

Mr. Berry stated that the softball players and little leagues don't need the sponsorship banners, citing the low costs of participation in softball and baseball, because the taxpayers heavily support that now.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Perkins regarding whether the City can look at how those funds are spent in reference to "Group I Users", Recreation Manager Jana Ransom stated that when the Recreation Division asks leagues for a copy of their by-laws, they are merely checking to see that they have an "everyone plays" philosophy. They are accountable to their parent organizations. She pointed out that many of the banners that are put up, are not dollar collections, i.e., in kind materials, and there is a value established either in kind or monetary, that goes to support the leagues to help defray the costs.

Gregg Pearce, 2953 Baker Street, Costa Mesa, is President of the Costa Mesa National Little League, stated that the City basically allows them to use the fields at no cost. He said accountability for the money raised is through Williamsport National Little League. He said they are also required to file with the IRS every year in a non-profit status. Their records are open to anyone who requests to see them. They submit their by-laws and constitution to the City for review every year, while obtaining their permits. He said they follow the code as written and have been doing it for years, and further, staff has done a great job of persuading the league to apply the codes. He believed the enforcement issue was not an issue because it is being watched closely.

In response to questions from Vice Chair Perkins, Mr. Pearce explained that they have approximately 30 banners among 3 fields each year. He said about 50% of the banners are for donations, equipment, dirt, the fields, etc., and the money raised from the banners is put back into the league, with most of it going back into the fields. They are constantly upgrading fields they do not own, and this past year, they spent \$10,000 on fencing. There was also discussion between Vice Chair Perkins, Commissioner Foley, and Mr. Pearce concerning owners who have businesses that may be inappropriate for advertising on a banner, such as a strip bar, and how it could be worked out. Mr. Pearce offered to add a policy to their by-laws on this subject, if the Commission felt it was necessary.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Perkins concerning the number of banners that have a white background, Mr. Pearce stated that 100% of the banners this past year were white.

Beth Refakas, 320 Magnolia Street, Costa Mesa, believes the banners are offensive, and that the City does not enforce the banner ordinance already on the books. She said City Council approved investigating a corporate sponsorship program for the skate park, and as a result the City is on "advertising overload."

In response to a comment from the Chair regarding enforcement, Ms. Brandt stated that to clarify an earlier comment, that these regulations are to be incorporated into the City's zoning code, and Code Enforcement is the enforcement arm of the City in relation to com-

pliance with these new regulations.

In response to a request from the Chair, Ms. Milligan described the process and events that would transpire if a violation occurs.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Perkins concerning other cities that offer free little league fields, Recreation Manager Jana Ransom stated that fee waivers in whole, or in part to user groups, is becoming less frequent. Santa Ana, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Long Beach, and Garden Grove, gave fee waivers entirely to whatever the “Group I User” definition was to those types of groups. She said Council Member Schaeffer suggested looking at a nominal fee this year. She said they are now finding that many cities are going to a small nominal fee, but not one that covers the full cost.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, asked for the definition of a utility. In response, Ms. Ransom explained it is generally a soccer field that can also be used as a football field or a Lacrosse field, and is named so because it is used for more than one purpose. He did not feel that the field at Paularino School directly across the street from residential on Paularino Avenue was appropriate for banners.

In response to Mr. Millard’s comments, Ms. Ransom stated that on page 9 of the staff report, under (a) Applicability, it states that, “only a “Group I User” shall be able to request approval to install banners on a public baseball or softball field that has been allocated to them by the City.” She said the user groups that have banners, put them on their game fields only; it makes no sense to put them up where they only hold practices and Paularino is one of the schools where they only hold practices. She said “out-of-city” users would not be a “Group I User.”

Tim Lewis, 2750 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, felt that those who acquire a permit and don’t offend anyone don’t usually have any issues. He said this is really all about those kids that were born and raised here in Costa Mesa that need a place to play baseball; those signs are part of baseball. He said they need a place to play and it’s not right to charge them for the fields because that’s what this City’s here for and that’s what those fields are there for—the kids.

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

MOTION:

Draft Ordinance amending temporary signs on public property and banners on public baseball and softball fields.

Recommended to City Council

A motion was made by Commissioner Foley, seconded by Chairman Garlich, and carried 3-2 (Bever and Perkins voted no), to recommend to City Council, that they give first reading to the draft ordinance, with the following recommendation: Under Sec. 13-118.2 **BANNERS ON PUBLIC BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL FIELDS (c) Standards. (2) Banner Composition:** Banner copy and/or logos shall be limited to one side of the banner, and the banner shall be made of white durable cloth, bunting, plastic, or similar material. The motion was called later (see below).

During discussion of the motion, Commissioner Foley stated that she agrees with Mr. Lewis that the fields are there for the kids and that’s why we live in this community. She said as a taxpayer, she expects there to be places for her kids to play with athletic and recreation opportunities for them. The volunteers are the parents who live and pay their taxes here and expect that the City will provide these resources. There will be the same number of banners that have always been there—it is not about the banners on the fields. She said that some people in our community believe the fields are overused, and she believes, that’s what they are there for.

Chairman Garlich said this is true; the issue came about because of a loophole in the ordinance so it is now being addressed and has been an ongoing “situation” for approximately 8 to 10 years in many places around the City. He said the money goes to a good use and by

comparison in some surrounding cities, it costs about \$100 per child to play and in Costa Mesa it costs approximately \$35; that's a good place for the money to go. The Chair also discussed code enforcement and how it would work.

Vice Chair Perkins thanked everyone who participated in this ordinance for their hard work and efforts. He agreed with Mr. Lewis that this is a program for the kids. He felt it was not appropriate to dictate the color of the banners. Vice Chair Perkins also discussed code enforcement.

Commissioner DeMaio stated that he would also support the ordinance but did not believe we ever needed one. He said he did not believe there was a problem and everything is working out well for the children of this community.

Commissioner Bever stated that this is about serving the children. However, as Planning Commissioners, it is also the Commissioners' job to make sure this legislation is appropriate and effective. He asked Commissioner Foley if she was willing to change her motion for "Temporary Signs on Public Property", page 8, section (c), subsection 3, "64 square feet" to "32 square feet" for "Group I Users", and on page 9, section (c), section 2, adding the word "white" for the banner material. He said the letters could be any color. He also suggested that in section 7, page 9, at the top of the page, "not to exceed 5 per year per site" for the temporary banners, not baseball field banners.

The Chair questioned Commissioner Bever's new language "not to exceed 5 per year per site" and stated he was uncomfortable supporting that change.

In response to a question from Commissioner Foley for previous speaker Gregg Pearce (returned to the podium), he stated that all banners displayed during the past year, were on a white background and it would not be a problem to add it to the ordinance.

Commissioner Foley said she was agreeable to adding the word "white" as described by Commissioner Bever. She said she was not agreeable to the change under "Installation Period" because she did not really feel there is a problem right now with respect to those temporary signs. She said she would also be concerned about reducing the banner size for "Group I Users" (soccer and baseball registration typically 4' x 8' and hung around school yards on chain link fences), because she did not believe it was an abuse at this time.

Chairman Garlich agreed with Commissioner Foley. He advised that he had asked staff early on in this meeting about "staff discretion" regarding the 64 square-foot maximum. He believed that was enough and most of the signs are smaller anyway, even though from time-to-time, there will be exceptions.

Vice Chair Perkins said he agreed with Commissioner Bever's suggestions except for the word "white" being added to the "Banner Composition."

SUBSTITUTE MOTION:

Draft Ordinance amending temporary signs on public property and banners on public baseball and softball fields.

Failed for lack of a second.

A substitute motion was made by Vice Chair Perkins, and failed for lack of a second, to recommend to City Council, that they give first reading to the draft ordinance, with the following recommendation: (1) Under Sec. 13-118.2 **BANNERS ON PUBLIC BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL FIELDS (c) Standards. (3) Maximum size:** change from 64 square feet to 34 square feet. (7) **Installation Period:** Add a sentence, "not to exceed 5 times a year, total."

There was discussion between the Chair, Vice Chair, Ms. Milligan and Commissioner Bever regarding the addition to the "Installation Period."

The Chair called the original motion, which carried 3-2 (Bever and

Perkins voted no) as shown above.

Commissioner Bever commented that he was okay with the baseball banners part of the motion, but the area he had a problem with was with the temporary signs, and therefore, could not support the motion.

REVIEW, REVOCATION
AND/OR MODIFICATION OF
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
PA-03-26

City

The Chair opened the public hearing for consideration of the Review, Revocation and/or Modification of Conditional Use Permit PA-03-26 for C&D Properties, for noncompliance with the conditions of approval, for an expansion of a motor vehicle rental/leasing business, located at 1192 Bristol Street in a C1 zone. Environmental Determination: exempt.

Associate Planner Mel Lee reviewed the information in the staff report and gave a presentation. He said it is staff's opinion that the applicant has been provided adequate time (10 months) to provide the landscaping as required by the CUP, and based upon the applicant's lack of cooperation with City staff, staff is recommending revocation of the conditional use permit, and that the applicant be directed to remove all vehicles from the 1192 Bristol Street property no later than 30 days after Commission action.

Kent Crawford, representing the owner, 1192 Bristol Street, Costa Mesa, said he never received a letter regarding this information because the letter was sent to the property and his office is elsewhere. He said he found out approximately 8 to 10 days ago about this situation. He said they are a small business and received their CUP in October of last year, and they had anticipated \$5,000 to \$8,000 for implementation of the landscape improvements. He said the bids were \$25,000 to \$30,000 and they are now financing an SBA loan to cover those costs. They anticipate funding in mid to late September (between the 10th-25th). Mr. Crawford said it is their goal to comply. He said they have done a bad job of communicating with staff; they are not professional developers; and he has not been involved in a project like this. He asked the Commission for an extension of time to receive the proper funding and then they will implement the landscape plan. In response to the Chair, Mr. Crawford said they would need a 4-month extension.

In response to a question from Commissioner Bever, Mr. Crawford said he had not received City approval for a landscape plan, but has not been involved in the project. He said Mr. Pointer is in Spokane Washington and could not attend the meeting. In response to further questions from Commissioner Bever concerning the landscaping, Mr. Crawford said he understood there is no landscaping, but said he never received a copy of the letter until today.

There was discussion between the Chair and Mr. Lee regarding Commissioner Foley's inquiry about the trucks and van she asked to be removed from the property. Mr. Lee confirmed that they are renting out space to park landscaping vehicles, which is not allowed, and was made clear to the property owner.

Vice Chair Perkins requested documentation that would substantiate the loans. The representative did not have documentation with him this evening.

Commissioner DeMaio confirmed with Mr. Crawford that he did not receive the letter, and that he has already had 10 months and now needs 4 additional months to complete the landscaping on site.

Commissioner DeMaio asked Mr. Crawford if he could accomplish the funding and implementation of the landscaping sooner than 120 days. He said he was not sure but they were going to try to do that and have it completed by early October.

Rose Mary Schaulis, 158 The Master Circle, Costa Mesa, described the problems she was having with the trucks: her view was gone because one of the trucks on site is parked at the back of her house and the odor emanating from the plant material and clippings is objectionable. She submitted photographs showing the different trucks, a trailer, and a van as they are parked on site. She said she showed these pictures to Mr. Pointer in May, and told him that the trucks parked behind her home are an "eye sore." Although he said he would take care of the problem, he never resolved it. She said she has also sent e-mails and she knows they were read because the e-mail registered opened mail. She said the truckers come in the morning before 7 a.m. and leave the trucks running from 20-25 minutes. She made Mr. Pointer aware of that but he did not believe her.

In response to a question from Commissioner Foley concerning the trucks running, Ms. Schaulis stated they are the trucks right up against the back fences adjacent to residential properties.

Mr. Crawford acknowledged that he saw the e-mail for the first time this morning and in addressing the comments made, he said the trucks will be gone and he would try to have it done by tomorrow.

Tim Lewis, 2075 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, commented that there is an incredible parallel between this project and the Beacon Bay/Robbins project.

Mr. Valentine stated that if the Commission is leaning in the direction of providing additional time, one option is to provide additional time and then staff will reschedule a hearing if the landscaping is not done by that time; and the other option is to simply continue the item to a date certain, so that it will already be on the agenda and the Commission can take action without having to reschedule it and wait through the notice period.

No one else wished to speak.

MOTION:
PA-03-26
Withdrawn

A motion was made by Vice Chair Perkins, and seconded by Dennis DeMaio to continue the item for 45 days; the motion was later withdrawn (see below).

During discussion of the motion, Chairman Garlich said he is presuming that Mr. Crawford is well aware that there are some major concerns out there and that Mr. Pointer has neglected to forward some e-mails and other materials to Mr. Crawford. He said he is requesting the 45-day continuance because Mr. Crawford should have the money in hand and the Commission should know exactly where everything stands.

Commissioner Foley said she was concerned that the Commission is burdening itself with this kind of a motion, and asked Vice Chair Perkins to increase it to a 90-day continuance with a 45 to 60-day status report by staff that would not necessitate a public hearing at that time. She pointed out that as it stands, the motion would require 2 public hearings instead of one.

There was discussion among the Commissioners regarding the applicant's ability to obtain his loan, and the fact that even if they did not obtain it from the bank, they would find other sources of money but they would prefer to use the bank funds. The Chair was concerned about the effort to micro-manage this process and felt there was a potential for one 45-day continuance after another because there could be many circumstances that might cause that to happen. He pointed out the burden in terms of staff and the cost of running the process, which may be unnecessary. He felt the lack of knowledge and the forthrightness in terms of some of the promises that were apparently made, were not in good faith and he would not like to have staff and the City continue having to pay the costs for these hearings. He asked Vice Chair Perkins to consider another alternative with a

longer continuance with some feedback.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION:
PA-03-26
Motion failed for lack of a second

A substitute motion was made by Commissioner Bever, to continue the item for a total of 60 days with a 30-day period by which landscape plans are submitted and approved by the City. Motion failed for lack of a second.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION 2:
PA-03-26
Motion failed to carry

A substitute motion was made by Commissioner Foley, seconded by Chairman Garlich and failed to carry 2 to 3 (Bever, DeMaio and Perkins voted no) to continue the item for 90 days and require at 45 days, a status report from staff, and directed applicant to remove all trucks, campers, vans and anything else not allowed on that site, by 5 p.m., tomorrow evening, August 10, 2004 with Code Enforcement overseeing the process.

Commissioner DeMaio requested that Commissioner Foley consider 60 days for completion of the landscaping and 30 days for the loan status.

Commissioner Foley said this means that all improvements have to be completed in 60 days, and that would be difficult because the asphalt has to be torn out and she does not believe that is a sufficient time period for the applicant to complete the landscaping plan.

The Chair called the motion and it failed to carry 2 to 3 (see above).

Vice Chair Perkins withdrew his previous motion for 45 days completion as shown above.

MOTION:
PA-03-26
Continued

A motion was made by Commission Perkins, seconded by Commissioner DeMaio and carried 5-0, to (1) continue the item for a total of 60 days (later changed to 75 days) with a 30-day progress report; (2) submit a landscaping plan; and (3) direct the applicant to remove all trucks, campers, vans and anything else not allowed on that site, by 5 p.m. tomorrow evening, August 10, 2004 with Code Enforcement overseeing the process.

During discussion of the motion, Commissioner DeMaio suggested 75 days to completion instead of 60 days. Vice Chair Perkins asked staff, if the applicant could reasonably complete this project in 75 days. Mr. Lee said staff's part would involve the plan check for the landscape plans and would take a few days. Vice Chair Perkins agreed to change his motion to 75-day completion (see below).

Commissioner Bever said he would not be able to support the motion if it includes financial verification. He did not believe that this is the Commission's business. Commissioner Foley agreed and asked Ms. Milligan for advice. Ms. Milligan said she did not believe the request was appropriate. Vice Chair Perkins said he did not care how the funding is obtained, he wants to verify that it's there. Commissioner Bever stated that if Vice Chair Perkins wanted to make the same motion without the financial information request, he could support the motion. Ms. Milligan added that one of her concerns regarding the financial information is that it is not a requirement of the landscaping. The requirement is that the applicant installs the landscaping, not that he obtains funding for it. If that was a condition, then it's possible to be in a position of asking for it. She pointed out, its simply, "install the landscaping." The issue of where the money is coming from is really not an issue. Based on this dialogue, Vice Chair Perkins made the motion without the request for financial information.

Commissioner Foley said she would support this motion, however, she is concerned that the Commission is setting themselves up for another hearing and request for 30 more days. She hoped the good faith statements made tonight would be followed through.

Chairman Garlich said he would also support the motion to get on with it, but felt it may take more than 120 days to get this project

completed.

Mr. Valantine stated that the 75-day continuance would bring this item back to the agenda of October 25th and the 30-day report would be provided to the Commission for the meeting of September 13th (not agendized, but informational only).

BREAK:

The Chair called a break and the meeting resumed at 8:50 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

COMMUNITY VALUE STATEMENTS:

City

The Chair announced a Request for Planning Commission consideration and feedback regarding proposed Community Value Statements is in order.

Assistant City Manager Steve Hayman reviewed the information in the staff report and advised the Commission that staff would like to be provided with comments and feedback regarding the proposed Community Value Statements.

Director of Finance Marc Puckett gave a presentation outlining the proposal for reworking of the entire Community Objectives process in conjunction with long-range planning.

There was discussion between Vice Chair Perkins, Mr. Puckett and Commissioner Foley regarding how community objectives may be handled and accomplished over time through budget cycles. Mr. Hayman explained that this is a process of moving away from the concept of creating community objectives on an annual basis as driven by the thoughts of the City Council at that time, and trying to focus on short-term accomplishments linked to long-term goals, and tying them into the budget adoption process.

Commissioner Foley questioned whether there would no longer be a method by which someone could propose a specific objective that was not already included in one of the long-range planning documents. Mr. Hayman said the process would still allow for that, but it may require changes to one of the other documents before that modification could be implemented.

Commissioner Foley asked why this type of long-range planning model was chosen as opposed to a traditional or strategic planning model that's utilized by numerous public agencies and nonprofit organizations. Mr. Hayman stated that in simple terms, because at the time this was developed they could not really obtain Council consensus on another process. Commissioner Foley said the trouble she is having with the word, "community" is that we haven't polled the community on this process or these values, and she wondered why we didn't have participation from the community in establishing the Community Value Statements because she felt they are essentially value statements that have been prepared by staff with some hard work and a lot of discussion, but not pulled together from meetings with the community. Mr. Hayman explained that they went this route as a mechanism to get the subject and dialogue before the City Council. The proposed Draft Community Value Statements was literally an attempt to get the process started and not to narrowly define the result. Commissioner Foley said that the Newport Unified School District just went through a strategic planning process to update their strategic plan. They had 2 to 3 community meetings over a 2 to 3 month period; hired a professional consultant, and the process seemed smooth, seamless, there was a lot of input from community members, and that information will be compiled, revised, and approved by the board. It seemed like a more representative type of process.

The Chair asked if City Council had received this staff report. Mr. Puckett said this item has been before City Council, three (3) times, so generally all of the information that is in this staff report has been

before City Council. This particular staff report was prepared for the Planning Commission, so it has not been to City Council.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, said he was respectfully requesting that this body add an additional Community Value Statement, and it would read perhaps: “#5. To encourage the development of new owner-occupied, single-family, quality homes in the upgrading of current housing consistent with housing found in similar ocean-close cities in Orange County.” The reason why is because we have some serious problems in this City and the problems often come down to demographics; to financial demographics specifically. He felt the City should reduce its industrial area and encourage homebuilders to develop the “Bluffs.”

The Commissioners made the following comments:

Chairman Garlich said this discussion is really about a long-range planning process more than a discussion about Community Objectives or Community Value Statements. He didn't think the process best serves Costa Mesa's long-range planning needs. He recommended that Council redirect staff to go back and establish requirements for a planning system, identify options, establish criteria for comparing options, and bring back recommendations for Council's consideration. He felt that, if we need to review an unintegrated, inconsistent, and sometimes outdated set of General Plan objectives, community objectives, and/or other forms of objectives, we should pull that task out and focus on it without burying it in the task of developing or adopting a long-range planning process. He felt that a discussion of community value statements should involve the community. He felt a discussion of community values should be separated from discussion of a long-range planning process. Community Value Statements should be at a very high level, so that almost any set of goals, objectives, and strategies, including new ideas which may arise years later, can come forward and be considered. That being the case, the utility of this process is questionable. He said he understood the goals and strategies included in the report were illustrative, but he felt there were some good ideas included. He especially liked, and recommended Council pursue the following: (1) Develop performance measurement systems (metrics) to monitor organizational effectiveness; and (2) Semi-annually (every other year), audit the General Plan's effectiveness in taking us where we want to go. Periodically, look at specific plans for similar reasons.

Vice Chair Perkins quoted, “a community value is something that has the benefit for all the people that make up the City whether it be the individual, the business, or the developer.” He said he disagreed with the Chairman and Commissioner Foley, although he did think having community input would be good, but it would drastically slow down the process.

He commended the City Manager's Office, Assistant City Manager Steve Hayman and Director of Finance Mark Puckett for all their work and efforts to put this in place. He said he felt we really need to go back to the basics of Costa Mesa in that there is need to: put the sidewalks in, begin an emergency services fund, a “rainy-day budget” should be created for parks, streetscapes, and roads. He said this may or may not be the process that we will use but believed we are embarking on something that could really benefit the community. He felt Mr. Millard's comment about home ownership is one of the basics that this City needs. He said we need to develop what the term “community value” really means and get back to basics.

Commissioner Bever said he believed the basic premise was good, but what he believes has happened here, is that we've tried to solve every organizational/managerial situation through one system and he did not believe it was a very effective way to go about it. He said page 15 of the staff report sums up what he believes is the most im-

portant part of the process and that is what should be given to Council. He said page 10 through 14 which discusses strategies, he found in some areas are contradictory and aren't necessarily what he would consider root solutions and he gave examples. He felt perhaps we may need to redefine the goal here and simplify with 4-6 goals that work in parallel.

Commissioner DeMaio thanked staff for all their hard work. He said he sees this as a strategy for the long-term. He felt it does streamline the objectives and gives focus and puts short-term objectives into the budget arena for actually accomplishing things more effectively. He felt this plan was well thought out and ties everything together. It's a good process and when you go back to it every 2 years it can be redefined if necessary.

Commissioner Foley said she agreed with the Chair's comments and the comments made by Commissioner Bever. She felt the graphic illustrates some of the problems with the lack of process. She said it is symbolic of Community Value Statements that are a kind of "pie in the sky in the clouds", and not really something that can be attained. She believed there has been a lot of hard work put into this and finds it difficult to critique, but said this is what they were asked to do. She said she strongly believes that we need to have long-range planning, and as the Chair indicated, there are a lot of mature models of long-range strategic planning that are available to us. The girl scouts for example, just went through a strategic planning process. The process was clear, and you could understand what the plan would be for the next 10-15 years. There were ways to tie it to the goals, objectives, and mission of a particular organization. She felt this proposal is a confusing process. She did not think it was clear, or ready for implementation. The other concerns are, while she agrees there needs to be discipline, and we need to attempt to complete many of the objectives that we currently have on the books and prioritize those objectives and plans, she is concerned that this process has an element of "we are always going to want to prioritize those plans that are already in place" and so nothing will likely ever be put at the top priority; at least that is how she is interpreting it and how its presented. The timeline is of concern because when the community objective process begins in October/November before a new Council is seated, the current Council is on it's way out. She felt the value statements in the presentation were a little better than the ones in exhibit "B", page 7 of the staff report. She detailed how she would like to see them stated: (1) Preserve quality of life and protect quality of community for residents. (2) Maintain public safety. She said she was not clear on "promoting social order." (3) Support of a strong diverse economic base balanced by residential interests. (4) Propose to build a fiscally sound organization that responds to the expectations of the community, maintains measurable service standards and delivers exceptional services in an efficient and effective manner. She felt the process did not involve the community and that it could be done in a way that doesn't delay or drag it out or create an unnecessary bureaucracy.

Commissioner Bever said he could sympathize and understand Commissioner Foley's concern for public involvement, but he was disheartened by the fact that this auditorium is empty. This is a very important public process and community members are not here. He said he also sat in on the Newport Mesa School District Strategic Plan and he found that it was very heavily "unattended" and was very easily skewed by the people who attended.

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SVS. DEPARTMENT

None.

REPORT OF THE SENIOR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairman Garlich adjourned the meeting at 10:13 p.m., to the study session of Monday, August 16, 2004.

Submitted by:

PERRY L. VALANTINE, SECRETARY
COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION