

MINUTE EXCERPT

GARDEN GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN NO. SP-046-2018, LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT NO. LLA-013-2018, VARIANCE NO. V-018-2018. FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF 9TH STREET, BETWEEN COLLEGE AVENUE AND STANFORD AVENUE, AT 12671 9TH STREET.

Applicant: ANH PHAN
Date: March 1, 2018

Request: Site Plan approval to demolish all existing on-site improvements, which include three (3) existing one-story apartment units, and to construct four (4) new three-story apartment units on a 12,564 square foot site. Also, a request for Lot Line Adjustment approval to eliminate an existing property line to consolidate the two (2) existing parcels into one (1) lot, along with a request for Variance approval to deviate from the minimum lot size requirement of the CCSP-PR61 (Community Center Specific Plan – Peripheral Residential, Area 61) zone, to develop the site with a multiple-family residential development. The site is in the CCSP-PR61 (Community Center Specific Plan – Peripheral Residential, Area 61) zone. This project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Section 15303 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

Action: Public Hearing held. Speaker(s): (Applicant) Anh Phan, (In opposition) Cynthia Beltran, Greta Corona, Darrin Pedersen, Nicole Varner, Joe Lee, Charlotte Bryant, Lizbeth Gonzalez, (In favor) Vivian Cao.

Those in opposition cited concerns in regard to parking and a dangerous sight line for pulling out of College Avenue onto 9th, aggressive drivers in a small area, car accidents, concerns for the current tenants in apartments to be demolished, privacy, loss of views and sunlight, a decrease in property values, street sweeping, loitering, debris, construction noise, and quality of life.

The person in favor stated that the project would improve Garden Grove and fix unpleasant surroundings, noting that the high obscure windows and inward facing balconies would solve any privacy issues.

Action: The Commission directed staff to bring back a Resolution of Denial to the March 15th meeting citing that Finding Nos. 3 and 5 were not accurate: No. 3 – the project would

adversely affect essential public facilities such as on-site circulation and parking, and No. 5 – the project was not compatible with the physical, functional, and visual quality of the neighboring uses and desirable neighborhood characteristics as the project was inconsistent in height and massing for the area. Additionally, the public hearing would remain closed.

Motion: Truong Second: Lazenby

Ayes: (5) Brietigam, Lazenby, Lehman, Nguyen, Truong

Noes: (0) None

Absent: (2) Kanzler, Salazar