

GARDEN GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION  
Council Chamber, Community Meeting Center  
11300 Stanford Avenue, Garden Grove, CA 92840

Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, June 2, 2016

CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Chair O'Neill  
Vice Chair Kanzler  
Commissioner Barker  
Commissioner Margolin  
Commissioner Nuygen  
Commissioner Paredes  
Commissioner Zamora

Absent: Kanzler

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Chair O'Neill. He then mentioned Memorial Day and remembered those who gave their lives so that people could express themselves freely.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – PUBLIC – Mr. Hugh Tra asked that some restrictions be removed on Main Street entertainment in order to attract new and local customers; that bands could be allowed on certain nights; and, that fees could be charged for special events.

May 19, 2016 MINUTES:

Action: Received and filed.

Motion: Margolin Second: Zamora

Ayes: (6) Barker, Margolin, Nuygen, O'Neill, Paredes, Zamora

Noes: (0) None

Absent: (1) Kanzler

PUBLIC HEARING – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP-073-2016 FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 13272 GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD, SOUTH SIDE OF GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD, EAST OF FAIRVIEW STREET.

Applicant: Heaven's Gate Funeral Home, Inc.  
Date: June 2, 2016

Request: Conditional Use Permit approval to operate a new funeral home, within an existing approximately 19,460 square foot office building, which will include a mortuary and crematory.

Ms. Binh Minh Tran was available for Vietnamese translation.

Staff noted that a Neighborhood Meeting, open to the public, was held on Wednesday, April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016 to review and receive input on the applicant's proposal to operate the proposed funeral home with a mortuary and crematory. The eight (8) attendees expressed opposition to the project with similar concerns related to the creepiness of living next to dead bodies, a general fear of ghosts, and that human remains may be stored for long periods of time.

Subsequent to the April 13, 2016 community meeting, staff received a letter of opposition, along with a petition containing 486 signatures, which was included in the record. Some of the reasons for opposition to the project set forth in the letter included: that there are many schools and churches in the area; that the fear of dead bodies being stored behind neighboring homes and the dangers from air pollution from the crematory has caused stress and anxiety in the community, especially for children, that the crematory emissions, such as vaporized Mercury, and other toxic chemicals, could pose health risks. An updated list included 81 additional signatures.

Staff also received another letter of opposition from [www.change.org](http://www.change.org) with identical language to the previously mentioned letter, with the website tallying an additional 376 supporters of the opposition, along with 108 comments, which was also placed into the record.

One letter of support was received from Tuan Nguyen, the owner of the Funeral Home, with 465 signatures of support. This letter was entered into the record.

Two additional opposition letters, received prior to the meeting, cited a concern relating to potential hazards to human health from crematory emissions. These letters were also entered into the record.

Additional handouts provided at the meeting included a Heaven's Gate Funeral Home Frequently Asked Questions sheet by the applicant, a Crematory Emission's Data sheet, a letter of opposition from Chieu, and petitions of 81 and 287 additional signatures opposing the project. All of these were entered into the record.

Commissioner Margolin asked if annual testing of the RPPD (Reduced Pressure Principle Device) backflow device was standard. Staff replied yes, the device was related to fire prevention.

Commissioner Margolin then asked how long the embalming process took. Staff deferred to the applicant.

Regarding Condition No. 24, allowing food on the premises with City approval, Commissioner Margolin asked if the health department addressed the discarded food after a funeral for health standards. Staff replied yes, that food may be brought in as long as there was no cooking on site due to no kitchen facilities, and that a special events permit would be required for any temporary food event in the parking area or yard areas.

Commissioner Zamora asked how long human remains were kept on site and how many bodies would be cremated per day. Staff deferred to the applicant.

Commissioner Zamora asked about the removal of non-bone fragments or foreign materials. Staff replied that any foreign materials would be removed prior to placing the body in the cremation chamber.

Commissioner Zamora then asked staff to confirm that if the applicant did not get approval by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), they could not open. Staff replied yes.

Commissioner Zamora then asked who inspects the crematory on a weekly basis and was the facility open at night. Staff responded that the owner would inspect the machine, with the State of California and SCAQMD monitoring the business for proper operation and use, and that the business was not open in the evening.

Commissioner Zamora noted that no alcohol was to be sold or consumed on the premises, and asked what happened if alcohol was brought in. Staff replied that the City would be notified as this would be a violation of the Conditional Use Permit; that the applicant would be accountable and could be fined with an administrative citation of up to \$1,000.

Commissioner Zamora asked staff to clarify 'amusement devices' in Condition No. 17. Staff responded that this condition was typical and related to gaming or gambling machines.

Commissioner Paredes asked for the number of crematories operating in Garden Grove and where were they located. Staff replied that there were two funeral homes without crematories; that the applicant's other crematory facility was off-site; and that this facility would have two cremation chambers.

Commissioner Paredes then asked where the embalming process chemicals would be stored, how long bodies would be in cold storage, and if tooth fillings with mercury and amalgams were removed. Staff

deferred to the applicant on the chemicals and length of time, then stated that any foreign metals would be removed prior to cremation and that vaporization would not be a factor.

Commissioner Barker asked if a system would be in place to measure emissions. Staff deferred to the applicant and equipment manufacturer.

Chair O'Neill opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tuan Nguyen, the owner, Ms. Chi Tang, the representative, and Mr. John Raggett, the cremation equipment representative, approached the Commission. A fact sheet on the funeral home was distributed in both English and Vietnamese.

Ms. Tang described the project and stated that the facility could help with lower cost funeral services all over Southern California; that remains could be shipped to Vietnam; that they wished to expand the level of business/service/convenience for all groups; that land was expensive; that the business would benefit the City with revenue; that they have a petition of support with signatures from clients who have supported them through the years; that bodies were kept for 3-5 days with no storage more than a week; that embalming was for burials only; that fluids with poisonous substances were not allowed; that the facility had cameras and all areas were locked; that there were two cremation units; that licensed staff was required; and that the owner was a licensed embalmer.

Mr. John Raggett, the technical manufacturer, stated that the surrounding area had 14 machines; that two were down the street by the Christ Cathedral; that four were around the corner from there; that two were in Westminster, and four in Santa Ana, near the 5 and 22 Freeways, and two at Fairhaven Cemetery in Santa Ana; that the City recommended finding a C-2 or C-3 zone; that a crematory was cleaner than burning a fire in a fireplace or cooking a hamburger in a hamburger facility as these have higher emissions due to lower temperatures of burning; that a crematory burns at 1800 degrees and was regulated by Air Quality, from which they have a permit; that if there was anything unethical near residents they would not look at that zone; that the crematory would be inspected yearly unannounced by Air Quality, sometimes twice yearly by Consumer Affairs; that the machine was to be maintained every six months for proper operation; that a cremation takes one to one and a half hours; that there would be no smoke or odor, only heat flume from the stack like a car; that the machines were quiet and residents would not be able to see it or smell it, no smoke or odor; and that the property had been vacant for years and was chosen for the zone in a commercial/industrial area off the freeway.

Commissioner Paredes asked if the chemicals used in the embalming

and cremation processes were different. Mr. Raggett explained that regardless, an individual was put in 40 degree cold storage for sterility and sanitation; that there was no embalming with cremation; that only after paperwork was completed would a body be cremated; that embalming was for the viewing process or burial; that certain cremation machines could handle larger bodies up to 1,000 pounds; and that for this facility, anyone larger than 200 pounds would be outsourced.

Commissioner Paredes asked if there was a cremation backlog because if there were other crematories available, why build another. Mr. Raggett explained that families like to keep the loved one close; that they sometimes want to witness the cremation and participate in the service; that bodies were in boxes, or caskets, all mandated by the state; and that metals and plastics, such as pacemakers, would cause emissions and were removed.

Chair O'Neill asked the applicant to clarify the cultural issues, and Ms. Chi provided a response and discussed Asian religious traditions and practices.

Commissioner Barker asked if other waste was burned, for example, hazardous waste, medical waste, or trash. Ms. Chi replied no, that was illegal, and that the California Bureau of Cemetery and Funeral Services inspected the facility every six months as it was heavily regulated.

Commissioner Barker asked if there would be a system to measure emissions. Mr. Raggett stated that the machine would be source tested about every three years, mandated by Air Quality, to ensure the machine was operating properly to be smoke, odor, and particulate free; and, that the machine itself was a constant measure, being temperature and air quality controlled.

Commissioner Barker asked for clarification of the mercury and amalgam. Mr. Raggett responded that older people's teeth, such as baby boomers, have small amounts of amalgam and mercury in their teeth. Also, foreign materials in bodies would be removed at the funeral home and recycled to be properly disposed of.

Commissioner Zamora asked who did the weekly inspections. Mr. Raggett stated that the operator would inspect before the machine was run, both daily and weekly, along with inspections by the manufacturer; and, that records were kept for Consumer Affairs and Air Quality.

Commissioner Zamora then asked about alcohol consumption on the premises. Ms. Chi answered that alcohol and food were not allowed; that coffee and water was available; that praying food, such as fruit bowl by outside restaurants, was allowed on the shrine for prayer; and that there were no parties.

Commissioner Paredes asked for confirmation that 34 bodies were allowed to be cremated per month. Ms. Chi said yes. Mr. Raggett stated the hours would be Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with no activity at night.

Commissioner Barker asked for clarification on the filtration system. Mr. Raggett explained that there was a two-second retention time at 1800 degrees; that the stack sensors work as the filtration system; that when the heat hits the atmosphere at a cooled 900 degrees, this was better than the machines in the 1970-80's; and, that everything was pollution controlled, for example, if there was an upset cremation with smoke, the burner turns off automatically and gives it air.

Commissioner Nuygen asked what process was used to ensure toxins were not released into the air. Mr. Raggett responded that daily, each cremation would be documented with a chart recorder to log in each step of the cremation process and this log would be checked by the state unannounced; and, that the chart recorder on the machine was checked by Air Quality, so the information was kept both manually and electronically, stored up to five years.

Commissioner Paredes asked for the logistics of taking bodies in and out of the facility. Ms. Chi stated that to be respectful, the loading and unloading of bodies would take place inside the facility; that the hearse would enter an area with a roll-up door; that a wall would be built between the warehouse and the cremation machine; and that a short distance, from the door to the coach/hearse for burial, was typical.

Chair O'Neill called for a recess at 8:20 p.m. The session reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

Chair O'Neill opened the public hearing to receive testimony in favor of or in opposition to the request.

The following people opposed the request for the following reasons:

Mr. Saul Quinones: 20 feet from the homes, where his cousin lived; and they do not want to smell the burning fumes of bodies.

Ms. Stacey Hua spoke on behalf of the residents: negative impact on physical and mental health on children and seniors; negatively affects property values with lower re-sale values; fear of deceased, may have to move away; toxic chemicals released and contamination in the air such as mercury dioxin and amalgam poisoning as these metals were not removed prior to cremation; mercury vapors harmful causing health issues such as an effect on young children and fetus's, immune system issues and cancer; process not regulated as safe levels cannot be

measured; would affect future children, who would be leaders; some children stopped going outside; elderly would have issues too; need to protect health; other states have complaints of increased traffic and smells; ten other funeral homes were located in the area and another was not needed in the neighborhood.

Ms. Katie Le: lived next door to the proposed site; concern for how children would be affected with toxic emissions such as mercury, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon dioxide, sulfur oxide, and volatile acids such as hydrogen chloride, hydrogen fluoride, and carbon dioxide, which were listed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; though fumes were filtered, crematoriums still spill toxins; no statistics on mercury emissions; the number of people opposing the project was large; the signatures for support from the applicant were people not from the community; and Nicole at the Cremation Society of Orange Coast, who had a cremation business at Lewis Street and Lampson Avenue, agreed that the crematory should not be close to the homes.

Mr. David Lee: health risk due to the particulates that could be breathed in and lodged in the lungs, with active children high at risk; emissions rise with aging machine parts; questioned qualification of inspectors and effectiveness of mitigation; filtering fumes has little effect on toxins; weekly inspections were pointless; disputed integrity and questions accuracy of study.

Mr. Dylan Tran, Ms. Brooklyn Tran, and Mr. Peter Hua: affected asthma; could cause diseases such as cancer; children afraid to go outside, scared of dead bodies; they would not be able to sleep and would have nightmares of dead bodies.

Mr. Nu Bui: seniors not eating or playing; the poor want days without worries; listen to our wish; they want to live in peace.

Mr. Richard Rowe: the City has a stewardship for health and quality of life; lived in Garden Grove 40 years; mercury has low vapor pressure so 900 degrees not low enough, which results in mercury going into air.

Ms. Thao Tran: proximity issue as there was not a lot of space around the facility; odors; traffic; loud noises; property value reduction; mercury; burned body releases chemicals.

The following person supported the request for the following reasons:

Mr. Steve Abraham, the real estate broker for the project: the request was based on facts not fears; the property owners have rights; owners have met hurdles; only eight (8) people showed up at neighborhood meeting at which four were former family members who used his services and would have supported the proposal had they known Tuan

Nguyen was the applicant; one other person was a competitor; business would bring in revenue with sales tax; benefit for the neighbors; if the conditions were not met, the Conditional Use Permit could be pulled; the decision to support should be based on fact.

The following persons opposed the request for the following reasons:

Mr. Vincent Nguyen: the children would be a concern, especially at nearby school for eight (8) years; he experienced being near a furnace at 50', it was too hot and his eyes watered; applicant did not know about the Vietnamese culture; dead were celebrated; would have smell every day; afraid of the fear from everywhere.

Mr. Viet Mai: no one knew about the neighborhood meeting; people are afraid; smoke; dead people in cars; suggest Commissioners put themselves in their shoes; no one would want business next to funeral home; lower property values.

Mr. Quan Van Luu: cremations occur already at Lewis Street and Harbor Boulevard, so with others around, another one was not needed here.

Mr. Jessie Arambulo: lived a few blocks from crematory; project was disturbing; need to take seriously; loved neighborhood; not easy to sell house, would have higher property taxes if moved elsewhere; consider another location; consider morally.

Ms. Lynn Hua: do not approve; psychological effects; children want to play outside.

Mr. Joseph Tran: dentists today were moving away from amalgam and instead were using composites; with baby boomers still around, mercury emissions would increase over time in the next two or three decades.

Mr. Stan Wirth: he would be yards away from funeral home; lots of children in the area; increased fumes, noise, and traffic.

Mr. Alex Pantoja: already parking problems across the street at Cedar Grove from church; if there was viewing and church on the same day, 76 parking spaces would not be enough; already had restrictions on water usage; water contamination with embalming; kids walk across area to go home; senior home next door where bus stops.

Mr. Tim Nguyen: he found out about the project through his daughter's friend; was not aware of psychological affects; children would lose self-confidence and be afraid of ghosts; too close to backyard.

Mr. Khai Nguyen: 100 feet from project with two children; report doesn't matter; no guarantee on health; if machine breaks, particles go into



environment; does not want children to be guinea pigs; fears they would have to move; residents lived in the area already; no one would buy their property at market value.

Ms. Hoang Ho: lived one street behind funeral home; Commissioners already heard enough opinion from community; the number of people present were a statement, along with elderly and children, to voice opinions; Tuan Nguyen would have no support from at least a few hundred families of all cultures.

Ms. Auralia Garcia: three-story school within 500 feet of funeral home, which her daughter attends; daughter had cancer, but did not want it to come back; kids scared of dead people.

Ms. Kia Marina: need to cool bones more than 900 degrees; this may affect earth and environment; residents may have to pay more to air condition their homes; lived by freeway with emissions and could be a problem mixed with funeral home emissions.

Mr. Siraj Hussein: he had a different religion, but the proposal was scary, especially near a school; needs to be in a neutral area; he loves his neighborhood, but area would be chaotic; services were already nearby.

Mr. Thuy Nguyen: need to look at sociological perspective; four generations; wondered if the applicant's research and study was factual; people fear death; surprised the Vietnamese owner did not consider the proximity, cultural, ethical, and moral values regarding grief.

Ms. Nicole Nguyen: used to work at Rose Hills Memorial Park; sometimes bodies were kept longer than 3-5 days; usually a crematory was separate and not within a funeral home; would impact other cities, such as Santa Ana.

Mr. Robert Darcy: emissions would be from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. every day and it was not clear how people would react; proximity way too close to homes.

Mr. Rick Vu and Tu Vu: agreed that the funeral home would be too close; don't want to see hearses every day; environmental and psychological effects; have to explain to children.

Mr. Carlos: unsightly and ghoulish issue people do not like to think about; area has nice homes and schools; science just coming to understand mercury.

Ms. Madalene Tran: her relatives live right behind; she remembered her experience of living near a cemetery as a child, very sad; put benefit of citizens first.

Mr. Martin: funeral home would affect everyone's peace; something will be in the air that people would breathe; people's feeling were important.

Ms. Gina Nguyen: funeral home would be trauma for children; imagination can create fear and stay with a person; there was life after death; there were many families, but one business.

Mr. Thomas Tran: suddenly everyone was talking; people were scared.

Mr. Keith: proximity concern, especially with our children and their future; let people decide what they want; there were other location options, such as rezoning.

Ms. Phuong Hoang: enough funeral homes around; would not bring in business; in residential area, would only bring fear to residents, children, and seniors; imagination was scary; people would live in fear; put the project somewhere else.

Commissioner Paredes commented that he lived near a funeral home, without a crematory, at Chapman Avenue and Nutwood Street, with a Boys & Girls Club nearby. He asked if the crematory was the real issue or the whole facility.

The applicant was invited back up to respond. Ms. Tang thanked all present and stated that they chose the zone for the opportunity to be a benefit to the community; that they understood the concerns, but would leave the decision up to the Commission based on the facts; and, that they would respect whatever decision was made.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Margolin commented that she understood the dedication to the Vietnamese young and old and wished that other ethnicities cared as much; that the fear factor was what bothered her and that children learn from their parents; that a culture believing in ghosts was fine, however, to instill this fear of ghosts in children was not right because there was enough fear already; that the parent's suffering was their own personal experience; and that there was no reason to frighten children with the idea of ghosts.

Commissioner Paredes commented that the public testimony was the funeral home versus the crematory; that the environmental impact was not clear, as the neighborhood was also next to a freeway with pollutants and an industrial area; that he would look at the community area as a whole.

Commissioner Nuygen asked for a raise of hands of people who lived behind the project area. A majority of the people raised their hands. He stated that their voices needed to be heard, as well as the applicant's.

Commissioner Barker commented that his experience of living near a funeral home as a child was creepy, but soon the home became a neighborhood fixture as parents began to pass away.

Commissioner Zamora expressed concern with the children's fears, which may be taught to them; that death was a fact of life and was sad that children were afraid of the dead; that her environmental concern was with the air and that she would like unbiased emission facts from similar situations. She asked if there were there any regulations regarding proximity to neighborhoods.

Commissioner Paredes checked Realtor.com online and stated that the lowering of property values could be based on nearby strip clubs, rental properties, and funeral homes, which may impact a neighborhood.

Staff mentioned that before the Commission was the proposed resolution of approval based on legal findings supported by facts; that four findings must be made, which were included in the resolution, to approve a Conditional Use Permit; that if the Commission decided to deny the Permit, a finding must be made that a finding could not be met.

Chair O'Neill stated that the weight of the concern was proximity rather than the crematory itself, and the environmental.

Commissioner Nuygen agreed with Commissioner Zamora and commented that his concern was the contradiction of facts regarding environmental impacts and asked staff if an independent study could be done to make the decision easier.

Commissioner Margolin moved to approve the request, subject to the recommended conditions of approval, and commented that Commissioners have received the facts, the project had met the requirements regarding emissions and needs, and that as a Commissioner she could not deny a business that had met the Code. She added that her reasoning did not have to do with anything other than a Commissioner's obligation.

Motion No. 1:

Action: Public Hearing held. Speaker(s): Chi Tang (Representative), Tuan Nguyen (Owner present, but did not speak), John Ragget (American Cremation Equipment Company), Mark Blodgett (Blodgett, Baylois

Environmental Planning). 36 people spoke in opposition to the request. In addition to the Applicant and its representatives, one person spoke in favor of the request.

Action: Motion to adopt a Resolution approving the proposed Conditional Use Permit failed for lack of an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioner's present.

Motion: Margolin Second: Barker

Ayes: (3) Barker, Margolin, O'Neill,

Noes: (2) Nuygen, Paredes

Abstain: (1) Zamora

Absent: (1) Kanzler

Staff noted that the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study consultant, Mark Blodgett, of Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning, was available to respond to the Commissioner's technical questions if the Public Hearing was re-opened.

Commissioner Zamora moved to continue the case to the Thursday, June 16, 2016 meeting, in order to have a consultant answer questions regarding area emissions as a whole, to address Page 53 of the report, and to address the contradictions and receive further research.

Commissioner Margolin then asked if a Commissioner, who abstained from voting, had the right to ask for another motion when the first motion failed. And, with a continuance, would the audience speak all over again.

Staff pointed out that further public comment at a future meeting could be limited at the discretion of the Commission and that more than two weeks would be required to gather additional information. The suggestion was to continue to a date uncertain and to have the case re-advertised. Additionally, if an independent consultant was hired to check the consultant's work, the applicant would be responsible for the cost.

#### Motion No. 2:

Action: Motion to continue the item to the June 16, 2016 meeting to receive additional technical information from Staff died for lack of a second.

Motion: Zamora Second: None

Chair O'Neill re-opened the public hearing to receive testimony from the

consultant/expert.

Mr. Mark Blodgett stated that he was retained by the City of Garden Grove to prepare the Initial Study; that the project was unique by occupying an existing building; that the use needed to be scrutinized through CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act); that they looked at air quality as well as 16 other issues that included noise and traffic; that California has the most stringent emissions controls in the United States; that earlier studies occurred before the more stringent standards; that they identified potential contaminants as part of their study; that they asked for the technical specifications and paperwork that the South Coast Air Quality Management district provided; that they went and observed a cremation looking for smoke, visible emissions, particulates, or odors; that their observations concluded there were no noticeable emissions to see, no odors to smell, and noted, however, that they could not get up in the flume to do measurements; that this was a CUP and fugitive dust or odors were not permitted from any business; that visible emissions were a nuisance and not permitted from a crematorium, a Burger King, or any other use; that the CUP could be rescinded with any violation; that the study was open and independent; that the applicant had to agree to the mitigation; and that CEQA would find everything and anything that could or would be wrong.

Commissioner Barker asked if the company was pre-approved. Mr. Blodgett replied yes.

Commissioner Barker asked how the smells would be contained. Mr. Blodgett stated that the two enforcement agencies, the City and South Coast Air Quality Management District, would be monitoring health risks, and that concerns were complaint driven.

Commissioner Zamora asked for clarification of children around the toxins, and the supposed contradictions on Page 53. Mr. Blodgett stated that the citation was a reference to a report they reviewed; that they wanted to look at a new facility, so they did a field survey; that the manufacturer installed a crematorium near his home and he did not know it, which gave him a comfort level; that if there was any type of health risk to anyone, the recommendation would have been denial; that if he could eliminate the risk he would do it; that if the equipment was working properly there would be no odor; that the staff would be well-trained and the equipment maintained; that professionally, the concerns may or may not be fear-based; and, that the residents did not have the opportunity to look at an operating crematorium, experience living in close proximity to one, or conduct extensive research, which took three to four months, as he did.

There being no further comments, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Barker moved to approve the request, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Motion No. 3:

Action: Motion to adopt a Resolution approving the proposed Conditional Use Permit failed for lack of an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioner's present

Motion: Barker Second: Margolin

Ayes: (3) Barker, Margolin, O'Neill

Noes: (2) Paredes, Zamora

Abstain: (1) Nuygen

Absent: (1) Kanzler

Chair O'Neill moved to re-open the public hearing and continue the case to the next regular meeting on Thursday, June 16, 2016 in order for a full Commission to vote on the project. Staff was also directed to prepare and have on hand, a resolution of denial, should the request be denied.

Motion No. 4:

Action: The motion to re-open the public hearing and continue the public hearing to the next regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 16, 2016, in order for a full Commission to be present to vote on the project, and to direct Staff to prepare an additional alternative Resolution of Denial based on the testimony provided at the public hearing, was approved.

Motion: O'Neill Second: Barker

Ayes: (5) Barker, Margolin, Nuygen, O'Neill, Zamora

Noes: (1) Paredes

Absent: (1) Kanzler

MATTERS FROM COMMISSIONERS: None.

MATTERS FROM STAFF: Staff gave a brief description of the items for the next regular meeting to be held on Thursday, June 16, 2016, which includes a drive-thru Starbucks and the continued case.

ADJOURNMENT: At 11:20 p.m. to the next Regular Meeting of the Garden Grove Planning Commission on Thursday, June 16, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Community Meeting Center, 11300 Stanford Avenue, Garden Grove.

Motion: Margolin Second: Zamora

Ayes: (6) Barker, Margolin, Nuygen, O'Neill, Paredes,  
Zamora

Noes: (0) None

Absent: (1) Kanzler

---

Judith Moore  
Recording Secretary