

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

December 2, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Chair Evans called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Cooper

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director White
Asst. Planner Horrisberger
Asst. Planner Farbstein

**APPROVAL OF ORDER
OF AGENDA** Commissioner Gordon moved approval of the Order
of Agenda; Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
NOVEMBER 4, 2013** Commissioner Gordon moved approval of the
minutes of November 4, 2013; Commissioner Brown
seconded the motion.

The motion carried 6-0-1.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Nibbelin,
Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioner Campbell

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 9, 2013:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. UP-031-13 PV-510-13 USE PERMIT, UP-031-13 and VARIANCE, PV-510-13, filed by the applicant, Chris Coones, to install nine AT&T cellular antennas on a new 38 foot tall tree-pole at a North Coast County Water District property, at 1186 Fassler Avenue (APN 022-330-070). Recommended CEQA status: Exempt.**

Asst. Planner Horrisberger presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper asked if alternate sites were looked at before selecting this site.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger stated that they also looked at 4700 Fassler, on the other side, westward.

Commissioner Cooper mentioned that there was a propane tank and a generator included in the building, and he asked if that was going to be tested periodically or how were they going to service the generator.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger suggested that he ask the applicant when he takes his turn to speak.

Chair Evans referred to page 4 regarding the height, "could be permitted without need of a variance," and asked that she elaborate on that.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger explained that, if the support structure was not made to look like a tree, it would be at 35 feet. The extra 3 feet is for the screening of the facility for tree-like components.

Chair Evans assumed she referred to the fake foliage.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger responded affirmatively, adding that they would still need a use permit but not a variance.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the attached photo and mentioned that quite a few trees were recently removed prior to the application. He then referred to the photo simulation, and asked if they were completed before or after the trees were removed.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger stated that it was her understanding that the trees were gone at the time of submittal, but she suggested they confirm with the applicant.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to the standards for granting a variance and he asked about 6a and privileges enjoyed by other property owners in the vicinity. He also asked if the City was the relevant geographical area when talking about the variances.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger referred to verbage stating identical zoning and the other facility on the site would meet that, but they used a general comparison for wireless variances because they are allowed in any zoning district and they used the comparison of other sites.

Commissioner Nibbelin concluded that it was City-wide.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger responded affirmatively.

Chris Coones, applicant, concurred with the staff report. He referred to the question about the height, and he explained that, to make a fake tree look right, you have to build a crown to it, adding several feet. He then referred to the question on the generator, and explained that the reason for using a propane generator was that it required almost no maintenance. By using propane, instead of diesel, they can put a bigger tank and, if it kicks on in an emergency, it burns cleaner and requires less visits for maintenance. He thought they might make two visits a quarter for the technical aspects, but probably less visits than that. He then explained that they had previously looked at the other North Coast County Water District site but the project died. When they returned this year, they revisited the spot but, because of issues with the neighbors, the water district decided to be a good neighbor and weren't leasing any more space there, but they had space at the upper tanks. He mentioned that the upper tanks were more than 300 feet away from residential and were out of the way. They were also building a stealth facility to help it blend in. He stated that in the past, all the trees were still there which was different and why they liked the lower site better. When he returned nine months ago, all the trees were cut down, long before the photos and drawings. He wasn't sure why they were cut down.

Commissioner Cooper asked how often they would cycle the generator on and off for maintenance. He asked if it was done monthly.

Mr. Coones reiterated that they went with the propane because there was almost zero maintenance. He thought they would probably fire it up once a year. He added that, if there was a blackout or power outage, it would kick on, but he reiterated that there was very little service done on propane generators.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there was a provision in the lease agreement to remove the facility after a certain number of years.

Mr. Coones stated that they have a lease for 25 years, and they have the right to be there for those 25 years unless technology changes and they have no reason to be there or if their operation interferes with the water district. He added that, with a lease like this, they have ideas of what their general plan is and they site them in a spot where they will probably be there for the long term. He explained that one provision of every lease was that they restore the property to its original condition, which at this time was asphalt and pavement and they would merely be removing the shelter and taking down the structure.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he hasn't seen those "trees" up close but he asked if there was a way to prevent the kids from climbing them.

Mr. Coones stated that this was easy because it was behind an already existing locked facility by the water district. He stated that there was a cyclone fence around the facility and it was as secure a facility as possible with no public access to the location.

Commissioner Cooper understood that, but he merely wondered, if the kids did get into the facility, whether they were prevented from climbing it.

Mr. Coones thought it was harder to climb than a real tree, adding that the first branches were higher up.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that one of the findings they were asked to make was that a reasonable alternate site that would result in fewer visual impacts didn't provide reasonable signal coverage. He asked for confirmation that there was not an alternative site that would provide reasonable coverage.

Mr. Coones responded that there wasn't one that they could lease. He stated that, given Pacifica's topography, you can go from one side of the street to the other and it changes. He pointed out that Fassler was kind of a ridge and there were only two possible spots, unless the City entered into a lease on the public right-of-way, which gave them limited choices. He reiterated that, since the lower water tanks were no longer available, they were left with the site on the top of the hill. He stated that they would have liked the lower area.

Commissioner Nibbelin reiterated that it wasn't available.

Mr. Coones agreed, and added that this spot provided the coverage that they needed, and it was out of site from the public right-of-way.

Chair Evans referred to the other existing pole on the property, and asked if the height was at 40 feet.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger stated that it was approved at 40 feet initially, but the plan shows that it is a little below that, probably at 37 or 38 feet.

Chair Evans asked for confirmation that it was not a pole tree.

Asst. Planner Horrisberger agreed, stating that it was a green pole with antennae.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Cooper moved to approve the resolution UP-031-13 for installation of the cellular facility at the location of 1186 Fassler Avenue; Commissioner Gordon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked if they were required to make a finding with respect to the project being exempt from CEQA and whether there were other findings needed in connection with the motion.

Planning Director White stated that there were no separate findings for CEQA because staff recommended that it was exempt. If there was a CEQA finding to be made, they would have put that in the form of a resolution.

Commissioner Nibbelin explained that he was reading from the staff report, and the motion suggests that they include it.

Planning Director White stated that they could include it in the motion but there wasn't a separate finding.

Commissioner Nibbelin reiterated that he was wondering about the other findings set forth in the packet on page 6, asking if they should incorporate those in the motion.

Planning Director White reiterated that there were resolutions attached and he thought a simpler matter would be to move that the resolutions be adopted and it would be appropriate to do it in two separate motions, one for the use permit and one for the variance.

Chair Evans asked if he wanted separate motions.

Planning Director White thought that was typically how it was done. He thought, in this case, if there was consensus, they could do it in one motion or two motions.

Commissioner Cooper asked if he should revise the motion to incorporate the exhibit.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he was looking at how it was framed under "commission action," and that it appeared to be comprehensive.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he would revise the motion and do it all in one motion.

Commissioner Cooper moved that the Planning Commission find the project exempt from CEQA, **APPROVE** Use Permit, UP-031-13, and Variance, PV-510-13, subject to conditions 1 through 5, and **ADOPT** the attached resolutions and findings contained in the December 2, 2013 staff report, and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Gordon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

Chair Evans declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

2. **PSD-785-13 CDP-339-13 UP-029-13 SUB-222-13** **SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, PSD-785-13, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CDP-339-13, USE PERMIT, UP-029-13 and SUBDIVISION, SUB-222-13, filed by the applicant and owner, Ciyavash Moazzami, Pacific Crest Builders, to construct two three-story condominium units (four units total) on two separate vacant lots at 10 & 16 and 20 & 26 Santa Rosa Avenue (APN-016-182-020 and 030). Recommended CEQA status: Exempt.**

Asst. Planner Farbstein presented the staff report.

Commissioner Vaterlaus wanted to indicate, for the record, that she met with the applicant prior to this meeting.

Commissioner Cooper stated that, when they looked at the Holiday Inn expansion, they had taken away parking spaces and there was a fee associated with that. Upon reading the report, he noted that they had taken away a parking space due to a driveway, and he asked if the fees were applicable in this case.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that they weren't, explaining that the fee was only within the Specific Plan area. The parking space he is referring to are street spaces, and there is no parking in lieu fee.

Commissioner Gordon asked for an explanation of how parking was not accommodated when parking needs to happen in the street.

Planning Director White thought it was about the fact that these lots were not developed and, by developing them, street parking is eliminated by putting in driveways. He stated that it was natural with an undeveloped site because there has to be access to and from the property and there was no provision in the code stating that they have to compensate for the lost parking space.

Commissioner Brown referred to the storage area on the balcony, and thought that cuts into the overhang allowance. He understood that they will have a wall with a door to the balcony and it would be a storage space accessible to the balcony only and now it will be open.

Asst. Planner Farbstein agreed, explaining that it would eliminate the enclosed storage space. The walls will still be there as architectural features but it won't be enclosed space.

Commissioner Brown thought it was still a structure that overhangs, and he asked if there was anything that will prevent the condominium owner from putting a door in there. He didn't think the units have a separate closet in the master bedroom where the balcony is.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that, because there is a requirement with a condominium development, they have to have enclosed space. Originally, the applicant was proposing to put it in the balcony. The plans have flex area and that was the area to designate the enclosed space and shift it from the balcony into some portion of that flexed space. She stated that she will follow up during the plan check process to make sure they meet the requirements.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the repaving on the outside of the street, asking if that goes from side to side as far as the two-inch grinding and, in the meantime, are they repairing any of the other sidewalks out there.

Planning Director White thought they could use the Public Works condition which talks about repaving the street frontage. He stated that, typically, it was the half width of the street, but he understood that they have had this conversation with Public Works and it was done on an as needed basis. They will do an assessment and determine how much damage might occur as a result of the construction and, if there was trenching, etc., it was likely that the whole street section will be replaced or, if in good enough condition, it won't be replaced. He thought the street would probably be replaced at least the half width along the frontage.

Commissioner Gordon asked for clarification regarding the parking garage. He referred to the renderings, and mentioned that there were two alternatives presented. He thought the terms of approvals were set up so that the alternative favored by the Planning Director was the one included in the motion.

Asst. Planner Farbstein agreed, explaining that was the alternative to the side. She stated that the full size floor plan shows the applicant's proposal with the narrow garage entry. She stated that the partial floor plan with the entryway of the garage to the left was the option recommended by staff.

Commissioner Gordon then assumed that, when they do a straightforward motion for approval subject to conditions listed, they are adopting the wider garage.

Asst. Planner Farbstein agreed, stating that he was referring to condition #2.

Chair Evans stated that condition #2 makes it a 14-foot garage door instead of the other 11-foot door.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper asked if this follows the provision where the applicant has to tie into the sewer main all the way to the center of the street.

Planning Director White presumed that was covered in the conditions, but was not sure.

Asst. Planner Farbstein also thought that was correct, and read condition #29 which referred to that requirement.

Ciyavash Moazzami, owner, stated that he was the property owner with Jeffrey Randolph, and Ralph Straus with Straus Design Group was going to be representing them and talking about design related questions. They looked forward to building a nice project. He stated that he lived in Pacifica for a year. His wife was born and raised in Pacifica and is now a high school teacher in San Bruno where they now live but are looking forward to occupying one of the units.

Jeff Randolph, owner, was with Pacific Crest Builders. He thanked them for hearing their application. He stated that it has been a good experience working with staff. He stated that they are small builders out of Walnut Creek and they specialize in sustainable construction. They are

planning a green element and they feel that, once they are here, they will hang out their shingle and will find other opportunities.

Ralph Straus, architect, stated he designed the project with Ciya and Jeff, and they tried to take advantage of the characteristics of the lot, explaining how they used that by turning the decks towards the view and provided nice articulation. They used nice colors and materials to create an interesting street scene and were happy with how it turned out. He felt one important part was having the door facing the street and following the condition of no tandem garages, they have provided an abundance of garage space. He referred to the question about storage and stated that the deck storage was additional because they had flex space on the ground floor. He mentioned that the standard garage was 669 sq. feet, and was slightly larger than a three-car garage, although they were only showing two cars. He added that, depending on what the owner does, they could have the equivalent of a four-car garage. He explained how they guaranteed that the typical car could get into the garage and would additionally have extra storage space. He explained their thinking in getting creative about the garage door and front door.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the alternate design for the front door and he asked if they had plans for the alcove, mentioning possibly having people hanging out there.

Mr. Straus assumed he was referring to the security aspects. He stated that the challenge with a home this wide was that they have to have some structural strength for earthquakes. With a wider garage door, the only space in the front at ground level was the blank portion in front of the alcove facing the road. He stated that they needed that section when they narrowed the garage door. That gave them enough space for the door to the living space to face forward.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the metal rail and mentioned that most metal rails rust quickly.

Mr. Straus acknowledged that and stated that they would do the rail in 100% aluminum to resist the salt.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the deck above the garage which was a solid deck and mentioned that we have a lot of frontal wind and water coming through on that side, and he was concerned about that area gathering water and looking disgusting.

Mr. Straus stated that he has been instructed by the builder to make the detailing bulletproof.

Commissioner Cooper thought that would apply to the downspouts, etc. He then referred to "spoils" located on one area of the site, asking if they have been dumped there over the years and how they planned to get rid of it.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded that she had mentioned that there was another property between these two, owned by someone else, who would be speaking later. She stated that it was material he had placed there in connection with his remodeling project at 2117 Beach Blvd.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the mention of colors going to be used, and he asked if that was up to restriction as it stated "pleasing color."

Asst. Planner Farbstein read condition #3 which stated that applicant would submit colors and material subject to approval by the Planning Director, adding that they would ask for a color board.

Commissioner Cooper then referred to the heritage tree, stating he didn't see it on the landscape plan.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that the heritage tree was on a neighboring property at 30 Santa Rosa, not on the subject site. She stated that there was also an arborist's report which showed the tree.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he saw drain lines for the run off around the property, he was curious where it landed adjacent to the heritage tree.

Mr. Straus stated that they would work with the arborist to make sure that everything was done correctly.

Commissioner Vaterlaus stated that her question was about the front door and it was answered. She then mentioned her question about this being a condominium project and she thought she would look into it being attached single family units, rather than condominiums, which she thought would make it a lot easier. She added that there were attached single family structures on Beach Blvd., instead of having CC&Rs and a homeowner's association with only four units.

Commissioner Brown referred to the garage entry alternative proposed by staff, stating that they didn't have an elevation drawing, and he asked for confirmation that there would be no front door visible on the plan proposed by staff.

Mr. Straus agreed, adding that it was on the side of the home.

Commissioner Brown referred to the restriction on the storage area on the decks with a requirement that they not be closed off but open, and asked if it changed his mind in any way about how they use those spaces.

Mr. Straus didn't think so, adding that it will become a larger deck space, which some will find nicer. He was not concerned about the amount of storage because the garage size is exceptionally large for this type of unit and there was plenty of storage space.

Chair Evans asked for more information on the flow well details of the underground storage tanks.

Mr. Straus stated that it was out of his area of expertise, but added that it was a facility to collect surface water and put it back into the ground as drainage requirements rather than send back into the storm drain system.

Chair Evans wanted to clarify that they did have it in the plans for all the units.

Mr. Straus stated that it was typically a perforated well that disperses the water.

Commissioner Cooper referred to all the restrictions and asked staff if that prevented them from approving this and then potentially not doing one of the provisions.

Planning Director White stated that the Commission had the prerogative with the garage door opening. He stated that the code was silent on this. He has never seen this plan in real life and they had concerns that it might not be practical, but they did appreciate the effort aesthetically. He agreed that it was a good thing, but they did have concerns about the practicality of it. They erred on the side of practicality but that didn't mean that the Commission had to agree with them.

Commissioner Cooper asked, if they approved the resolution, whether they leave that item up for discussion or how they would go about it.

Planning Director White stated that, if they were inclined to go with the narrower opening, it might be the simple matter of eliminating the second condition.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing.

Brian O'Flynn, Pacifica, stated that he was a neighbor and was present to express his support of the project. He was familiar with the project, having reviewed the plans in detail, and thought it was a very good project. They indicate that they are going to be quality builders, not just in green construction but durable coastal construction, such as for salt. He felt it was going to elevate the quality of construction along Santa Rosa and he felt it tied in nicely to the proposed improvements on Palmetto. He stated that architecture was important to him, doing his own design, and he was plugging his support of the narrower garage door because he felt garage doors have been one of the principal banes on American residential architecture over the past 50 years, making them less friendly. He felt the project was well ordered and he approved the decks and modern architecture, which he has come to appreciate over the past ten years. He also felt it was appropriate to the location and he hoped they approved the project.

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Randolph referred to Councilmember Cooper's comments, stating that they were all about risk proofing. He stated that he has spent his entire career of 25 years, having lots of opportunity to go in and build new homes on existing infrastructure. They also do construction defect work, and their plan in connection with this project is to have a great deal of pride in this. He felt the biggest referral is when the people do not call them because everything works and they are happy. He felt it was a great opportunity to show what they can do and he hoped other opportunities will come out of that.

Commissioner Brown stated that he was a fan of the project, adding that he preferred the narrower garage door opening over staff's alternatives because he likes front doors and small garage doors. He stated, if there is consensus, he would like to exclude condition #2 in the motion.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he also supported the diminishment of the garage door and approved removal of condition #2. He was in support of the rest of the project. He appreciated the colors, scales of project, etc.

Commissioner Nibbelin echoed the comments mentioned so far. He appreciated the staff report and, while he was ordinarily persuaded by the views of the staff, he tended to agree with what his fellow commissioners said so far.

Commissioner Vaterlaus also agreed that the aesthetics of the front door in the front was much nicer. She appreciated that it would be easier with the larger door, but she agreed with the deletion of condition #2.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he was offering an alternative viewpoint. He stated that he didn't know how many have actually tried to enter such a configuration. He stated that his brother-in-law in the Marina has a similar configuration, and it was harrowing for him to navigate, with his wife having to flag him in and out. He appreciated the aesthetic issue, and he agreed with Planning Director White's comparison of form versus function. He understood the intentions of putting a front door there and the narrower garage space were right from an aesthetic standpoint but he wouldn't want anyone to go through what he had to go through, adding that he was driving a Saab which wasn't a huge car. He stated that the problem wasn't in the space for the bigger car but in the far space and you have to be a good navigator. He added that we are such a car-centered society and we are ideally heading to smaller cars and this would make sense, but part of his concern was that no one was talking about the other side of the debate and it was difficult to back out of this space with anything bigger than a "bug." He felt staff was "spot on" for the opening for practical reasons. He agreed it was a nicer look, but that his opinion was for the wider option. Otherwise, he supported the project.

Chair Evans referred to a complex in the past that was very similar and, at that time, they had issues about the garage because it was too big. He liked the idea of a smaller garage door. While understanding what Commissioner Gordon was saying, he thought that, according to the plan, they were only getting rid of 1.5 feet past the foyer because they still have the staircase. He felt they would still have that behind the car when backing up. He thought, after you have lived there for a while, backing out will remind you and he liked the look of the smaller door with the front door facing. He added that his door faces the side and, except for the long walkway you wouldn't know it was there and that was the one portion that he didn't care for. He liked the drawings, sections, tiered, etc. He stated that they were only gaining three feet and he was tending to go with the majority and state that the smaller door was the way to go. He understood Commissioner Gordon's concerns but he didn't see how they would get around the staircase because you can't remove it and back out. He liked the project and was disappointed that the previous one didn't go through. He wasn't a big box fan, but there were a lot of them and it goes with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Campbell agreed that Commissioner Gordon raises a good point, but what they want to be clear about with approving this configuration was that they were not setting a precedent with this type of configuration in other single family dwellings in the City. This won't work every time, because these are like two condos pushed up against each other.

Commissioner Gordon asked staff what the difference was in the two proposals in terms of the width.

Planning Director White stated that it was three feet, adding that the opening created by changing the entry was about 2 feet, 1 inch but he thought they can accommodate a larger door at that time.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the net was three feet per garage door.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively, adding that the previous one approved were 14-foot wide garage doors.

Commissioner Brown moved that the Planning Commission find that the project is exempt from CEQA; **APPROVE** PSD-785-13, UP-029-13, CDP-339-13 and SUB-222-13 by ADOPTING the attached resolutions for the duplexes at 10 & 16 and 20 & 26 Santa Rosa Avenue; and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference with the exception of excluding condition #2; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Campbell, Nibbelin,
Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: Commissioner Gordon

Chair Evans declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

CONSIDERATION:

3. **CC-05-10 EXTENSION OF PERMITS to convert 170 existing apartment
 PE-148-08 units into condominium units at 435 Gateway Drive
 UP-097-08 APN-009-540-110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170).**

Asst. Planner Farbstein presented the staff report.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission **EXTEND** CC-05-08, PE-148-08, SUB-216-08 and UP-987-08 to December 31, 2014; Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
 Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director White stated that, while there are no Planning Commission items on the next Council agenda, it is the reorganization meeting and they have extended an invitation to the Commission and he suggested that, if they have time, they might attend.

Commissioner Brown asked for a reminder of the date and time.

Planning Director White stated that it was the 9th. He stated that there was a regular public meeting with a light agenda, and the main purpose was for the ceremonial proceedings.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m.; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director White