MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

September 28, 2006 4:00 PM Thursday

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 PM by Chairman Daybell CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Daybell; Committee Members

> Cha, Duncan and Larsen PRESENT:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Hoban

ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: Katie and Tom Dalton and Rick Moser

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior

Planner St. Paul, and Clerical Staff Leopold,

MINUTES: There were no minutes.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00248 - ZON06-00043. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: RICK MOSER.

Senior Planner St. Paul presented a staff report for a request for a Minor Development Project to construct a 1,143 sq. ft., 3-bedroom, 2-bath second dwelling over a new, and detached 3-car garage with alley access on a property currently developed with a 1-story single family residence at 126 East Glenwood Avenue. (Generally located on the south side of Glenwood Ave., approximately 360 feet east of Harbor Boulevard). (R2-P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (R2-P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines) (BSP)

Senior Planner St. Paul presented the background on the project. He stated that the applicant has designed and proposed bay style window pop-outs facing the rear of the property along the alley. Staff is recommending that the pop-outs be extended down to the top of the cantilevers. which would better correspond with the craftsman-style design. Senior Planner St. Paul pointed out on the east and west elevations, the applicant has proposed a small minor pop-out and staff is recommending that the applicant remove the façade design because staff believes it is not an intrical part of a craftsman style home and therefore not an intrical part of the second dwelling. The applicant proposed double columns that are similar to the front structure, and exterior stairs that have wood siding going from the base of the stairs turning up into the two-story deck. Staff recommends that the stairwell siding be removed and be replaced with a rail baluster style open for safety, light and ventilation. He stated the original house has distinctive attic vents that the applicant has tried to carry over to the second dwelling. They are vertical in design and staff has

recommended that they match the existing, which is more horizontal. Staff has added a condition for the three-car garage, which has a storage area and laundry room. The condition states that both shall remain non-habitable. Staff believes that the project, as proposed and conditioned, meets the intent of the Preservation Zone Design Guidelines and Community Improvement District.

Senior Planner St. Paul stated the applicant has added change-out windows on the existing front single story structure without benefit of permits. Staff has added Condition No. 1 where the applicant must apply for permits from the City for review and approval. Staff recommends that the RDRC recommend approval of this project subject to the findings and conditions identified in the staff report.

Senior Planner St. Paul stated one of the findings is that the proposed structure is consistent with the historic character of the neighborhood and complies with the development standards as stated in the R-2P zone and design guidelines for a residential preservation zone. As conditioned, the proposed project will be reasonably compatible with the properties in the area and will not be detrimental to the surrounding area.

Committee Member Duncan said Condition No. 5 states "reasonably" match, which he thinks is fairly vague, or general. He asked if we are after the same design that is there but maybe using different thickness of material? Senior Planner St. Paul stated it is not necessary to match the front house, but be close, and it is not reasonable to match since the existing attic vents have a slat look ½" x 2" wide, both vertical and horizontal. He stated as proposed in the plans, staff would like to have something that closely matches this design. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said staff is not recommending that the applicant make it identical, staff is looking for mass, scale, proportionality and some detailing as it relates to the trim.

Committee Member Duncan asked if the proposed roof pitch matches the existing. Senior Planner St. Paul said no it is reasonably close. The existing single story has a flat slope due to the characteristic of the craftsman design. This project has a slope that is shallower than the existing house.

Committee Member Cha asked if the carport will be removed from the foundation. Will it be used for parking space? Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the un-permitted addition will be removed in its entirety as currently proposed. Committee Member Cha asked if there will be landscaping. Senior Planner St. Paul said yes.

Chairman Daybell asked if the applicant has seen the proposed conditions in the staff report and is in agreement? Senior Planner St. Paul said yes, he has been in contact with the applicant and understands the issues and is willing to work with staff and the decision of the Committee.

Rick Moser, applicant, said he had made the changes requested by staff to the plans and is willing to work with staff, Director of Community Development and the Committee on the conditions. He stated the plans have been through plan check and been approved, fees and permits have been paid. He stated he will be coming to the permit counter to obtain a permit for the windows on the existing house and will have the owner change the three front windows to be more consistent with the bungalow style double hung windows versus the sliders. He clarified there was no foundation underneath the carport. He stated the purpose of the 3 and 12 pitch versus the possibly 4 or 5 and 12 to the front was it is a two-story building and they would like to keep it a lower profile. The applicant asked how long it will take for the Director to approve the submitted drawings and sketches. Staff explained the 10-day appeal period.

Committee Member Cha asked about the trenches around the existing residence and the type of work that is being done. The applicant stated it is the underground utility drained to the street for the rear unit and is open for inspection. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the applicant has submitted plans for plan check and they have been reviewed by the Building Division. He said permits have been issued for foundation work only. Work has started and staff approved foundation only and not the building itself, at the applicant's risk. (He knows that he needs to go through this process.) Any conditions or revisions or denial that the Committee would issue, the applicant will need to comply with. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that is not the City's standard policy, however staff was providing good customer service and working with the applicant. As a result, some work was started with the benefit of permit, but that should not in any way impede the Committee's decision tonight.

Committee Member Duncan asked the applicant if there was a reason why the detailing on the capital post of the existing residence was not being matched to the trim. The applicant stated that the note on the plans explained the trim has to be like the trim in front. Chairman Daybell said it will be recommended that when the project is finished they must match.

Committee Member Duncan asked if the diagonal brace is an original on the front residence or if it was added to the existing eaves? The applicant stated it was all original. Committee Member Duncan asked if the eave extension match the front residence? The applicant said that based on code and during plan check, they had to cut back the side that is within 3 ft. of the property line.

Committee Member Duncan asked if the roof was pitched? Senior Planner St. Paul said staff and the applicant discussed nuances of this and he felt because it was going to be a second story that it was a more simple design. Staff supported this decision based on the attic bands and everything else he was trying to match.

Chairman Daybell said he was concerned about the plywood garage/carport being left up while the dwelling is built, and is concerned that it will never get taken down. He stated he would personally like to see it demolished early on before the new construction starts. The applicant stated it was a reasonable request. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated it was in the purview of the Committee and staff to recommend prior to issuance of permits or prior to occupancy. Chairman Daybell said he would prefer it being done prior to permits.

Public hearing opened.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, said her biggest concern is what happened to the front house? Did the owner do that without the applicant knowing about it? Mr. Moser said he saw it today for the first time. Mrs. Dalton stated the windows, which are addressed in the staff report, are completely unacceptable as is the trim around them, the siding, and corner pieces from the siding. The Daltons expressed their concern that all of the elements be brought more in line with what was there before it was ripped off and that is more in character with the actual bungalow construction of the 1920s. Mrs. Dalton said it was pathetic. Mr. Moser said putting wood trim on the end is a necessity and said he will submit elevations and details to restore it back to the original look and submit for approval. He stated it will be up to the owner to come back and remove the sliding windows and put double hung in and treat around the windows and put a band around the corner. Mrs. Dalton expressed her concern with the following changes that were not identified in the staff report including the siding, trim, and other elements that have been changed. She requested clarification that it has been acknowledged those items have been changed and an attempt needs to be made to make those elements be more appropriate. She added the windows

that slide horizontally are inappropriate and the window re-configuration and lack of trim between them. Mrs. Dalton said everything about the window configurations and the trim is pathetic. She clarified that those need to be conditions of issuance of permits too and not just the windows themselves. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the approval process by the RDRC and said staff would address Mrs. Dalton's concerns and will be included in their report to the Committee and will take it into consideration. Mrs. Dalton stated that if her comments would not be included in the conditions, she would appeal the project.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Daybell said what is currently out there at the present time, is real amateur, and the existing house looks "like it fell out of the sky in the wrong direction". He stated there should be an architectural effort about getting the house back into the historic situation that was there. The porch will need to be re-done as well. Chairman Daybell agreed with Mrs. Dalton's comments and need to be taken out and the work done by professionals (windows, trim and whatever needs to be done). He said the design needs to be professional, and the rehabilitation should be done by a professional.

Committee Member Larsen said he is fine with the project subject to the conditions that were discussed.

Committee Member Cha said the reason he asked about the carport is because he couldn't see the foundation, but was concerned about removing it and replacing it at a later time. He stated it needs to be removed at the beginning stages of construction. He is happy that they are trying to match it with the existing characteristics of the existing residences. The windows must be done properly and it must be stated somewhere.

Committee Member Duncan said he basically liked the project and said what he noticed that stood out was on the front porch roof. He asked Committee Member Larsen if it could match the same pitch of the front house from the street, so you can look across from the street you'll see the same pitch in the front as you do the back. Would modifying it out affect it structurally? Committee Member Larsen said it could probably be done, but did not know how far, perhaps 4 to 12. Committee Member Duncan said the rest of the project is fine and is in basic agreement with staff's recommendations.

Chairman Daybell pointed out that the ratio on the front page of the building analysis ratio living area is 1,926 sq. ft. and said his calculations were 2,180 sq. ft. rather than 1,926 of the second area. He said it would not affect the applicant and is within the code.

Chairman Daybell asked if they could use can light instead of surface mounted lights, vintage porch lights, in the overhang in the alley for lighting in the back for security purposes. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said it would be concealed lights in the soffit. The applicant said he could do that but would prefer to use both and liked the look of the carriage type lights rather than the commercial look of can lights in a soffit. Chairman Daybell said the porch lights may be vulnerable to vandalism and would like to reiterate that the existing house has to be fixed up (siding, trim, etc.) so that it meets the preservation zone appearance preferably by a professional architect. He said he can't stipulate it, but recommends it. Chairman Daybell said that the Committee should include it in the recommendation and approval.

Chairman Daybell agreed with Committee Member Duncan's comments and said if feasible, the roof should be steeper in the back. Committee Member Duncan said the maximum match the

existing roof pitch or achieve as best as possible to the satisfaction of the staff. If the applicant can't structurally match it, for whatever reasons, it should match as close as possible. Chairman Daybell said he is very supportive of this.

Committee Member Larsen asked if the beams that were showing were structural or are they slapped on for effect?

Public hearing opened.

Committee Member Duncan said it was his understanding that they were going to match what is on the front. Committee Member Larsen asked how the applicant was protecting the end of the beam which is being exposed? He commented that it would "never make it" in a bad rain. The applicant said the where the beam ends and another beam buts up against the end of it.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated some of the items that were identified previously including:

- 1. Raise the pitch of the front porch of the new structure to reflect the pitch of the front house.
- 2. Ensure plans indicate a 4 x 4 post on the porch, which currently indicates a 2 x 4 post.
- 3. Eaves on the new house to match the existing house. (if it's not a condition already)
- 4. Bracket beam at the top of the front house post are to match the original house's post.
- 5. Revise Condition No. 1 to say "prior to issuance of building permits, applicant shall provide plans for the replacement, installation of exterior siding and windows for the existing house to add in and replace of window and corner trim or something to that affect. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated to add a sentence at the end "trim and windows shall reflect the design of the existing house's original construction.
- 6. Soffit lighting shall be installed at the exterior alley and the front porch.

Senior Planner St. Paul added the condition of the removal of the attached unpermitted garage. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked the Committee if they feel a need to remove the structure prior to issuance of building permits or prior to final. Chairman Daybell said he would prefer prior to issuance of permits.

Public hearing opened.

The applicant said if the Committee is going to recommend the porch 4 and 12, they should make the other roof 4 and 12, otherwise you create a "bastard" transition when you have two pitches that are not at 45 degree angle. Chairman Daybell said he liked that idea.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE project subject to staff recommendations with the modification to Condition No. 1 as identified by staff (corner trim and window) and the existing plywood structure be removed or demolished at the beginning of construction prior to issuance of building permits. The roof pitch be modified to 4 and 12 for the proposed unit. Condition No. 4 that the post be constructed out of 4 x 4 with a wrap to better match the front houses existing posts and the diagonal bracing and any exposed beam also match the existing dwelling, reasonably. Condition No. 5 the addition of soffit lights either in lieu of or addition to the proposed wall mounted fixtures.

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

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tom Dalton commented as to why the same requirements for this project weren't applied to the project heard at last week's meeting, which is equally needed. He asked about Item No. 14 listed under staff's recommendation regarding landscaping and irrigation. Acting Chief Planner said it is a standard condition that is usually included in the staff report to provide clarification teeth and that the landscaping must be maintained.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented a review of the September 27, Planning Commission meeting regarding the Amerige Court project.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ruth Leopold Clerical Support