

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

February 8, 2007

4:00 PM

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. by Chairman Duncan

**ROLL CALL:** COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Duncan; Committee Members  
PRESENT: Cha, Daybell (arrived at 4:35 p.m.), Hoban,  
and Larsen

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None  
ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: Tom and Katie Dalton, John Dilauro, Joe  
Petitpas, Marvin Crocker, John Monson

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior  
Planner St. Paul, Acting Senior Planner  
Allen, and Clerical Staff Leopold and  
Pasillas

**MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by  
Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting  
members present to APPROVE the November 9, 2006 and December  
14, 2006 minutes AS WRITTEN.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00453 - ZON06-00072. APPLICANT: ROBERT BORDERS & ASSOCIATES.  
PROPERTY OWNER: TIMOTHY LUBERSKI.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a review of exterior materials for a previously approved minor development project to renovate the building exterior and remodel the ground floor tenant spaces for restaurant use on property located at 310 N. Harbor Blvd. (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that this project was approved by the Committee last year, but the Committee had conditioned the applicant to come back to the RDRC for approval of color and materials prior to building permits being issued. She displayed a materials board, and indicated that the exterior would be a combination of used brick veneer, stucco, steel, and glazing. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that at last year's meeting there had been discussion on using a half brick; the brick being shown on the material's board was comparable to the thick brick discussed at that meeting. Acting Senior Planner Allen indicated that the applicant intended to grout between the bricks. Committee Member Hoban asked if the grout would be raked or filled flush, and the applicant responded that it would be grouted to look like a

mortar joint (raked). Committee Member Hoban asked if the current grout was smooth, and the applicant responded that currently there was no grout, but rather the veneer was a tile that was pressed onto a thick layer of mastic, which extrudes into the space between the tiled. The “half” brick and mortar will have a traditional look.

Committee Member Larsen asked what type of finish would be used on the stucco, and the applicant responded it would be a smooth finish.

Committee Member Hoban asked about the signage. Acting Senior Planner Allen responded that it was conceptual at this point, but would be an individual channel type letter. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that the awning would act as a sign band (raceway). The original approval considered the conceptual signage. Assuming this is what remains proposed, further review by the RDRC would not be required. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that not all signage in downtown came before the RDRC, only when it was considered inconsistent with the area, or it would have a negative impact on a historic structure, or if it was very unique.

Committee Member Larsen asked about the finish color on the aluminum, and the applicant responded that it would be a dark, anodized bronze. Committee Member Larsen asked how wide the profile for the framing for the glass would be and the applicant responded 2 x 6, or whatever the wall thickness was.

Committee Member Larsen believed the exterior proposal to be such that it would work well for the building. He thought the aluminum would look better without a dark finish, as he liked the natural finish of aluminum, but either way worked.

Committee Member Hoban thought the proposal was similar to what he expected.

Committee Member Cha thought the material matched the building, and he liked the glass.

Chairman Duncan believed the materials would look good and be a nice addition to the building.

MOTION made by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Larsen, to APPROVE project with staff recommendations. Passed unanimously.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **Item No. 2**

PRJ06-00615 – ZON06-00104. APPLICANT: MARVIN CROCKER. PROPERTY OWNER: MAY-BROWARD INVESTMENTS.

Senior Planner St. Paul presented a staff report for a request for Minor Development Project located at 135 N. Yale to demolish an existing garage and construct a 2 story second dwelling unit (1,491 sq ft) with ground floor 4-car garage on a property with an existing dwelling unit (935 sq ft) to remain. (Generally located on the west side of Yale Avenue, 230 feet south of Wilshire Avenue). (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines). (BSP)

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that there were actually two requests; the first request was to construct a two-story, three-bedroom approximately 1,500 square foot unit with two bedrooms on top and two two-car garage on the first floor, the second request was to reduce the

cumulative side-yard setback from ten feet to eight feet. He added that this project had come before the Committee three years ago and was approved, but that approval has expired, therefore it had to come back before the RDRC.

Senior Planner St. Paul continued by giving a description of the site. There was an existing one-story building with a detached garage, which faced the alley. A description of the buildings was given. The proposal for the second story is compatible with the existing house in that it emulates the truncated eaves, the hip roof style, the hung windows, and some of the wainscoting. The applicant was proposing two two-car garages facing the alley. The proposal had fewer windows than the original approval. Two windows were removed from the garage area on the first floor, which staff supports. The applicant was also requesting removal of a window in the bedroom that faced the alley, and staff was concerned with the blank façade this would create. Staff had concerns with the single bedroom on the first floor and the additional square footage for a closet, and will require the applicant to remove the proposed closet so the project remains at the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR), which was 40%. Staff was also concerned with the bedroom downstairs, and it's conduciveness to become a second dwelling unit, and would be requesting a deed restriction be recorded to ensure there will only be two dwelling units on the property.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the side-yard setback reduction was previously approved. The applicant was requesting a 3' setback on the south elevation and a five foot setback on the north elevation.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that three years ago, when a similar project was approved, the Committee had concerns with the size of the building and the FAR. This project proposed now was essentially the same with some modifications. Staff was concerned with the ground-floor bathroom reorientation and the addition of the closet, and would condition recording of a deed restriction to prohibit a third unit, as was conditioned three years ago.

Chairman Duncan asked if the closet would have to be removed entirely or could it be made smaller. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it would need to be removed in order to stay within the FAR. Chairman Duncan asked if staff believed it allowable to leave the sink and counter if a deed restriction was recorded, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that traditionally is was not allowed, as there was concern with added plumbing in a room that was isolated from the other living space. The concern was not necessarily with this owner, but with future owners. He stated that having a sink in a bedroom isolated from the rest of the unit was a problem waiting to happen. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that staff was concerned with the mass of a solid wall in the alley that the removal of the windows would create, and stated that there had been previous discussion in the RDRC regarding improvement of the alley's, and felt this wall would be a step backwards.

Committee Member Hoban asked is there was staff discussion regarding the inconsistencies between the proposed roof and the slate roof on the front house. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that the house was re-roofed approximately two years ago. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated there was a condition requiring roof material and exterior wall texture shall be similar to the treatment of the existing house.

Committee Member Larsen asked what year the front house was built, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded 1938.

Chairman Duncan asked for clarification on the eight foot setback request. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the R-2 code required a cumulative total of ten feet total. This lot was forty-eight feet wide, instead of the standard width of fifty feet; therefore the reduction in side-yard setback was requested to accommodate the garage, which needed 40' to have four cars.

Committee Member Hoban asked why staff was not requiring the applicant to adhere to code and change the garage to a three-car garage. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the applicant would need a minimum of a two-car garage and two additional parking spaces to meet code, but the applicant wanted a four car garage. The applicant could have requested a reduction in garage space size, but adjustments would be required either way to get the desired four car garage.

Chairman Duncan asked if the width was sixteen feet standard, why was there a need for this request. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that code required nineteen feet interior clearance; with the thickness of the wall the garage would be twenty feet for each two-car garage, or forty feet for the two two-car garages. The standard garage door was sixteen feet, and it was difficult to reduce the remaining wall sections between garage doors due to structural requirements.

Committee Member Daybell arrived at 4:35 p.m.

Marvin Crocker, the contractor for the applicant, explained that the reason for the downstairs' bedroom/bathroom was to accommodate a person in a wheelchair. The owner would be willing to remove the closet. He stated that the windows in the garage had been removed because the applicant did not feel they served a purpose. The windows in the bedroom had been removed to create a solid wall which would allow the owner a wall to place a bed. As for the roof material, they were flexible on the type of material, but would like to use a type of manufactured product that would have a similar look to the slate. The owner intended for this second house to look very similar to the existing house.

The owner, John Munson, explained that he owned other properties in Fullerton, and believed that it was important to keep with the style of the front house. He stated that there would be minimum visibility of the roof on the second building.

Public hearing opened.

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated his concerns were the same as they were in 2003 for the original application. He agreed with conditions four and twelve, but did not see a need for the bathroom downstairs. He believed the downstairs bedroom would open the area up for a multi-tenant type use, and did not see how a deed restriction could be enforced.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, was concerned with the compatibility of the two roofs. She believed that you would be able to see the back roof, and slate would have a vastly different look compared with composition. She liked the applicant's suggestion to use a manufactured, slate-type product, rather than composition. She was also concerned with the downstairs' bedroom and the increased possibility for multi-tenant use. She did not want to see the windows removed, but she was agreeable with the side-yard setbacks.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Hoban asked if there had been any thought to the addition of a cupola on the new structure, to tie it to the existing structure. Mr. Crocker responded that they had not considered adding a cupola because they felt it would be too high on top of a two-story building. They did plan on repeating other architectural features, such as the posts. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that the cupola on the existing building was actually a chimney that was converted to a cupola when the re-roof was done.

Mr. Crocker stated that a family with three children would appreciate having a three bedroom unit. As for enforcement, if someone had a complaint that the first floor bedroom was being rented out separately they would have to contact the City for enforcement.

Committee Member Cha thought it was important for the roof to match the original unit. He also thought the first floor should remain as it was on the original submittal.

Committee Member Daybell believed the roof should match, and stated the alternative to putting slate on the new building would be to change the front building back to composition. He did not agree with the reduction in setbacks, and felt it conducive to illegal use in the future. Committee Member Daybell thought it possible to take two feet off the unit and eliminate the reduced setback request. He also felt the garage wall facing the alley would look "boxy" without the window.

Committee Member Hoban liked the project overall. He believed the roofs should match, but felt it possible to make it similar in look and mass with a manufactured product. He would like to see the windows remain, but thought they could be moved up to allow a wall for furniture placement. He understood the concerns with the possibility of a third unit on the first floor, but thought any illegal use would be a code issue. He was agreeable with the project and staff's conditions, but would like a condition added that the roof have a similar look to the existing building's roof.

Committee Member Larsen agreed with Committee Member Hoban in regard to the roof. He believed you would be able to see it and it should be similar in visual weight. He was agreeable with the side-yard setback reduction.

Committee Member Daybell asked if a four-car garage was required, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the alternative would be a two or three car garage with one or two open parking spaces (four total).

Chairman Duncan wanted the roof to be compatible in material and look with the existing building. He suggested the applicant provide staff with a sample of their proposed roofing materials.

Committee Member Hoban made a motion to approve the project with staff's recommended conditions, with the added condition that the roof match in color and appearance with the front building, but not necessarily material, and that condition number two be revised to allow removal of the south facing window.

MOTION by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha, to APPROVE project with staff recommendations and the following added conditions; (1) The roof will match in color and appearance with the front building, and (2) that condition number two be revised to allow removal of the south facing window. Vote 4-1, with Committee Member Daybell voting against.

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

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comments

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

Committee Member Daybell stated that a local newspaper had misrepresented a condition the RDRC had placed on the EV Free project. He explained that they had requested, not required, that trees be planted as early as possible. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that EV Free intended to plant the trees soon, regardless.

**MEETINGS:**

Senior Planner Eastman provided a summary on the City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

**AGENDA FORECAST:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Janelle Pasillas  
Secretary