MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday May 24, 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, Vice Chairman Hoban,

PRESENT: Committee Members Cha, and Daybell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None

ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting

Senior Planner Allen, Consultant Planner

Wolff, and Clerical Assistant Flores

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by

Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the May 10, 2007 minutes AS

WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS

Item No. 1

CUP 1056 & 1057 and Major Site Plan 844 & 845

Applicant and Property Owner: Grace Ministries International. The property owner has submitted final architectural and landscape plans for Phase 2 of a previously approved project, which converted the former Hunt Wesson/Con Agra office/industrial property to religious, educational and office use. The RDRC will review the architectural and landscape plans for a 2,500-seat sanctuary, to be located at the southeast corner of Commonwealth Avenue and Brookhurst Road. The Grace Ministries campus is addressed 1645 and 1701 W. Valencia Street. The address of the proposed sanctuary building will be 150 S. Brookhurst. (C-2 Zone) (The Fullerton City Council certified an Environmental Impact Report for this project on December 17, 2002.)

Planning Consultant Wolff presented a staff report with two alternatives in response to the RDRC's recommendations. The first approach was a subtle slope in the top of the parapet on the east and west facing elevations. The parapet rises about 2 ½ feet from the southerly edge to the center, and then falls about 1-½ feet from the center to the northerly edge. The second alternative lowered and cut away at the parapet so the skylight could be more visible. The cutout was a "T" element that associates with the Pereira buildings. A cross rises from the cutout area, identifying the structure as a church.

Committee Member Daybell asked if all they had done was drop down the parapet and Vice Chairman Hoban responded that they did not lower the whole parapet.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the project was reviewed by the RDRC at their last meeting and the Committee felt the building was a quality design. The concern from the last meeting was that it lacked certain personality to elevate it beyond an office building appearance. The applicants had come back and were not in a position where they desired to change the design they had already presented. Staff believed that alternative two was a more appropriate approach then alternative one.

Public hearing opened.

Ted Kim, Business Director for Grace Ministries stated that he felt alternative two would address the concerns that the RDRC had at the previous meeting.

Committee Member Daybell stated he would like to see the end view of the project. He stated he could see the east and west sides, but was having a hard time visualizing the north and south side. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that the north and south side were not visible from the public area and what he was looking at was the east and west side.

Committee Member Hoban asked if alternative one would have glass on the back of the building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that alternative one modified both the east and west sides, through the roof change. Alternative two modified both the east and west side. On the west side that fronts Brookhurst they did the parapet cutout and cross. On east side they did not want to duplicate the same elements, so instead they changed the glass.

Committee Member Cha asked if there was anyway to incorporate both approaches into the project. Chairman Duncan stated that it would be the roof lining change and elevation change combined. Mr. Kim stated that from the exterior, the curve line could not be seen and they would only be adding a slight elevation.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha stated that what ever the church was willing to change was ok with him. If they were not willing to combine both approaches he would prefer approach number two.

Committee Member Daybell believed that the design was still too boxy and plain.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that he liked alternative two. He believed there was some reverence to the Pereira Buildings. He believed that the glass wall and the garden were an improvement to the project, and was wondering if the box sizes for the trees were large enough.

Chairman Duncan agreed with Vice Chairman Hoban about the reverence of the proposed "Y" cutout to the Pereira Building. He mentioned that the container sizes for all trees should be a minimum of 36" boxes. He recommended that the trees along Brookhurst be of the same box size so they match. He also mentioned it would be nice to mix the box sizes with large trees in some areas to get a variety, so everything would not be the same.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and alternative two. Motion passed unanimously.

<u>Item No. 2</u> <u>PRJ07-00182 – ZON07-00036</u>

A request for a Minor Development Project at 131 E. Orangethorpe to review exterior architectural changes to the existing Taco Bell restaurant. (Generally located on the north side of Orangethorpe approximately 320 ft east of Harbor at the Fullerton Towne Center) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. She explained that Taco Bell was remodeling their exterior. She commented that the RDRC's concern from the last meeting was that the rear elevation of the building looked like the back side of a building although that side is visible from the shopping center driveway. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the architectural treatments that would be added to the building were now being proposed for that refrigeration unit. The applicant had added a parapet with mosaic cornice band and a wainscot to the portion of the building with the cooler. They had also added a three-foot high wall at the rear to provide screening of the mechanical and storage cabinets if viewed from a car.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the bike rack had been conditioned. Acting Senior Planner Allen confirmed that it was. Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the wall would be brought out to the edge of the refrigeration units so that bikes could be parked there. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that it depended on where the bike rack would be placed, but the wall would need to come out, likely at least four feet, to provide for building egress and access to the mechanical cabinet.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if there would be landscaping beyond the three-foot wall. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant had not proposed any landscape changes at this time. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there could be a low wall with intrusive landscaping behind it to discourage someone from hiding there.

Public hearing opened.

Ron Faris, Taco Bell Corporation, stated that he was ok with staff's recommended conditions. His only concern was the condition on wall pack lights not being permitted. He stated that there was a light fixture that was over the back door for security purposes. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the intent of that condition was that the rest of the exterior lighting not be wall pack, but instead be decorative. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that wall pack lights, in addition to often not being aesthetically compatible, did not control light; they flood areas. He stated that staff would work with the applicant on an appropriate safety light, provided there was no glare.

Committee Member Daybell asked Mr. Faris if the wainscot would be applied around the entire structure, and Mr. Faris replied yes.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

<u>Item No. 3</u> PRJ07-00221 – ZON07-00043

A request for a Minor Development Project to locate an existing single-family dwelling unit over a four-car garage that was relocated from another site. (Generally located at 224/226 N. Yale, 200 feet south of Chapman on the east side of Yale). (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines) (JWO)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. He explained that properties in preservation zones must comply with the City's design guidelines. The intent of the design guidelines was to provide guidance for construction and improvements in a preservation zone, to protect and retain the area's historical context. On or around April 7, 2007 the property owner/applicant relocated a residence from Laguna Beach to the project site. The relocated structure was relocated prior to getting approval from the City; the Building official has required that a demolition permit be obtained and that the property owner post a \$30,000 bond to ensure its removal or demolition if not approved. The applicant has expressed a desire to salvage as much of the existing siding and windows as possible, and to custom mill match siding for the addition. Staff has recommended a condition that as much of the original siding of the Laguna house be preserved, and that if it is to be removed or added to, the applicant would provide a comparable siding that matches the existing home's profile. The existing front house was constructed in the 1920's, and reflects a "Ranch Style" home. The addition presents some elements of craftsman style homes that are consistent with the historic character of the neighborhood.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked why there needed to be two water and electric meters. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it is in a R2-P zone and it does allow for two meters on the property. Two meters are usually preferred by property owners for rental properties. He clarified that the meters need to be replaced. The condition was due to the Engineering Department's Water Division requiring that all new development in this City be brought up to current standards.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked why written approval was needed from Southern California Edison prior to the issuance of any permits associated with the project. Planning Consultant Wolff stated that there was an existing power pole in the alley that may interfere with vehicular access to and from the garage.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Laguna house was a split level design. The proposed new home would be two stories in height, but due to the houses original split-level the proposed project has three different levels. Although there are three levels, as is evident in the elevations, no portion of the structure would contain more than two stories at any given area.

Committee Member Cha asked if there was one, two car garage for both houses. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that it was a two car garage for each unit; a total of four spaces. He also stated that garages are required to be setback a minimum of five feet

from an alley, and there is an existing power pole in the alley that may interfere with vehicle access to and from the garage.

Public hearing opened

Noel Krijger, Property Owner/Applicant stated that he decided to relocate the Laguna House to Fullerton because it was going to be demolished. He mentioned that he has restored, improved and upgraded several of his properties in Fullerton, in trying to make Fullerton a better place.

Don Monteleone, Architect stated that the house moved from Laguna was on a slope and would have been difficult to put on a flat level without changing what the house looked like. Mr. Monteleone stated that they would try to retain most of the siding on the outside and match that with the parts that are being added on.

Committee Member Daybell asked how they were going to retain and match the siding if half of the siding was vertical and the other half was horizontal. He also mentioned that the windows on the plans did not match what the structures windows physically are.

Mr. Krijger replied that the lower half of the siding would be removed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the house had a basement and that portion would be removed. The applicant has stated that as much of the original siding of the Laguna house be preserved; however, staff is recommending a condition that if it is to be removed or added to, the applicant would provide a comparable siding that matches the existing size, scale, mass and profile. Staff believes that the siding of the second unit will be difficult to recreate and maintain because it is miter-joined at the corners.

Chairman Duncan asked if the windows on the new structure were going to match or come close to existing structure. Mr. Krijger replied yes and said it was his intent to keep all the windows consistent.

Committee Member Cha asked if the roof would be consistent on the front and rear units. Mr. Krijger replied yes.

Chairman Duncan asked if the railing on front house was original. Mr. Krijger replied that the front side was the original railing and on the north it was new.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked what was above the French door and Mr. Monteleone replied that it was a two foot eave.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the four feet setback was at the roof line or the wall line. Mr. Monteleone replied that it was at the wall line. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that code allows for the eves of roofs to encroach up to eighteen inches into a setback.

Committee Member Daybell asked what kind of lighting would be over the garage entrances. Mr. Monteleone replied that it would be can lights or small pin lights, in the garage door headers.

J.L. Rhymes, property owner to the south, 220/222 N Yale Avenue, stated that when her back unit was built she had to reflect the exact architect style of the front existing house along with the landscaping and everything else. She stated that she receives numerous

complaints from her tenants that Mr. Krijger does not keep his property maintained. There are weeds growing over four feet tall and there is a lot of trash in the alley. So she was concerned on whether the new structure would be kept up with community standards.

Patty Galente, property owner at 217 N Cornell, wanted to see how the project was going to progress. She stated that from the alley it didn't look too remarkable, when looked at head on. Ms. Galente was also wondering if the windows were going to be double hung divided windows. Ms. Galente stated that in order to reflect the character of the neighborhood better, the windows should not have divided lights, but clear.

Jo Monteleone, Property owner 228/230 N Yale Avenue directly North of Mr. Krijger's property, stated that her concern was with the work getting done according to plan, with quality craftsmanship. Ms. Moneleone stated that when Mr. Krijger remodeled the front property he changed the original structure of the house in order to get more square footage in the house. Mr. Krijger moved the front door to the other side. The original siding was not matched and was a different size and look. As a result what ended up happening were different floor levels in the living room. Ms. Monteleone's concern was that something equally strange or odd would happen with this design and in trying to match things up. Ms. Monteleone stated that she would like to see the City stay on top of this project because once Mr. Krijger gets started and money gets involved time becomes of the essence.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that she agreed with Ms. Monteleone. Ms. Dalton stated that she had been concerned about the maintenance of the front house for the past year. She stated that the project was problematic because it didn't look like the front house. Ms. Dalton stated that she was concerned about the quality of the siding. Ms. Dalton stated she would like to see the proper oversight within the department on the part of the plan checkers and inspectors to make sure that the project ends up what it's supposed to be.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there were comments on changes to the existing house that staff was not aware of. So he did not know if those changes were done with permits. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that what was being reviewed was the rear house at this time. Staff had indicated in the staff report some concerns that certain details of the project shown would be difficult to follow through on, due to cost and craftsmanship.

Committee Member Cha asked since the project was considered new construction how far would it be stripped down to see the frame work. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the interior plaster would be removed to provide for the shear wall sheathing. The building would have to be constructed from within; as it relates to plumbing and electrical. The building official had indicated it had to meet all the code requirements and Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that, that would require significant modifications. Committee Member Cha stated that all the detail work had to be shown on the plans.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he agreed with Committee Member Cha. He stated that the Edison pole in front of the garage needed to be looked at. He also stated that he would like to know what was done to the front house because it's in a preservation

zone and he had not seen any projects presented to the Committee for that. He stated that at the present time he could not support the project.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that there should not be divided lights on the windows. He stated that if the siding could be saved that was great, if not it could just be duplicated. Otherwise, he was fine with the project.

Chairman Duncan stated that it was a nice design, but would like to see the final design plan come back to the RDRC.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE UNCERTAIN, to allow for revisions to the design. Motion passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that she had shared her concern with the Mayor about the fact that there is no architect on the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that June 22nd will be the application deadline for the RDRC applicants. Ms. Dalton shared that in the past there have been two trained architects, one landscape architect and two positions open for anyone in the design field. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the appointments are at the leisure of the mayor, and that the composition of the RDRC is outlined in the municipal code.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that outdoor dining permits have been revoked. The City has stopped issuing them. The ordinance will be rewritten to include conditions and criteria that are appropriate to manage for some of the activities going on. Everyone who has an outdoor permit will be invited back to reapply. The amortization period for those permits will be through December 31, 2007.

The City Council took action to determine necessity for condemnation of the property at 130 W Santa Fe, Donald Duck Juice Factory. The City intends to construct a parking garage at that location with OCTA funds. The City has provided a more than reasonable offer to purchase that portion of the property. The property owner has chosen not to accept that offer, to which has led the city to condemnation.

The Civic Center Master Plan Space Planning Assessment was presented to the City Council. City Council supported some of the Library expansion. It will include relocating The Launer Room which is the historic document map plan room. There will be a small café inside the library and new meeting rooms. Council was less supportive of the Senior Center expansion, and particularly the reconstruction of a Boys and Girls Club facility.

The Morehouse Building caught on fire and was destroyed. From an insurance stand point it is a total loss. From a project standpoint, the project identified preservation of the north wall. The structural components that tie the wall back to the approved new

construction include steel beams and structural posts. The posts are destroyed and would have to be replaced. The question is whether it would go back to council for consideration because a significant part of the project was the preservation of the facade. The other question was whether or not the Olson Company would follow through with the close of escrow. They had an agreement with Cal State Fullerton that if the units were built Cal State Fullerton Housing would buy them. They were in escrow when it burned down.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided a summary on recent City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be June 14, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 6:24 P.M.