

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

June 14, 2007

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:13 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, Acting Associate Planner Kusch and
Clerical Assistant Flores

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Committee Member Hoban and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present to APPROVE the May 24, 2007 minutes AS
WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00221 – ZON07-00043

A request for a Minor Development Project to locate an existing single-family dwelling unit, which was relocated from another site, over a new four car garage. (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)

Planning Consultant Wolff gave a brief overview of the project. She stated that the RDRC reviewed this item at their May 24, 2007 meeting and continued the project to provide the applicant time to revise the plans and provide additional information. The RDRC noted that the plans were lacking the detail needed to fully evaluate the proposal, and asked the applicant to address some issues pertaining to the second unit. Some of the issues included preservation of the wood siding and the elimination of divided light windows. The applicant had revised the plans and brought them for consideration, staff recommended approval subject to 18 conditions of approval.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant agreed with the recommended conditions. Acting Chief Planner Eastman had not spoken with the applicant.

Public hearing opened.

Noel Krijger, Property Owner/Applicant stated that he had not reviewed the conditions, but his architect had, and the changes necessary would be made to satisfy the RDRC. Mr. Krijger explained that in the past the RDRC approved a similar garage format for this property, with the Edison power pole in the alley.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that on the back of the report was a statement provided by the applicants architect with the intent to look at the siding as “parts” and would try to preserve those “parts” as much as possible. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that one approach the RDRC may consider was to consider the project with all the replaced siding. He explained that to some degree the siding would have to be removed, perhaps in its entirety.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the siding was 1x6 and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the existing wood siding on the upper level of the second unit has alternating 1x4 and 1x6 horizontal.

Chairman Duncan asked if it was the applicant’s intent to use the 1x10 horizontal wood siding on the garage to match the front house. Mr. Krijger stated that it was his intent to give the appearance that it was consistent even though the siding would not match exactly.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that the framing of two individual windows in a single frame was uncharacteristic of historic housing, and the windows needed to be individually framed. Ms. Dalton stated that she did not have a problem with the window design if a support element were placed between adjacent windows, but staff needed to make sure that what was called for would be implemented.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked what had been conventional when it came to corresponding structures. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the issue was compatibility with the neighborhood and adjacent properties. He stated that buildings could have different sidings, but still have other elements that create consistency. In the past the RDRC has approved projects that did not match the front house, but were compatible with the neighborhood. In other cases the RDRC looked for consistency of buildings on-site. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that from staff’s perspective, having three different types of siding or having three different design approaches on two different buildings becomes extremely busy.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that he liked the project but was concerned with the reuse of siding on the second story. He believed that the siding on the bottom section (garage) should match the top even if that meant milling the custom lumber to match the siding. He did not like the idea of having three different sidings on two homes on the same lot.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the siding on the moved in house and new garage should be compatible with the original siding on the existing front house.

Committee Member Cha was agreeable with Committee Member Daybell.

Chairman Duncan stated that he would like to see the proposed 1x10 siding changed to match the siding on the front house. Or would like to see the recreation of the existing siding on the entire second unit, with the lower and upper levels the same.

Committee Member Daybell agreed with Ms. Dalton's recommendation that the windows should remain separately framed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that historically speaking adjacent single hung or double hung windows usually had a post between the windows supporting them; and Staff tries to avoid small spaces between windows with siding down the middle.

Public hearing re-opened

Ms. Dalton stated that she would like to see two windows with support in the center that would separate the two windows.

Mr. Krijger stated that he did not have a problem with that. He also stated that if the siding could not be saved on the moved in property he would mill the wood to make it consistent with the front house.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he did not like the three different sizes of siding on the upper level, lower level and front house, and preferred two patterns.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked Mr. Krijger what he would do if the top siding could not be used. Mr. Krijger stated that at that point he would go with the two patterns. The siding would match the front house on the bottom and scale down to a smaller siding on the top.

Jeanette Rhymes, Property Owner at 220/222 N Yale Ave stated that she did not like the variation of different materials used at different levels. Ms. Rhymes was concerned with the completion of the project due to the amount of work involved, and the maintenance of the front house.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it was not typical to have two overlapping types of sidings in Fullerton's historical preservation zones, but it is a frequent historical practice. He clarified that staff could not make assumptions as to the future maintenance of the property.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to windows having framing between them, all siding match the front house and the bond be held until the project is completed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the bond was a demolition bond and the building official would only hold the bond until the building permits were pulled. At the written request of the applicant the demolition bond could be continued for another thirty days. At which time plans would be submitted and would go through plan check corrections. The applicant would have six months to move forward with the construction of the building and would have to show due diligence during that six month period. If at any time the applicant stopped work on the project he would have six months to start work again to complete the project. If Mr. Krijger does not complete the project it would become a code enforcement circumstance and would be pursued in an appropriate fashion.

Chairman Duncan and Vice Chairman Hoban were not agreeable with the motion and the motion failed 2-2.

Substitute MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and the alternating 1x4 and 1x6 siding on the top of the second unit be carried to the bottom.

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan to AMEND his MOTION, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and conditions that adjacent windows have support posts between them. The siding on the lower portion of the second unit match the alternating siding on the upper level, or that the siding on the entire second unit(both lower and upper levels) match the siding on the front house. The intent of this added condition is to allow the property owner two options for choice of siding; provided that there is only one type of siding on the second unit, both upper and lower levels shall have the same siding. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00134 – ZON07-00022 / ZON07-00048

A request for a Minor Development Project to demolish an existing garage and construct a new 840 sq. ft. garage, with a 920 sq. ft. dwelling unit above, on the property located at 119 W Brookdale Place. The proposal also includes a request to construct an entry deck and stairway within the side yard setback on the west side of the proposed structure. (Generally located on the north side of Brookdale Place approximately 230 feet west of Harbor Blvd in a preservation zone) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (JEA)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that it was a Minor Development Project and Minor Site Plan Request for a new second unit on a lot. The proposal was to construct a 920 square feet dwelling above a four car garage. The Minor Site Plan Request approval was for the side yard set back. The proposed project was previously reviewed by the RDRC on May 10, 2007. At the May 10 meeting the property owner did not agree with the relocation of the entry deck and stairs. However, the ability of the RDRC to approve the project with the entry deck and stairs within the side yard setback required the applicant to file a Minor Site Plan application. The RDRC did not consider the encroachment at the May 10 meeting because the encroachment request was not noticed and posted in the neighborhood. The applicant has filed a Minor Site Plan application requesting an encroachment of the deck and stairs into the side yard setback. Also, the May 10 RDRC report stated that, should a Minor Site Plan application be pursued, the Municipal Code would require the deck be modified to include screen walls to prevent views onto the adjacent properties. Staff clarified that the Code required screening, but the screening might not be consistent with the Design Guidelines. Regardless, Staff felt the building design, with the entrance at the side, was not consistent with the design guidelines. However, Design Guidelines are not development standards, and may be interpreted on a case-by-case, or waived, if the RDRC determines that the project reflects the neighborhood character, is consistent with the historic development pattern for the area, fosters quality neighborhood improvements, and/or is an undue hardship. Either way Staff was recommending denial based on the guideline criteria and the code.

Committee Member Cha stated that he believed the Municipal Code required a cumulative total side yard setback to be no less than ten feet. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Fire Department requests a four foot clear path of travel from the yard to the alley. So the four feet could be provided on the east property line and all that would be required would be a gate. In that case four feet would be provided on one side and six on the other side.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant had seen the new staff report. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that the applicant had seen the staff report and was not in agreement with the recommendation of denial.

Public hearing opened.

Margarett Jewitt, Property Owner/Applicant briefly clarified that the plans were submitted a month before the May 10th meeting and during that month period she spoke with staff and was provided with several recommendations for changes that were made prior to RDRC meeting. One of those changes included the change of the location of the stairs on the side of building. Ms. Jewitt stated that she understood the code and the need for the noticing. She explained the project maximized the available open space and to expand the project any further on the outside would be a violation of statute. Ms. Jewitt stated that consistency with the neighborhood was important and she had provided photographs of other properties with side entrances. Ms. Jewitt stated that she had another proposal that her architect said might work. She proposed that the stairs be brought into the garage. Ms. Jewitt explained that it would cut back three and a half feet of the living room space, but the outside structure would remain the same. Ms. Jewitt was requesting that if the committee were not in agreement with what she previously proposed that they accept her amended proposal.

Chairman Duncan asked Acting Chief Planner Eastman if Ms. Jewitt's plan modification was an item for the RDRC to discuss or leave as a condition. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the committee could discuss the project to see if it could be redesigned to meet the RDRC's criteria. He explained that staff has no modified plans to determine code conformance, and that the project as currently designed barely met open space. If the applicant wanted to redesign the project staff would have to see plans to do the calculations and ensure it met code. Also, a number of issues would need to be looked at including adequate parking dimensions.

Ms. Jewitt explained that she would have four parking spaces and was only required to have three, and that should not pose a problem with one parking space over.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman briefly clarified that the applicant was required to have four parking spaces and only two garages, but at least two open spaces.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the alternative involved moving the stairs inside the garage. Ms. Jewitt stated yes. Committee Member Daybell believed that there would have to be a separate entrance into the living space that was not through the garage.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he had not communicated with the applicant or architect regarding an interior change, and was making the assumption based on what had been provided at the moment. The architect was indicating that the stairs would be placed inside the building and the size of the second floor would be reduced because the

stairs would be in the living room area. The second story entrance would be eliminated and placed at the grade. Additionally, there would be some landing requirements of four feet on the top and the bottom. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he was not sure if the proposal could be accommodated, and what effects it would have on the garage clearance.

Julia Winer, Property Owner at 113 W Brookdale stated that she was not opposed to Ms. Jewitt improving her property, but was concerned with the encroachment on her property. Ms. Winer was requesting that the RDRC require Ms. Jewitt to comply with all the open space requirements.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage believed that the RDRC should not grant the stair encroachment. Ms. Dalton stated that it was important to honor setbacks in an R-2 Zone because density would be added to a neighborhood that had not had density in the past. She stated that the design guidelines were developed to go with the preservation zones to eliminate encroachments and difficulties in terms of adding density.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Duncan stated that he would like to look at modifications of the applicant's proposal to move the staircase into the building.

Committee Member Daybell suggested to continue the project and keep in mind that he would deny the project if the stairs encroached into the setback. He stated his belief that the RDRC had to follow the guidelines in the historic preservation zone.

Committee Member Cha agreed that the project needed to be continued.

Vice Chairman Hoban also agreed to continue the project. He stated that the proposed project had not been modified since the last RDRC meeting on May 10. He explained that the committee was typically concerned about encroaching into setbacks. Overall, what he saw from the project was building to the maximum capacity and expressed concerns with reducing code requirements simply to accommodate the applicant's design. He suggested that the applicant come back with modified plans.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of July 26, 2007 to allow for revisions to the design. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 3

PRJ07-00227 – ZON07-00047

A request for a Minor Development Project to review the proposed exterior changes to an existing Kentucky Fried Chicken Restaurant. (Generally located at 150 W. Orangethorpe in the Fullerton Metro Center located at the southwest corner of Orangethorpe and Harbor.) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. She stated that the applicant was proposing to remodel the exterior of the current Kentucky Fried Chicken building. The applicant is proposing to remove all the features extending from the building facade. Metal Louvers will be provided over the windows to provide shade. The proposal also includes new signage including mural panels and decorative wall lighting. The

building would be repainted with a mixture of red, burgundy, and beige. A bike rack will also be added.

Committee Member Cha asked if the trash area had a gate. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the trash area was existing, and the only proposal was to repaint the enclosure.

Vice Chairman Duncan asked if the louvers were going all the way around the building based on the recommended condition. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that a separate section of louvers was recommended on the south elevation and provided a revised elevation prepared for the meeting by the applicant.

Ron Faris, with Yum Brands, stated that he was in support of staffs recommendations.

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

Item No. 4

PRJ07-00116 – ZON07-00018

A request for a Minor Development Project to construct a 780 square foot addition to a residence. Located at 125 Malvern Avenue in a residential preservation zone. (Generally located on the north side of Malvern Avenue between approximately 310 and 360 feet west of Harbor Boulevard.) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15332) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch, presented a staff report for a request to do an addition to an existing single family residence. He stated that the addition was visible from the street and exceeded 500 square feet. The addition would be along the east side of the residence as well as an addition to the rear. The addition measures approximately 700 square feet, and includes a sitting room, conversion of a den into a master bedroom, and expansions to the kitchen, dining room and living room. The proposal would demolish an existing sitting room adjacent to the front entrance, replacing it with an expansion to the front porch. Additionally, the applicant was proposing to relocate the front door. Staff believed the project was in conformance with development standards and as conditioned would be in compliance with the City's Preservation Guidelines. The existing stairway leading to the front porch would also need to be relocated. The roof would need to be heightened to accommodate the addition. The roof would be similar to the existing gable roof design of adjacent properties.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff was concerned with the design of the front door side-lites which were not consistent with the historic neighborhood. He stated that staff would like the details of the door to come back to the RDRC for approval with photographs or a manufacturer's brochure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that in the past, "Home Depot" doors have been put in with side-lites and gold trim that were not compatible with the preservation zone. Typically in a historic area side-lites are much more substantial, less ornate and have mullions. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff did not have guidelines as to what the committee would find appropriate. He also explained that if the Project were approved, it would come back to the RDRC as a non-noticed agenda item to determine consistency.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff did not have a problem with the relocation of the porch steps. Staff had recommended that the relocated steps be constructed to match the existing design, and that the siding that terminates at the existing steps be repaired and replaced when the steps are removed.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the frontage of the house was going to be enlarged and if the porch would be staying the same size. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the porch would also increase in size because the applicant was relocating the porch enclosure.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that windows on the addition should be casement, single or double hung in type, not sliders. To ensure consistency with existing windows, new windows shall not have mullions or divided lites. Three casement windows should be used on the street-visible addition to replicate the existing appearance.

Public hearing opened.

Lucas Williamson, Applicant stated that he was very familiar with California Bungalow designs and the project would turn out to be a great Bungalow.

Mark Antimie, Contractor stated that he had a concern with the casement windows in the front of the house not being consistent with the rest of the house. Mr. Antimie stated that the applicant would like to have single hung windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the porch enclosure windows on the east needed to have three casement windows to match the existing appearance. Mr. Antimie stated that what they proposed were two separate windows that would be single hung and would open up from the bottom. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that staff was looking for consistency in replicating the appearance of having three windows, as opposed to two.

Mr. Williamson stated that he believed he should not have to keep the casement windows that were added to the house by the previous owner. Mr. Williamson stated that his intention was to have all the windows be consistent with the original windows.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that double or single hung windows were appropriate window types. Staffs recommendation was to maintain three windows for the enclosure. He believed that casement windows tend to allow for clear glazing versus hung windows which have the divided frames, where the windows slide up or down.

Chairman Hoban asked if the three windows being mentioned were the existing windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman confirmed that the three windows that were shown on the patio enclosure were the existing windows referenced in the staff report. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that a frequent development pattern on bungalow homes were front porch enclosures. He stated that staff had no issue with an enclosed patio since it already exists.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked that the applicant wanted to meet the preservation guidelines. He believed that replicating the original house windows in the porch addition was what he was supporting.

Committee Member Cha had no comment.

Vice Chairman Hoban was not opposed to the project. He stated that the applicant had the right intension with the windows.

Chairman Duncan stated that he would like to see consistency with the existing window design.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations, including the three front windows, which may be consistent with the side windows style. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 5

PRJ07-00106 – ZON07-00016

A Request for a Major Site Plan to construct 136 attached residential units. (Generally located on the south side of Hughes Drive between Bastanchury Greenbelt/Park and Nicolas Street) (SPD Zone) (Previously certified EIR per CEQA Guidelines 15183) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the project was the last undeveloped parcel of Amerige Heights. In the original Amerige Heights Specific Plan the site was considered a mixed use property, with an overlay of eldercare units and was not designated a residential neighborhood. The applicant is proposing an amendment to the Specific Plan to replace the eldercare beds with 136 attached residential townhome-style units. The applicant has proposed three styles; Park View Townhomes, Loft Townhomes, and Green Court Townhomes. All three were simple architectural styles using stucco and wood siding material, but each style has its own unique elements. Staff felt the project was consistent with the development standards of this Specific Plan. For each of the three townhome styles, the applicant proposed different roof lines and roof materials. Acting Senior Planner Allen addressed two conditions that would change several architectural details. Using concrete or clay tile, or slate rather than composite shingles, and using vertical rather than horizontal windows.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the contemporary design was appropriate in the context of the neighborhood, as nothing was across the street (Hughes Drive) and the development was on the edge of Amerige heights, adjacent to an industrial site to the south (Hydroflow).

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant had seen the recommended conditions, and if they were in agreement with them. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant wanted to discuss the roofing material and window condition, numbers five and seven.

Public hearing opened.

Jirair Gapabedian, Project Architect stated that they were proposing three different types of townhomes. Green Court units have two, three, and four bedroom options in five floor plans. Park View units have three and four bedroom options in three floor plans. Loft units have two and three bedrooms in three floor plans. The Loft units have flat roofs. The Green Court units would have a mixture of flat, pitched, and curved roofs. Park View

units will have varied building heights and composite shingles and pitched roofs to emphasize the first two floors versus the roof. Mr. Gapabedian believed that using a different type of roof material, like concrete, clay tile or slate, would bring the attention back to the roof. The composite shingles were proposed so that the roof would disappear. He stated that most of the windows complied with a vertical dimension equal to or greater than the horizontal dimension. However, he felt that those were not an integrated part of the architecture style.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Duncan stated that the project looked great and the roofing material was not a concern for him. He was okay with the composite shingles.

Committee Member Daybell had no comment.

Vice Chairman Hoban supported the use of the composition shingles to reduce the massing and the windows did not bother him.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban to recommend APPROVAL of the project, subject to staff's recommendations, minus conditions five and seven. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 6

PRJ07-00262 – ZON07-00055

Review of a Miscellaneous Development Project to demolish an existing detached garage measuring approximately 200 sq. ft. located at 338 Jacaranda Place in a residential preservation zone. (Generally located on the south side of Jacaranda Place between approximately 100 and 150 feet east of Ford Avenue.) (R-1P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project. He explained that the applicant was proposing a demolition of a detached garage and construction of a new two car garage. The proposed garage would be located at the rear corner of the property, directly adjacent to the west property line and rear flood control channel. The submitted plans indicate stucco siding for the new garage, which would not be consistent with the design guidelines. Staff recommended that the siding match the existing wood siding of the existing residence. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that Katie Dalton of Fullerton Heritage had contacted him and expressed concern that all sides of the garage should contain wood siding to match the residence.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Building Code requires one hour construction within three feet of the property line. One way to achieve that was through stucco in the building. Staff does not support stucco on Craftsman style bungalows, although this is only on one side of a garage.

Public hearing opened.

Jennifer Lilley, Property Owner/Applicant stated that she planned to come back with an addition to her home in the near future. Ms. Lilley explained that the existing garage sits mid way on the property and interferes with her room addition. The Building Department

has allowed the proposed garage to be located adjacent to the property line. The submitted plans indicate stucco siding for the new garage because she was under the impression that was the requirement. However, since the only elevation that must be stucco to meet the one hour construction was the west elevation; the rest would be wood siding. Ms. Lilley also wanted clarity on why the new windows could not have mullions or divided lites.

Committee Member Daybell clarified that the RDRC liked to see original style windows maintained.

Chairman Duncan asked Ms. Lilley if the windows in the front of the house were the original windows and Ms. Lilley stated yes.

Public hearing closed.

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

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

None

MEETINGS

Acting Chief Planner Eastman noted the Planning Commission had two items on their agenda. One item was to review the capital improvement program and determine its consistency with the General Plan. The other item was a condo subdivision of the Jacaranda Senior Apartments Project, which was previously approved. Acting Chief Planner Eastman discussed the history of the project.

City Council reviewed and approved a moratorium for bars and restaurants in downtown. The moratorium addressed developmental projects on private property that included outdoor dining.

City Council also reviewed an amendment to the development disposition agreement with the developer of Amerige Courts. The project originally went to City Council with nine stories and Council requested that the developer certify the EIR. Council had a study session with the alternatives to the project. Acting Chief Planner Eastman discussed the project status and an amended DDA.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be June 28, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 P.M.