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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

**FULLERTON CITY HALL** 

November 8, 2007 Thursday 4:00 PM

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. by Chairman Duncan.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Duncan, Vice Chairman **ROLL CALL**:

Hoban, Committee Members Daybell, PRESENT:

and Lvnch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Cha

ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting

Associate Planner Kusch, Planning Consultant Wolff. Actina Senior Planner Allen and Clerical Assistant

**Flores** 

MINUTES: The October 11, 2007 and October 25, 2007 minutes were not

available.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

## Item No. 1

PRJ03-00887 - ZON03-00080 / ZON03-00081 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: FIRST EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH OF FULLERTON Applicant is requesting modifications to a portion of the landscape plan, specifically to that area in the vicinity of the westerly property line, from a point north of the new parking structure to Rolling Hills Drive. Additional planting materials are proposed along both sides of the driveway that is currently under construction, to increase screening of the future proposed multi-purpose building and of existing classroom buildings A and B. The project was approved by the City Council on July 18, 2006, and RDRC approved the landscape plans on October 26, 2006. The property is located at 2801 N. Brea Blvd. (Located at the northwest corner of Brea Blvd. and Bastanchury Rd) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (R-G Zone) (JWO)

Consultant Planner Wolff gave a brief overview of the project. She stated that the applicant proposed modifications to the landscape plan north of the parking structure. Consultant Planner Wolff explained that a driveway was required along the westerly property line of the church and the landscaping would be installed in conjunction with the driveway. The applicant was proposing to augment the landscaping that was previously proposed using the same podocarpus trees, Texas privets and natal plum shrubs on the residential side of the wall. The applicant also proposed to create a solid row of trees beyond the multi-purpose building by filling in gaps where the existing landscaping was not full, creating a better screen.

Chairman Duncan asked if the additional landscaping was a result of discussions with the residents. Consultant Planner Wolff clarified that most of the comments received from the public had to do with the parking structure.

Public hearing opened.

Jim Clark, EV Church, stated that meetings were held with each individual home owner north of the parking structure regarding the landscaping process and seeking their input. As a result of public input modifications to the landscape plan are proposed. Mr. Clark explained that the neighbors had the opportunity to view the types of trees and helped determine that the podocarpus tree was what they wanted along the wall.

Larry Carlson, Landscape Architect, stated that the landscape layout had two parts. Carlson explained that there was an opportunity to work with the landscaping along the road behind the multi-purpose room by putting in the same spacing and variety of trees that were behind the parking structure for screening the building. Mr. Carlson explained that several mature eucalyptus trees that screened the residential homes from the Church buildings and the play area were removed when the road went in. He stated that they were trying to make up for the loss of the trees by adding a 10 foot planter area strip so that trees can be planted along the sides of the buildings and at the play area for screening purposes. Mr. Carlson explained that they would continue with the podocarpus trees (fern pines) on the west side of the road as part two of the landscape layout. On lot 79 behind the project site, Arizona Cypress trees are massed along the property line. New podocarpus gracilor trees are proposed at about 20 feet spacing on the Church property to fill the gaps between the evergreen trees and provide additional screening. Tristania trees will be fanned out against the side of the building on the east side of the new driveway. Mr. Carlson stated that several residents were concerned with keeping people away from the wall, so they were adding 3 feet high natal plum shrubs and Texas privets to keep a buffer between the wall and the driveway.

Gary Zavadil, Resident, stated that he lived directly behind the parking structure. Mr. Zavadil stated that he attended the church meetings and agreed on podocarpus trees. He stated that Boston ivy was planted, and after many complaints from residents the church took out the Boston ivy. Mr. Zavadil was concerned about the bamboo that was put in.

Chairman Duncan asked Larry Carlson to address the Boston ivy and bamboo concerns. Mr. Carlson stated that the bamboo was an alternative to several trees that were thought of originally in order to breakup the long line of podocarpus trees.

Jim Clark stated that as soon as the ivy was planted the residents were concerned that the church would not be able to maintain the ivy that could possibly break the composition of the wall, so the church removed the ivy.

Mr. Zavadil stated that his landscaper believed bamboo to be an aggressive plant that could grow underneath and disturb the foundation of the wall. Mr. Zavadil stated that the single family residential home developer put the wall up and was wondering if the wall belonged to the church and/or the property owners.

Tina Lapierre, Resident, asked why the bamboo was not going to be carried out on the rest of the landscaped area. Mr. Carlson explained that the reason for the bamboo on that side was because the trees could be seen all at once from any angle. He stated that to add interest, the line of podocarpus is broken up by the bamboo. He stated that it was the only area where an entire line of trees can be viewed from off site whereas to the north there are no such wide views.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Duncan stated that he appreciated the efforts by the Church to include the residents in the landscape plan. He believed that the extra trees added on the back side of the building would add a nice layer to soften the view across the property line.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he did not see the word bamboo mentioned on the original landscape plans reviewed by the Committee. Consultant Planner Wolff stated that the comment from the Committee was that Tristania trees (as originally proposed) were not appropriate to break up the row of podocarpus trees. Committee Member Daybell asked if the bamboo was arranged by the applicant and approved by staff. Consultant Planner Wolff responded yes. Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked the additional landscaping and was in support of the project.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that he was in support of the project. He believed that the Church was doing a good job at communicating with the residents in the area. Vice Chairman Hoban stated that the applicant has gone above and beyond his expectation with the number of plantings and their size.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he was not on the Committee at the time the item was heard the first time, but he was in favor of the project.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

## **NEW BUSINESS**:

## Item No. 2

PRJ07-00097 – ZON07-00013 APPLICANT: DAVE DUCHENE AND PROPERTY OWNER: TEXORA CORP A request to establish an existing modular office as a permanent structure at an automobile dealership located in a Community Improvement District at 1860 W. Commonwealth. (Located at the southeast corner of Commonwealth Ave and Lloyd Ave). (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (C-H Zone) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project and stated that the property has been used for automobile sales since 1970. In 2005, a permit was issued for the temporary placement of a modular office on the property. The applicant was now seeking permanent location of the office building. The property is in a Community Improvement District. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that in September 2005, the Municipal Code was revised to establish specific development standards and operational conditions for automobile sales facilities. The subject property is in a C-H zone and complies with the standards with three exceptions: First, there is a need for 6 parking spaces based on the square footage and the display area of the sales area. Second, there is a need for a landscape setback along both street frontages. He stated that code requires a 10 foot setback; however a 5 foot setback can be considered based on site constraints. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that there was an existing setback along Commonwealth Avenue that was void of landscaping. Staff recommended that the applicant submit a landscape and irrigation plan to provide for the landscape setback along the streets. There is a requirement that at least 25 sq feet of landscaping per parking space be provided in the employee/customer parking lot. Staff recommended that a landscape planter be provided adjacent to the modular office building. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that the site plan that was provided indicated a landscape planter; however staff believes that the landscape planter does not meet the square footage required. Staff recommended a landscape planter that measures 175 sq feet and 4 feet in width. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the appearance of the area could be improved by including a required stripped fire access lane, to delineate the display area and to slurry patch and stripe per the approved plan. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the Engineering Department was requiring public right-of-way improvements which included the removal of an unused driveway on Commonwealth Avenue, and the planting of street trees along the Commonwealth frontage.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there was a concrete foundation underneath the building. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that he was not sure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the Building Code has requirements for seismic issues; and these requirements apply to both permanent and temporary structures. He explained that the applicant has provided for some kind of foundation for the temporary office to meet the structural requirement. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Building Code was for public safety.

Committee Member Lynch asked if permanent occupancy was the only option, or if the modular office could remain a temporary structure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City Zoning Code does not allow for temporary structures except under certain circumstances like construction trailers, or temporary lots for Christmas Tree sales. He stated that the applicant would need to go through the process for the permanent structure, get approval, meet the code requirements and provide for landscaping.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the design of the structure was for RDRC review. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Committee should view the structure as if it were a new building.

Chairman Duncan asked if the required on-site planter needed to be next to the modular building or if the landscaping could be all in one spot. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the parking lot landscaping could be dispersed around a parking area based on the required square footage, and does not all have to be at the same location.

Chairman Duncan asked if the applicant would have to put landscaping along the foundation of the building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Zoning Code requires landscaping in the parking lot and front setbacks only; but staff usually tries to soften the transition of a paved area to a building with landscaping.

Public hearing opened.

Dave Duchene, Applicant, stated that he had a master lease on the property and was trying to make improvements to the front portion of the property. He stated that he wanted to make the modular office building permanent. Mr. Duchene was concerned with the recommended condition requiring the setback along Lloyd Avenue. He stated that consideration was given on the setback for the back property along the same street and was requesting consideration for the front portion of the property along Lloyd Avenue. Mr. Duchene was also concerned with the 50% maintenance cash deposit and stated that he did not know what that was for.

Myrna Duchene, Applicant, stated that condition 2 of the staff report mentioned that 7 parking spaces were needed, and based on her calculations she believed that only 6 spaces were required. Mrs. Duchene stated that she was told several times that she did not need a licensed landscape architect to prepare the landscape plans as long as all the requirements were met. Mrs. Duchene informed the Committee that they were proposing small bushes or ground coverings instead of street trees along the Commonwealth Avenue frontage because they did not want to block the auto displays. She stated that the modular building had earthquake straps and was secured down.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that there are 6 required parking spaces based on the square footage and stated there was an error in the report. He stated that the landscape maintenance deposit of 50% is a code requirement to make sure that the landscape is maintained and healthy for a period of one year, and is refundable after one year. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that Code requires a 10 foot landscaping setback; however staff believed that 5 feet of landscaping would be appropriate, based on the existing site constraints. Acting Associate Planner Kusch clarified that the Planning Commission reviewed a CUP for the back portion of the property. Because that property is not readily visible from the street, and there are existing site constraints, staff did not recommend that the street frontage be landscaped. He stated that it was important for this request that both street frontages be landscaped because they are readily visible from the public right-of-way, and the property was located in a Community Improvement District.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Zoning Code identifies that for a commercial property, a licensed architect is required to prepare final plans for submittal. A licensed landscape architect is not necessary to prepare and submit landscape concepts to the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the trees in the public right-of-way was an issue to be responded to by the City landscape superintendent and the Engineering Department.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the Maintenance Department had identified in the City's Master Street Tree Plan a combination of magnolia and palm trees planted at 40 foot intervals. In this case there would be a need for about 3 trees. Chairman Duncan asked if 40 feet was required between the same species of trees. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the tree species alternate and the spacing are between tree planters (not tree species).

Mr. Duchene stated that he wanted a clear view display and the trees could become a big issue for him as they grow. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the trees required are on the public right-of-way, not on-site, and stated that condition 12 was a standard condition recommended by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Duchene was concerned with the 50% maintenance cash deposit because he believed the planters would have simple shrubbery. He stated that he had a gardener that kept the area clean. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the deposit was a code requirement based on the cost of installation of the material and the irrigation. He explained that the one year cash bond was to make sure that the landscaping was established and could be refunded in its entirety to the applicant after one year.

Chairman Duncan asked if the planter proposed in front of the building would be a raised planter. Mrs. Duchene stated that they could do a curbing or a raised planter. Mr. Duchene stated that it was originally set up to be raised to cover as much of the building skirt as possible to make it look more like a permanent building.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch believed that by approving the "trailer" on the site the Committee would be setting a precedent in town that trailers are okay and stated that they were not okay with him. He believed that allowing the trailer to take permanent residency was doing the opposite of what is to be done in a CID and was opposed to the idea.

Vice Chairman Hoban agreed with Committee Member Lynch and stated that he did not consider the project as new construction. He believed that the project was not appropriate for the RDRC to review and stated that the area along the Lloyd frontage was very visible and needed as much landscaping as possible.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the criteria for reviewing applications from the code perspective and the RDRC review. He clarified that the Committee should not deny the project simply because it is a modular building; but rather identify specific findings with the proposed design.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that he has dealt with many modular buildings in his industry, and explained what architectural elements were needed to make the modular building pleasing to look at.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he could not support the project. He believed that the project should have been presented to the City as a permanent building before it went up, and stated that there was no architecture to the unit.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to DENY the project, with Chairman Duncan abstaining.

Chairman Duncan stated that the structure should be enhanced.

Mr. Duchene stated that he had a 20 year lease on the property and believed that the project was within Code. Mr. Duchene stated that he had a lot of money invested in the property and wanted to make improvements but could not spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on the property because he did not own it.

Mrs. Duchene stated that they could add awnings over the windows. Chairman Duncan stated that the applicant needed to dress the building up. Mrs. Duchene stated that they have tried to make the modular structure permanent from day one, but the permit was issued as a temporary structure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified how the building came onto the property as a temporary structure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the applicant could pay the fee and appeal the denial decision to the Planning Commission. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Committee could reconsider the item and bring it back for consideration. He stated that the motion was to deny the project, and not a motion to deny without prejudice. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the applicant would have to wait six months to reapply. He explained that if the motion was intended without prejudice that would allow the applicant to reapply immediately. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the project could have been continued to allow the applicant to come back with revisions.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if a revised project was not allowed to come back as a project or if the project that was reviewed was not allowed to come for six months. Acting Chief

Planner Eastman stated that the project that was reviewed by the Committee could not come back for six months unless it's substantially different. A revised project would need to make substantial changes to allow an immediate re-submittal.

Chairman Duncan stated that he was willing to hear a different motion and continue the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the motion would need to be reconsidered to allow for discussion. Chairman Duncan stated that he would like to reconsider the motion. He stated that he would like to see additional landscaping in the entire area. He believed that the trees would not screen the view of the cars. Chairman Duncan stated that palm trees do not take up much space or view. He believed that the street tree program was important for the area as well as the on-site landscape.

MOTION by Chairman Duncan, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban to RECONSIDER the project.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the project would be considered a new project or the same project if significant changes were made to the existing structure that gave architectural elements to address some of the Committee concerns. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff would be looking at the design of the building. He clarified that an application process would be required either way, even if the project looked totally different. The issue was whether it was substantially different to circumvent the 6 month reapplication period.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant would have to wait the six months if the Committee denied the project without prejudice. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the applicant would not have to wait the six months, but he would still have to file an application. He stated that, if it is the Committees desire to see revisions, a continuation may make more sense.

Chairman Duncan stated that there are many modular buildings in schools that are dressed up architecturally and look very nice. Committee Member Daybell stated that St. Jude did a nice job with the modular building in Richman Park before it was put on the site. Chairman Duncan stated that the landscape and entrance canopy was a part of making the St. Jude modular building look nice.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to DENY the project WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Motion passed unanimously.

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

#### Item No. 3

PRJ07-00470 — ZON07-00109 APPLICANT: NADEL ARCHITECTS AND PROPERTY OWNERS: FREDRICKSON ENTERPRISES, INC AND TOPAZ-FULLERTON, LLC A request for a Minor Development Project to review the architecture of proposed 800 sq. ft. fast food building and minor modifications to previously approved site plan PRJ06-00452/ZON06-00073 to accommodate a double drive-thru and outdoor seating area located at 1201 S. Euclid St. (Located at the northwest corner of S. Euclid and W. Orangethorpe) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15332) (C-2 Zone) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project and stated that this was the fifth and final building proposed for the shopping center. She stated that Checkers also known as Rally's had a walk-up window and the proposed seating would be located at a separate pad. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that staff was proposing that the bike rack at the walk-up ordering area be moved for additional walk-up space. Staff also recommended that a low solid wall or railing be placed on the walk-up area to ensure separation from vehicles. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that there were several parking spaces along the walk-up eating area and to the south of the building. Staff believed people would park in the spots to the south and suggested continuing the sidewalk through, so that there is a path for customers other than through the landscaping. Staff was concerned with the trash enclosure, grease interceptor and CO2 storage which were next to the eating area. Staff recommended that the trash enclosure be enhanced and screened with landscaping to separate the two. The colors and proposed matched those of the center with the exception of the windows which were identified as a black aluminum finish. Staff proposed a clear aluminum finish for consistency with the rest of the center. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that staff was concerned with the lack of detail on the west elevation and recommended that a greenscreen be added, as done on the east.

Committee member Daybell stated that there was no need for condition number 12 (final colors and material back to RDRC), since the applicant had brought to the meeting most of the details addressed by staff.

Public hearing opened.

Matt Stowe, stated that they were back for the final piece of the project. Mr. Stowe stated that Rally's/Checkers was like a 50's diner. He stated that they had incorporated a style that is unique for the double drive thru concept and was the final piece of the pads. He believed that the restaurant fit in well with the shopping center. Mr. Stowe presented elevations, including designs for the trash enclosure, which addressed the conditions of approval.

Chris Buckstien, stated that he was excited that they could keep some of the design elements from Checkers, which fit in nicely with the rest of the center.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that staff would modify condition 10 to eliminate the requirement for the clearstory windows. In its place staff recommends the "autumn blush" pop out condition be applied also to the west side to add architectural details.

Mr. Buckstien stated that there was concern at the Checkers Corporate Office regarding a solid wall at the walk-up area because the wall could potentially be a safety hazard. So they proposed a decorative railing to match the rest of the center and still provide visibility and solve the corporate concern.

Committee Member Lynch referenced the material board and asked if the stucco sample represented the finished stucco or if a sanded finish would be used. Mr. Buckstien stated that the stucco would be a sand finish; the sample was only to show the proposed color.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked and supported the project. He asked if the issue on the windows finish was critical. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated a clear aluminum finish was recommended because other corporate tenants have a store front window system that they would like to use and haven't on this project for consistency with the site.

Committee Member Lynch, Vice Chairman Hoban, and Chairman Duncan supported the project as well.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project, modify condition 12 to not come back to the RDRC, but to the Director of Community Development, a modification to condition 9 that the autumn blush be popped out on both the west and the east elevations, and a modification to condition 10 to require the greenscreen on the west elevation eliminating the requirement for windows, and subject to staff's other recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

## Item No. 4

PRJ07-00464 – ZON07-00108 APPLICANT: TOM TICE AND PROPERTY OWNER: FULLERTON HISTORIC THEATER FOUNDATION A request for a Minor Development Project to review "phase 1" upgrades to the Fox Historic Theater; specifically (1) exterior repair/remodel and upgrades to utilities, doors, windows, HVAC, roof in Firestone Plaza and Tea Room; and (2) seismic safety upgrades in the Firestone Plaza, Tea Room, and Theater. Site is located at 500-512 N. Harbor Blvd. (Located at the northeast corner of N. Harbor Blvd and Chapman Ave) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (C-3 Zone) (JEA)

For the record Committee Member Daybell stated that he has financially supported the Fox Theater effort.

Acting Chief Planner gave an overview of the project and stated that what was proposed was Phase 1 of a 2 Phase project. He explained that Phase 1 did not include much in terms of interior renovations to the Fox Theater. What Phase 1 included was modifications to the Tea Room restaurant, renovations to the Firestone Building which at the corner property at Chapman and Harbor, and seismic additions to the theater building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided the Committee with information on the history of the project and stated that the buildings were on the National Register of Historic Places. The theater complex is a Historic City Landmark building and will go before the Landmark Commission for review and approval due to the proposed demolition and addition. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the Firestone Building was not listed as a Local Landmark, but was part of the National Registry with the Fox Theater. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that The Fox Historic Theater Foundation was formed in 2001 to make sure the buildings are preserved over time. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the storefront windows would be removed and replaced on the Firestone Building and an opening on the south side wall facing Chapman would be opened All the doors and windows are proposed to be aluminum framed bronze and will be consistent with the historical patterns of that time. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that Phase 1 included the creation of a passageway at the Firestone Building to connect the existing corner parking lot to the City's parking lot. Staff was concerned with vandalism at the Firestone Building passageways and recommended vandalism resistant fixtures and wrought iron gates at the end of the passageway that can be closed after hours if there is a problem. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there are changes to the bell tower window, and the existing square window will be taken out and replaced with a rosette decorative round window. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that there are 3 steel columns that are coming up through the flower shop tenant space and they will break through the roof and they will be enclosed with stucco to make it match the column that exists at the street. The structural improvements that will be done on the building to bring it to code are internal to the building and will not be seen from the street. There are also three windows being proposed on the east elevation at the City parking lot. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that a vase will be added at the roof of the Firestone Building, which shall be aesthetically (consistent with the historic photographs requirements of the Secretary of Interior Standards). Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the windows on the Tea Room will be refurbished and the existing windows on the south side of the building at the courtyard will be removed and the archways will be restored to create an arcade that existed originally on the building. On the northern side of the building at the

courtyard space all the windows will be modified and removed, other than three windows that will be rehabbed. Acting Chief Planner explained that there is an existing kitchen addition to the restaurant that is proposed to be demolished, and staff believed that the demolition is necessary so the restaurant becomes functional. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the second floor includes restrooms for the banquet facility and a small banquet kitchen. The Tea Room also includes the addition of two internal elevator shafts and a stairwell. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that there was a proposed demolition in the basement of the existing stage, dressing rooms and storage areas to create a functional basement. During Phase 2 of the project there will be dressing rooms, and offices constructed. Additionally the demolition will provide for a mechanical room as part of Phase 1, plus for future generators and electrical rooms. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the window located on the northwest corner of the tea room would have a shear wall behind it. Staff was concerned because the window was at pedestrian level at the Harbor sidewalk. Staff believed that the shear wall could be designed to maintain the opening at that location and preserve the use of that window. The seismic work that is being done on the Fox Theater provides for a shear wall behind the stage. There is a moment frame proposed that removes some of the existing seating on the first floor of the auditorium. The location is relevant to whether or not phase 2 gets approved. Staff had a question as to whether or not that moment frame could be relocated south to eliminate the loss of seating spaces or to address the fact that if that portion of Phase 2 is not approved the moment frame is not sitting in the middle of the auditorium. As part of phase 2 there will be a restroom constructed in the Firestone Building to get the necessary restroom facilities for a venue of this size.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the glazing or storefront of the Tea Room was going to be eliminated to create an arcade. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the intent was to remove windows facing the courtyard and make a deep arcade, and to go back to the original design.

Committee Member Daybell reference recommended condition 2 and asked if the mechanical equipment was going to be in the basement area. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that some HVAC units were proposed on the roof and would be screened.

Public hearing opened.

Robert Mather, Architect, agreed with all the recommended conditions. Mr. Mather stated that the condition on the existing first floor window sheer wall on the north elevation can potentially be relocated. He stated that the structural engineer believed that cutting a hole was a problem. He requested flexibility in that response to look at other alternatives. Mr. Mather stated that on recommended condition 6 the reason for the location of the columns is that there is a steel truss that expands across the auditorium from one side to the other and moving it back would create a difficult situation. Mr. Mather clarified that in Phase II there will be a control booth at each lobby door so that noise from the lobby space cannot be heard in the theater. He referenced a picture and stated that the ceiling will be restored. Mr. Mather stated that the windows in the tea room will be wood and the Firestone Building will have storefront windows.

Terry Galvin, Fullerton Heritage, stated that he was very interested in the project and believed that the staff report covered all the issues. He stated that a good design team was working on this project and supported the project with the recommended conditions.

Bob Linnell, Fullerton Heritage, agreed with Mr. Galvin and asked about the report that was submitted to the State Department Historical Preservation Office. Mr. Mather explained the two part application process for the tax credit. Mr. Linnell asked if it was safe to say that the

State had reviewed everything that was being proposed. Mr. Mather stated that the State has signed off the application and believed that the documentation to get the tax credit was tougher than a lot of other approvals that have been requested.

Todd Haufman, President of Fullerton Historic Foundation, stated that the tax credit part of the project was significant for the completion as it goes towards the renovation. He stated that the tax credits will be sold to help pay for the project.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Hoban believed that the project was in good hands and was impressed with the work. He stated that Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave an in depth presentation and was looking forward to watching the project move forward.

Committee Member Lynch agreed with Vice Chairman Hoban and stated that he was in complete support of the project.

Committee Member Daybell approved of the project.

Chairman Duncan stated that the project was in good hands and supported the project.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Robert Mather stated that there was loss of parking area at the Firestone Building Corner. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if it was a part of Phase I or Phase II. Mr. Mather stated that the loss of the parking area was Phase I. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified for the benefit of the Committee that the parking lot at the Firestone Building was proposed to be removed and turned into a courtyard. He believed that the historical documentation showed that the Firestone Building was one of the first sites in Fullerton to have on-site parking. After that addendum for consideration, the Committee still recommended approval.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

No Public Comments

## **STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

#### **MEETINGS:**

## **AGENDA FORECAST:**

Next meeting will be December 13, 2007

# **ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 6:38 P.M.