

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

February 28, 2008

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban and Committee
PRESENT: Members Cha, Daybell, Lynch and
Silber

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior
Planner Allen, Acting Associate
Planner Kusch and Clerical Assistant
Flores

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Chairman Hoban and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present, to APPROVE the December 13, 2007 minutes
AS WRITTEN.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present, to APPROVE the January 24, 2008 minutes AS
WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00344 – ZON07-00073. APPLICANT: JPI DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY
OWNER: PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE A review of final colors, materials & architectural
details for a Major Development Project for a student-oriented mixed-use development on
property located at 2545-2565 E. Chapman Ave, 501 N. Commonwealth Ave, and 2450 E.
College Place. (Northwest corner of Commonwealth & Chapman Avenues, south of E.
College Place; excluding 2550 E. College Place) (SPD Zone) (Previously Certified EIR)
(HAL)

Senior Planner Allen informed the Committee that the applicant and staff were trying to
work out some differences in recommendations. She stated that the applicant requested a
continuance.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to
CONTINUE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

The following items were heard out of order

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00043 – ZON08-00017. APPLICANT: HABITAT FOR HUMANITY AND PROPERTY OWNER: CITY OF FULLERTON. A request for a major development project to develop nine (9) affordable residential condominium units on property located at 413, 425 and 431 West Valencia Drive, in a Community Improvement District (Generally located on the north side of West Valencia Drive, between approximately 471 feet and 651 feet east of Richman Avenue) (R-2/R-3 zones) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project and explained the request. The individual parcels will be consolidated to construct nine units. Senior Planner Allen explained that the site plan fronts five units on Valencia and all of the vehicular access is off the alley. The four additional units are located off the alley and they front each other. The style of architecture is craftsman, consistent with the two Habitat for Humanity dwellings on the south side of the street. Senior Planner Allen stated that the porches are different on each plan to give each unit a different look. The applicant is also requesting several deviations from development standards under the density bonus provisions. Senior Planner Allen stated that the units will be very low income to low income. She explained the deviations requested. Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant was also proposing a conceptual landscape plan which provides a common landscape area and a landscape setback along Valencia. Senior Planner Allen referenced the site plan and stated that the applicant was essentially proposing three different elevation plans. She stated that the request would go on to the Planning Commission because it includes a tract map so that each of the units could be sold as an individual condominium unit.

Committee Member Lynch asked where the general craftsman style design idea came from. Senior Planner Allen stated that the architectural style was in conformance with the Richman Park Neighborhood Enhancement Plan, which identifies a Craftsman style and Spanish Mission revival style.

Committee Member Silber asked if other architectural styles were considered. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Richman Park Plan was a neighborhood driven document providing policy direction for future development. Craftsman architecture is not mandated, but is a style the neighborhood had identified when the Richman Park Plan was developed.

Committee Member Daybell asked what the overall area of the project was, and Senior Planner Allen stated that it was two sites totaling 120x120. (28,880 sq ft)

Chairman Hoban stated that the property was low income and the density of the project was likely greater and asked if the setbacks were smaller. Senior Planner Allen stated that the density bonus itself could add additional density, but this project did not propose to do that. Senior Planner Allen explained that within the bonus provision there are other incentives which a developer can request.

Chairman Hoban asked if the proposed setbacks were an issue for fire safety and Senior Planner Allen responded no.

Committee Member Silber asked how many units were demolished to create the new units, and Senior Planner Allen stated that it was 16 units. (A clarification was obtained after the meeting confirming that three 4-unit buildings were demolished for a total of 12 units)

Chairman Hoban asked if the conditions included items that still need resolution with the applicant. Senior Planner Allen stated that the architecture conditions were identical to the conditions placed on the prior project, and the landscape conditions were for the two secondary private yards. She explained that staff was concerned about the private yard being an unused space because of its small size and location. Senior Planner Allen believed these areas should be opened and landscaped as they are not needed to meet private open space requirements. The other recommendation was that the applicant identifies the material of any fence that would be put in for the common open space abutting Valencia. If the applicant was proposing a fence higher than 3 feet staff recommended wrought iron or something that would allow visibility into that area. Senior Planner Allen stated that the other landscape conditions were standard. Senior Planner Allen explained that the 2-bedroom floor plan does not include a bathroom on the ground floor, and the three 4-bedroom plans include a full bathroom. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff, the Redevelopment Agency and Housing were recommending that the 2-bedroom units include a half-bath facility on the ground floor.

Vice Chairman Cha asked how many guest parking spaces were proposed and Senior Planner Allen stated that there would be 10 guest parking spaces. Vice Chairman Cha asked if they were going to be signed as guest parking, and Senior Planner Allen responded yes. Vice Chairman Hoban asked if each unit had two parking spaces, and Senior Planner Allen responded that each unit had a two car garage and an extra guest space.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant had seen the conditions, and Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant had seen the conditions and she believed they were in agreement.

Public hearing opened.

Mark Koronado, Senior Vice President, Habitat for Humanity, stated that they have the best interest of the Community in mind and look forward to another successful development and a long term relationship with the Redevelopment Agency, the City and the Community.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he was not a fan of the "fake old". He stated that he would like to see more of a modern contemporary approach. He referenced the staff report and read that the DDA stipulated that the buildings be "designed to update the surrounding architectural styles and promote a pleasing renewal of the housing stock". He believed that statement was reinterpreting the neighborhood and doing something new and fresh. Committee Member Lynch believed the design looked great but was not particularly satisfied with the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he liked the project, and the different look of the units. He also liked the landscape area in the middle of the site plan. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he was in support of the project because it was similar to the previously approved and constructed 2-unit project across the street.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he agreed with Vice Chairman Cha, and was concerned about Condition 20 regarding NPDES. He did not like the condition and stated that NPDES applies to a site that is over 1-acre in size. Acting Chief Planner Eastman

clarified that it was a standard condition. He stated that there are other aspects of NPDES that need to be complied with and not necessarily the SWPPP requirements. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there may be a need to modify the language to reflect that some requirements of NPDES do not apply to sites that are less than 1-acre in size. Committee Member Daybell stated that he would not like to see the Water Quality Management Plan for a site that is under an acre. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that staff would not require that and Committee Member Daybell stated that the condition did not clarify that. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the language and the condition would need to be modified, but staff would recommend the condition to ensure compliance with BMP and other NPDES issues, current and future.

Committee Member Silber stated that he agreed with Committee Member Lynch's comments about an 80 year old style as the "new" form for the neighborhood. Committee Member Silber stated the project was fine if the neighborhood believed that style represents their community's point of view. He stated that the term "styles" in architecture is troubling because it categorizes architecture and is often a substitute for good design. Committee Member Silber stated that the City does not have an unlimited supply of land and is not achieving density. He believed that the City should not have a net loss of affordable units by building fewer new units. He stated that he would support the project because he was raising issues that have not been before the applicant prior to this day. Committee Member Silber stated that he understood the issues of density and density bonus are not within the purview of the RDRC.

Committee Member Daybell asked Committee Member Silber if he was advocating that there should have been 16 new units to replace the 16 old units, and Committee Member Silber responded at least that. Committee Member Daybell asked if the lot could be a single building with multiple units. Committee Member Silber responded yes, and stated that the problem is likely the relationship with parking to units.

Chairman Hoban believed that the project should move forward as presented. He believed that the craftsman style design is an economic way to build, which is important for the Habitat for Humanity construction model. Chairman Hoban stated that he was in support of the Habitat's project because it was similar to the project across the street.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell to RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the Planning Commission. Motion passed unanimously

PRJ07-00366 – ZON07-00016. APPLICANT: HL BLEND LLC AND PROPERTY OWNER: ROBERT I. ZERRENNER A request for a Minor Development Project to construct a new outdoor patio for dining on private property. The proposed patio is located on the west side of an existing building, which is presently being renovated to become Cherch's restaurant. The site is located at 101 South Harbor Boulevard. (Restaurant Overlay District) (Generally located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Harbor and Commonwealth) (C-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project and explained the request. The request was for a 660 sq. foot patio at rear of an existing building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the City has a moratorium that prohibits type 47 ABC licenses, during which time the City is only approving beer and wine licenses. He noted that the moratorium mandates RDRC, Police Chief, and Fire Chief approval for an outdoor patio. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the applicant was requesting a roof covering over the patio with two holes for the existing palm trees to extend through the

cover. Staff identified that there is a proposed exit door from the patio onto the Commonwealth sidewalk. There are also posts that have footings that extend into the sidewalk, which would require encroachment. Staff has indicated that the plan should be modified to eliminate the encroachments in the public right-of-way. Acting Chief Planner stated that as a standard condition staff mandates that the patio exits only be used for egress. The applicant has also proposed to obscure the windows with tinting and drapes on the interior of the building. Staff has identified that this is not consistent with the Downtown Business District Design Guidelines.

Vice Chairman Cha referenced the site plan and asked how many sq. feet the restaurant would be, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it was approximately 2600 sq. feet. Vice Chairman Cha asked if more than two doors were required for retail space more than 2600 sq. feet. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the project complies with the required number of Building Code exits and there are 3 exits shown on the site plan.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the applicant proposed protective bollards from the parking lot to the patio, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the applicant did not propose any.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant could provide blinds for the windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the applicant could provide for blinds versus tinting, although staff recommends allowing up to a 15 percent tint.

Chairman Hoban asked about the connection between the existing Heirlooms building and the restaurant possibly expanding. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that if the applicant wanted to expand into the adjacent tenant area, they would have to go through an approval process.

Vice Chairman Cha about the planter at the base of the palm trees, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the planter would be removed, but the trees will remain.

Public hearing opened.

Nick Lombardo, Applicant, clarified that the architect designed the two tenant spaces as having a common access door. The project has been revised, and Cherch's Restaurant will not have access to the other tenant space. Mr. Lombardo stated that he had not reviewed the recommended conditions, but that Acting Chief Planner Eastman had read the required conditions to him over the phone. He stated that the moratorium conditions can be modified if the applicant applies for a Conditional Use Permit. The Committee asked Mr. Lombardo to review the recommended conditions.

Robert Zerrenner, Property Owner, stated that the connection was a hall way that has been removed, and there is no longer access between the two buildings.

Mr. Lombardo stated that he agreed with the recommended conditions and asked about condition 7 regarding the outdoor lighting fixtures and video equipment. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the proposed T.V. monitor cannot create a glare or create a public distraction, and must be approved by the Director of Community Development. The condition clarifies the Director's authority.

Chairman Hoban asked what the roof deck patio cover was going to be, and the project contractor, Wade La Clear stated that it was going to be rolled roofing with composition shingles on top.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if there will be glass behind the wrought iron railing, and Mr. Lombardo responded no.

Chairman Hoban asked if the wood was going to be painted, and Mr. La Clear explained that the cover would be comprised of 6 x 6 inch posts, that would be painted.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Silber was concerned about the patio roof cover not holding up. He believed there would be a wear-and-tear issue. Committee Member Silber believed the project was engineered, but not designed, and the patio cover would need more work.

Committee Member Daybell was opposed to the patio door encroaching on the public right-of-way. He believed that the T.V. should be mounted to face away from Commonwealth. Committee Member Daybell agreed with Committee Member Silber, and believed the patio cover would need more work, since it is at a major intersection in the City of Fullerton.

Vice Chairman Cha agreed with Committee Member Silber and stated that the patio roof design needed to be revised. He stated that he would like to see the wrought iron design and bollards separating the patio and the parking lot.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the wood patio cover needed to be addressed. He recommended steel and masonry to enhance the existing structure. Committee Member Lynch suggested that the applicant consider rain gutters.

Chairman Hoban was concerned about the roof line and the lack of pitch. He believed that the patio cover was not appropriate for downtown, and is something he would put in his back yard for shade. Chairman Hoban believed that the wrought iron fencing had nice elements. He further believed the use of 6-inch steel columns could be the traffic collision deterrents that Vice Chairman Cha believed were needed. Chairman Hoban recommended continuing the project to a date certain.

Committee Member Silber stated that there were many appropriate solutions for the patio cover as an example, the applicant could consider fabric awnings or sail canopies.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the Committee was okay with the patio, but were concerned with the covering of that space. He stated that staff has some question with the ceiling height of the cover and the height of the ceiling fans.

Mr. Lombardo stated that continuing the project to March 13 would be fine. He noted that the project was being designed by a restaurant designer and did not believe that it looked like a typical wood cover.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he would like to see the design details match the building.

Committee Member Silber clarified that the Committee was not just talking about a refinement of the detail, but also scale and proportionality in relationship to existing buildings.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of March 13, 2008 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 4

PRJ08-00012 – ZON08-00009. APPLICANT: MILAGRA DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY OWNER: MICHAEL C. STRAUSS. A request to consider site and architectural plans for a Minor Development Project which includes demolition of a detached garage, an addition of approximately 840 square feet to the rear of an existing residence, and construction of a detached single-story structure consisting of a two-car garage and a second dwelling unit measuring approximately 330 sq. ft. at 217 Malvern Avenue (located on the north side of Malvern Avenue, approximately 240 feet west of Malden Avenue) (R-2P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. The property is located in the “Jacaranda/Malvern/Brookdale” historic district. He explained that the elevations reflect matching the materials on the existing residence. Staff reviewed the proposal and notes that it meets the development standards for the R-2 P zone and the City’s Design Guidelines for the preservation areas with two exceptions. The site plan reflects a required open parking space in the front yard setback, and the windows proposed include slider windows. Associate Planner Kusch clarified that the applicant will replace the slider windows with single hung windows and will move the parking space further down the driveway beyond the front setback. Staff believed that the proposal as conditioned meets the intent of the design guidelines and the development standards for the Preservation Zone. Staff recommends approval.

Committee Member Daybell noted that the garage addition was called a home office and asked if it qualified as a living unit. Associate Planner Kusch explained that after discussions with staff the applicant opted for a second unit because the development standards for a second unit could be met.

Public hearing opened.

Ralph Ringo, Project Designer, stated that they decided to go from a home office to a second unit was because the building fees were the same, but real estate value is better. He stated that their intent is to follow the preservation guidelines.

Michele Powell, 214 W Malvern, stated that the project looked great.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell noted that there was a partition on the side of the property that could cause security problems.

Vice Chairman Cha and Committee Member Lynch were in support of the project.

Committee Member Silber was in support of the project. He believed the Preservation Program in the City of Fullerton has been very well run. He was in support of the project.

Chairman Hoban was in support of the project, and believed it was consistent with the guidelines. He believed the partition on the side of the house was for privacy. He believed that any security concerns with the partition could be mitigated by lighting.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staffs recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that staff has considered the RDRC'S request to modify staff reports to show which conditions are standard, and which are unique to the proposal. Staff will bold face the number on standard conditions in the staff report to indicate that they are "typical" conditions.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of recent Planning Commission actions.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susana Flores
Clerical Assistant