

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

March 27, 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, and Clerical Assistant  
Flores

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chairman Cha, SECONDED by Committee  
Member Silber and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members  
present, to APPROVE the February 14, 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 an approved 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)

(Continued from February 28, 2008)

Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant modified the site plan originally reviewed by the RDRC in order to address some of the concerns addressed by the Planning Commission. She gave a brief overview of the project and explained the modifications to the site plan, which were approved by the City Council. Senior Planner Allen explained that the final colors, materials, and architecture details were back before the Committee. Senior Planner Allen explained that the main material of the building was a LaHabra Exterior Stucco with a float finish and a 20/30 aggregate texture. She referenced the site plan and noted that the ground floor would include a smooth finish Vetterstone and midnight black and brown/green slate. Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant was now proposing white aluminum residential windows and matching patio doors. She referenced the site plan and explained that the applicant was proposing "Mini-gutters" on the balconies for drainage. Senior Planner Allen referenced the site plan and noted that there would be decorative metal louvers at several locations of the project as well as four

canopies. She further explained that the parking structure would be constructed of split face block on top of the concrete slab.

Public hearing opened.

Lance Hanna, JPI Development, gave a brief history of the project. Mr. Hanna noted that they incorporated bicycle accommodations for residents and retail employees to address RDRC concerns at the last meeting. He referenced the site plan and noted that the project size was reduced from 363 units to 350 units, and increased parking for residents and retail. Mr. Hanna explained that they registered the project with California's Build-It-Green program, and will be seeking a sustainable building certification.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there was going to be bicycle parking inside closets in the hallway, and Mr. Hanna responded yes.

Committee Member Lynch asked how the Build-it-Green program differed from LEED programs. Mr. Hanna explained that it compares most closely to the US Green Building Council LEED for Homes Mid-rise. He stated that the Build-It-Green Program was well suited to the construction type they were building.

Ed Cadavona, Architects of Orange, stated that they went with a contemporary look and emphasized some of the detailing on many of the public entries and provided visual reference with towers. Mr. Cadavona referenced the site plan and stated that there are 30 units facing the parking structure. He explained that they were doing lush landscaping for screening purposes as well as softening the parking structure. Mr. Cadavona explained that there were horizontal elements on the canopies being used to identify entries.

Committee Member Silber asked if aluminum windows would be used at the residential level. Mr. Cadavona stated that they would be using white aluminum windows at the residential level and clear anodized store front system at the commercial level.

Committee Member Silber referenced the window sample and asked if it was available in a mill aluminum finish. Mr. Cadavona stated that he would look into that and explained that they selected a white trim color so it can work with the architecture and would continue throughout the project.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the applicant believed the white was compatible with the aluminum store front. Mr. Cadavona believed that it was compatible in terms of the architectural style to match the contemporary look on the ground plane.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he did not like the white windows and stated that there was a condition that the residential windows shall be compatible with the commercial storefront window system. Mr. Hanna stated that this model of aluminum windows help them exceed Title 24 by 15 percent, which is a requirement for the Green Building certification.

Committee Member Daybell referenced the site plan and asked what material the balcony rail would be, and Mr. Cadavona stated that it would be steel.

Committee Member Lynch stated that there was a lot of stucco and asked the applicant if they were willing to add more metallic finish on the column towers. Mr. Hanna believed that

they would be leaving the simplicity of contemporary architecture by tacking on decorative metal features.

Mr. Hanna explained that they would be building a median on Chapman and would be enhancing the median along Commonwealth. Senior Planner Allen clarified that all landscaping will come back to the Committee at a later date.

Judith Kaluzny, 400 N Malden, asked what was meant by “contemporary” architecture. Mr. Cadavona explained that it would be contemporary in that it is modern, and tries to rely on form and mass. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that contemporary architecture is a term that was developed to capture current architecture that doesn't try to mimic a previous place, style or time.

Willa Vanderburg, 1850 Fairway Dr #85, Chino Hills, asked if the architecture being used was similar to what is being used in the City of Brea. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that, to some degree, architects borrow from other architects or tend to reuse there architectural styles from one project to another. He identified that much of the Brea Promenade is an interpretation of “Art Deco”.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Silber believed that the adjustments to the site plan to break up the mass along Chapman were an improvement. He was concerned about the color palette for trim on the building. He believed that the applicant should be consistent with the finish from the bottom to the top. Committee Member Silber stated that he would prefer to see mill finish aluminum windows. He stated that he would like to see that the aluminum windows have a mill finish and the architect should explore the accent schemes other than white.

Committee Member Daybell asked Committee Member Silber if he believed there were too many elements to the project making it busy. Committee Member Silber responded yes and stated that too many elements becomes a static composition.

Committee Member Daybell agreed with Committee Member Silber. He stated that he would prefer mill finish windows, and was in support of the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he supported the project in general. He stated that there were issues like requiring deck drains to drain into the walls and not having scuppers, which was previously discussed. He believed that the windows should be anodized aluminum mill finish. Committee Member Lynch was concerned about the split face block, and preferred a honed or sandblasted block, and smooth plaster instead of the 20/30 aggregate finish. He stated that he would prefer aluminum reglet as a reveal.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he was overall in favor of the project. He stated that he liked the material selection of the first floor. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he liked the bicycle parking and foot traffic areas. He was concerned about the vine rope on the parking structure, and did not like the white trim on the windows.

Committee Member Daybell did not like the bicycle closets in the residential hallways because of maintenance issues.

Chairman Hoban liked the courtyard and entry point setbacks. He was not concerned about the window choice. Chairman Hoban liked the stone and stated that he would like to

see the split face block moving to an exposed aggregate. Chairman Hoban liked the closets in the residential areas. He liked that the project was a Build-it-Green building.

Public hearing re-opened.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if they explored anything beyond the white trim aluminum window. David Helms, JPI Development, believed that the white trim was appropriate to blend with the architecture. He stated that JPI has tried to incorporate the Committees concerns as much as possible. Mr. Hanna stated that they looked at many options and believed that the white blends in nice with the colors that have been selected.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the applicants have not addressed the RDRC or City Council concerns about the windows or deck drains. Mr. Hanna stated that the aluminum windows and aluminum storefronts were a material match, wherein he believed that white blended in with the contemporary architecture.

Kara Sutch, Architects of Orange, explained the mini-gutters. She stated that all of the roof drainage would drain towards the garage, and no down spouts or gutters will be seen. Committee Member Lynch asked if the mini gutter would be extending out the front of the deck. Ms. Sutch stated that it would drain out the side or the front, depending on the location.

Committee Member Daybell asked where the water would go when it exits the mini gutter. Ms. Sutch stated that it would drain off the projecting spout. She stated that the gutter was not up against the stucco and if it does drip off there will not be any staining on the stucco.

Vice Chairman Cha asked how far away from the stucco plane the downspout will discharge. Ms. Sutch explained that the gutter runs along the balcony and the floating balcony walls would be about 30 inches away from the building wall.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Hoban stated that the only point of contention was the color of the windows, and believed it was an opinion. He stated that he was happy with the project.

Vice Chairman Cha believed that the design process and the color choices are subjective. He stated that if the architect wanted white trim that would be fine and he was in favor of the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he would like the motion to include that all windows be mill finish aluminum, smooth plaster, install the deck drainage system within the walls of the building, the reglet details instead of tool expansion joints, and honed or sand blasted block in lieu of the split face, with color and aggregate content to be determined by the Director of Community Development.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he did not want to see white balcony rails.

Committee Member Silber stated that a way of designing things begins as a movement, a point of view, and convictions and then eventually becomes a series of measures to take or style to work out. He believed that the residential windows should be mill finish, and the fascia color should be chosen to be complimentary. Committee Member Silber stated that

the applicant would have to take care of the gutters if it doesn't work, and was not concerned with the gutters.

Committee Member Lynch believed that if the mini gutters becomes a bad design it becomes the Committees problem as citizens, because they would have to look at the staining on the walls. He stated that the applicant will not be able to go back and put the drains in the walls.

Committee Member Silber suggested going to a honed block or something that has color to it as an alternative to the split face. He believed that there could be a problem with using the color white, because dust settling on the decks and the railings, such that when it gets wet, it creates dirt stains on the building face; but would leave the decision to the architect and the developer. He stated the railings should match the windows, and be a mill finish or painted to match the fascia of the building.

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Hanna stated that they were fine with the mill finish windows and railings and the honed block finish as well.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, based on the following conditions:

1. Residential windows shall match the mill finish of the commercial storefronts.
2. The color scheme shall be revised to eliminate elements that are white in color. In addition to the windows, these include exterior stucco around windows, widow trim, fascia, parapet cap, horizontal accent bands, tower braces, canopies, canopy supports, balcony railings, and pipe columns.
3. Balcony railings and supporting elements shall be of a color which matches the residential windows.
4. Block for the retaining wall at the residential units shall be honed or exposed aggregate.
5. The balcony drainage shall be designed to be installed within the building.
6. Plaster shall be smooth.
7. Reglets shall be used for stucco joints.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the Committee's intent that the applicant could look at alternatives to the in-wall drains; alternatives to the in-wall alteration drains, which would need to come back to the Committee. The project could be approved subject to the mini gutters coming back before the commission with modifications.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch to AMEND his motion to require balcony drainage to be installed within the building unless an alternative design of exterior scupper or "mini gutter" is reviewed and approved by the RDRC.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the conditions for the Committee

Committee Member Silber stated that rather than a reglet he would prefer a “mechanical” joint in the stucco.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the applicant would not prefer to do a smooth plaster finish. To avoid doing a lot of smooth plaster, the applicant has included a lot of stone and other features at the ground floor so the stucco is pushed up higher off the base, and moved away from the pedestrian. Committee Member Daybell stated that he would not like to include the plaster finish in the motion. Chairman Hoban stated that he would leave the plaster as proposed.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch to AMEND his motion, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Cha, to eliminate the smooth plaster and to modify the reglet to be a mechanical screed joint. Motion passed unanimously.

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

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

#### **Item No. 2**

Committee Member Silber recused himself from the item, and stated that his business was twenty feet from the project.

PRJ08-00072 – TTM-17094 – ZON08-00026 – ZON08-00027 – SUB08-00002.  
APPLICANT: RICHARD HAMM; PROPERTY OWNER: CITY OF FULLERTON A request for a mixed use project proposed on existing City parking lots on the north and south sides of the 100 block of W. Amerige Ave., and on property at 138 W. Amerige Ave., 140 W. Amerige Ave., 112 N. Malden Ave. and 118 N. Malden Ave. The proposal includes up to 124 residential units and 40,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. Components of the project include; 1) a six-story building, comprised of five stories of residential condominiums above ground floor commercial and parking, including subterranean and mezzanine parking levels; 2) a three-story commercial building with a fourth-story mezzanine tower; and 3) a six-level (five stories in height) public parking structure with approximately 700 parking spaces to be provided, including 460 public spaces. Applications associated with the proposal include a Major Development Project, Conditional Use Permit request to consider a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) above the base FAR of 2.0, to allow shared parking and off-site parking; a Tentative Tract Map for condominium purposes; a Zoning Adjustment to consider reduced parking lot dimensions; and an Abandonment of portions of Amerige Avenue (north side of West Amerige Avenue, between approximately 215 and 590 feet west of the centerline of Harbor Blvd.; and the south side of West Amerige (between approximately 170 and 637 feet west of the centerline of Harbor Boulevard) (An addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2006061034) has been prepared pursuant to Section 15164 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. He explained that the RDRC would be reviewing the concept, size, massing and layout of the project. The project site as proposed is a mixed use development project, which includes up to 124 residential units, and up to 40,000 sq. ft. of retail and office space. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced and explained the concept plans. He noted that the applicant made revisions to the original 9-story development after the City Council directed the applicant to reduce the height of the building and provide for more open space.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the applicant entered into an option to purchase the adjacent four properties to the west of the parking lot, including properties fronting on Malden. He further explained that at this time the proposal only includes the 3 properties to the west of the existing parking lot, although the addendum prepared for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) considers the option to purchase the fourth property should the opportunity become available. As recommended by staff to the City Council and included in the approved EIR, the final architecture would come back to the RDRC for final review and approval. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the RDRC will be making a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council after looking at the concept and the spatial planning of the project mass, scale and design approach. He explained that there was a mitigation measure that was put in place by the certified EIR, which identifies that the RDRC will review the project for compatibility with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced and explained the site floors and access to the parking garage. He noted that the project as proposed eliminates the parking that is currently on Amerige, and relocates the 297 public parking spaces into the proposed parking garage. However, parking is a land use issue for the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council and is not within the purview of the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the request included a four foot abandonment and a reduction for some of the parking dimensions inside the parking garage. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the architecture of the proposed parking structure. He referenced the site plan and explained the plaza space. Acting Chief Planner Eastman noted that the proposed building would be “continuous”, but the architecture has been designed to break up the building into individual spaces. Acting Chief Planner explained that staff believed the Brownstone unit’s architecture would not work as designed. Additionally, staff believed detailing elements of the parking garage would need to be provided, and there were concerns about the alley that comes off of Wilshire and the angled entrance of the south residential parking garage (turn at ramps). The RDRC was provided with material boards as it relates to the concept of what was proposed and the materials for both buildings on both sides.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the RDRC members were not qualified Preservation Architects, and asked if the City had access to someone who could fulfill that roll. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained why the RDRC and/ or qualified preservation architect would be required to review the project for conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Chairman Hoban asked what the changes were from the open public space versus open space for tenants of the property. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the residential private space is dictated by code. The public space is the plaza, and has been increased from what was proposed before. The applicant proposed that the public plaza materials and the landscaping continue off to the south side of the street to include more of a spatial environment.

Public hearing opened.

Richard Hamm, Pelican-Laing, LLC, stated that City staff has done a great job in helping with the project. Mr. Hamm introduced the project staff and stated that they could go into more detail.

John Loomis, 30<sup>th</sup> Street Architects, stated that staff did a great job at presenting the project. Mr. Loomis stated that they have increased the open space amenities and the height of the building is about 20 feet less than previously proposed. Mr. Loomis noted that

the mass and scale were reduced to break up the south block into three buildings. He explained that they have tried to select materials that relate to other buildings in Downtown. Mr. Loomis believed that the open space public amenity would be a sizeable plaza for Downtown Fullerton, and they have tried to enhance the pedestrian linkages. He noted that amenities to the plaza areas have been added as well as opportunities for landscape environments. Mr. Loomis explained that architecturally they have tried to create a very timeless architecture that relates to the adjacent residential uses to the west. He noted that they have tried to anticipate compatibility with the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Paul Bensus, BBG Architects, explained that they have tried to create an urban space for people to come to by preserving the existing uses and outdoor dining on the north side. He further explained that they were tying the existing uses with the new uses on the other side by orienting some spaces so that they also have views. Mr. Bensus noted that they were trying to incorporate a "Spanish Steps" theme for access to the parking garage and the office level.

Rocky Shen, KTG, stated that they were excited about the additional area that was gained along Malden. He stated that the height and bulk of the building were brought down lower, and at the same time they were creating a vibrant open space, by including some of the existing store owners into the project. Mr. Shen referenced the elevations and explained how the project fits in with the surrounding community. Mr. Shen explained the site elevations, and explained the extended plaza area along with the tower element at the corner of the parking garage. Mr. Shen referenced the Chapman building for scale.

Vice Chairman Cha asked about the proposed bridge on Amerige. Mr. Shen stated that they originally had units on both sides of Amerige and considered connecting those units to the common areas. He clarified that it was not going to be a "bridge", but a pedestrian gateway feature. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the original RFP project included a concept of a bridge going across Amerige. However, the proposed project today does not include a bridge because the residential units on the north side have been eliminated.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the commercial tenants on the first floor were going to have their own façade or if the developer will design the façade for each tenant. Mr. Shen explained that some kind of tenant criteria would be prepared, and the basic architect will be done by the developer.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the parking structure the north elevation was going to be covered up. Mr. Shen explained that they were looking at some type of element that screens the angled ramps better at that location.

Mr. Bensus noted that there was a possibility of using a green screen or landscape element to screen the upper portion where the sloping ramps occur. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the concept of the mass and scale were before the Committee today, and the project details will come back to the RDRC for final approval.

Committee Member Lynch asked if there was thought given to a roof top pool on one of the residential units. Mr. Bensus stated that there was a roof top spa element that would be on top of the club house, and there would be smaller water elements. There is no intent to have a full size pool.

Committee Member Daybell recommended that courtyard area and blacktop on Amerige be changed out to some kind of enhanced paving. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City needs to keep asphalt because of utility franchise easement requirements, and access to underground utilities.

Committee Member Daybell stated that there are more than enough restaurants in Downtown Fullerton, and he would like to see a "Green Grocer", deli or something other than a restaurant.

Committee Member Daybell asked what the cost was for the Malden properties including the townhouse construction. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the general concept design was before the Committee, and not land use decisions or property acquisition issues, which are RFP/Redevelopment Agency concerns. Mr. Hamm responded that the inclusion of the Malden properties increase the land basis for the project. He explained that the purchase of the properties made it possible for the plaza space to grow to the size it is. Committee Member Daybell stated that he would hate to see the City spend more than the properties are worth.

The City believed that the properties on Malden were needed in order to create a plaza that would find functional. He noted that the plaza space increase and the decrease in the height and scale of the south side were accomplished through the inclusion of the Malden properties into the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the plans and the draft addendum would be posted online as soon as possible. He explained that reference copies of the draft addendum were available at the Community Development counter and the library.

Tony Bushala, Fullerton Resident, had the following comments:

- The proposed trash enclosure would be directly outside of a coffee shop at 124 W Wilshire
- Project has come a long way and has continued to evolve
- He supported tall or vertical and slim buildings
- Project has been scaled back, but does not fit with the surrounding community
- Not against the development; he is pro-development pro-good design
- Brick veneer is not allowed in the current design guidelines for the CDBG
- Need to think about the implications of the project down the road
- Project should be a LEED certified building
- Project should be a sustainable design
- Buildings along Malden should not be taken down for residential use
- Site Plan should have been approved before it came to the RDRC
- Closing Amerige is a bad idea
- Natural light, ventilation and shading are important elements in a design
- Good attempt to break up the building

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage President, had the following comments:

- In support of the 5 story project; they did not support this 6 story project.
- With proper guidance and direction by the City they will provide an excellent plan

Willa Vanderburg, 109 N Harbor, had the following comments:

- Unfair to take all the parking away from Mo's Music
- Alley on the north side could be utilized in some manner, shape or form

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that 12 public parking spaces will remain on the east side of the alley, adjacent to Mo's Music, for short term parking.

Roger Palmateer, Fullerton Music, had the following comments:

- Beautiful self contained project, but needs to be integrated into the community
- Takes parking away from the businesses on Harbor Blvd., Wilshire, and Commonwealth
- Parking should be integrated throughout the project

Judith Kaluzny, 400 N Malden, had the following comments:

- Lives and works in downtown
- Stated that Mr. Rob Zur Schmiede in a document said he would take special consideration for buildings that are older than 50 years old
- There will be a tunnel effect when looking east or west down Amerige
- When the Committee considered the project before they only had 1/5 of the EIR and no one had read it
- Committee should go back and review the original EIR
- Four and a half million dollars were used to pay for the properties on Malden
- Move the project some place where it is acceptable

Mo Meloy, Fullerton Music, had the following comments:

- City needs to figure out if they want retail or open spaces and bars
- The City used to preserve the old buildings and environment
- Retail stores are being driven out of the area
- Not opposed to change
- Should try to preserve the City of Fullerton intimacy
- Loves the City, but retail is needed

Jane Rands, Fullerton Resident, had the following comments:

- RDRC should not recommend approval of this project to City Council based on inadequate and incomplete parking analysis
- Should the parking prove to be inadequate, the public space may be limited or shrunken down to make space for required parking
- After subtracting the DDA parking requirement, there will not be enough spaces for new retail, office, and residential parking
- RDRC is being asked to recommend approval for a project that asks for a CUP for shared parking and off-site parking
- If the streets to the west of Malden are to be used for off-site parking, what impacts will it have on residents
- If public parking structure is to be used, how will the distance to get to the retail affect the businesses

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the off-site parking request has to do with the fact that parking on the north lot accommodates some of the requirement for the south lot. He explained that parking is not within the RDRC purview, and pursuant to the Municipal Code, what is within the RDRC purview is related to architecture.

- Ms. Rands believed the applicant needed to be more honest about the public space dimensions not including the street or alley where the deliveries go through

Jane Reifer, Fullerton Resident, had the following comments:

- Project is not appropriate for the historic area
- Concerned with a possible cumulative effect
- The EIR is using the concept of urban settings instead of the building height variations and the context of the impacts on historic resources
- 99.9% of buildings in Fullerton are 3 stories or less
- The project is going to have an effect on the historic buildings and surroundings in the area
- All decisions as to whether something is impacting a historic resource should be done in the EIR
- In a letter from State Office of Historic Preservation it says the project description is too vague in the draft EIR
- Project is not definitive, details have not been determined
- Pleased to see that the addendum talks about the Malden properties as inconsequential 60's stucco buildings

Matthew Leslie, Fullerton Resident, had the following comments:

- The balance between newer developments and the historic downtown is in danger of tipping the balance
- Project should not be recommended for approval because it is a massive structure
- The architecture is marginally contemporary and undistinguished
- The character of downtown will be altered because of the proposed project
- There are concepts that produce interesting sustainable buildings, and this does not
- Project is too massive for the downtown area and not worth it

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell believed that the project should be moved on to the Planning Commission and City Council for concept approval. He stated that he had mixed feelings about the project, and the purchase price for the properties on Malden bothered him. He recommended approval of the project.

Committee Member Lynch agreed with Committee Member Daybell about having mixed feelings about the project. He recommended approval of the project to the Planning Commission, and noted that he would like to see the project when the exterior details come back for architecture review. Committee Member Lynch encouraged that the applicant consider adding or relocating the trash enclosures. He recommended using modern materials like steel, aluminum and glass. He was in support of the brownstone concept, and did not like the mansard roof. Committee Member Lynch recommended approval to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that the Committee approved the project once before, and he was still in favor of the project with the modifications. He believed that the alley should be used for deliveries only. Vice Chairman Cha was in support of the project.

Committee Member Daybell believed that something other than a restaurant should be put into the area.

Chairman Hoban stated that he was in support of the project. He believed that the architect made strong efforts to move into the direction that City Council gave. He noted that the applicant made an effort to address the height, parking, and public space. Chairman Hoban was okay with the height and mass. He stated that land use comments need to be taken to the Planning Commission and City Council.

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

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the project was scheduled to go to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission on April 9, 2008. However, due to the lack of a Planning Commission quorum the date will be moved. He clarified that the plans and addendum will be on line as soon as possible.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comments.

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

None

**MEETINGS:**

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

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susana Flores  
Clerical Assistant