

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

May 8, 2008

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Silber
ABSENT:

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

MINUTES: The March 27, 2008 minutes were not available.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00452 – ZON06-00073 APPLICANT: ARCHITECT'S ORANGE AND TOPAZ
FULLERTON, LLC AND PROPERTY OWNER: FREDRICKSON ENTERPRISES, INC. A
request to review the sign program for the previously approved 50,452 sq. ft. retail center in
5 buildings on a 4.51 acre property located at 1105, 1201, and 1207 S. Euclid Street and
1001 and 1035 W. Orangethorpe Avenue. (Generally located on the northwest corner of
Euclid Street and Orangethorpe Avenue in a Community Improvement District) (C-2 Zone)
(Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project and stated the program is the last
piece of the project and was conditioned to come back before the RDRC. The applicant is
proposing two pole signs, one on each frontage, as well as two monument signs, one at the
corner to identify the center, and one on the Euclid frontage for identification of the fast food
tenant (which will be Checkers). It was stated that the materials used for all four signs will
be pulled from materials used on site. The base of the signs will be stone, which is also
used on several of the buildings. The metal is a finish of an aluminum, which matches
accents on the site; colors of the signs are pulled from the stucco or new colors, such as
the dark and light cream color being used for the signs. The sign program also includes
building signs and identifies the location of the signs on the multi-tenant space, identifies
appropriate locations, or sign bands for the signs. It also establishes the type of signage
appropriate, which typically is an individual letter with varying types of lighting. The sign
program also encourages unique designs for the signage and would be reviewed by the
sign consultant before it comes into the City for permits.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the fast food tenant sign was for Checkers, and Senior
Planner Allen answered affirmatively. Committee Member Daybell inquired as to why the

fast food tenant sign was not consistent with the logo design and color of the other Checkers signs. Senior Planner Allen stated she would defer this inquiry to the applicant.

Public hearing opened.

The applicant, Matt Stowe, stated there will be "Checkers" on the fast food name tenant sign because when signs are designed, the leases are already in place and it is already known who the tenants will be. However, when a sign program is incorporated, signs are designed in a generic-type format and individual tenants place their, own panels in the signs.

Committee Member Daybell's understanding was that Checkers has its own sign colors and logos and was wondering if these colors and designs would not be used. Mr. Stowe stated that Checkers will be inverting its panel with proprietary colors and logo with the monument sign. If Checkers were to put up their own signs, it might not compliment the balance of the shopping center.

Chairman Hoban referenced a rendering in the plans and asked if that was the location and design of the Checker sign, and the applicant stated it was correct.

The applicant also added that all the signs were within code and had deliberately kept the sign that was to be placed on Euclid lower than the minimum allowed height. The Euclid sign was also limited in height in order to not have it interfere with the sign band of the retail building. The applicant also stated Milton Solomon, the principal at their signage consultant, was available to answer any questions about the signage.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the Orangethorpe Plaza corner sign would incorporate a place to lie or sit down. The Project Architect replied that there would be up-lighting in front of the sign, as well as landscaping, but nowhere to sit down. Senior Planner Allen added that there was no grass on the corner at all--that it was all plant material.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated he took no exception to the signage and believed it was appropriate to the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he had nothing against the project.

Committee Member Daybell stated he was glad to see the wall was going up, and supported the sign program.

Chairman Hoban stated he thought the signage was sharp, clean and simple.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, and SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00346 – ZON07-00105 APPLICANT: PAUL LEE AND PROPERTY OWNER: SHUN H. KO. A request to determine consistency with, or otherwise request, a modification to a previously-approved Minor Development Project for exterior wood siding and color scheme for a restaurant building remodel at 1050 W. Valencia Drive (south side of Valencia Drive, approximately 180 feet west of Euclid Street) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch explained this project was reviewed by RDRC in October of last year. He stated it was a restaurant remodel, approved with certain conditions, including a

concealment of the method of attachment of wood siding. Originally, the RDRC believed the wood siding was an attribute and had the appearance of floating on the building. During the city plan check, staff noticed the structural details did not reflect concealment of attaching the wood siding. The wood siding that was reviewed was one-by-four inch horizontal pieces, with four-inch spacing between the individual pieces. Associate Planner Kusch stated one-by-three inch horizontal pieces were now being proposed, with a smaller gap between the horizontal pieces. Staff was requesting the RDRC review the revision and determine whether it is consistent with the RDRC's previous review and recommended approval.

Associate Planner Kusch explained the applicant had provided sample photographs attached to the staff report of what he envisions, in terms of the application of the wood siding. The submitted revised building elevations reflected an expansion of the application of the wood siding on the front elevation, and wrapping to the side elevations. The wood siding was not previously identified on the side elevations. Associate Planner Kusch also stated that, during the preparing of the report, staff believed there would be an earth-toned color scheme that would further conceal the method of attachment of the siding. However, the applicant clarified the color scheme would be similar to the rendering depicted, which was originally reviewed by the RDRC, yellow in hue, light backdrop with the wood siding applied to it. Staff noted the stucco has been removed down to the framing and there may be an opportunity to conceal the method of attachment of the siding by incorporating it into the framing. However, the applicant has expressed this may be labor intensive.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified this was a project that had already been reviewed by the RDRC. It is being brought back for discussion in order to decide whether the construction details are consistent with the project the RDRC had reviewed previously. Acting Chief Planner Eastman also stated there was considerable discussion previously on whether fastening these wood pieces to the building would enable it to look like what was presented. The committee should then consider if this proposal would be relevant to the community's concerns and whether it should be supported or not.

Vice Chairman Cha questioned whether the wood siding would be covering the same portion as originally discussed or would the elevations of wood siding be expanded. There was an expanded application of the wood siding on the front of the building, whereas originally, it was confined to a general area but is now expanding along the front elevation and is also wrapping around to the sides of the building.

Vice Chairman Cha asked since there would be more wood siding, would there be gaps between the wood at all. Associate Planner Kusch clarified that the spacing would be reduced between the individual pieces of wood.

Chairman Hoban inquired if there would be stucco underneath the wood siding. Associate Planner Kusch directed the question to the applicant.

Public hearing opened.

Applicant, Paul S. Lee, stated he had been working on this project since one year ago, but since then there had been a change in floor plans. He stated wood siding on both sides of the building, versus one side would look better and more symmetrical. There would also be a colorful molding placed on the building to prevent it from looking too old.

Chairman Hoban asked if there was a color sample of the wood. The applicant replied the color would be the same color as shown in the pictures, which was included with the report.

Committee Member Daybell said he was confused as to what was going to go below and behind the windows and decorative wood. The applicant replied before he wished to demolish these areas; but landscaping was required adjacent to the front of the building.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that what was seen in the pictures was not what was being proposed.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the building would be entirely re-stuccoed and the wood siding expanded all the way around. The applicant replied affirmatively.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there would be a color for the stucco. Associate Planner Kusch replied there was a sample paint palette provided. The applicant referenced the red and gold colors in the picture as the colors used for the stucco and the wood. Committee Member Lynch asked if the applicant would be using a semi-transparent stain as the red color for the wood, and the applicant stated that was correct.

Chairman Hoban asked if the band would be above the wood. The applicant replied no, there would be a cap on the parapet wall.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the windows would be changed out. Associate Planner Kusch also asked the applicant if the windows would be aluminum store front. The applicant clarified that they would be changed to aluminum.

Committee Member Daybell wanted to clarify how the supports for the wood siding would be held onto the building. Associate Planner Kusch referenced Detail 18 and 19 of the plans reflecting the attachments.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the wood siding attachments would be concealed. Associate Planner Kusch replied that, in staff's opinion, they would not. Committee Member Daybell stated that it was a condition the attachments be concealed.

Acting Planner Eastman clarified Detail 19 (as indicated on plan check drawings attached to the staff report) was not proposed, which was a vertical backer-board with horizontal boards screwed into that. The 3D modeling of the building shown in October showed clear spacing between the horizontal boards and the building behind the boards. However, in the revised proposal, the gaps between the boards are reduced to a shadow line, so the stucco was barely visible.

Chairman Hoban stated plans were sent to them showing details 18 and 19, one showing a one-inch gap with intentional spacing.

Acting Planner Eastman clarified there were two details shown on the plans. One was consistent with what was proposed in October, but one has a new elevation which was not proposed or discussed previously.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha liked the closed gap attachment better because the first one had a four-inch gap, and he worried about its appearance. He felt the change to the original plans looked fancier and was an upgrade as compared to the last design.

Committee Member Daybell believed the change in spacing of the wood would probably be more buildable, and if the wall underneath was going to be stucco, he would support it.

Committee Member Lynch stated now that the spacing between the wood was to be reduced, the design was consistent with the original design and it looked fine. Committee Member Lynch expressed his concern about the vertical methods of attachment, and that they should be darkened to further conceal them from view. The applicant replied he was planning on painting the "methods of attachment" the same color as the stucco. Committee Member Daybell replied painting the methods of attachment gold would make them stand out next to red wood. The applicant agreed black would be a better color to conceal the methods of attachment.

Chairman Hoban stated he was not present for the last meeting so he could not state whether the new design was consistent with the previous one, but that he understood staff's concern, that if there was a four-inch gap between the wood siding, it would need to be heavily spaced from the building so the horizontal members would look like they were floating. He stated this new design was a departure from the original idea, but had he seen the new design first, he would have accepted it.

Chairman Hoban also stated he wished to further clarify whether the question at hand was regarding a departure from the design the RDRC reviewed originally. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the question was whether the new design would spur additional concerns or questions from the public. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that as far as the juxtaposition of the wood, stucco and color, the design was similar, but the design was a big enough departure to question whether it is consistent. Ultimately, there needed to be a decision if there was a departure from the original design, and whether it was good or bad.

Chairman Hoban stated he understood the methods of attachment for the four-inched spaced design and thought it had more architectural energy. His concern was whether all of the joints lined up, which could be a poor carpentry look. Another concern was that each screw hole had just been puttied up over, serving as a cost-efficient method.

Committee Member Daybell stated he did not think the new design was consistent with the previous, but thought the cost method was appropriate in light of the current economy.

Committee Member Lynch stated he preferred the original design but liked the new design and thought it was consistent. He applauded the use of other materials, other than stucco, to clad the side of the building. He stated the design overall was unique.

Chairman Hoban stated there also might be an issue with the wood warping. If smaller and thinner wood was going to be used, there almost had to be a vertical method of attachment, where everything gets screwed down. Committee Member Daybell also expressed concern with the wood warping. Chairman Hoban stated the wood would have to be maintained. Committee Member Lynch stated there would have to be multiple points of connection to be made sure the wood was screwed down tightly. Chairman Hoban asked if it would be chem-dry redwood, and the applicant confirmed that it would be.

Committee Member Daybell asked what would be used to seal the building. Chairman Hoban replied stucco would seal the building and the wood siding would likely be bolted in with sealant applied. Committee Member Lynch suggested half-inch hardy plank to seal the building rather than stucco, which would be easier to screw through, rather than stucco. He said sealant could be put around each screw before being sunk.

Chairman Hoban stated he believed there was a general consensus that the new design is different but consistent in design, and acceptable. Acting Chief Planner Eastman suggested there be a motion that the new project design was consistent with the previously-approved project discussed in October, but they would allow the alternative proposed project.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Cha to APPROVE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

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

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00112 – ZON08-00037 APPLICANTS AND PROPERTY OWNERS GARVIN AND ELIZABETH CHU. A request for a Minor Development Project which includes the demolition of a detached garage and construction of a detached structure measuring approximately 1,124 sq. ft. and consisting of a two-car garage, an office, storage room, laundry area and a bathroom on property located in a residential preservation overlay zone at 141 W. Malvern Avenue. (located on the north side of Malvern Avenue approximately 50 feet east of Malden Avenue) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project. He stated the project was before the committee due to the fact that the property was located in a preservation overlay zone. Even though it is not a second unit, the Municipal Code required RDRC review for accessory structures, such as garages, when they are in excess of 120 square feet, which is what triggered this Minor Development project. He referenced the plans in showing the location of the accessory structure, which is approximately 1125 square feet, consisting of a two-car garage, office, storage room, laundry area and bathroom.

The features of the existing structure are typical of early century Bungalow architecture, with lap siding, gabled roof, exposed rafter tails, out-looker beams and braces, and wood frame fixed and hung windows, including sills. The Planning staff had reviewed the project as it related to development standards in the R2P zone and noted it was consistent with the code as conditioned. The location of the accessory structure on the west side of the property was set back three feet from the property line, and that side of the structure, including eave overhang, had to be fire-rated. Staff recommended shifting the accessory structure an additional foot to avoid the CBC's fire-rating requirement. This would enable the eave overhang to be consistent with the front residence.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if there had been a discussion with the Building Division about this issue. Associate Planner Kusch replied there had been a discussion, and it was indicated that even at three feet, they could accommodate a fire rating on an eave overhang. It would wrap underneath the eave overhang. An easier solution would be to shift the footprint to avoid the extra cost. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if the

Building Division would approve shifting the footprint, and Associate Planner Kusch replied yes. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if that conversation was held after January 1, 2008, due to the adoption of the new Building Code. Associate Planner Kusch responded that the new code required even a five-foot setback, and that he discussed this with City Plan Check Engineer, Chi Yang, who indicated the three-foot and perhaps four-foot, could be accommodated, presumably because it was an accessory structure.

Associate Planner Kusch stated that even though it was recommended that there be a shift in the building, it was not added in the recommended conditions. He stated to add a condition to the recommended approval that the building be shifted one foot from the west property line. This would make a four-foot setback on the west property line, and the eastern setback would be reduced accordingly on the plans.

Associate Planner Kusch stated one other development standard in the preservation zone is that the driveway (located in the front setback) that no longer serves a garage or parking space (located outside the front setback) should be removed as a condition of project approval. Staff also believes the architectural features carried over from the front residence are consistent with the preservation zone design guidelines.

Associate Planner Kusch stated, from a floor plan standpoint, this structure might be recognized as a second unit; therefore, recordation of a deed restriction is recommended. Associate Planner Kusch stated the applicant did not want a second unit. It was also stated the adjacent properties have rear second dwelling units, but the applicant is not proposing this.

Associate Planner Kusch also stated an email from Fullerton Heritage was received expressing support for the project and also found it to be consistent with the preservation zone design guidelines. There were also no public inquiries to the request.

Chairman Hoban asked what the difference was between having an accessory structure and a habitable structure. Associate Planner Kusch replied, from a site development perspective, additional parking spaces are required for a dwelling unit. For each dwelling unit, there needed to be at least two parking spaces and a certain amount of useable open space. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified this accessory structure was defined as a habitable space, but was viewed as a bedroom since a kitchen was not included.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained this was not a land use question but more a design question; however, these two issues can cross paths. Because this was an R-2P zone, the applicant is entitled to have two units on the property, but does not choose to do this. If the applicant designed the structure accordingly, he could have a second unit with parking, but because this is not the case, he will put a deed restriction on the structure saying it will not be a second unit.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the interior of the existing unit would be modified as well. Associate Planner Kusch replied the applicant could answer this question.

Public hearing opened.

Applicant, Garvin Chu, replied he had no plans to modify the existing unit. His main intent was to create more storage space and move things out of the garage, but still keep them covered.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the 290 square foot shed, shown on the plans, still existed, and the applicant answered that it did. Vice Chairman Cha wanted to clarify if everything shown on the plans was up to date, and Associate Planner Kusch answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Daybell asked why centering the addition on the lot (with five feet on each side) wasn't considered. The applicant responded there was no particular reason other than to give his children more play area on the property. Committee Member Daybell expressed concern about access to the back structure from the west side of the existing structure. The applicant replied that it was accessible. Committee Member Daybell expressed concern about the storage unit being attached to the house and being one foot from the property line in terms of code. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that the house was old and there are no plans to change the existing structure. There was no evidence on file that what exists did not comply with code when it was built. Committee Member Daybell stated that it looks as if there has been an add-on to the residence. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded there had been a significant remodel in the 1940's.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant was planning on repainting the existing house. The applicant replied that he was planning to repaint and re-side the house as the side paneling was very old.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated he believed the project to be consistent with guidelines and looked fine.

Chairman Hoban concurred.

Committee Member Daybell said he had a problem with the simplicity of the architecture in the back building, but it looked pretty well concealed, so he would recommend approval. Committee Member Daybell also asked if there were to be any can lights to light up the alley, for security purposes. The applicant responded he did want lights, but was not sure if the time was right to address them. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that lights in alleys have developed as a "standard" condition. Committee Member Daybell stated there should be exterior lighting but would leave the criteria for lighting design up to staff to coordinate with the applicant.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he liked the project, and it was consistent with the architectural style.

Committee Member Daybell stated he would approve the project on three conditions: (1) the driveway to the existing structure should be removed prior to any occupancy of the new back building; (2) there be lighting in the back of the new building, adjacent to the alley; and (3) that the project be approved per staff recommendations, including the alteration of the west property line setback from three feet to four feet.

Chairman Hoban wanted to clarify that one of the conditions was to remove the driveway to the existing structure. Committee Member Daybell decided only the curb cut should be removed as a condition, but the driveway was optional. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that staff recommended a condition regarding the front property. The code stipulates that any driveway from the front street not being used to access a garage shall be removed. It had been included as a condition that the driveway be removed and replaced with landscaping, and any curb cut shall be removed so as to adhere to city standards. He

stated it was added as a condition for clarity, but as a code requirement it could just as easily been a plan check correction. It did not need to be added as a condition.

Committee Member Daybell stated he was concerned about the timing of the driveway removal as well, that the driveway should probably be removed not before the permit is issued, but during construction. The applicant expressed his desire to keep the driveway for parking during construction, due to the inconvenience of parking in the area.

Chairman Hoban clarified the motion to approve with staff recommendations and the addition of back alley lighting and removal of the driveway prior to occupancy of the back house. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there was a modification to Condition seven, before prior occupancy of the rear unit, the driveway will be removed. There will be an extra sentence added to Condition 6, that there will be lighting provided in the alley to provide proper illumination in that area. The third condition would be that the proposed structure be moved four feet from the west property line. Rather than a specific distance, Staff recommended the building to be shifted to accommodate building code and fire rating requirements, or accommodate ratings through sufficient design methods as determined by the Chief Planner or the Building Official.

Committee Member Daybell clarified he wished his motion to mandate the building be shifted four feet from the property line versus three feet from the property line, which would include having to make sure the fire retardant is met inside the building. Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if shifting the building four feet from the property line was satisfactory and the applicant agreed to this requirement.

MOTION by Chairman Hoban, SECONDED, by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project. 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 stated there was a new staff member, Nadia Muhaidly, who is the temporary, possibly full-time, clerical assistant.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he will not be able to attend the next RDRC meeting because he will be out of town.

MEETINGS:

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

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant