

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

October 9, 2008

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:23 p.m. by Committee Member Daybell

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Present: Committee Member Daybell, Committee Member Lynch, and Committee Member Silber

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairman Hoban and Vice Chairman Cha

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner Eastman, Parks and Recreation Director Felz, and Clerical Assistant Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present, that the minutes of the regular meeting of August 28, 2008 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

The September 11, 2008 minutes were not available.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ08-00389 – ZON08-00126. APPLICANT ROBERT LONG AND PROPERTY OWNER: WINFRED A. LONG. A request to demolish an existing two (2) car garage and build a new one (1) car garage in a residential preservation zone on property located at 315 Jacaranda Place. (located on the north side of Jacaranda Place, generally between 150 feet and 200 feet west of Highland Avenue) (R-2P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15302 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Eastman)

Senior Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. He stated the applicant's father will be moving into a care facility soon so the applicant is looking at demolishing the existing, tandem garage on the site, rebuilding the garage, and renting out the house. The existing garage has access both from the alley and a driveway. A single-car garage will be re-constructed and pushed back to the alley but will not take access off the alley; it will take access off the driveway. The applicant has not been provided any plans, which was in part, staff's direction. The applicant has indicated he will construct

the single-car garage to match the existing garage as it relates to siting, height, pitch roof, exposed rafter tails, etc. The garage would be located in the general location it exists today, just not as deep; however, the garage will be wider to provide for a laundry facility and a work bench. It is the applicant's intent to come back with a larger garage and a granny unit in the future, but as of now those plans are tentative. Staff has prepared a site plan, something that staff drew to show that the project can comply with code.

Senior Planner Eastman noted that a concern has to do with access to the open parking space; there is currently a parking space behind the existing house. It provides parking that would be out of the way of drive access to the garage. Both of the existing and the new garage would allow for vehicles to back out the driveway. An alternative would be to construct a slab adjacent to the entrance of the new single-car garage to provide for parking as indicated as "B" in the staff-drawn site plan. Staff has recommended project approval subject to a number of standard conditions, which would require Director's approval.

Public hearing opened.

Applicant, Robert Long, stated that he is in the process of deciding upon one of three contractors to do the job. The reason he wants to replace the garage, initially, is so that he can rent the house out to help offset the cost of his father's assisted living. He stated he would eventually like to move into the house, which he grew up in, and maybe remodel the house to his needs in the future. However, currently he would like the garage to be constructed so that he can rent the house out in order to gain additional income to cover his father's medical care. Mr. Long added that he intended on keeping the garage design consistent with the feel of the historical neighborhood.

Committee Member Silber asked why the garage does not have alley access. Mr. Long stated that he does not have a particular reason why, he just thought he should have access from the front. Committee Member Silber stated that he does not think the issue is substantive, but he suggested experimenting with access. Committee Member Silber asked Senior Planner Eastman whether this concern would make a difference to the project. Senior Planner Eastman stated that he and the applicant previously discussed this issue; staff felt that alley access makes more sense because of accessibility; there can be two cars parked on the driveway and a driveway in the garage as well, and not have to move cars when trying to leave the house. However, there is nothing in the Code that prevents front access, and if the applicant is not comfortable with having alley access, then it is his prerogative not to have that. Committee Member Silber stated that alley access would require the garage to be set in five feet, so there will be 25 feet of turning radius. He suggested that applicant consider this suggestion. Mr. Long stated that right now the old garage has alley access and he used it many times and would consider the suggestion. Committee Member Daybell stated that an advantage to alley access is to have a pedestrian door towards the house, so that there can be access through the entry door to the laundry facility in the garage. Mr. Long asked if he did not have to make this decision regarding alley access until he submits the drawings. Senior Planner Eastman stated that it is at the direction of the RDRC. Committee Member Lynch stated that he is fine either way regarding alley access and would be fine if the applicant changed his mind down the road to have alley access; it is the applicant's right to determine access. Mr. Long stated that he will consider it.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated that she is fine with the project. She stated she was a little concerned that there are not plans for the Committee, but because it is such a straight forward project and Mr. Long is committed to using appropriate materials and having the garage match the house, she trusts staff can handle the project. Committee Member Lynch asked if Fullerton Heritage would be overlooking this project, and Ms. Dalton stated that it would not be her specifically, but she was sure neighbors would be monitoring the project. However, she stated she was sure there would not be any problems with the project, because the applicant grew up in the neighborhood and appreciates the historic factor of the location.

Ms. Dalton noted she also thought it was unusual to take access from the driveway. She thought it would be more logical to have a bit of an area for the trashcans so that they are out of the public view from the front right-of-way. The benefit is that there can be parking along the driveway leading up to it, and the space does not have to be taken out of the yard to create a new pad. Mr. Long stated that the pad is already there and that is why he chose to only have access from the front driveway.

Public hearing closed.

Senior Planner Eastman noted that if there was access taken off the alley, staff would look for lighting to provide illumination, which is a standard condition for safety.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he took no exception to the project.

Committee Member Silber stated that he was in support of the project.

Committee Member Daybell stated that regardless of where the door is, the garage should be inset five feet from the alley. Also, providing there will be power to the building for the laundry facility, lighting has always been encouraged for security purposes on the alley side. Mr. Long asked if he does not have alley access, what the purpose of requesting the five foot inset is. Committee Member Daybell stated that he presumed there will be a door used for alley access in order to take out the trash. Mr. Long stated that there is a gate right next to the garage that leads out to the alley. Committee Member Daybell stated that he does not like buildings jammed up against property lines, but it was just a strong recommendation and will not be a condition of approval. Other than this concern, he would look for a motion from the Committee.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, and SECONDED, by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

Committee Member Daybell asked if one of the conditions was related to ensuring the constructed garage will be similar in design to the existing house due to its location in a preservation zone, and Senior Planner Eastman answered affirmatively.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

Item A

PRJ08-00394 – ZON08-00138 Review and recommendation to the City Council regarding renovation of Sports Fields (Lions Field), located on the south side of Brea

Blvd., east of Harbor Blvd, on property addressed as 1440 N. Brea Blvd. Lions Field is located in Hillcrest Park, a site listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the RDRC was being asked to review the three architectural styles of the building and Senior Planner Eastman answered affirmatively. Committee Member Daybell stated that the reason he addressed this issue was to clarify what the RDRC should be focusing on in the meeting.

Joe Felz, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated the Parks and Recreation Commission and the City Council has asked staff to work with user groups and citizen groups for this project due to its significance in the City. It was recommended by the Parks and Recreation Commission that the RDRC review the architectural themes of this project. The comments and recommendations made by the RDRC will not go forward to the Planning Commission, but will be part of a series of recommendations made directly to the City Council. Director Felz added that there has already been a lot of work done with user groups, both informal and formal, Fullerton Heritage, other Commissioners, etc.

Public hearing opened.

Rick Barrett, Project Landscape Architect and Design Director, stated that the focus of the meeting will generally be on the two buildings near Brea Boulevard and Hillcrest Park. These two buildings are combined restroom and concession buildings with associated storage, and a meeting room in one of the two buildings. The building near Lemon Street is less significant since it is a storage building.

Mr. Barrett stated that the project began with looking at the architectural style of the field. First, designs were explored that would compliment the park architecture, and then in meetings with user groups and Fullerton Heritage, three designs were developed: a Craftsman style design, a Spanish Mediterranean design, and a Modern/Contemporary design. User groups and Fullerton Heritage expressed preference for the Modern design because they believed it to be complementary to the park, without trying to mimic the historic architecture. Mr. Barrett emphasized the importance of not attempting to replicate historic architecture because it becomes problematic for historians, downplays the importance of authentic historic architecture in the City, and is more expensive to build.

Mr. Barrett referred to plans and noted that certain design elements (furniture, fencing, etc.) pertaining to the specific style of architecture are included in the plans to ensure a unified design is incorporated for the entire park. Gazebos and historic themed elements are depicted for the Craftsman style. Specific design elements are also incorporated for the Spanish Mediterranean and Modern designs.

Mr. Barrett referred to the Modern style, which he noted was preferred most for its clean look, ability to set a tone for the future of the City, as well as the fact that it does not attempt to replicate any historic architecture of the park and neighborhood. Mr. Barrett added that the boards and some of the floor plans were provided in the staff report.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the maintenance building on Lemon was part of the redesign. Mr. Barrett answered that it is a storage building so it does not have the concession and public restrooms, but will have the same style as the other two buildings.

Director Felz stated that the reason the Modern design is recommended from a staff perspective, and from the user groups, is because it is believed to be an appropriate style for the age of Lyons Field when it was developed in the 1960's. The Modern design makes for a fairly bold statement, and there is a lot of history to this project.

Director Felz stated that this project began in 1991 and has undergone many obstacles since. Completing the renovation establishes Lyon's Field as an important place in the City. The function of the modern style gives the use of materials (concrete, steel) that can handle the high and intense use and provides for firm materials that will handle the rigors of the sports complex.

Committee Member Silber asked the general locations of the site sections. Mr. Barr referred to the plans and indicated the location of the sections.

Committee Member Silber stated that the field is above the street level and asked if the grade would change. Director Felz answered affirmatively and noted that there will be a substantial change in elevations. Mr. Barrett referred to a picture depicting the new elevations. Committee Member Silber asked if there was a retaining wall bordering a portion of the field. Director Felz noted that it is a retaining wall with a fence on top.

Committee Member Daybell wanted to clarify if the building on Brea Boulevard and the work sheds on the other side of the creek were coming out, with a little bridge built over the creek on the south side for circulation and Mr. Barr answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Lynch stated that, while he likes all three designs, he was not interested in mimicking or recreating the architecture either. He believes the Modern design is very appropriate and would like to see it happen.

Committee Member Silber stated that he preferred the Modern design; however, he had two comments regarding the design. One, both buildings represent opportunities to create an entry experience as one comes into the field. He stated that the shed roof is appropriate; however, the shed does not need to pin wheel off in three directions. Rather than make a more complex roofline, it would be better to create more overhang over the restroom elements and in front of the restroom and barbeque area. If there is a six foot wide, arcade walk-way experience under that overhang, and that is the highest part of the roof, with the building as a backdrop to the roof, the arrival experience will be significant for both buildings. Especially if the building on Brea will be incorporated in the grade change, there will be an aesthetically pleasing experience coming up the street level and rising up to the terrace of the fields.

Committee Member Silber also noted that it would be really interesting to see how these ideas are applied to the maintenance building as well; however, he believed the maintenance building seemed to be in a tentative position. Director Felz stated that the maintenance building size may change substantially depending on whether real or synthetic turf will be used. Committee Member Silber suggested that if the building is set down from the field, the field could roll over the top of the roof or incorporate something that looks like it does.

Committee Member Silber stated that the basic idea of the shed roof is right, but having it pin wheel out in three different directions is more complicated than a small building

should be, especially if it results in more unnecessary roof and volume, which prevents the creation of more overhang. In viewing the plans, if the posted area in the arcade was all overhang, and the building was treated as a backdrop, then it would be the gateway experience to coming into the field, especially with lighting at night. In form, if the building needs to jet out for the concession for visibility he can understand that, but believes the building should be very simple.

Committee Member Silber asked if the narrow bars on the fenestration were for security purposes or an opportunity to incorporate a horizontal element. Mr. Barrett stated that it was more for security purposes. Committee Member Silber stated he believes that aligning the base, where materials change, and aligning the windows, so everything registers off the same point, will be simpler to build and be more attractive. He stated that generally, small buildings required simple mass.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he concurred with Committee Member Silber regarding the windows, but did not agree in regards to the butterfly roof. He stated he did not see butterfly roofs too often, and he was very pleased that the design may be interjected into the City. Committee Member Silber clarified that he liked butterfly roofs, but the concession area needed to resolve itself in some way in order to be consistent with the butterfly roof. He stated that if there was a three dimensional model of the building, it would show how the different planes intersect or collide with one another, which creates a fussy design. He stated that a shed that is walked under or a concession stand with columns supporting a broadly hanging butterfly roof would be satisfactory. Committee Member Lynch concurred with Committee Member Silber's suggested design.

Committee Member Silber added that, even though there are security issues, the concession stand should entirely consist of the base material or possibly consist of translucent material, which would increase illumination from the lights inside the building, and act as a lantern under the overhang.

Committee Member Silber stated that ultimately, the shed should have a simple roof line, with only one or two moves: the shed with the pitch perpendicular to the long line of the building, the other, a butterfly roof, but without the interruption of the concession area and a big overhang to walk under.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he was not a particular fan of Modern design themes, but understood that everyone else seemed to be in favor of the design. With that, he liked Committee Member Silber's idea of making the design simpler.

Committee Member Daybell added that he believed the design should consist of natural turf, as opposed to artificial turf, because it is more cost-effective.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he was confused as to what "Circle 3" on the plans meant. Mr. Barrett clarified that the label indicated an area for batting cages. Committee Member Daybell stated that he was just curious because the area was obscured by trees in the drawing.

Committee Member Daybell asked Senior Planner Eastman if a motion was needed and Senior Planner Eastman clarified that a motion was needed regarding the three architectural styles as a recommendation to the City Council.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there were any public comments.

Ms. Dalton stated that Parks and Recreation has been very generous in terms of bringing Fullerton Heritage along with the project. Fullerton Heritage also prefers the Modern theme and feels it will nicely articulate with the historic park, be more cost effective, easier to maintain, and maintains the sport and historical context.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch asked Senior Planner Eastman if the Committee was supposed to propose certain conditions for the project, or just recommend a design style. Senior Planner Eastman stated that the Committee's comments would be included as minutes to the City Council. The Committee is essentially being asked to review the concept of the architecture of the three styles. He noted that Engineering will look at potential cost in terms of the Committee's comments. The aspect of the usability of having an arcade will be looked at through Parks and Recreation. Ultimately, staff will present to Council something that reflects the best interest of the City. Council will be presented with the RDRC minutes to reflect upon. Committee Member Lynch stated he had a concern regarding the Committees' comments going unheard due to the inability to make conditions on the project. Senior Planner Eastman stated that there were good comments made regarding the three architectural styles, but they cannot be included as conditions due to lack of knowledge regarding cost and functionality. Director Felz added that he does not know how successfully the comments will be resolved, but assured the Committee that their comments will not be unheard.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Silber, to RECOMMEND approval of the Modern theme. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member Daybell stated he hopes that the Engineering Department will not be deciding the architecture of the design, unless an architect is involved in the process. Senior Planner Eastman clarified that the Engineering Department's role is to assure the project is within budget, and that there is a project architect who will consider the aesthetics.

Committee Member Daybell also clarified that the recommendation included the idea of simplifying the roof lines.

Director Felz noted that the issue of natural versus synthetic turf is highly debated right now and is one of the issues to go before Council. Both sides are being considered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Senior Planner Eastman stated that staff is currently dealing with a code issue on a preservation property. Margaret Jewitt, a Fullerton resident, came in with plans for a second unit behind her existing house. After several plan corrections, Ms. Jewitt got her plans approved to construct the project; however, she decided not to purchase or install

the windows that were agreed upon and identified on the construction documents. She installed white vinyl sliders. Senior Planner Eastman stated that he had visited the site, and told the contractor that staff will not approve what is being installed. Ms. Jewitt does have the right to file an amendment to her approved project, should she decide to keep the windows she installed.

Senior Planner Eastman noted that regarding preservation issues, staff is in the process of conducting a window survey. Staff is going out to observe what type of windows have been installed in buildings in the preservation zone to try to establish some examples of windows that are appropriate and acceptable. Planning interns are still in the process of taking pictures and cataloguing windows. Committee Member Lynch stated that, in the past, the Committee had enforced a precedent of window installation, where the Committee denied the installation of unapproved windows. Senior Planner Eastman stated that it has been made very clear to Ms. Jewitt that she has the right to request the sliders, but staff would not support the request. He said he also told the contractor the windows that have been installed would not be supported.

Senior Planner Eastman noted that the Preserve America application from Fullerton Heritage was given to Planning Manager Zelinka. He stated that Ms. Dalton can provide clarity if there are any questions about the application. There was a brief description of the intended purpose of Preserve America.

MEETINGS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:17 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant