

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

May 14, 2009

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. by Chairman Hoban.

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Present: Chairman Hoban, Vice Chairman Cha, Committee Member Daybell, and Committee Member Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Absent: None

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

MINUTES: The April 23, 2009 minutes were not available.

The following items were heard out of order.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 2

PRJ08-00492 – ZON08-00162. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: JOEY HOPPER. To consider site and architectural plans for a Minor Development Project which includes the demolition of a single-story residence measuring approximately 730 square feet and construction of a two-story residence measuring approximately 1,830 square feet on property located in a potential landmark district and residential preservation zone at 130 East Brookdale Place (generally located on the south side of Brookdale Place, adjacent to the flood control channel) (R-2P zone) (CEQA Determination: Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner: Kusch).

Senior Planner Eastman gave the staff report.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant had seen the recommended conditions, and the applicant answered affirmatively.

Public hearing opened.

Rick Crane, Project Architect, made several comments regarding the proposed structure:

- He stated that because the garage and driveway are able to accommodate about five to six vehicles, they are not concerned with parking on site and are in concurrence with the staff recommended variance for tandem parking.
- In relation to staff recommend condition number five, they were proposing to use vinyl for the side and rear windows, and wood material for the front windows.
- They are proposing to remove the existing inner set of columns on the front porch, but plan to keep the existing outer columns to fit the architecture.
- There was no need for staff to recommend the applicant go through the permit process for the existing shed accessory structure, because they were proposing to demolish the shed.
- They proposed the access to the basement be at the east elevation.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the proposed basement location would be at the front of the house, and Mr. Crane answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the area near the right-of-way would be landscaped and Mr. Crane answered affirmatively; he added the parkway would be landscaped as well.

Committee Member Daybell stated the house is more tall than wide and asked why the roof was so steep. Mr. Crane replied that the style of architecture dictates a steep roof. Senior Planner Eastman clarified that if the roof were to be decreased by a few feet, the house would look more like a box.

Chairman Hoban asked what the average square footage was for bungalows in that neighborhood. Senior Planner Eastman replied that the average size was probably about 1,000 square feet, with no additions.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, commented on the proposed structure and noted the following:

- She stated that, traditionally, the preservation zone guidelines state that two story massing would be toward the rear of the property. However, because many houses in this neighborhood are already altered and do not necessarily reflect a certain era, the expectation for the proposed structure is not as strict.
- She noted she did not have a problem with the 19-foot setback and tandem parking due to the constraints of the lot.
- She appreciated the additional landscaping as it would make the proposed house look nicer.

- She had concern over the vinyl window material and would encourage staff to make sure the vinyl is high quality and almost identical to the wood windows.
- She requested a traditional sill structure be included with the windows that would have been typical of bungalows in the 1920's.
- She encouraged staff to ensure the front door is of high quality, as it has an impact on the aesthetics of the house.
- She liked the design and thought it was a good attempt to improve the structure.

Mr. Crane added that he submitted material colors and a color board, and the colors would include black window frames and a charcoal roof.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated he was ok with the two-story massing because the two-story apartment complex across from the structure diminishes the need to be strict two-story massing in that area. He stated the vinyl windows need to have the appearance of craftsmen, early style wood. He also stated he was ok with the relocation of the basement, and he also wanted to condition the landscaping be constructed to prevent parking on the lawn. With those conditions, he would support the project.

Committee Member Cha stated he liked how the design fit the context of the neighborhood and supported the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated he supported the project but wanted to condition the sill window treatment.

Chairman Hoban stated his only concern was regarding the massing but still supported the project.

Public hearing re-opened.

Ms. Dalton stated that normally Fullerton Heritage would not support demolishing a structure, but because the house was built in an era after traditional housing and not an example of any architectural style of the time, it is ok to demolish the structure.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell and SECONDED, by Chairman Hoban to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the project to the LANDMARK'S COMMISSION, subject to staff's recommendations, and added conditions as follows: (1) Landscaping must be constructed to prevent lawn parking (2) basement access would be located at the east elevation, and (3) sills shall be installed in the window treatments. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 4

PRJ09-00152 – PRE09-00026. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CITY OF FULLERTON.

Request to remodel and expand the Fullerton Main Library, which includes a 6,535 square-foot addition, comprised of a community room, restrooms, and a vending "cafe". The renovation will also include floor plan changes to the existing library, and the renovation of roof, carpet, shelving and lighting. The Main Library is located at 353 West Commonwealth Avenue (generally located adjacent to City Hall, northwest of Highland) (P-L zone) (Staff Planner: Eastman).

Public hearing opened.

Charlie Williams, Project Architect, gave a brief overview of the floor plan, site improvements, and exterior renderings for the proposed project. Chairman Hoban asked if there was an eyebrow jetting out of the roof line of the Community Room. Mr. Williams answered affirmatively and noted the eyebrow is a clad metal product, giving a layering effect to the project.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the existing entry to the library would be redesigned in any way. Mr. Williams stated the ramp and stairs will remain and the handrails will be replaced with a planter; a new book-drop will also be provided, as well as additional landscape to soften the painted red concrete. Committee Member Lynch asked if the glazing and mullions would remain, and Mr. Williams answered affirmatively; he stated the colors of the store front system will be replicated throughout the main entry and the elevation by City Hall. The color of the mullion system will remain the silver color, and the glass color will be brown.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the pine tree by the south side of the library would be removed. Senior Planner Eastman stated plans call for all the existing pine trees to be removed from the site. Since the Committee has previously tried to preserve existing trees, staff believes there are other approaches that could take place to save some trees. Mr. Williams stated they were proposing the use of a green screen, with a small gate at the walkway, to protect the pine tree on Commonwealth.

Committee Member Daybell stated he liked the existing appearance of the library on the Commonwealth side and did not see the need to spend money on changes, such as adding windows, due to the current state of the economy. He asked the architect if they looked at the financial difference between changing the south side and leaving it as is. Mr. Williams stated they had, and the proposed design is the reduced version of the original remodeled design. He noted that they felt the windows help establish a presence of the library on the Commonwealth elevation. Committee Member Daybell stated he did not see the need for people to be able to see into the library on the Commonwealth side.

Committee Member Cha asked if they ever considered moving the sculpture. Mr. Williams stated it was discussed, but limited funding prohibited it. He stated opening up the corner at Commonwealth would allow for a better view of the sculpture from City Hall and the street, which would frame the sculpture and discourage people from sitting on it. They also tried to soften the structure with landscaping.

Senior Planner Eastman stated staff believes the expansion achieves its architectural objectives and would only identify that there could be some advances in the landscaping, such as making it more consistent between the library building and City Hall to help create a sense of "government complex", arranging drought-resistant plants

as an educational garden, and considering and accommodating future bike storage consistent with the forthcoming bike element.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated he agreed with Senior Planner Eastman's comments about the landscaping and hoped more drought-tolerant plants would be incorporated to educate the residents on native landscaping. Committee Member Lynch stated he thought the existing entrance and the bunker entrance were not complimentary to each other. He also said he agreed with incorporating fenestration on the Commonwealth side for natural lighting.

Committee Member Cha stated that changing the south elevation would not accomplish anything. He believed the exit plan for the building addition's lobby should be revisited to reduce noise when going in and out of the conference rooms.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the landscaping should be carried from the library to the City Hall. He also reiterated that there was no need for funds to go to unnecessary building improvements, such as the windows on the Commonwealth side.

Chairman Hoban stated he really liked the proposed design, especially the windows on the Commonwealth side. He said the windows will make the library more obvious, as many do not know that the building next to City Hall is a library. He also said windows will provide more lighting for the building, which is very pro-active. Chairman Hoban stated he was happy to see drought-tolerant plants were proposed and that the landscaping would incorporate the monument outside the library.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he would not let his concern over the budget stand in the way of recommending approval of the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that, with the exception of the windows on the Commonwealth side, he liked the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he liked the windows and thought one good reason for incorporating them would be for LEED certification purposes. He also thought that the landscaping should be implemented throughout the civic center plaza. He also said the he was happy with the north elevation's design.

Chairman Hoban asked what would happen to funding if it was not used for the project. Mr. Williams stated if for some reason the allotted project funds are not used entirely, the remaining funds will be given back to the City to be used at their discretion, whether it be for extra architectural detailing, landscaping, etc.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell and SECONDED, by Vice Chairman Cha to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the project to the CITY COUNCIL, as discussed. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 3

PRJ06-00084 – ZON09-00033/ZON09-00034. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: FULLERTON REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY. A request for a Major Development

Project and Conditional Use Permit for an approximately 850-space parking structure with four levels and a pedestrian bridge over Harbor Boulevard on property located at 130 West Santa Fe Avenue (generally located on the south side of Santa Fe Avenue between Malden and Harbor) (M-G zone) (CEQA Determination: Previously Certified Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner: Allen).

Senior Planner Allen gave the staff report.

Committee Member Daybell made comments regarding the proposed design:

- He did not think bamboo was a good idea for landscaping.
- He felt a parking structure is a background building that is not supposed to stand out.
- He asked if brick facing could be used in place of real brick due to the cost involved.
- He thought the white fins on the back of the building were too modern for the structure.

Committee Member Daybell left the room due to a scheduled appointment.

Vice Chairman Cha asked what the purpose of the fins were on the back of the structure. Senior Planner Allen stated the fins were designed for several reasons: to potentially support future solar panels, prevent graffiti, and to create an aesthetically pleasing element when a moving train passes by the back of the structure.

Public hearing opened.

Lee Sterns, Project Architect, made several comments regarding the proposed design:

- The north side has a parking structure driveway line up with an alley leading to the SOCO District and a canopy that represents the idea of a storefront.
- The east and west sides have sculptural, brick elements in order to relate to Harbor Boulevard.
- The south side has vertical fins on the back of the structure to create shadows, prevent graffiti, support solar panels and also to relate to the gravel and train tracks within that area.
- The bamboo lining potential building sites is temporary until the frontage on Santa Fe is built.
- The glass elevator and broad stairways provide for an open and inviting environment.
- Overall, the different use of materials lends to an eclectic feel that relates to each surrounding elevation.

Chairman Hoban asked about the brick material. Mr. Lee stated he would be using a full brick veneer.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if Santa Fe Avenue would be widened. Yelena Voronel, City Civil Engineer, said no and clarified that making Santa Fe Avenue a two-way street is still undecided.

Chairman Hoban stated that the landscaping lining the potential building sites may be a problem because of the local bars and people loitering on the landscaping.

Steve Ellingson, 119 W. Santa Fe Avenue, stated he was excited with the project. However, he would have liked to see some of the truss structure that holds the SOCO sign used on the proposed building itself to continue an architectural theme. He stated his biggest concern was regarding the pedestrian traffic. The proposed elevator will be dropping people off on Santa Fe, and if they want to get to Harbor Boulevard they will be tempted to jay-walk. He stated if there is an issue with pedestrian traffic, a traffic signal at Santa Fe may be appropriate.

Mr. Sterns stated he does not think there will be a signal at Santa Fe, so people will either go to Commonwealth or cross using the proposed walk-way. Therefore, he tried to make the walk-way as interesting and explicit as possible.

Senior Planner Eastman asked if the walkway was at the second level of parking. Mr. Sterns said the walkway was actually level with Santa Fe, and the first level of parking is underground. Senior Planner Eastman stated he was surprised the elevator was towards the corner with the street and not closer to the rail track. Mr. Sterns explained the elevator placement makes the parking contribute to the urban design of that part of SOCO. Senior Planner Eastman stated that the elevator placement serves as a focal point and may end up leading people in the structure away from the pedestrian bridge and towards Santa Fe.

Chairman Hoban asked if there was any consideration for staircases in the back of the structure for people to get back to the southeast corner. Mr. Sterns stated that they would explore this further.

Public hearing re-opened.

James Chan, 322 Gateway Court, asked if there was access from the structure to the pedestrian bridge. Mr. Sterns answered affirmatively and showed Mr. Chan the access to the structure from the main level.

Mr. Chan asked if there would be some kind of security monitoring on the bridge to prevent gang activity or loitering. Mr. Sterns stated the nature of the design is very open to prevent places to hide. Chairman Hoban stated that this was not within the purview of the RDRC. It was clarified that cameras would be installed.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he appreciated how the design complimented the surrounding areas. He also said the best place for a staircase was at the end of the

walkway across Harbor. He offered that a moving walkway could facilitate pedestrian movement through the garage.

Committee Member Lynch stated he was, overall, happy with the design. He agreed with Steve Ellingson's comment about incorporating the same elements from the SOCO sign into the proposed structure. He also liked the use of the citrus groves and the date palms for landscaping.

Chairman Hoban stated the design shows respect for the location. He liked the fins on the back of the structure; however, he thought the landscape in front was a welcome mat for bar-goers. He also suggested the proposed structure give respect to what industry used to be there. He would not support a signal for Santa Fe, but would suggest a staircase on the backside. He also thought the staircases in front were well-designed. He would support continuation of the project.

Committee Member Lynch added that he would support the use of bamboo because it softens the rough materials.

Vice Chairman Cha suggested a sign that tells pedestrians the structure is parking for the Transportation Center.

Chairman Hoban stated he was comfortable with the recommendations in the staff report in regards to modifying the design to meet the requirements for a historic structure.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, and SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of June 11, 2009 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 1

PRJ03-00804 – ZON08-00008. APPLICANT: TOM MOORE; PROPERTY OWNER: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON. A request for a Minor Development Project to review site improvement plans and landscape plans for an existing Southern California Edison electrical substation on property located at the southwest corner of East Walnut Avenue and Walnut Way (located approximately 250 feet west of South Lemon) (M-G zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Eastman).

Senior Planner Eastman gave the staff report.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the wall was 12 feet high all the way around. Senior Planner Eastman stated that the wall is measured from the substation's grade. He clarified that the proposed 12' wall will hit an 8' wall at the northwest corner of the site.

Chairman Hoban asked if the discussion is to revolve around the three art pockets. Senior Planner Eastman clarified that, currently, there are fifteen art panels proposed in groups of three. Staff requests RDRC input regarding five 12' x 4' panels instead of the fifteen, because the large art pieces will be easier for the public to view from the train.

Vice Chairman Cha said that the layers of street trees may block the public's view of the art from the train. Senior Planner Eastman stated the existing trees were proposed to be

removed and replaced with Brisbane Box trees, which will grow higher than the wall, provide a taller canopy, as well as a better view of the art pieces.

Public hearing opened.

James Chan, 322 Gateway Court, said he attended the meeting with hopes to petition some sort of barrier between the substation and the adjacent neighborhood. He did not realize it was an architectural discussion.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Hoban liked the idea of replacing the existing trees with ones that would grow taller than the wall. He also liked the idea of incorporating larger art pieces versus smaller ones.

Committee Member Lynch asked about lighting for the art. Senior Planner Eastman stated that Edison does not want any lighting on the wall for safety purposes. Committee Member Lynch suggested conditioning up-lighting in the landscaping to illuminate the art at night.

Vice Chairman Cha expressed satisfaction for the design.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch and SECONDED, by Vice Chairman Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and an added condition that there be up-lighting to illuminate the art at night. Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Senior Planner Eastman discussed alternate ways to deliver the plans and staff reports to the RDRC instead of mailing them.

MEETINGS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant