

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

August 9, 2007

4:00 PM

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

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Duncan, Committee Member
PRESENT: Lynch, Committee Member Cha and
Committee Member Daybell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Vice Chairman Hoban
ABSENT:

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

MINUTES: The July 26, 2007 minutes were not available.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00309 – ZON07-00066. APPLICANT: ALEX FISHER. PROPERTY OWNER:
MICHAEL FRANCIS A request for a Minor Development Project to construct a new 2 bedroom,
900 sq. ft., detached unit over a 3 car garage along the alley. Project is located in a
preservation overlay zone at 312 W. Whiting Avenue (Generally located on the south side of W.
Whiting, approximately 160 ft to 200 ft west of Highland, 470 ft east of Ford Ave) (R-2P Zone)
(Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (JEA)

Staff determined that the project did not meet some of the code requirements and had concerns
about the preservation standards. The applicant was favorable of continuing the item to the
August 23, 2007 meeting and making the necessary revisions as suggested by Staff.

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00326 – ZON07-00067. APPLICANT: RICH ROTHMAN. PROPERTY OWNER:
BERSHON REALTY CO A request for a Minor Development Project to review proposed exterior
changes to an existing 9,321 sq. ft commercial building located at 1700 Placentia. (Generally

located at the northwest corner of Placentia and Topaz) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (JEA)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that the applicant was proposing a façade remodel of an existing 1964 building in which three tower elements would be included. The existing flat canopy would be removed and replaced with a canopy that has a parapet. The existing signage would be removed and the new canopy with the parapet would provide for new signage opportunities. Staff was concerned with the screening of the mechanical equipment on the roof. The parking lot has no landscaping and any addition of landscaping would remove parking spaces, staff recommended a two foot planter along the property and or landscaping in the arcade. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there shall be adequate lighting that doesn't create glare and all exterior lighting should be included in the construction drawings. This project is located in a Community Improvement District.

Committee Member Cha asked if trees could be planted in the two feet of landscaping that exits in the front setback. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the applicant could plant palms because they are narrow enough for the two foot space. Staff believed that shrubs, ground cover or vines could be a landscaping alternative.

Committee Member Cha asked if the trash bin in the back of the property was enclosed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he was not sure. The applicant indicated that it was not enclosed.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant agreed with the recommended conditions. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that Senior Planner St. Paul mentioned that the applicant was comfortable with the conditions.

Public hearing opened.

Terry Parker, REP Commercial stated that they were proposing three wall pack lights to provide security and better lighting for the side of the alley. Mr. Parker was willing to work with Staff for the proper roof screening of the mechanical equipment. Mr. Parker stated that he was looking into hiring a landscape architect to come up with a landscape plan for the 2 foot strip. He believed that he could incorporate shrubs and palms since palms have a narrow base and grow tall. Mr. Parker stated that the landscape area along the entryway would be widened and extended so the existing pylon sign stays inside the planter area and is not on the parking lot. There will also be large pots adjacent to the major entry ways. Mr. Parker stated that he was in the process of submitting a sign application and was familiar with the City of Fullerton's code requirements. The pylon sign would be remodeled and cut down some to make it a modern sign.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that this was a great center and believed that the remodel of the building was great.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell believed that there needed to be some sort of lighting in the rear of the building. He stated that the applicant needed to submit a sign program to enhance the existing signage.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City code requires a sign program for multi-tenant buildings. Regarding lighting, he stated that the applicant could provide shielded wall pack lights. Mr. Parker stated that he was agreeable to "half pack" lights on the side of the alley.

Committee Member Cha believed that lighting was needed on the side and behind the building. He stated that the trash bin needed to be enclosed.

Committee Member Lynch believed that landscaping was an opportunity to enhance the property.

Chairman Duncan commented that he has always liked the scale and the design of the existing project and was agreeable to the project either way (keeping existing or remodeling).

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Parker stated that the space behind the building was extremely tight and there was also a telephone pole there. Mr. Parker did not believe the trash bins could be enclosed. He stated that he could move the fence line to the rear of the project and that would allow for double bins.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if there would be room to provide for a door mounted on the building to prohibit illegal dumping.

Chairman Duncan asked if the trash enclosure was on the pathway. Mr. Parker stated no. Chairman Duncan asked if the pathway space needed to be utilized in order to pull the trash bins onto the street. Mr. Parker stated that the loading door for Mercado Davis opens out and the trash bin has to be pulled out onto the street in order for the loading trucks to access the area.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that Staff usually works with MG Disposal to see what would work best for them.

Committee Member Daybell suggested fencing in front of the trash bins. Mr. Parker stated that he was willing to do that.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project. Subject to Staffs recommended conditions and adding a condition that the screening of the trash enclosure be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development, that the condition regarding wall pack lighting be modified to allow for half pack lights to help illuminate the alley and a sign program shall be submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 3

PRJ07-00344 – ZON07-00073. APPLICANTS: JPI DEVELOPMENT AND SHELDON GROUP. PROPERTY OWNER: PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE A request for a Major Development Project to construct a 375 unit student-oriented housing project with 30,000 sq. ft. of neighborhood-serving commercial on property located at the north west corner of East

Chapman and North Commonwealth Avenues, specifically 2545 - 2565 E. Chapman Avenue, 501 N. Commonwealth Avenue, and 2540 E. College Place. (O-P/R-3 ZONE) (EIR) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave an overview of the project. She explained that this project was located on the northwest corner of Chapman and Commonwealth Avenue, between the 57 freeway and State College Blvd. The site is located south of Hope University and Cal State Fullerton, and within a several mile radius of Western Law, the School of Optometry and Fullerton College. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the RDRC should review the design in terms of site plan, architecture and landscaping, and land use issues would be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council. The applicant is proposing to construct a student-oriented housing project on approximately 6.8 acres. The project is designed as a wrap around a seven level parking structure. The proposed parking structure has a basement level, 6 levels above that, including a rooftop level. Around that would be a four level ground floor commercial and residential project. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that there would be three vehicular entrances. The main entrance located on East College Place was for residents and the entrance on Chapman Avenue was the retail customer's entrance. There will also be a service entrance off of Commonwealth Avenue. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the ground floor had a proposed 10 foot setback. The architecture was contemporary with stucco exterior and stone accents. The building has a few pop out features with "floating" elements and the height ranges between 50 ft and 60 ft. The corner tower feature is the tallest at about 68 feet and the parking structure is about 62 feet. Staff was concerned with what the service area would look like because it would be visible and recommended that the area be enclosed on all sides. The applicants proposed a commercial grade window on the ground floor which would be clear anodized aluminum and the residential windows would be white vinyl. In the past the RDRC has recommended that the windows be of the same material for consistency. Staff was also concerned with the light poles on the upper level of the parking and believed the light poles should be replaced with bollards or something similar.

Committee Member Cha asked where the bicycle parking would be added. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that there would be bicycle parking in the residential area and one for guest and commercial patron parking, although not at the right turn pocket.

Committee Member Daybell commented that the staff report said that on-street parking was available on Commonwealth and Chapman Avenues; however Commonwealth Ave does not have on-street parking because it's a right turn only lane. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that in conjunction with this project Commonwealth would be redesigned to allow for on-street parking.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the architectural style that was proposed came from some direction by Staff. Staff asked the applicant be consistent with Cal State Fullerton's architecture and try to create something that is compatible with the education district, as it may consist at the present time.

Chairman Duncan stated that he remembered that one of the design criteria at Cal State Fullerton was that all buildings be white. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he was not sure what Cal State Fullerton's design approach is today, but many of the new buildings are not white and have a variety of materials.

For public record Committee Member Daybell stated that he met with the applicant and Acting Senior Planner Allen for a briefing on this project.

Public hearing opened.

RC Alley, Architects Orange, stated that the project was well explained by Staff. The main corner at North Commonwealth and Chapman was an important focal point and a tower element was placed at the same area. They were also focused on the drive intersections for the project so the parking garage would be inviting as people drive by. Once in the garage people could walk through the passage way to the retail area. The relationship of the garage to the streets was also important. Mr. Alley stated that they did a line-of-sight study to analyze what a 6ft tall person on the south side of Chapman Ave would see. That person couldn't really see anything on the roof top of the parking structure because of the parapet. However, the lighting poles located on top of the garage would be visible from the street at the street driveway area because of the building's articulation. To address the concern of the visibility of those light fixtures, Mr. Alley proposed to locate the fixtures away from that drive entrance and more towards the middle of the garage and around the perimeter of the motor court so the light poles would not be visible from that motor court entry. Mr. Alley stated that drain at the end of the balcony would divert water along the two street fronts off the building face. Staff was concerned that the balcony drains would allow water to run along the face of the building and stain the building faces. Mr. Alley stated that JPI was going to hire a bike parking consultant to come up with the number of bike parking spaces the project needed and locate the facilities. Mr. Alley stated the windows could be white aluminum store front to match the white vinyl windows above if the RDRC was concerned about matching the two. Mr. Alley stated that they preferred clear anodized aluminum storefront windows, and that it's difficult to get an aluminum residential window that meets the energy requirements.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that Staff's concern that the residential and retail windows match is based on what the RDRC had previously conditioned another mixed-use project at Lawrence and Commonwealth. The condition was to use windows of the same materials throughout the project, both for the commercial and residential.

Committee Member Daybell, referencing the balcony drain exhibit, stated that he did not understand where the water would go because of the weep holes on the wall. Mr. Alley stated that they were proposing a mini gutter. The weep holes would be on the edge of the deck and a small gutter assembly would run along the entire face of that deck. The small amount of water would drain off of the deck, or essentially drain off the concrete surface at the balcony ends. It would weep out through the tee bar assembly and collect in a mini gutter, and then in one or two places at each balcony it would drain off the edge of the mini gutter.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman commented that when balconies are exposed to dirt they are hosed off or are "washed" by rain water; thus leaving a lot of staining. Staff recommended internal drains so the water would drain off the end of the balcony into a small gutter and then would be redirected to a downspout. Mr. Alley stated that the small amount of water would be directed to one or two places where the water is pushed out, but not put into a downspout system. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the water would go to a lip which would drain away from the building. Mr. Alley stated that water would be directed away from the building face.

Chairman Duncan asked if the gutter could drain to a downspout instead of a scupper that would free fall to the ground. Mr. Alley stated that it would be difficult to put it into a downspout because of the quantity of balconies.

Rick Polhamus, Sitiescades Architects mentioned the importance of making the Commonwealth and East Chapman Avenue street scene pedestrian friendly with street furniture and a vertical skyline. Mr. Polhamus was proposing colored concrete unit pavers and brick to break up the paving and create spaces. He stated that there were three internal residential court yards which would be study courts and passive seating areas. For the courtyard between the parking structure and the commercial structure they were proposing stringing cables above the first floor and growing vines. That way the residents that live above the commercial area don't look down into a service area.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that this was the conceptual landscape layout to give an idea of the direction they are heading in. Staff has made a recommendation that they come back with a more finite plan.

Chairman Duncan asked what the function was of the landscape area between the parking structure and the commercial area. Mr. Polhamus stated that it was a commercial plaza patio. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that it was a pedestrian land service area.

Chairman Duncan asked if the commercial area along Chapman was considered the frontage versus the residential living at ground level. Mr. Alley stated that they did not want to continue the retail area down further because of where the parking areas were located.

Lance Hanna, JPI, stated that Staff had provided meaningful comments a year ago and the project was now a good showcase to the education district within Fullerton. Mr. Hanna stated that JPI was agreeable to the conditions of approval, but had concerns with conditions 12 and 8. Mr. Hanna understood the risk of other things falling into that balcony drain besides water that could cause backup of the drain. He believed that if there were a backup it would sheep flow over the balcony. If water were behind the wall due to a commode or a kitchen sink that water flows under a higher volume and pressure so it would clear; the balcony drains would run the risk of collecting water behind the walls because of the lower volume and pressure. Mr. Hanna stated that the optimal solution was the scupper concept with multiple lip designs that would then allow for the steam of water to be directed away from the face of the building. Mr. Hanna was concerned about the condition on light poles on the parking deck. He stated that they did not want light glare going into the residential spaces, but they also do not want dark corners or shadows. He stated that a small portion of the light poles would be visible by a pedestrian on Chapman. They would use downward lighting. The bollards or a waist high wall pack type of light would be spread out and blocked by the vehicles. It is JPI's desire that the top part of the parking deck be well lit for the residents in the evening time.

Committee Member Cha asked if a trash chute was located on every floor of the parking structure and if it would get compacted at the ground level. Mr. Hanna stated every floor has a chute. Committee Member Cha asked if the noise of dropping trash from the 7th floor to the 1st floor would be considered a nuisance and problem. Mr. Hanna stated that they have not experienced any problems with the trash chute in similar developments. Committee Member Cha commented that it would be very noisy if someone dropped a computer down the chute from the seventh floor.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the residential building was only four stories, not seven.

Committee Member Cha asked if there was enough ventilation for the trash chute. Mr. Alley clarified that at the ground floor the trash is put into a bin and there are only trash chutes from

the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors down. The trash rooms are isolated enclosed rooms and any noise of trash going into the bin is contained within the room. The trash chutes have vents that go to the roof and there is a system that deodorizes them.

Jane Beck, 2495 Santa Ysabel Ave was concerned with the location of the project. She believed that the project would make the residential area very noisy and congested. She did not like the idea of the air quality being compromised because of the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the RDRC Committee reviews the architecture design, site design, and landscaping of a project. Air quality and traffic fall within the purview of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Derek Hollingsworth, 2441 E Commonwealth Ave agreed with Ms. Beck and understood he needed to address the level of occupancy and the traffic issues with the Planning Commission. However, he was wondering if something could be done to accommodate recycling in the trash chute.

Chairman Duncan asked if there was a design that would allow for recycling. Mr. Alley stated the opportunities to recycle are determined by the trash provider. Fullerton's waste hauler, MG Disposal, takes everything to a MRF station and it gets sorted there. They do not pick up recyclable material separate from other trash. He clarified that the City does recycle, just not at the "curb".

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha stated that he liked the 3-dimensional style and the courtyard design. He was concerned that there was not a designated area for the bicycle traffic.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he liked the overall design and was in favor of aluminum clad windows throughout the project. He was wondering if it was difficult to maintain the Title 24 compliance in the residential section with aluminum windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he believed it could be done however the public hearing would have to be re-opened so the applicant could speak towards the technical aspects. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the RDRC was making a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council. Committee Member Lynch stated that he would like to recommend aluminum windows and wanted to know if a mechanical engineer had studied the pressure on the balcony drains.

Committee Member Daybell was concerned with the free falling drainage from the building. He believed the design was busy but unique. He was concerned with the light glare from the parking structure into the residences. Overall he supported the project.

Chairman Duncan believed the project would be a good addition to the area. He stated that he liked the mini gutter solution, since he understands what staining does to a buildings exterior. He stated that at a minimum the aluminum windows at the commercial ground level were fine and did not mind the vinyl above. He stated that the Metro Project was presented with grey aluminum vinyl versus white vinyl (although ultimately conditioned for aluminum windows consistent with the ground floor). Chairman Duncan believed that evergreen street trees were needed along Chapman and along North Commonwealth to give it a tree lined effect. He liked the close spacing of the trees along East College Place. He liked the palms used to accentuate the entry points and corners. He did not have a problem with the interior court yards but suggested that tall palms not be placed up along the building sides. Chairman Duncan did not

have a problem with someone standing on the opposite side of Chapman looking up at the parking structure and seeing one light pole.

Committee Member Daybell asked Committee Member Lynch if he was proposing that the windows all be consistent in the commercial and residential areas. Committee Member Lynch stated yes and that he preferred aluminum windows for the design. Committee Member Daybell stated that he did not like the all aluminum look and would prefer using a color other than white for the vinyl. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the architect for the Metro Project proposed the clear anodized store front window with a similar vinyl color. However, the Metro Project ended up being conditioned for all aluminum windows because the two materials would age differently. Committee Member Daybell stated that it would be better to have the windows of one material through out the commercial or residential areas. Committee Member Lynch agreed with Committee Member Daybell and stated that he preferred the aluminum. Committee Member Cha stated that he would like staff to review the bicycle parking plan when submitted.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the Planning Commission and City Council with Staff recommendations, adding that detailed bicycle parking and storage plans shall be submitted to Staff and that the windows shall all be aluminum.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that based on Committee comments condition 12 needed to be modified because staff had recommended that the lights on the top floor not be light poles. Instead Staff suggested bollards or something low. Committee Member Daybell stated that the applicant explained the reasoning for the light poles and he believed that the light poles would be ok as long as they were not centered, so that residents won't have to stare at the poles.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to AMEND his motion to allow for light poles on the upper level of the parking structure as long as they are located such that they are out of the line of site.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the applicant would like to respond to the conditions that were added, but it would be up to the Committee to re-open the public hearing.

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Alley stated that it would be difficult to do all aluminum windows on the project. He proposed white vinyl windows and a white aluminum store front system. He stated that they have a similar appearance and the vinyl window frames are substantial in thickness and are very similar in scale to the aluminum store front windows. Mr. Alley believed that the white vinyl and white aluminum were compatible and did not age differently.

Chairman Duncan asked if white vinyl was the only option or if they were willing to go with a different color vinyl. Mr. Alley stated that he has only seen white and off white vinyl and he has done a considerable amount of research.

Committee Member Lynch asked how much of the R value was contained in the frame of the window and not the dual glazing portion. Mr. Alley stated that the aluminum frame transmits the temperature to the interior of the unit and the vinyl frame does not. He stated that he was not a mechanical engineer but that is what he was told.

Mr. Hanna requested consideration of the powder coated white aluminum storefront windows at the commercial ground floor and the white vinyl up above. He stated that there were quite a lot of windows and it was their desire to use a window type that is energy efficient.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha believed the white vinyl and white aluminum store front would look ok with all the straight lines in the design.

Committee Member Daybell stated that Staff and the applicant needed to come up with a solution.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the windows should be all aluminum.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the window issue should be left open for discussion between Staff and the Applicant and encouraged the applicant to explore other alternatives including other colors of vinyl windows.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to AMEND his motion to include that the windows match in color and to review the feasibility of aluminum windows with Title 24 after review with the Director of Community Development. Motion passed unanimously.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that this was a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council and was not an issue that could be appealed.

The following items were heard out of order.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented a report to the committee. He stated that Staff received a complaint about 201 N Lincoln. The window and framing details that were approved for the project were not implemented. Staff believed that what was being built was not what was on the plans and will be deferring the interpretation to the Planning Commission. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the double hung windows on the Wilshire façade have been installed as double hung and do not have the center post and trim. The sill is also not included. Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that the applicant had stated the window sill will be installed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the complaint that was filed was that without the trim and divider the windows are significantly different in character than what was reviewed and approved by the Committee. Staff is looking to the Committee to express their views as to whether or not the windows are consistent with the intent and the direction of the design; or whether or not they feel that it is not consistent and not what they approved.

Chairman Duncan asked if the windows were the only thing the Committee was looking at. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the complaint was based on the windows, but there are other details that are not consistent. Chairman Duncan pointed out that the arch was also not what was approved on the building plans. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that was correct, as it relates to the Building Permit Plans.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented a letter to the Committee from the applicant. The applicant indicated the project was within the intent and did not feel it was inappropriate.

Chairman Duncan referencing the windows asked if they were fixed windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that they were wood windows and was not sure if they were casement or fixed. He stated that they could use a modern window but when they start adding modern interpretations over and over, you deviate significantly from the detailing that added to the historic character. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that when the sill is added the windows will look, a little different.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked the Committee if what was installed was something that would not have been approved. Chairman Duncan stated that the Committee's intent, as well as Staff's, was clear on the windows at the previous meeting. Committee Member Daybell stated that the Committee had approved separate windows.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman believed the arch of the window would be ok because the low arch was consistent with what would have been seen historically.

Committee Member Cha stated that a "stop order" needed to be put on deviations from approved plans. Committee Member Lynch agreed. Committee Member Daybell stated that when a plan is approved by the Committee the applicant is expected to follow that plan. Committee Member Cha disapproved of the changes to the plan and stated the windows needed to be corrected. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he would inform the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Cha suggested that plans be stamped "RDRC Approved" so that the building inspectors look for what is called for in preservation areas. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the building inspectors typically looked for structure requirements and are not trained in historic design.

Chairman Duncan asked if Fullerton Heritage could be given the plans, as they would be able to spot a deviation in the plans. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that they do not have City authority, but they do represent the public's interests. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that construction plans are available for public review once the permits are issued. The design concept plans are always available in the review process and anything that has been approved is public record.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that a Director for the Department of Community Development has been hired. John Godlewski will start on September 4th. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that John Godlewski previously worked for the City of Fullerton years ago as a planner. Mr. Godlewski went on to the City of Orange, then Los Alamitos as the Director and is currently the Planning Manager for the City of Downey. The new Senior Planner position and Chief Planner position are advertised through the 17th of August and then hiring process will begin. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he worked with John Godlewski for the City of Orange. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that John Godlewski was good boss and he enjoyed working with him. He believes Mr. Godlewski has the best interest of everyone at heart.

Committee Member Daybell asked Acting Chief Planner Eastman if he would be applying for the Chief Planner position. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it was his intent to apply.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the Committee would be writing a letter of recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated that she would like to see that what gets approved gets built. She stated that 201 N Lincoln is a prominent corner in one of the largest preservation zones. Ms. Dalton believed that there was no need for a Committee if people were going to get away with not being consistent with their approved plans. She believed that people should be held accountable for what they say they are going to build. Ms. Dalton stated that this should be a test case.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Planning Commission had approved a medical office building at 1555 North Harbor Blvd. There was a lot of discussion regarding the retaining wall, how it was going to be constructed and how it would impact the buildings behind it. A resident of the area stated that she would appeal the approval of the project.

City Council reviewed a development proposal for the Spanish Restaurant Lizarran. The restaurant has 120 stores in Europe and is extending to the United States. They are seeking a beer and wine license, but because of the moratorium, Staff cannot approve it over the counter. The moratorium allows for beer and wine licenses with approval from City Council.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be August 23, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 P.M.