

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

August 23, 2007

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. by Chairman Duncan.

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None
ABSENT:

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

MINUTES: The August 9, 2007 minutes were not available.

The following items were heard out of order.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 4

PRJ07-00334 – ZON07-00069. APPLICANT: VICTOR VALDES. PROPERTY OWNER:
JUVENAL S SERNA A request for a Minor Development Project for two (2) additions to
two (2) existing units at 528 E Truslow Ave. Project consists of a 268 sq. ft. habitable
addition and a 400 sq. ft. garage on unit #1 along E. Truslow, and a 652 sq. ft. habitable
addition with a 400 sq. ft. garage on unit #2 along 527 E. Patterson Way in a Community
Improvement District. (Generally located at the east end of E. Truslow to the north and E.
Patterson Way to the south approximately 400 ft east of Balcom and 375 ft. west of the
Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way) (R-2 ZONE) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303)
(HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a brief overview of the project. The applicant was
proposing additions to the living space on both units and was also adding a two car
garage on both units. The property is within a Community Improvement District and
review by the RDRC of new construction is required. The proposed additions would
match the existing homes with the architecture, stucco, and shingle roof.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that additional units in a Community Improvement
District must come before the RDRC to ensure quality development and design in the

City's redevelopment areas. Staff believed that the architecture improvements were consistent with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Cha asked if the tree in the back yard was going to be removed for construction, and replaced later. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that it would be removed.

Committee Member Cha asked if the open space in between the two units was going to be grass or concrete. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that there was a condition that the applicants include the landscape plans for the common open space area.

Chairman Duncan asked if the City required a replacement of the tree that would be taken out for the construction. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the City did not require that the tree be replaced. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the Committee could condition the tree to be replaced.

Chairman Duncan asked if the intent was for the exiting house to have a roof line that came up to a peak, and some of the other elevations have a flat roof. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that she was not sure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that according to the proposed roof plan, it would maintain a ridge and a pitched roof throughout, with no flat roofs.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the windows would be changed out on the existing structures and replaced. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the elevations indicated the existing windows would remain.

Committee Member Daybell asked what the required setback was for the side property lines. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that it would be a total of ten feet in between the two sides. She stated that existing unit "one" was currently built on the property line, but the addition complied with the setback requirements. Committee member Daybell stated that the garage was three feet from the property line. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that with the three feet on the garage side, seven feet would be needed on the other side to make ten.

Committee Member Cha asked if the purpose of the setback requirement was for access in case of fire. Acting Senior Planner Allen clarified that there are two separate requirements, one is a zoning set back requirement, and the other is a recommended Fire Department access requirement. She stated that typically when it's a street and alley condition and a second unit is added in the back, a four foot walkway is required by the Fire Department. In this case each unit fronts on what is a public street.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the proposed part of unit one would be built off the property line. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that if a habitable space was being extended and the addition was attached to the garage the required setback would be ten feet. Vice Chairman Hoban asked if that was legal.

After reviewing the plans, Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that he believed the project did not meet code. The addition would have to meet code, but the existing building would set the precedence for what that setback should be. New construction would need to meet the ten foot side yard setback. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that an addition to an existing dwelling must meet the setback requirements of

the existing dwelling at a minimum 10 foot cumulative setback. The project as proposed only had a 3 foot cumulative setback shown. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the plans did not meet code; therefore the RDRC could review the project as proposed and provide for some comments, or approve the project with conditions that would modify the building to meet code. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the 10 foot setback was not applicable just to the addition, but the structure as a whole.

Chairman Duncan asked if the west side had to have a 10 foot setback. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the existing structure was on the property line, and the addition would need to have a 10 foot minimum setback on the other side.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the RDRC could approve the other unit subject to the front addition coming back for review. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that they could approve the unit on Patterson only.

Public hearing opened.

Maria Conception Serna, Property Owner, stated that this was the first time she was remodeling or doing anything to her house. She was not familiar with the RDRC process, and was not sure what she needed to explain.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the applicant that there was concern with the setback to the property line. He explained that the east and the west side had to have a 10 foot setback, total. The proposed plans only showed 3 feet total for the building in the front since the existing building was on the property line. The project did not comply with code. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the committee could review the project and approve the unit on Patterson or they could continue the project to allow for revisions to the plans as a whole. However, it would be up to the Committee to make the final decision.

Ms. Serna, stated that she preferred the approval of the Patterson unit and supported the continuance of the Truslow unit to allow for revisions.

Ms. Serna asked how long the process would take for the unit that would be continued. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it depended on how long it took the architect to make the revisions to the plans. He stated that the Committee meets twice a month it would take staff about two weeks to write a report.

Committee Member Cha asked the applicant if she planned to replace the tree that would be removed. Ms. Serna stated that the tree near Patterson Way was an Avocado tree, and she did have plans to add another tree.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell supported the unit on Patterson Way and deferred approval on the Truslow unit to a later date. He also suggested putting an open carport and a one car garage instead of a two car garage.

Committee Member Cha wanted to see the landscaping plan between the two houses before final review and approval.

Vice Chairman Hoban and Committee Member Lynch were okay with the unit on Patterson Way and would like for the Architect to design something that was okay with Staff.

Chairman Duncan believed that the scale of the house was small, and a two car garage ruined that scale. He stated that a single car garage and a carport would be nice.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the existing garage faced Truslow. Ms. Serna stated that the garage was hidden between the two houses.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban to APPROVE the unit on Patterson Way with CONTINUATION on the Truslow side to resolve the setback issue, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 5

PRJ07-00263 – ZON07-00056. APPLICANT: RAUL PINA. PROPERTY OWNER: ERNESTO MARTINEZ A request for a Minor Development Project to construct a new 870 sq. ft., 2-bedroom, single-family dwelling unit with an attached 800 sq. ft., 4-car garage on a lot with an existing 3-bedroom unit located at 315 E. Ash Ave in a Community Improvement District. (Generally located approximately 230 ft east of Lemon on the north side of Ash Ave) (R-2 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. The property was within a Community Improvement District and new construction had to be reviewed by the RDRC. The applicant was proposing to add a second unit to the rear of the property, and construct a garage that would serve both additions. Staff had concerns with the access path which was on the opposite side of the property from the entrance to the main unit. Staff recommended that the floor plan of the new unit be flipped so the entrance would be on the same side of the path. Staff noted that a large patio cover was constructed on the property with permits, but was not shown on the plan. The patio covered the area between the two units and staff was not sure if the patio cover was going to stay. Staff conditioned that the landscape plans come back so they could review how the design would accommodate the open space requirement for both units. Staff recommended the continuance of the project to allow for revised plans that show how the patio area is going to be used as open space to accommodate access to the rear unit.

Committee Member Cha referenced the plans and asked what the RV parking was. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that it was a non-required parking space that would pull through the garage so a vehicle or boat could be parked in the interior of the property.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that in terms of meeting open space, the RV parking area was not counted, and would only be used for parking of some sort.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant agreed to the continuance of the project. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that she was not sure.

Public hearing opened.

Raul Pina, Architect, stated that the patio cover would remain and about five feet would be cut off the 20 foot cover. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the applicant would have to check with building because there might be adequate distance separations needed between the two structures.

Committee Member Cha asked the applicant if he had considered continuing the project. Mr. Pina stated that he would revise the plans for the second unit.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff was recommending flipping the floor plan so the entrance is on the east property line. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that when people enter the second unit from the street they would walk past the kitchen versus the bedrooms of the existing house and they would not have to cut across the grass. Mr. Pina stated that people could enter through the back. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff required that access to the unit be provided from the front street.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that if the applicant had concerns with flipping the project, the Committee would need to make a decision to see if that was an appropriate requirement. Mr. Pina stated that he would flip the floor plan, but would keep the RV parking in the same place.

Vice Chairman Hoban suggested that the applicant come back with revised plans.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked the applicant if the property owner had any concerns with the recommended conditions. Mr. Pina stated the property owner was anxious to begin construction.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to CONTINUE the project to allow for revisions to the design. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 6

PRJ07-00258 – ZON07-00053 / ZON07-00085. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CAMERON IRONS A request for a Minor Development Project to remodel an existing +/- 6,000 sq. ft. commercial building to create individual restaurant tenant spaces with six (6) on-site parking spaces and a request for a Minor Development Project to construct patios for outdoor dining on private property located at 133 W. Chapman Avenue in the Restaurant Overlay District. (Generally located on the north side of Chapman Avenue, approximately 350 feet west of Harbor Boulevard centerline). (C-3 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner stated the applicant had received the staff report and had some questions they wanted to discuss. The applicant requested that the project be continued.

Chairman Duncan asked if the applicant was going to work on parking. Acting Senior Planner Allen clarified that the parking lot design went before City Council with a six space proposal and Council approved the reduced concept. However, the actual design of the project was not reviewed by Council, and as such, the design is within the purview of the RDRC.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of September 13, 2007 to allow for revisions to the design. Motion passed unanimously.

OLD 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)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. The applicant was proposing to construct a second unit above a three car garage and add an additional carport space on the property. The property was in a historical preservation area and zoned R-2P. The applicant revised the plans after comments staff had on the architecture. The previous project had a parapet wall on the property line to address the fire rating requirements. The revisions now placed the one hour construction internal to the attic and the building space so the parapet wall would not be necessary. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that one of the issues with placing the structure on the property line was that there would be no eaves on the property line of the building. A recommended condition was that the detailing on the west and east side gable eave be consistent. Staff recommended a maintenance easement over the adjacent property to allow for repair and maintenance of the building. That easement would be recorded with the Orange County Recorder. The parking requirement is at least a one car garage and one open space per unit. In this case the applicant has provided three car garage spaces and one open space. Staff believed the architecture was simple and consistent with the area. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the applicant was proposing the new structure with a 4-inch lap siding. The existing house was constructed with an alternating wood siding comprised with two smaller dimensions and a larger siding. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Committee should consider whether the back building should match the siding on the existing home or stand alone with the 4-inch lap siding.

Committee Member Cha asked if the laundry room had a door on the north side. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there was inconsistency on the site plan and elevations. The laundry room was a cubby in the garage versus the entry way.

In response to a Committee member's phone call, Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that Planning did preliminary measurements to determine existing building side yard setbacks. The building from the hedge line was 4'-4", and 7'-7" on the other side. He stated that the plans showed 6 feet and the assessor's records indicated a 40 foot lot on the rear of the property. The building permits reflect a 26 foot wide structure so Staff assumed the measurements were correct. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there had to be a 10 foot cumulative setback for the site whether it was 5 and 5, 2 and 8, or 10 and 0, etc.

Committee Member Cha asked why there were no windows on the east elevation. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there were no windows because the Building Code

requires one hour construction within three feet of the property line, and the proposed building is at the property line.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the vent shown was ornamental and was provided in both gable ends to match the gables of the existing house.

Committee Member Cha asked if there would be any lighting on the south elevation. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there would be soffit lighting above the garage. In the past the RDRC Committee has recommended concealing lighting in soffits in preservation areas.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the applicant was allowed to have an eave on the side where it would encroach over the property line. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that Building Code does not allow for construction over the property line.

Chairman Duncan asked how much space was needed for the frame of the garage door elevation on the side of the house. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that a garage door has about two feet on each side and a standard garage door is about 16 feet. There is usually a 20 foot exterior. There are pre-manufactured structural walls that are put in place when a structure is built to give it more rigidity. Based on this design, a steel frame over the garage door area may be needed, but that would be determined during building permit plan check.

Committee Member Cha asked if there would be a problem with access if the stairs were moved and lined up with the building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that moving the stairs would probably move the entrance door farther to the east. The balcony would also be shortened to accommodate the landing being moved.

Public hearing opened.

Alex Fisher, Designer, stated that he had designed several buildings in the same preservation area and brought in pictures to show his work. He believed that the project would be a huge improvement for the area.

Michael Francis, Property Owner, stated that the garage was in bad shape and that is why they were tearing it down. They would build a new garage with a unit on top that would be consistent with the area. Mr. Francis stated that he intended to live in the unit and did not have plans to rent it out.

Jim Bailey, Property Owner on west side, agreed with the adjacent neighbor in opposition of the proposed project who had called in. Mr. Bailey stated that he wanted staff to make sure all the preservation requirements would be met. He stated that he liked the community and liked being in a preservation area.

Mr. Francis stated the he intended on complying with the preservation guidelines.

Committee Member Daybell asked the applicant if he could match the siding on the new addition to the siding on the front house. Mr. Fisher stated that they would try to match it or get close to it. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the question was for the property owner. Mr. Francis stated that he would like to match the siding as much as possible. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff had not measured the dimension

of the alternating wood siding, but it appeared to be one 6-inch lap, followed by two 4-inch laps.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that he received a phone call from the public in opposition of the proposed project. The adjacent neighbors concern was related to the deterioration of the existing areas single family residential appearance, the areas shortage of parking and the increased degradation of bar patrons and new tenants in the neighborhood.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha asked if the 10 foot setback had to be met by moving the stairs to the property line. Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the staircase was an issue for the setback. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that code identifies that decks can not encroach into the setbacks if they are higher than 3 feet. The number of risers and steps need to be less than three feet in height. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the portion that encroaches in this project is less then three feet in height on the landing and is allowed in the setback area.

Committee Member Cha asked if it would be ok if the encroachment was three feet in height all the way to the property line. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there could be landing clearance issues, but a deck three feet off grade up to the property line is ok as long as it has a railing.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he was not happy with the zero lot line setbacks. He recommended approval of the project subject to the siding matching the existing front house siding. Committee Member Daybell also recommended turning the stairs so they no not encroach on the property line.

Chairman Duncan liked the scale of the project and wanted the eaves to go all the way around the building.

Chairman Hoban was ok with the project. He believed that the siding should match the existing front house and the eaves should be on the three sides that are not on the lot line. He stated that moving the staircase was a good recommendation that the applicant could consider, but it did not bother him. He believed that the project was a good improvement to the back alley because of the condition of the existing structure.

Committee Member Lynch was in favor of the project with the siding matching the front house and did not have a problem with the stairs encroaching on the setback.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and matching of the siding, including condition 11 that the eaves of the new structure shall be constructed to reflect a design that matches the eaves of the existing house on all 3 sides other than the zero property line side, with the elimination of condition 9.

Committee Member Cha stated that he would like to modify the motion to change the location of the stairs. Vice Chairman Hoban did not want to amend the motion because he believed that moving the stairs should be a recommendation. Committee Member Daybell believed that moving the stairs would be a great improvement, but should only be

recommended. Vice Chairman Hoban believed that the staircase should not be moved because it could create a barrier if someone was looking in from the alley. Committee Member Cha believed it would be better if the staircase was moved so it does not encroach on the property line. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00116 – ZON07-00018. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: LUCAS J. WILLIAMSON A review of a front door and windows for a previously approved single-story addition to an existing single-family residence on an R-2P zoned property located at 125 Malvern Avenue (Generally located in a residential preservation zone on the north side of Malvern Avenue between approximately 310 and 360 feet west of Harbor Boulevard) (R-2P Zone) Categorically Exempt under Section 15332) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that the Committee had commented on the windows and door for the project at the last RDRC meeting. The Committee did not approve mullions or divided lites on the windows. However, the applicant was now proposing windows with divided lites for the front building elevation. To ensure consistency with the double hung window located to the left of the front door the RDRC had conditioned that there shall be two separate double hung windows at the sitting room that faces Malvern Avenue. The applicant was now proposing two casement windows, with divided lites, flanking a fixed window at the sitting room. The applicant indicated to staff that he was no longer proposing a new front door. The applicant also indicated that he was proposing a French door and a sliding door at the rear of the residence. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the applicant would like to modify the previous approval which prohibited the divided lites on the windows.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that at one of the previous RDRC meetings the Committee had approved the addition to the home with a condition that the side lites and entry door come back for final review and approval. Additionally, the condition required that the windows on the building not have mullions or dividers to them. The applicant was now proposing to have dividers on the front windows. The windows in the sitting room would be moved to align internally, but would be dimensionally the same and would have detail with mullions or dividers in the glazing. Staff supported the proposed windows even though the windows in the rear and side yards, behind the yard fencing, would not have the same detailing. The windows without the mullions or dividers would be in the rear yard. In order to be consistent, Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated that the RDRC previously indicated that the applicant should use either both French doors or slider doors on the rear elevation. The Committee preferred a French door because they believed a slider door was not consistent with the Preservation Guidelines. The applicant was proposing a French door and a slider door. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that those doors were approved based on the previous approval of the project. When the project first came to the RDRC, Staff recommended that three casement windows be placed on the front elevation at the sitting room. The committee felt that the three windows were consistent and appropriate. However, the type of windows did not need to be casement windows. They could be double hung windows to match the adjacent windows in the sitting room. At the last meeting the Committee also felt that the two single hung windows with the detailing were ok and appropriate for the sitting room even though that

was contrary to the previous conditioned approval. At this point the applicant is asking to have a single fixed window with two casement windows on either side. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked the Committee to consider the modifications to allow for mullions and divider lites on the front windows. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Preservation Guidelines identify that fixed windows are not to be encouraged other than as picture windows of a Spanish Colonial Architecture.

Chairman Duncan asked what the wall dimension was for the room where the windows were going in. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the opening was about 7 feet. However, the distance between the casement and the fixed windows needed to be verified. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that depending on the size of the dividing post, and what would get installed between the two, would dictate how wide the opening was.

Public hearing opened.

Mike Antimie, Contractor, stated that the applicant did not want two French doors in the back because one of the rooms was too small for a French door. Mr. Antimie believed that the back of the house could not be seen from any point so it should not matter if they went with a slider and a French door. Mr. Antimie informed the Committee and Staff that the applicant would like side lites with clear glass on top of a new entry door. He would also like to have double hung windows side by side at the sitting room and would add a window on the left side of the entry door.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff had not seen any revisions for the most recent proposed changes to the windows or adding side lites to the entry door. Acting Chief Planner Eastman believed the applicant was proposing two windows in the front and two three foot windows with a post between them. On the return of the sitting room there would be one identical window on either side. The replacement of the bedroom window that is on the front porch, and left of the entry door, would match the proposed sitting room windows in terms of window placement and style. Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated that the applicant would need to submit to the City working drawings reflecting the proposed changes if he wants to do something different.

Mr. Antimie proposed a double set of windows on the bedroom at the front of the residence as well. He stated that they would carry the window design on the other side of the front of the house. Mr. Antimie stated that if the Committee did not want side lites on the entry door, they would not put them in.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and two matching windows on the both the front elevation of the sitting room and bedroom with no side lites on the front entry door. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 3

PRJ06-00091 – LRP06-00001, LRP06-00002, LRP06-00003. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: ST JUDE MEDICAL CENTER A review of architectural and

landscape plans for the St. Jude Medical Plaza Phase 2, which includes a new 98,000± square foot medical office building and nine level parking structure (seven levels above grade, two levels below) in conjunction with a zone change, specific plan amendment and General Plan revision for property located at 2151 N. Harbor Blvd. (Generally located on the west side of Harbor, between Bastanchury and Valencia Mesa) (C-2 ZONE) (Environmental Impact Report). (JWO)

Consultant Planner Wolff gave a brief overview of the project. The applicants were proposing to expand the medical office building at 2151 N Harbor Blvd. At the June 28, 2007 meeting the RDRC reviewed and discussed the site, landscape and architectural plans and recommended continuance. Consultant Planner Wolff stated that the RDRC should consider the overall aesthetic character of the development, compatibility of the Phase 2 proposal with existing Phase 1 construction and the compatibility of the project design with the surrounding area. Consultant Planner Wolff stated that as a result of comments received on the environmental and traffic studies it was determined that the emergency access off of Harbor, as shown on previous plans, needed to be revised to allow ingress for all site users. The project traffic engineers and staff decided that a deceleration lane was not needed and a wide driveway approach would work. In the current plan, some trees and shrubs have been added along the Harbor Blvd. frontage for enhanced screening. Consultant Planner Wolff stated that latest plans were revised primarily with respect to the Harbor Blvd access point; otherwise, plans were the same as those previously reviewed by the Committee.

Public hearing opened.

Burnie Dunlap, Director Community and Government Relations for St. Jude Medical Center, stated that the project team agreed to the recommended conditions as set forth by Staff. He pointed out the modifications to the Laguna side elevation of the parking structure. Mr. Dunlap was in agreement with the recommendation to make a right turn in, off of Harbor. This would change the loading pattern and would present an opportunity to keep the setback and landscaping.

Michael Street, HDR Architecture, explained the overall aesthetics in terms of compatibility with the Phase 1 project and the surrounding areas. Mr. Street stated that the primary goals were to unify the medical campus, create a gateway to the campus for traffic on Harbor and to create architecture of modern high quality health care, within the facility. The applicant's goal was to unify the building and parking structure with the existing facility using consistent materials, colors and architectural treatment. Mr. Street stated that they were looking at breaking the mass of the two buildings with a curtain wall system on the lower levels and punched openings on the upper levels, in order to blend the architecture of the proposed Phase 2 construction with the existing Phase 1 plaza and the southwest tower across the street at the hospital. They incorporated the buff stucco colors within the building, the same terra cotta stucco colors, and the same aluminum silver metal accents, that are already occurring on the campus. The applicant believed that the parking structure needed to unify and work with the existing Phase 1 building. So they tried to relate the two materials in the new garage by introducing the buff colored painted concrete structure and burnished grey concrete spandrel system from the existing structure. They also introduced the terra cotta accent bands and metal eyebrow forms on the facades of the buildings at the upper level as a means of trying to break down the mass. The same concrete colors were used to differentiate and create an emphasis at

the main garage vehicular entry off of Laguna. Mr. Street believed that the multiple materials would help add visual interest and help identify the entrance.

Bill Rabben, of Rabben/Herman Design Landscape Architects, stated that he would be able to provide more landscaping with a wide driveway approach instead of a deceleration lane. Now that there is an entrance off of Harbor the landscape addresses the issue of creating more mass planting and greater detail at the ground plane. Mr. Rabben stated that they kept the materials compatible with what already existed along Harbor Blvd. The same landscape materials would also be used to provide a transition from the first building to the second building. He stated that the elevation would create more of a focus in terms of a feature landscape treatment in that area because there would be more room to do that. Mr. Rabben explained that they carried through the same landscape materials to provide a focus and an accent which would make the transition more clear. The expression of the materials as it carries through to the corner was also more in relationship to the changes that occurred in the architecture. Mr. Rabben stated that they would have the same trees and shrubs. However, they would be organized slightly different to carry through the architectural theme, and reinforce a sense of expression as a transition and new entry.

Committee Member Lynch asked if it was their intent to use mature trees to resemble the elevation. Mr. Rabben stated that they would use 36" and 48" box trees consistently throughout the project with the exception of the 20-25 feet palms. He stated that the trees would not be mature but would be further along than the typical 24" installation size box.

Mr. Street stated that they were trying to expand upon the higher end burnish block of the existing parking structure and would use materials that related to the building.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City had received numerous comments as it relates to parking structures throughout the City. One of the comments that had been provided to Staff from numerous people had to do with the existing parking structure for the Phase 1 Plaza. It has a blank façade and does not have detailing. However, the applicant is proposing to add additional detailing to the existing parking structure to provide it with a higher aesthetic appearance than what exists today.

Mr. Street added that the split face material would be carried onto the existing garage.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha stated that he was happy with all the changes made along the Harbor frontage, the parking structure, and the entrance.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the metal fabrications and the color scheme enhanced the concrete areas.

Vice Chairman Hoban believed that many of the recommendations and comments from the Committee and public had been incorporated. He liked the elements and the materials being used in the complex especially the glazing and aluminum. He agreed with the applicant that modern architecture lends itself to high quality health care.

Chairman Duncan believed the parking structure was big, but liked how the applicants have dealt with that. He believed that the Mexican fan palms should be taller.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the RDRC was making a recommendation to the Planning Commission in regards to design, and land use, square footage, and traffic was not within their purview.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to RECOMMEND APPROVAL, subject to staff's recommendations.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he would like to amend the motion to include Chairman Duncan's recommendation on the Mexican fan palms.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that any recommendations that the RDRC provides to the Planning Commission are recommended conditions of approval.

The amended motion included the additional condition recommended by Chairman Duncan that the Mexican Fan Palms have a brown trunk height that is a minimum of 30 feet. The motion passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that a Director for the Department of Community Development had been hired. John Godlewski will start on September 4th. Mr. Godlewski worked for the City of Orange, as the Principal Planner then Los Alamitos as the Director and is currently the Chief Planning Manager for the City of Downey. Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that the new Senior Planner position and Chief Planner positions have closed and the hiring process would begin soon.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there were three items on the Planning Commission agenda including a subdivision, a second unit above the garage, and 201 N Lincoln. Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of 201 N Lincoln and the Planning Commission deliberation and discussion.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there was discussion at the Planning Commission meeting about the retaining wall for University Heights. A discussion regarding retaining wall planting situation followed.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be September 13, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 6:48 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susana Flores
Clerical Assistant