

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

January 24, 2008

4:00 PM

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

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present, with Committee Silber abstaining, to APPROVE the November 29, 2007 minutes AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00443 – ZON07-00100 APPLICANT: RODRIGO COBA AND PROPERTY OWNER: FELIPE BELTRAN A request for a Minor Development Project to construct a 260 sq. ft addition to an existing dwelling; construct a 400 sq. ft. detached garage; and approve an unpermitted second dwelling on property located in a Historic Residential Preservation Overlay Zone and Community Improvement District, located at 143 E. Valencia Dr. (Generally located on the north side of E Valencia Dr, approximately 100 ft. west of Pomona) (R-3P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

(Continued from December 13, 2007)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that the applicant indicated he was withdrawing the application, but has not provided a withdrawal letter. He stated that the Committee should consider the application, and gave a brief overview of the project. The request was to legalize an unpermitted second dwelling unit at the rear of the property. The proposal also included an addition that would be located to the north of the illegal second unit. Acting Associate Planner Kusch identified some issues with the site plan and explained that the project does not meet code.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the entry gate on Valencia was a double wide gate, and if so he would like it to be a single wide gate so that people cannot drive up on the

lawn. He stated that if the garage in the back is removed there needs to be a barrier at the back to prevent vehicles from driving on the lawn and parking on the side of the house. Chairman Hoban stated that the proposed gate did not line up to the proposed sidewalk. Committee Member Daybell stated that the proposed gate needs to be lined up with the sidewalk and must be the same width of the sidewalk.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the illegal addition was built to code, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch responded that the project was a code enforcement case and presumably did not meet code. Chairman Hoban asked if the project would be legal if approved with staff's recommended conditions assuming that everything was built correctly, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch responded yes.

Public hearing opened.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the applicant was not in attendance.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated that staff did a good job of trying to bring the property into conformity with the zoning and design guidelines. Ms. Dalton stated that the gate needed to be aligned with the sidewalk so that it is not used for vehicles. Ms. Dalton stated that the unpermitted windows on the front house need to be consistent with what is conditioned for the addition, and the unpermitted second unit. She stated that the windows need to be single hung, double hung, or casement, and not sliding windows. Ms. Dalton stated that the whole property needs to come into conformity with the design guidelines.

Chairman Hoban asked if the three post configurations were consistent with the guidelines, and Ms. Dalton responded no.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the item had to be continued because the applicant was not present, and stated that the unpermitted unit should conform to code. Chairman Hoban asked if the item could be approved with staff's recommended conditions or if it has to be denied. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that applicant can appeal whichever decision to the Planning Commission, and if denied Community Preservation will follow through with regards to the illegal second unit.

Committee Member Lynch stated that the item should move forward because it is the chance to make something illegal, legal. He stated that the windows should be changed out on the exiting residence to be in conformance with the guidelines, and was in support of the project with staffs recommended conditions.

Committee Member Silber stated that something should be done with the alignment of the gate to the sidewalk to preclude parking along the side of the house. He believed there should be a single gate aligned with the sidewalk with restricting features at the line of the old garage if it's taken down to prevent it from being used as a parking strip. Committee Member Silber stated that the ridge lines on the porch do not meet, and asked if the porch was existing. Acting Associate Planner Kusch responded yes, and stated that it was an existing shed roof. Committee Member Silber stated that the porch should be modified to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

Committee Member Daybell agreed with Committee member Silber. He believed that there should be a date certain for the windows to be changed out and stated that the illegal addition needs to be brought up to code.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to approve the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions, a single gate aligned with the sidewalk, restricting features at the line of the old garage, and the porch be modified to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

Chairman Hoban asked if the porch was in keeping with the guidelines. Committee Member Silber stated that the post should be conditioned to be appropriate for the architecture.

MOTION by Chairman Hoban, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to AMEND the motion to include the three post configuration be modified to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member Daybell left the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00534 – ZON07-00118 APPLICANT: OSCAR MORA AND PROPERTY OWNER: JOSE G. PEREZ A request to construct a new second unit and two-car garage and demolish a converted detached garage on property located within a Preservation Zone with an approximately 1,400 sq. ft. dwelling to remain. The property is located at 224 W. Brookdale. (Generally located on the south side, approximately 280 ft east of Highland) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. She explained that the original project in 2006 was designed to legalize a garage conversion. Based on the current application the applicant was looking to demolish the remaining garage that was converted and construct a new second unit. Staff was concerned with the proposed ridges on the garage and the new unit, which are oriented in the same direction. Senior Planner Allen explained that the main entrance as proposed would be on the west side and with the ridge lines proposed in the same direction the applicant would end up with a linear box project. Staff believed the ridge lines would not be consistent with the guidelines or with the main dwelling articulation. Staff recommended moving the entrance closer to the garage into the lawn area to provide the ability to create a larger entrance that is more of a focal point to mimic what is on the front house. Staff recommended that the project be continued to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise those elements.

Chairman Hoban referenced the site plan and asked if staff's concern with the entrance was because two entrances would give the potential to split the unit. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff's concern was to accentuate the entrance on the west.

Public hearing opened.

Oscar Mora, R.A.M. Designer, was concerned about the condition of the 16 ft. width setback to the open car spaces, and stated that he had 20 feet showing on the site plan. Mr. Mora explained that he was proposing two entrances to the dwelling. One entrance on

the west side for immediate access from the parking area, and the entrance on the north side for access to the laundry area. Mr. Mora explained that he can revise the plans and have one roof facing north and south and the other going east and west, but he believed the rafters for one roof would be longer than the other one. Mr. Mora explained the different ridge sizes and stated he was proposing to have both ridges going north and south so they could be the same size and match the main dwelling. Mr. Mora believed that he would not be able to meet the open space requirement with the four foot wide walkway condition in the staff report.

Senior Planner Allen stated that there was a gate along the property line in the alley and staff was concerned that the width of the opening was smaller than the dimensions provided on the site plan for the parking stalls. She stated that the condition of the 16 ft width was to remove the gate so there is no restriction of access. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff was fine with two entrances, but was concerned with a parking space not being useable because its so close to the entrance. Staff recommended leaving the entrance on the west side as proposed, but moving it down closer to the garage so there is no conflict between using the entrance, and parking in the space. Senior Planner Allen stated that the open space requirement should be fine with the four foot wide walkway that is a fire access requirement. Senior Planner Allen believed that changing the orientation of one of the roof lines should be done, but deferred to Committee Member Silber to see if the change in the ridge line orientation would affect the rafter size.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated that her concern was consistency with of the design site. She believed that it was unfortunate that the front house was stuccoed before the design guidelines were implemented. Ms. Dalton stated that the new dwelling unit should be stuccoed so there is consistency. She was concerned about the window configurations and style, and stated that the windows need to be single hung, double hung, or casement style and not sliding windows. Ms. Dalton was also concerned with breaking up the roof lines.

Mr. Mora presented staff and the RDRC with an alternative design based on staff's recommendations.

Committee Member Silber believed that the roof plan of the new design was going to be problematic. He stated there was the opportunity to make a little bit of a porch if the entry door was realigned closer to the garage to create a transition space. He believed it could be done through an extension of the roof line or trellis other than just a cross gable. Committee Member Silber stated that through careful engineering the different rafter sizes from the existing house could be resolved, and stated that a little bit of inconsistency in the rafter depth was not going to be a big deal. Committee Member Silber believed that the roof was a problem, and the porch as designed was inadequate for an entry element. He explained possible solutions so the entrance can be compatible with the existing house.

Mr. Mora believed that having the front porch on the west side of the building would be a benefit for the new second unit and referenced a new site plan. Committee Member Silber referenced the new site plan, and stated that Mr. Mora would probably end up California framing and stated that it is easier to water proof and will tie in better. Committee Member Silber drew on the site plan an example of what was being discussed.

Vice Chairman Cha asked the applicant if he knew he had to conform to all the preservation guidelines and Mr. Mora responded yes.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he had the same concerns as staff did with having the two ridge lines going the same direction.

Chris Leighton stated that they were trying to change the roof line on the back unit in order to be consistent with the front house. Mr. Leighton stated that they would prefer to run the ridge line the other way, but they were just trying to meet the requirements. Committee Member Lynch stated that both the ridge lines were running north and south, and one should be switched to run east and west. Mr. Mora stated that he would rather have the gable eaves facing north and south so the front of the house will not be getting all the rain. Mr. Mora stated that the revised plan was option 2.

Chairman Hoban stated that if the homeowner looks back he should envision seeing the ends of the two gables and the back house running perpendicular, and the garage gable running parallel. He believed that the gable view was given to the people in the back house. Mr. Leighton stated that the revisions made were in trying to reflect the front house. He stated that the ridge line running north and south on the rear unit would be preferable because there would be shade for the windows, which are primarily on the east and west side.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Hoban believed that the gable of the home should be what is viewed when looking down the driveway instead of the roof line. He stated that he liked option number two, but he would have reversed and changed the length of the rafter tails even though there could be a pre-engineered truss system. Mr. Mora stated that the homeowner and the contractor would rather use conventional framing.

Committee Member Silber stated that the main part of the house presents its gable parallel to the street, but it has cross gables that define the front. He agreed with Chairman Hoban about the house having its ridge running perpendicular to the street and the garage's ridge running parallel. Committee Member Silber recommended creating a simple porch at the entry by not making the ridge line fall precisely at the center of the garage roof. He believed the entry should be more pronounced.

Vice Chairman Cha agreed with Chairman Hoban and Committee Member Silber.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of February 14, 2008 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00008 – ZON08-00007 APPLICANT: DELAYNE BOND AND PROPERTY OWNER: BRIAN S. WILLIAMS A request for a Minor Development Project request to remove the old "Rail Restaurant" mural and replace it with a new "Bourbon Street" mural on the west side; and paint a new mural and install black awnings and a flower box on the south side. The site is located at 110 E. Commonwealth Ave, known as the Williams Building, a Historical Landmark (HL-15). (Generally located on the south side of E. Commonwealth, approximately 200 ft east of Harbor) (C-3 ZONE) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the request. The request was for two painted murals on the historic Williams Building. On the southern side of the building the applicant was proposing a Tompe l'oeil design, black awnings, and a flower box. Staff was in support of the design, and recommended a condition that the awnings be of a substantial fabric.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the murals were going to be stuccoed and painted and Senior Planner Allen responded just painted. Vice Chairman Cha asked if the brick wall was going to stay as is and the mural painted on it. Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant could clarify that. Senior Planner Allen stated that they have already painted a portion of the building at ground level in this area because of graffiti.

Chairman Hoban asked if a signage plan would come later because there was no identification of the business on the building, and Senior Planner Allen stated that the signage was on the other side.

Public hearing opened.

Brian Williams, Property Owner, stated that having something that looks like New Orleans on a brick building was a wonderful concept. Mr. Williams stated that the building had to be painted in the 80's because of all the graffiti in the area. He believed that removing the layer of paint would hurt the brick, and stated that he welcomes anything that brings added character to the building. Mr. Williams stated that the mural will make the southern façade that leads to the patio look very welcoming and was in support of the request.

Chairman Hoban asked if there was a signage plan for the back of the building, and Mr. Williams responded not at this time. He stated that the existing canopy had small letter signage that could be seen from the parking lot that had the "Rail Restaurant" on it. He explained that the lettering was there for the new restaurant to put their name on it if they wanted to. Mr. Williams stated that he is not an absentee owner and is very involved with the building. He believed that each of his tenants had done a lot to improve the building and work well together.

Committee Member Cha referenced the pictures and asked if the white brick section was stuccoed. Mr. Williams stated that the bricks were painted to enhance the look. Committee Member Cha asked if the air conditioner unit was still under the canopy, and Mr. Williams responded that it was a fly fan and would remain.

Chairman Hoban asked if the doors and windows would get changed out and Mr. Williams responded that they would just get painted.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stated that she was committed to the building because it's a Historical Landmark and was in support of the mural.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated that it looked great.

Committee Member Silber stated that it would be interesting to see the Trompe l'oeil effect on top of the brick. He suggested attaching a board in front of the brick and then painting on that as long as the brick was not damaged. He stated he was in support of the project as proposed.

Chairman Hoban asked if there was consideration to building a façade that would be part of the building. Mr. Williams stated that after he saw the quality of the persons work that went on the west side all his concerns was alleviated.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that the project looked great and he hoped that the painted mural turned out like the pictures.

Chairman Hoban stated that if signage were applied the applicant would consider putting the signage on the black canopies.

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

Item No.4

PRJ04-00919 – ZON08-00005 APPLICANT: ABDUL SALEHI AND PROPERTY OWNER: ACCRETIVE LAGUNA PARTNERS, LLC A Minor Development Project for a request for modifications to approved plans for Providence Center to accommodate Panera Bakery Cafe. Modifications include exterior details and patio fencing. Site is located at 1981 Sunnycrest Drive, Suite A, at Providence Center (Located at the south west corner of Bastanchury Rd. and Laguna Rd., encompassing an area between Bastanchury Rd., Laguna Road, Laguna Drive, and Sunny Crest Drive). (C-2 Zone) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (JEA)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. The request was for exterior modifications to add awnings, goose neck lights, and screen walls in the food court area. Senior Planner Allen explained that the property owner had not authorized the use of the food court space. Staff recommended continuing the discussion as it relates to the screen walls, and only focus on the awnings and goose neck lights. Senior Planner Allen believed that the traditional Panera awnings would be over all the windows, and stated that the awnings were not shown on the site plan. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff was recommending changing the shape of the awnings and did not have a problem with the goose neck lights. She explained that the plans indicate signage, but the sign program for the center has not yet been developed.

Committee Member Silber asked if the applicant had presented any kind of overall plan or site plan indicating where the awnings would go. Senior Planner Allen stated that it did not appear that the awning locations were clearly identified.

Chairman Hoban asked if the goose neck lights were in keeping with there franchise look and Senior Planner Allen responded yes and stated that they would go above the windows.

Chairman Hoban asked why staff was recommending changing the shape of the awnings, and Senior Planner Allen stated that staff was recommending that the awnings be of a box or valance design, rather than angled.

Committee Member Silber stated that he would like to consider continuing the project in its entirety. He requested clarity on the location of the awnings on both the floor plan and elevations. He also requested a site plan of the larger project to provide a context for the location.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he liked the goose neck lights, and stated that he needed more clarity on the awnings.

Vice-Chairman Cha and Chairman Hoban agreed with Committee Member Lynch.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Silber to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of February 14, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Katie Dalton asked the Committee if the Director of Community Development has talked to them about the interpretation of the design guidelines and the Committee responded no.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

None

MEETINGS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susana Flores
Clerical Assistant