

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

February 14, 2008

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Lynch, Daybell
ABSENT:

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

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED by
Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present, with Chairman Hoban abstaining, to APPROVE
the January 10, 2008 minutes AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

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)

(Continued from January 24, 2008)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff and the Committee had several concerns in terms of the roof line orientation and gables at the previous meeting. The applicant has revised the project so the ridge line of the dwelling runs north to south, and the ridge line of the garage runs east to west. Senior Planner Allen explained that the applicant has also proposed moving the entry down to address the concerns of access to those parking spaces and has also added a porch near the garage. Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant has made all the recommended revisions as requested by staff, and staff was recommending approval with conditions.

Public hearing opened.

Oscar Mora, REM Senior Designer, stated that he had read all the recommended conditions, and was concerned about condition number two. Senior Planner Allen stated

that there was a requirement that parking be set in from the alley when an alley is 20 feet in width because a 25 foot back up is needed. She stated that the original approval had that, and the spaces would need to be shifted further into the property to allow for sufficient back up coming out into the alley.

Chairman Hoban asked if the requirement was 20 feet plus 5, and Senior Planner Allen responded affirmatively.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the rear driveway setback is 5 feet, and most alleys are 20 feet, although some old alleys are smaller.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he was okay with the project.

Committee Member Silber stated that condition two was going to need work, and believed it could be worked out. He stated that he was fine with the project.

Chairman Hoban stated that all the concerns from the previous meeting were implemented and there was a better result.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED, by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

The following items were heard out of order.

Item No. 3

PRJ06-00452 - ZON06-00073 APPLICANT: ARCHITECT'S OF ORANGE AND PROPERTY OWNER: FREDRICKSON ENTERPRISES, INC A request to review final landscape plans in accordance with conditions of approval for a Major Development Project for the construction of a retail center of 50,452 sq. ft. in 5 buildings on a 4.51 acre property located at 1105, 1201, and 1207 S. Euclid Street and 1001 and 1035 W. Orangethorpe Avenue. Generally located on the north west corner of Euclid Street and Orangethorpe Avenue in a Community Improvement District. (C-2 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen stated that this was final RDRC review of the landscape, irrigation, and hardscape plans for the northwest corner of Euclid and Orangethorpe. She stated that the Committee previously reviewed conceptual landscape plans on this project. The Committee recommended adding palms at the driveway entrances, a minimum tree size for the parking lot trees, and changing out some of the property line trees. The applicant has made all those revisions and incorporated the greenscreen elements from the previously approved building elevations. Senior Planner Allen stated that staff has reviewed the plans and is in support of the proposed design.

Public hearing opened.

Matt Stowe stated that they been through many revisions and have enhanced the tree sizes through out the development.

Committee Member Silber stated that he was fine with the project as presented.

Committee Member Cha asked if the design for the sign had been submitted. Dale Hadfield, Landscape Architect, stated that a preliminary design had been submitted. Mr. Stowe stated that the sign program has not been finalized, but they will be proposing a center identification sign with boulders around it. Senior Planner Allen clarified that it would be a low monument sign. Vice Chairman Cha stated that the design of the 7-Eleven at the corner bothered him. Senior Allen explained that the grass terminates at that corner to create a separation from public versus private space, and the planting would be expanded at the corner.

Chairman Hoban asked if the 7-Eleven at the corner was the gas stations property. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it was the gas stations property, but there is a dedication for a future turn pocket, and that is why there is a lot of landscaping. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that at some point the City will do an improvement for a turn lane there.

Chairman Hoban stated that he wasn't on the Committee for the original discussion of the project and believed that some of the up sizing of plants was due to some of the former members, and was in favor of the project.

Mr. Stowe clarified that there was a conflict between a street tree and the street light, and proposed removing the tree. Mr. Hadfield stated that they would like visibility for the sign in both directions. Mr. Hadfield referenced the plans and explained what he was proposing. He believed that there would be more space for the street trees with more room to grow. Mr. Hadfield proposed to have the trees in 24-inch boxes instead of two 15 gallon street trees and four 24-inch boxes.

Chairman Hoban asked for clarification regarding which tree would be omitted. Mr. Hadfield referenced the site plan and explained that there would be a staggering continuous look as modified. Chairman Hoban asked if it was an existing street tree, and Senior Planner Allen clarified that the trees were all new. She explained that the Engineering Department had worked with the applicant to work out spacing and somewhere along the line the coordination between trees and street lights was missed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City has standards in terms of spacing for street trees. He stated that the curbs, gutters, and sidewalks were being reconstructed. The applicant would be required to put in street trees and irrigate the location.

Dave Bite, stated that there were numerous underground utilities, and stated that there were many conflicts within the public right-of-way and the site. He stated that it would not be possible to move the tree further away from that light because the shallow utilities would be affected.

Chairman Hoban proposed that the decision of the tree be left up to the Director of Community Development. Senior Planner Allen stated that the decision, as recommended, would be worked out with the Director of Engineering and Maintenance Services.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject staffs recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No.4

PRJ08-00030 – ZON08-00013 / ZON08-00014 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: STUDIO 1016 LLC A request for a (1) Minor Development Project to remodel an existing single story commercial structure (demo approximately 582 sq.ft., reconstruct 586 sq.ft., add 670 sq.ft.); and (2) a Zoning Adjustment to reduce the required landscape setback 20% from 10 ft. to 8 ft. and the required parking (10%) from 13 to 12 spaces on property located at 1016 N. Harbor Blvd. (Generally located approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of N Harbor and Berkeley) (C-3 ZONE) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. Senior Planner Allen explained that there were two detached buildings and the applicant was proposing to demo the front portion of the front building on the south and reconstruct it. The applicants also want to add on to the other existing building and attach the two with a covered courtyard area. Senior Planner Allen stated that the use of drought tolerant plants and rocks and boulders which increase in size as you get towards the building were also being proposed. Senior Planner Allen stated that one of the design considerations in the landscaping is that the property owner is being required to dedicate 10 feet of right-of-way for future widening of Harbor. Senior Planner Allen explained that the applicant has two zoning adjustment requests. One is to reduce the required setback from 10 feet to 8 feet, to accommodate a portion of the building. The second zoning adjustment request is to eliminate one parking space. Staff is in support based on the required dedication, the shape of the lot, and the topography because it slopes down into the channel.

Public hearing opened.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if he had reviewed all the conditions. Greg Coles, Studio 1016, stated that he was concerned about the landscape maintenance bond and questioned if there was any consideration to waive the bond because of the required 10 feet dedication. Mr. Coles stated that there was not going to be any compensation for the portion of land being dedicated. He was hoping not to have to endure additional costs to generate legal documents or whatever is needed for the dedication, and was looking for the City to help with that.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the landscape maintenance bond requirements and stated that a maintenance bond is a code requirement. He stated that the department can work with the applicant in terms of the amount because there is a lot of rock work and other xeriscape type of materials that do not require water, but the City does require that a bond be posted. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the cost of documents to prepare for the dedication was an issue to work out with the Engineering Department and is not within the purview of this Committee.

Mr. Coles stated that he had reviewed the conditions and does not see any issues with the recommendation.

Committee Member Silber stated that the applicant did a nice job. He referenced the site plan and stated that there was a note on the west elevation in terms of materials that graphically was meant to represent a stuccoed wall. He stated that the key note said new concrete block wall, and asked if it was a key note error. Mr. Coles stated that it was a key note error.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he liked that the trash area matched the architecture of the building, and also like the courtyard area.

Chairman Hoban asked if the gravel in the parking lot was going to be a colored DG or grey. He stated that in the rendering it looked like concrete but in the landscape plan is looked like a beige or DG color. Mr. Coles responded that they are still determining what the material is going to be. He stated that there are requirements in terms of size, and a coarser DG color is not allowed. Mr. Coles stated that it was likely going to be some form of gravel. He stated that all the colors of the cobbles had not been finalized, and they were still working with the County Flood Control to determine how they will be discharging into the channel. Mr. Coles stated that he could submit cobble and gravel samples when the color board is submitted for approval.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked staff if any comments were received from other departments in terms of materials. Senior Planner Allen stated that there was a condition that the applicants work with the Fire Department for the gravel parking lot design. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff has typically had concerns with using gravel as a material for Fire Department access, and had concern with the gravel getting carried onto the adjacent arterial street.

Mr. Coles asked if that could be worked out prior to plan check because the County was concerned with BMP's on the site for the WQMP requirements. Mr. Coles stated that one of the ways they were getting approval to continue discharging into the channel was due to the reduction of the amount of water. Mr. Coles stated that some of the banding near the driveways could potentially become concrete to get the gravel materials set further back from the street. Mr. Coles stated that he was not sure if the Fire Department would be coming on-site with the fire trucks or servicing from Harbor. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that they will come on-site with the trucks for medical aid. Mr. Coles stated that the materials were designed for that and the type of gravel would not be loose. Senior Planner Allen stated that condition 4 requires approval of the gravel parking lot design prior to the issuance of grading and building permits.

Committee Member Silber asked if it was a stabilized product and Mr. Coles responded yes. Committee Member Silber asked if there was going to be something that binds the material. Mr. Coles stated that there would be matting that goes down on top of the base material for the driving and parking service. He stated that there is also one inch circular material that is netted together via a hard plastic, the gravel sits down flush with the top of that, and is held together by the matting.

Chairman Hoban asked if a concrete band was being proposed. Mr. Coles stated that the bands are concrete and clarified that he meant there is a different banding of material on the east side of the driveway. Mr. Coles stated that the first bands where the landscape setback is could be concrete, so that in between the two bands there could be a contrasting color similar to the gravel color that would be concrete so that way any of the loose gravel comes off tires before getting on the public way.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED, by Chairman Hoban to APPROVE the project, subject staffs recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 2

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)

(Continued from January 24, 2008)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the request was to modify the exterior for the Panera Bread tenant space located in building “B” of the Providence Center Project. At the last meeting on January 24, 2008 the applicant proposed to add two awnings to the front of the building, facing Bastanchury, on the north side where the tenant space is. The proposal also included the addition of gooseneck lights, window treatments with decals, and improvements to the food court location. However, the property owner indicated that they had not approved the tenant improvement work, and the item was continued to allow for that to be worked out. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that what was currently before the Committee was review of the awnings and the window decals on the building, and staff was recommending approval of the project subject to conditions. He stated that staff had indicated a condition that the awnings not be a traditional angled awning, but a box or a valance type awning.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there would be awnings on the other side, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that there were no awnings proposed on the other sides

Public hearing opened.

Abdul Salehi, Architect, introduced David Babbush, Franchancy of Panera at State College and Chapman.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if he had reviewed all the recommended conditions. Mr. Salehi stated that he did, and explained that he revised the awnings, added a valance, and the sides of the awning would be closed. Mr. Salehi stated that the awnings would be like a box, but would be angled. He stated that the awnings are less than five feet in width, and are small. Mr. Salehi believed that a box type awning would not look vertical. He explained that the applicant wanted to maintain the signature element for Panera since nothing else would match the Panera signature elements.

Chairman Hoban asked if the new design was a compromise between the Committee and Staffs concerns, and Mr. Salehi stated that it was a compromise.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he liked the back side of the building and the small awnings.

Committee Member Silber stated that the proposed alternative was a good compromise. He believed it was nicely conditioned and was a good adjustment to take into account staffs concerns.

Chairman Hoban stated that it was acceptable that the Franchise would want to hold their look. He stated that he was concerned about the original awnings because he understood the branding element, and believed the revised awnings were a good compromise.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project subject to staffs recommended conditions.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that condition number one should be amended to reflect the second submittal which has angled awnings with a valance bottom.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha to AMEND his motion to amend condition 1, SECONDED, by Committee Member Silber. Motion passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that unfortunately there are conflicts with the street trees on Rosecrans for the revised Jacaranda Senior Apartment Complex landscape plan. He stated that Committee Member Silber recommended that the Rosecrans street trees be preserved, however there is a line of sight mitigation measure for Camino Loma. The traffic engineer has indicated that he has concerns that providing for street trees on Rosecrans would be worse then not providing any, and based on his comments street trees on Rosecrans will not be provided. Committee Member Silber stated that traffic engineering considerations should take precedence over his comment.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that Acting Associate Planner Kusch had been offered the Associate Planner position.

Chairman Hoban suggested separating out the general conditions that are always in the staff report. He also asked if the plans could be placed on the dry erase board so the Committee can focus on the person speaking so the Committee does not get lost in some of the points. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff can bring magnets to place drawings on the board. Committee Member Silber stated that he was not opposed to seeing half size sets of plans as long as they are legible. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that typically the applicants bring in the plans, and stated that he will communicate the comment on the general conditions in the staff report to the appropriate person.

MEETINGS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susana Flores
Clerical Assistant