

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

April 24, 2008

4:00 PM

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

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban  
ABSENT:

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

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by  
Committee Member Lynch and CARRIED unanimously by all voting  
members present, to APPROVE the February 28, 2008 minutes AS  
WRITTEN.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by  
Committee Member Lynch and CARRIED 3-0, with Committee  
Member Silber abstaining, to APPROVE the March 13, 2008  
minutes AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00334 – ZON07-00069 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: MARIA SERNA A  
request for a minor development project for an addition to an existing unit at 528 E Truslow  
Ave in a Community Improvement District. Project consists of a 268 sq. ft. habitable  
addition and a 400 sq. ft. garage on unit #1 along E. Truslow. (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 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. She  
reminded the Committee that they previously reviewed the project and approved one of the  
dwellings (527 Patterson). She noted that the Committee was reviewing the Truslow facing  
dwelling when staff noticed there were setback issues regarding the addition. The only  
solution for the applicant was to construct a one car garage with an open parking space  
instead of a two car garage. With that modification the project meets development  
standards and staff recommended approval of the project.

Public hearing opened/closed

Committee Member Lynch was in support of the project.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project with staffs recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00344 – ZON07-00073. APPLICANT:JPI DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY OWNER: PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE Review of a revised design for balcony drainage and a consistency determination for windows for an approved Major Development Project for a student-oriented mixed-use development on property located at 2545-2565 E. Chapman Ave, 501 N. Commonwealth Ave, and 2450 E. College Place. (Northwest corner of Commonwealth & Chapman Avenues, south of E. College Place; excluding 2550 E. College Place) (SPD Zone) (Previously Certified EIR) (HAL)

(Continued from August 23, 2007)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview the request. She explained that at the last meeting the Committee reviewed the final exterior materials, colors, and architectural details. The Committee had concern with the design of the balcony drains, and instructed the applicant to put the drainage inside the building walls or come back with an alternate design. Additionally, in the motion the Committee conditioned windows to not be white, but a mill finish. Senior Planner Allen explained that the applicant has provided a window, which has an appearance of a mill finish, gray in color to compliment the clear anodized aluminum store fronts. She referenced the site plan and explained the new proposed balcony drainage design, which consisted of a “V gutter” angled to match the fins on the balcony and the posts supporting the roof above. Senior Planner Allen explained that there were three location options, and referenced the site plan. She noted that staff’s recommendation was Option B because the “V’s” of the drip edge align with the fin to continue as an architectural element. Senior Planner Allen noted that staff believed the proposed windows with the mill finish appearance were consistent with the RDRC’s previous recommendation.

Public hearing opened

RC Alley, Architects Orange, explained that they were proposing the “wedge-drip edge”. He noted that they were proposing to sheet flow off the sides of the balcony so there is not a drip along the front face of the building. Mr. Alley referenced the site plan, and explained the drain system assembly. He further explained that there were three drainage location options. Mr. Alley stated the mill finish windows do not have thermal breaks, and the proposed windows with the appearance of a mill finish have the thermal breaks to meet the required energy requirements. He stated that the gray windows would be installed on one hundred percent of the project.

Committee Member Daybell believed that there would be a problem with water running down the “V” and splattering on the side of the building. Mr. Alley stated that there could be liability issues by taking the exterior water and putting it back into the building.

Committee Member Daybell stated that a heavy rain would wash dirt into the balconies and stain the sides of the buildings. Mr. Alley explained that staining on the side of the building happens when there are no gutter assemblies directing the water off the face.

Public hearing closed

Committee Member Daybell was concerned about the drainage, and was troubled that the applicant could not provide mill finish windows.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the windows with the appearance of mill finish windows would work.

Vice Chairman Cha believed that the Committee should compromise with the applicant about the drainage.

Committee Member Lynch believed that Option B could work.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there were two styles and three location options that the Committee should look at. The two styles were the "Wedge-Vertical (Style One)" and the "Wedge-Angled" (Style Two).

Committee Members Daybell and Cha liked Option B, Style 2.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell, to APPROVE the project, using the window with the appearance of a mill finish window throughout the project and balcony drainage Option B, Style 2.

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

### Item No. 3

#### PRJ07-00258 – ZON07-00053 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER CAMERON IRONS

A review of final colors, materials, landscape, hardscape and trash enclosure design for previously approved Minor Development Project located at 133 W. Chapman Avenue. (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 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project and explained the request. She stated that the landscape plans show various types of concrete with different levels of aggregate in it to give several different finishes. She noted that there were 3 circular planters and two have a seat wall, which frame a landscape area in the middle. The third has a planter and not a seat wall. She noted that along the street there is a low wall between the landscape area and the patio. The landscape theme has a palette of shrubs and the proposed trees are palms in the three circular planters. Senior Planner Allen noted that the street trees along Chapman Avenue proposed were Pineapple Guava, and along the east property line he proposed shrubs and Italian Cypress. She noted that the shrubs consist of Flax, Bird of Paradise, Jasmine, Ice Plants, Bamboo, Blue Fescue, Dwarf Philodendron, and Myoporum Pacificum. She noted that the applicant was proposing to take the standard dimensions that are needed to hold two trash bins and construct a semi circle wall and cover it with decorative concrete blocks.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there would be a grease interceptor, and Senior Planner Allen responded that there would one. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the grease interceptor would be located underground.

Public hearing opened

Committee Member Silber arrived at 4:35 p.m.

Patrick May, Design Landscape Architect, explained that he was trying to keep the landscaping simple to address the 1960's architecture. He stated that in the 60's there were a lot of palms and Italian Cypress trees planted and believed the proposed landscape plan would not impede the signage. Mr. May noted that the shrubs would include Bird of Paradise thickly planted.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the plants were drought tolerant, and Mr. May responded that they were.

Senior Planner Allen explained that the plans submitted included stucco on the canopies which would be added to the buildings. She noted that the other materials would include glazing on the store front windows and the seat walls would be stucco to match the canopies. In addition to the steel beams there would be a palapa roof.

Mark Blumer, Architect, noted that there was discussion about exposing some of the masonry under the existing finish. He explained that they would sandblast and match the block of the building, and referenced the material board. Mr. Blumer explained that there were gunite walls across the front of the building, which was part of the structural system so the larger windows could be opened up. The intent was to sandblast the gunite walls to match the aggregate to match that wall to the existing wall. He noted that they chose a green glass to act as a complimentary color to the reddish wall. Mr. Blumer explained that they chose a more intensive red color for the columns and the stucco canopies would be a neutral color.

Cameron Irons, Applicant, stated that he wanted to match the columns to the steel primer on a building.

Bob Linnell, Fullerton Resident, was concerned with the 3 foot planting strip along the property line that faces the City parking lot. He believed that a couple of feet could be taken from the City parking lot to increase the width of the planting strip. Mr. Linnell stated that the strip would need to be as wide as possible to ensure that the trees grow. He proposed using the London Plane trees in the City parking lot and not the Italian Cypress. He noted that the idea of landscaping in the public parking area was to provide a canopy and is a requirement by the City Ordinance. Mr. Linnell believed that there needed to be 4 or 5 London Plane trees to provide the canopy, which is required by the City Ordinance.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the RDRC could consider a recommendation to expand the landscape planters to include City property, but the authorization would have to come from Engineering or the Redevelopment Agency, depending on whether it is a City or Agency owned property.

Mr. Irons stated that he originally proposed having a public plaza with landscape everywhere, and if there was a way to widen the strip he did not have a problem with that. Mr. Irons believed that the Cypress trees fit the theme of the building and there will be line-of-sight issues with canopy trees and viewing the retail signs.

Public hearing closed

Committee Member Lynch was okay with expanding the landscape area, and using the Cypress trees at the applicant's discretion.

Committee Member Silber believed that expanding the planter area with cooperation from the City was desirable. He stated he was not a big fan of Cypress Trees, but understood why the applicant wanted to protect the signage. Committee Member Silber believed that a monument sign would have been appropriate for the architecture. He noted that widening the landscape planter into the vehicle overhang would require a curb, and he was not sure if the applicant would be responsible for that. He encouraged the applicant to sit down with the City to see how the planter could be widened. Committee Member Silber suggested that the applicant consider tall slender trees to get transparency for the signs.

Committee Member Daybell recommended taking out the landscape strip and putting in diamond cut tree wells spaced along the parking lot to soften that edge. He stated he was in support of the project and it was not within the purview of the Committee to decide about encroaching onto the City parking lot.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the Committee could not condition that the applicant do improvements on an adjacent property without the other property owners authorization. He explained that in this case the Committee could identify that they do not like the landscaping the way it is, and would like to see it widened onto the City's property with authorization. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that they could approve the project as is, and give direction to the applicant to work with the City, but not dictate that be done.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if a monument sign was proposed. Senior Planner Allen clarified that a monument sign is not proposed. She noted that on the front of the building facing Chapman there are three poles for a sign that will identify the site as well as the tenants. Senior Planner Allen further noted that a sign program will be developed, which is conditioned to come back to the Committee when it is complete.

Public hearing re-opened

Mr. Irons proposed the Committee approve the project as is, with the recommendation that he looks into widening the landscape area adjacent to the public parking lot, and adding a monument sign.

Mr. Linnell was happy to hear that the applicant was willing to work with the City to widen the landscape area.

Mr. Irons requested an approval for canopy trees and vertical trees so he can look into, which tree would work best.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to APPROVE the project subject to staff's recommended conditions; The applicant shall not come back to the RDRC if he decides to substitute the trees along the property line with a canopy tree; The applicant shall attempt to work out an agreement with the City regarding the widening of the planting strip, but will not have to come back if encroaching into the City lot is not granted.

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

The Committee took a 5 minute break

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Item No. 4

PRJ08-00123 – ZON08-00040 APPLICANT: AP FUNDS I, INC AND PROPERTY OWNER: SUNRISE VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER A request for a Minor Site Plan to remodel the facade at Sunrise Village Shopping Center. Project location is from 1801-1895 N Euclid, at the southwest corner at the intersection of N Euclid and Rosecrans. (C-2 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project and explained the request. The previous owner proposed a mixed use project, which included up to 300 condominium units. The community was concerned and the property has since sold the property. The new property owner is interested in rehabbing the center, and as part of that there is the façade remodel. The façade remodel only affects the large building along the west property line. He stated the remodel does not include the CVS pharmacy building, which only uses half of the space. He referenced photographs of the existing façade. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the site plan and explained the façade remodel. He noted that there were two stone tower features proposed with tile accent, as well as a hip roof. He clarified there would be modifications to the roof, which will be worked out through the construction drawings. Staff believed what was proposed was an improvement and would not negatively impact the surrounding properties. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the five recommended conditions in the staff report.

Public hearing opened.

Jason Lee, Project Architect, stated Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented the project well. Mr. Lee noted he would use the same material with a 3-dimensional feature for the two tower elements. He stated he would submit a sign program and will hire a lighting engineer to consider lighting, including the parking lot, for safety.

Paulette Marshall, 141 W. Wilshire #B, stated she was excited about façade remodel and putting in welcoming architectural features. Ms. Marshall stated the community would like to express a desire to have a Whole Foods Market or a Trader Joes in the area. Ms. Marshall stated she would like the owner to try to keep the existing tenants who have served the community well.

Cameron Irons, 1241 Valencia Mesa, believed the center should be remodeled and redeveloped. He stated he always goes the extra mile architecturally on his development projects, tries to be unique, and encourages authentic architectural elements. Mr. Irons believed the applicant was doing nothing to create a unique environment. He stated if he was doing the remodeling he would make it an Irvine Ranch Market or something a little more country in keeping with the equestrian neighborhood. He believed veneer should not be allowed, and the center would benefit from two story elements. Mr. Irons stated to approve a stucco and stacked stone remodel was letting the applicant off easy.

Denise Hebbensiefken, current tenant, stated that the existing tenants were not going to stay in the center, and believed it would not be the center the community wants it to be.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell believed the project looked like a touch-up. He stated the new owner should look into leasing to Trader Joes, and believed the CVS space was in bad shape, and outdated.

Committee Member Lynch believed the project was “dixie cup” architecture. He stated the scale of the storefronts were not in context with the neighborhood. Committee Member Lynch stated it was important to renovate the center, but the community deserves better than what is proposed.

Committee Member Silber was concerned about the color and how much is used. He was also concerned about using cultured stone veneer. Committee Member Silber referenced the site plan and stated that between grids 3 and 6, holding the same cornice line is more effective than stepping. He recommended the applicant come back with an alternate design.

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Irons believed the Committee could direct the applicant use real materials.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the Committee agreed less veneer should be used, and more detailing can be provided. He stated an alternative architectural design that is more reflective of the adjacent buildings and the surrounding area could be considered. He noted there was an opportunity for the architect to meet with staff and get clarity as to direction.

Committee Member Lynch believed that the architect should use less stucco and more natural stone should be used.

Mr. Irons stated the Committee should give direction because it will give the architect an idea of what the Committee is leaning towards. He believed more landscaping was needed in the parking lot as well as two story elements, and a public space.

Mr. Lee stated he was open to any changes the Committee suggested.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified he had a conversation with the property owner relating to CVS terminating their lease. He noted the property owner was looking into filling the vacancies including the Major Tenant “A”. He further noted a spa facility was in plan check for this tenant space. In response to the Committee, Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the Committee’s decision can be appealed to the Planning Commission if the project is conditioned in such a way that it is considered extreme. He noted the Committee could dictate outdoor plazas, and they should establish policy as it relates to the architectural design. He further noted the façade project meets zoning code requirements, and there has been an effort to try to provide for accent features.

Committee Member Silber suggested the project be continued and not denied, so the applicant can try a different approach. He noted there was space in the front of the project between the parking lot and the building for landscaping. He believed a plaza or public spaces could pull away from the face of the building and create arcaded walkways.

Committee Member Silber believed the color palette and the earth tone approach was appropriate, but noted the hot sun color should be used sparingly.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman noted the Jacaranda Senior Housing project was being constructed adjacent to the project. The two story new development has a mountain theme that will establish some identity and character for the area.

Committee Member Lynch stated the neighborhood was upscale, equestrian and country. He believed corrugated steel and open bean trust type stuff like what is on the 5 Freeway at Sand Canyon should be used. Committee Member Lynch believed the use of stucco should be minimized, and real stone should be used.

Committee Member Daybell believed the tenant should be established for Tenant A, and noted a Green Grocer concept would fit in well. He stated the center could flow with the architecture from Tenant Apace A.

Vice Chairman Cha believed the applicant needed to expand more on the design.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell, to CONTINUE the item.

### **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

#### **Item No. 5**

City Gateway Monument sign concepts. A request to review and comment on gateway signs for City entryways. (YVO)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the City has a number of entry monument signs at gateway locations that are dated and in need of repair except for one that was recently constructed on South Euclid at the 91 freeway. City Council asked staff to look at alternative design concepts and to consider integrating the words "The Education Community" into the signage. Staff asked the Committee Members to comment on the alternative concepts and provide feedback. Staff further asked that the Committee comment on ways the existing Euclid monument sign can be improved.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were any colors associated with the City of Fullerton and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded no.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the designs provided are renderings prepared by a consultant to give staff ideas, and are different then the entry monument sign constructed on South Euclid. He explained that staff would like the RDRC to brainstorm the idea of gateway signage, and to look at the concept signs with an open mind. As an example, he identified that the concept sign has two parts; the back wall and then the Fullerton lettering. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the sign could be replicated at different entrances, except that the back piece can change in terms of material to reflect the character of each location.

Committee Member Lynch asked if staff was looking for an overall uniform sign. Acting Chief Planner Eastman believed a uniform sign would be a benefit because it can be an identifier for the City. Senior Civil Engineer Voronel noted that the idea for the 6 entry monument locations was to have uniform signage.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he preferred the existing sign on S Euclid, and liked the gable look. He also liked the modern stainless steel look with the traditional, stone, and interpretive residential shape. He believed the sign could be modified to incorporate "The Education Community" lettering.

Committee Member Lynch referenced D-101 and stated that he liked the ledger stone and would like to see a stainless steel cap on the top of the stone if that sign was selected. Committee Member Silber agreed and stated that a stainless steel cap could be laser or water cut to say "The Education Community", and back-light it with a translucent material or something that would get shadowed during the day and glow at night.

Vice Chairman Cha noted that he liked the sign on South Euclid, but stated that the "Fullerton" letters do not show up on the background. He stated that the stone in the backdrop should be changed out to something like a black marble background so the Fullerton letters show up.

Committee Member Daybell believed that the signs did not have to all be uniform. He stated that it was a nice sign on South Euclid, but it was an "over kill". Committee Member Daybell stated that the monument sign should be smaller in scale.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that the South Euclid sign did not have to be chosen for the six locations. Committee Member Daybell clarified that he didn't think the South Euclid sign needed to be removed if a different sign is used at the other locations. He liked the idea of uniformity at the other locations.

Vice Chairman Cha believed that the letter font should be different on the existing sign. Acting Chief Planner Eastman noted that the "Fullerton" letters could be outlined with an acrylic background so they can be read during the day.

Committee Member Silber referenced D-100 and stated that it was not a bad design and could work with a system for illumination. He stated that he liked D-101 but believed there could be a challenge in terms of working out the illumination system. Committee Member Silber believed that if the background becomes too prominent the sign cannot be read under certain conditions. He believed that D-108 may have the same challenges as D-101 if the backdrop the sign is against becomes visually busy, thereby the letters around it cannot be read.

Committee Members Daybell and Silber liked D-108.

Committee Member Lynch noted that he would like the existing sign on South Euclid to be the uniform choice everywhere.

Committee Member Silber stated that a metal or acrylic "Ribbon" backdrop could be added behind the letters and in front of the stone. If it was simple and had "The Education Community" in the backdrop element, it might work. He said the existing sign may be too busy because there are several forms that are moving. He thought a new linear piece might help.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman requested the Committee come to a consensus through a vote, so staff could communicate to Council a clear RDRC recommendation.

Committee Member Daybell suggested putting the South Euclid sign on the north, south streets and the D-108 design on east, west streets. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he also liked D-108.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked the idea of the free standing separate sign element on D-108 with "The Education Community" embossed into the background wall. He stated that the "Fullerton" lettering needs to be easy to see day or night.

Committee Member Silber contemplated that on the concept South Euclid backdrop, "The Education Community" could be a smaller font cut into the ribbon element. Committee Member Lynch stated that he would be open to the idea. Senior Civil Engineer Voronel asked what the ribbon material would be, and Committee Member Lynch stated that it could be painted steel behind the stainless steel letters. Committee Member Lynch stated that the light fixture could be hidden or incorporated lower. Committee Member Silber stated that the element could be stainless steel with the lettering cut in, and then illuminated from behind.

Senior Civil Engineer Voronel asked the Committee if they had any material suggestions other than stainless steel that could work. Committee Member Silber liked stainless steel and believed it was somewhat timeless and would last a long time.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the design needed a solid metal that could be a translucent material that lights up at night. Committee Member Silber stated that "The Education Community" letters could be cut out of the steel and a translucent material could be placed behind that and lit at night.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there was an existing source of electrical power at every location. Senior Civil Engineer Voronel responded that some locations have power, and at some locations adding power will be part of the project.

The Committee decided to list their preference for the sign concepts by voting on whether they would support the sign design, assuming modifications were done as per the Committee's design discussions. Based on the votes, the signs were ranked as follows:

- D-100: 1 vote (Silber in support)
- D-101: 4 votes (Hoban absent)
- D-106: No votes in support
- D-107: No votes in support
- D-108: 3 votes (Daybell, Silber, Cha in support)
- Sign on South Euclid: 4 votes (Hoban absent)

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comments.

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that the Chief Planner that was offered the position did not accept the job. He also informed the Committee that Christine Hernandez was hired with the Planning Division as an Associate Planner.

Committee Member Daybell stated that during the rebroadcast of City Council meetings, Channel 3 gets stuck in one place. He asked staff to alert the appropriate person with the cable provider.

**MEETINGS:**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of recent City Council and Planning Commission actions.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Susana Flores  
Clerical Assistant