

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

December 11, 2008

4:00 PM

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

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban, Vice Chairman Cha,
PRESENT: Committee Member Silber, and
Committee Member Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Daybell
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner Allen, Planner Wolff,
Associate Planner Hernandez and
Clerical Assistant Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chairman Cha, SECONDED by Committee
Member Lynch and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members
present, that the minutes of the regular meeting of November 13,
2008 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00258A – ZON07-00053A. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER:
CAMERON IRONS. A request to modify the design of the exterior remodel approved as
PRJ07-00258 within a Community Improvement District on property located at 133 West
Chapman Avenue (generally located on the north side of Chapman Avenue, between
350 and 450 feet west of Harbor Boulevard) (C-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under
Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Heather Allen). (Continued from
November 13, 2008)

Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant had returned to the RDRC with a modified,
“Plan C” design, which is more in the direction of the first and previously approved
design and highlights more of the “Googie” architectural elements. She referred to color
elevations that were prepared in response to Staff’s concern with the “Plan B” design. A
section conveying how the canopy structure will be built is also included, which was not
conveyed in the elevations. She stated the applicant is proposing a cylindrical pipe
structure for the canopy, supported by the decorative “V” elements in the front. The
canopy would be covered with a metal screen, which would match the equipment
screening. Senior Planner Allen noted that the V elements replace the original steel
bents that were used to support the original stucco canopy in the Plan B design. She

stated that Staff still favors the original approval, yet believes the proposed design is better than the Plan B design. She stated that conditions are included in the staff report, should the RDRC approve the project. She noted that she did receive comments from Committee Member Daybell, who could not be at the meeting. She read his comments to the Committee and noted he felt lukewarm about the project as it remains, but realized the project did need to move forward and was in support of the project if the Committee supported it.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there will be a planting area by the transformer on Chapman. Senior Planner Allen replied that there will be a planting area in front and on the east side of the transformer, but in terms of additional coverage, it would just be the landscaping. Vice Chairman Cha asked if the planting would be shrubs and Senior Planner Allen clarified Birds of Paradise were proposed. Vice Chairman Cha asked if raised plants were in that area a while ago. Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively, and clarified the triangular areas on the plans represented proposed planting areas where the ground was burnt up to the stucco wall. Vice Chairman Cha asked if those areas were grass, and Senior Planner Allen answered that they were planting areas, not grass. Chairman Hoban stated the rendering indicated grass, and Senior Planner Allen clarified the landscape plans should be indicating plant material.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the column at the entrance could be moved inside by the patio wall. Committee Member Lynch stated that the column looked to be supporting a portion of the structure. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he was concerned with the column being so close to the driveway. Senior Planner Allen stated that the applicant may be able to answer questions about the column.

Public hearing opened.

Cameron Irons, Applicant, stated that he shared concerns with Vice Chairman Cha about the columns being too close to the driveway. He stated that if there was not a structural reason for their location, he would want to move the columns up on the curved wall, so they are integrated into the palappa. He stated that if it is possible to cantilever the palappa, he will. However, he stated he believed the columns were proposed in their present location because they met the other canopy. Mark Bloomer, Project Architect, stated he believed moving the columns was a good idea, and would try to get them back up on the wall.

Mr. Bloomer stated that his original intent for the design was to take an early 1960's structure and go with the same design elements that would have been incorporated in that time period. He wanted to keep it a 1960's structure, convert it to retail, and add excitement to the design. He stated he believed the proposed design accomplishes these aspects, more so than the Plan B design. He stated the structure is a simple welded pipe steel, with lightness to the design. It also has a straight-forward structural system, which is something that would have been incorporated in the early 1960's.

Mr. Bloomer stated that the V's in the design are used to add energy to the structure, and to provide lateral support to the canopy. He noted they were also a common architectural element in the 1960's. Staff has recommended they be detached, which he did not understand as they were trying to keep a structural honesty to the design. Mr. Irons noted that the V's cannot be detached because they are holding the canopies up.

Mr. Bloomer noted that the proposed design incorporates wrapping equipment screens. He noted that one of the recommended conditions requires the screen be near the roof parameter. He stated the screen will be set back five feet to give stepping to the massing of the structure, and a grey, metallic material will be used. He added that above the round pallas a focal point was needed, so signage is proposed to be located on the roof, as that is what would have been used in traditional Googie architecture. Mr. Irons noted that they realize the Code does not allow for this type of signage, so they will go through the sign process to get it approved. Mr. Bloomer stated the Code does seem to incorporate exceptions for this type of signage when it is important to the nature of the architecture.

Committee Member Silber arrived at this time.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant to explain the proposed railings. Mr. Bloomer stated that the railings are one-and-a-half-inch pipe steel railings, galvanized and painted grey--very simple and not made to draw attention.

Mr. Bloomer noted the canopy is pulled away from the wall to allow light to hit the façade and facilitate an interesting interplay of light at the center of the structure. It also allows light into the planters at the base below. He noted the planters provide a buffer between the interior and exterior diners.

Mr. Irons stated the original plan did not incorporate center supports, but because of the span, supports may be included.

Chairman Hoban asked about the surface of the roof top. Mr. Bloomer answered that it would be a corrugated metal panel. He stated they did not want to incorporate any element that was not necessary.

Mr. Irons stated the tenants liked the proposed design, because the Plan B design did not provide much weather cover.

Committee Member Silber asked the reason for the railing system. Mr. Bloomer stated that the Alcoholic Beverage Control requires a railing system incorporated in the design. Committee Member Silber stated the design looks dense in the rendered images. Mr. Bloomer noted that there are also chairs in the rendering. Mr. Irons noted that it will be as lightly built as possible. Mr. Irons stated any tenants that do not have alcohol will not have to be completely enclosed; there will be a common patio. However, anyone with alcohol will have to have a closed parameter. Mr. Bloomer stated they tried to make the railing recede into the background and thought about painting it the same color as the columns, but refrained because they thought it would detract from the major design elements.

Mr. Bloomer added that he had a few notes regarding the recommended conditions. He stated that the first condition labels the proposed design the same project number as the Plan B design, and thought an A should be added to the first project number to distinguish between the two designs. He stated the third condition should state the angular tube steel supports should be utilized to the structure, and in the eighth condition, he believed the equipment screens should be located five feet back from the perimeter of the roof. Senior Planner Allen clarified that the first condition is correct as written, as both numbers refer to the prior project. Chairman Hoban asked if there was a

reason for staff recommending the angular tube steels not to be utilized. Senior Planner Allen stated that the condition's intent was to communicate that the structure be something else other than angular tube steel. If tube steel is approved, than that portion of the condition will be removed. She noted that the eighth condition request regarding the equipment screening is fine; staff's intent was to not have the equipment itself be screened; however, five feet from the edge of the building is fine.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he felt good about the proposed design.

Committee Member Lynch stated he felt the last RDRC meeting was productive, as he liked many of the revised aspects. He stated he liked that the applicant brought back the Googie concept and would approve of the sign on top of the roof. He liked the tiki element incorporated in the design, and he stated he was disappointed that the large arches could not be included due to budget constraints; however, he thought the design was a nice compromise. He noted that he brought a book with information about the historical context of the V elements. He stated he would move to approve the project as is, with a change in the third condition about the posts.

Committee Member Silber stated that the proposed design is a big improvement. He stated the clarity and directness of the design ideas should be trusted, even if they are a two-dimensional projection of elevation. He agrees the ornamentation in the project is signage. He stated he will support the project in its current form, with the revision about the screen being pulled back five feet, as it gives depth to the top of the building. He stated he is confident the diagonal posts are appropriately used in the design. He believed the Plan C design is better than the first two designs.

Chairman Hoban agreed with all the comments; he stated he liked the first design, but he also liked the shade and Googie elements in the proposed design. He believed the sign element is appropriate also. He stressed that the design is being approved as a package. He stressed that often a project is approved, but due to economic constraints, elements are pulled out of the design and the design is not built as approved. For example, he stated the signage is out on the edge of the canopy, and if it gets plastered back on the parapet wall eventually, it will come back to the RDRC. With that, he stated he is very happy with the design.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, and SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, with the exception that the angular tube steel elements be utilized as proposed (modifying Condition 3), and that there be an addition of a five-foot setback between the roof parameter and equipment screening (modifying Condition 8). Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner Allen restated the revised conditions.

Condition 3: Construction drawings shall include details of the metal canopies and shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development.

Condition 8: The parapet or equipment screen shall be of a height necessary to screen all exterior roof-mounted machinery and machinery components. Construction drawing elevations and sections shall include roof-mounted machinery locations for review and shall be consistent with mechanical plans. Any equipment screen shall be installed near

the perimeter of the roof, up to a distance of five feet from the edge, to provide a continuous screen around the entire building rather than screening of individual equipment. Roof plans included in the construction drawings shall clearly indicate the location of the equipment screen.

Item No. 2

PRJ03-00887 – ZON03-00081. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: FIRST EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH. A review of revised architectural plans for a new multipurpose building previously reviewed and approved by RDRC, Planning Commission and City Council. This project is Phase 2 of a three phase project, Phase 1 being a three story parking structure (now complete) and Phase 3 being a new administrative building (future). The modifications are proposed with respect to building elevations only, with site and landscaping plans to remain as approved. Property is located at 2801 Brea Boulevard (generally located on the west side of Brea Boulevard between Bastanchury Road and Rolling Hills Drive) (R-G zone) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner: Joan Wolff).

Planner Wolff stated that the project involves modifications of the Phase Two part of the project, which is a multi-purpose building. The project came before the RDRC in January of 2006. At the original hearing, most of the attention went to the original parking structure because it was proposed for construction at that time. Elevations of the multi-purpose building were shown at the original hearing, but because a full, detailed plan for the building was not proposed to the RDRC, a refinement of the conceptual plan is being presented. Planner Wolff stated that color palette and materials are very similar to the original sets brought before the RDRC in the January hearing; however, different materials, such as frosted glass, sheet metal siding, and aluminum are no longer proposed. She stated there wasn't any differentiation in what the recommendation was for the RDRC; the building in the conceptual plan is still the same--just the architectural treatment is different. Planner Wolff stated that the proposed plan contains a slight modification in color palette and more detail in building material and architectural form. She also noted that frosted glass elements and aluminum panels in one area have been eliminated and replaced with masonry and plaster surfaces, and the east elevation heavy canopy covered walkway is refined to a stream-lined canopy that is cantilevered out about five feet from the building. She stated that a pool has been included in the corner of the building. Planner Wolff stated that the east elevation is primarily being reviewed. She stated that staff finds the plans consistent with the concept and recommends approval of the project.

Chairman Hoban asked if an element on the plans was glass or luca bond. Planner Wolff stated that it was plaster. Committee Member Lynch asked if the plaster was painted grey to mimic the luca bond and Planner Wolff answered affirmatively.

Public hearing opened.

Gary Johnson, Applicant, stated the footprint, height, location, floors, or anything relative to that are not being altered; the design is just a refinement of the exterior treatments. He stated that when the project was originally brought before the RDRC, it was not finalized in their perspective, due to cost. As a result of value engineering, the proposed architectural refinements were created. He stated they attempted to keep the overall concept and look of the building consistent with the original presentation.

Vice Chairman Cha asked why the steel guard rails were painted black and not white or beige, as most churches have light railings. Mr. Johnson deferred the question to the

project architect. Supachai Kiatkwankul, Project Architect, stated that the nature of the church architecture is masonry; the intent is to blend the railings in with the masonry unit of the site. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he sees black guard rails at liquor stores and asked the applicant if he would consider changing the railings to a lighter color. Jim Clark, church representative, stated that the railings are meant to tie into the existing architectural elements of the parking structure, such as the grid work and a plaza walk with darker grey grid work.

Committee Member Lynch asked if lines between each structure on the plans were black caulking joints or delineation of the planes. Mr. Kiatkwankul stated that they represented delineations between the architectural planes.

Committee Member Silber asked if the window placement on the west elevation was consistent with the original scheme. Mr. Kiatkwankul answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Silber asked if the staircase in the back of the structure was added for an emergency exit. Mr. Clark answered it was an existing staircase, which is being replaced and brought into ADA compliance.

Senior Planner Allen noted comments sent in from Committee Member Daybell in regards to the project. She read that he feels the new design is inferior to the originally approved glass design for the building; stucco and plaster in place of the glass design is a negative for the site. Also matching the color to the parking structure is a step in the wrong direction, and the colors of the parking structure are disappointing.

Gary Zavadil, resident, stated that he wanted to know where the gymnasium is in relation to the plans. Mr. Clark clarified that the plan Mr. Zavadil was viewing is the western elevation, the view from Mr. Zavadil's property, and the gymnasium is on the right hand side of that elevation. Mr. Zavadil stated that a neighbor to the west of the proposed buildings was concerned about the concealment and noise of the air conditioning units. Committee Member Silber asked to clarify if Mr. Zavadil was referring to the existing air conditioning or the new air conditioning for the proposed multi-purpose building. Mr. Zavidil answered that he was concerned about the air conditioning on the new building and the gymnasium.

Mr. Zavadil also noted that when the parking structure was built there was an approved landscaping plan, but when the structure was built, bamboo was used instead of approved landscaping. He stated the bamboo has not been maintained and has grown so high that it is running into the cable wires.

Mr. Zavadil added that along the west wall there is a fire lane. He stated that from what he understands from the Code, the trees and bamboo in that area need to be cleared straight up so they do not block the fire lane.

Chairman Hoban asked if there were any other comments.

Monika Moore, resident, stated she did not understand the plan elevations in relation to Brea Boulevard. Mr. Clark stated that if her back was to Brea Boulevard, she would be looking at the eastern elevation, with the gymnasium on the left of the building.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Hoban asked Planner Wolff if she would like to address issues with landscaping. Planner Wolff stated that, in terms of the approved landscaping Mr. Zavadil was referring to, there was a long row of Podocarpus trees, which the landscape architect wanted to break up. It was broken up with different types of trees, which the RDRC did not prefer. Clumping bamboo was approved to be put in place of the trees.

She stated the bamboo is supposed to be maintained, so the church will have to look into that.

Planner Wolff stated that the driveway, referred to as a fire lane, was approved later on to improve circulation, so it is actually not a required fire lane. Chairman Hoban asked if any of these compliance issues were within purview of the RDRC and Senior Planner Allen answered they were not.

Public hearing reopened.

Mr. Clark stated that there is an architectural screening on top of the proposed building required by Code for the air conditioning units; the units are completely blocked and screened. Committee Member Silber asked about the screening for the existing air equipment and Mr. Clark stated that the existing equipment is non-visible to the neighboring property and is well within the center of the gymnasium building. He stated the gym does not have air conditioning but there is a multi-purpose room on the left side of the gym that has air handling equipment, all interior to the building. Mr. Johnson noted that on the plans, a grey strip on top of the building represents the air conditioning screening, which is biased all the way to the east side of the building, away from the neighbors. He stated this was done to move the air conditioning and any noise away from the neighborhood. He stated that there have been discussions with neighbors in regards to the air conditioning noise that radiates from the air conditioning system interior to the gymnasium, on the west side. He noted that the air handling equipment and system was installed in 1979 and 1980 when the complex was originally built. Current technology dramatically reduces decibel output level.

Mr. Zavadil clarified that the lane he referred to earlier is painted red and reads fire lane, so he believed it to be a fire lane.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated that while he was not on the Committee when the project first was presented, he stated he liked the design and use of materials and saw no reason to stand in the way of an approval.

Committee Member Silber stated that he was generally satisfied with the design, but feels the design could almost be calmed down a bit. The decorative metal screen element for the parking structure is not dense enough. He stated he was sympathetic to Committee Member Daybell's comments and thought the project was more a function of presentation. He noted that he did not believe the proposed design was striving for the same transparency effect as the original design.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he believed the color scheme to be too busy for a church building and thought it was a mistake and unnecessary to match the elements to the parking structure. He stated that, overall, the scheme was up to their preference and he was okay with the design.

Chairman Hoban stated he believed it to be appropriate for metal to be black because if it matches what it is next to. There is a utilitarianess of the hand rail. He noted there is a lucabond or aluminum look to the façade. Where there is a gray plastic finish, he would prefer luca bond. Overall, he stated he supported the project.

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

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00439 – ZON08-00149. APPLICANT: ROY HERBOLD JR. AND PROPERTY OWNER: FULLERTON METRO CENTER AND INLAND WESTERN FULLERTON METRO CENTER.

A review of site and architectural plans for a proposed remodel, including building façade and landscape improvements, of a commercial building located in a Community Improvement District on property located at 1401 S. Harbor Boulevard (generally located on the west side of Harbor Boulevard, approximately 250 feet north of Orangefair Avenue) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Christine Hernandez).

Associate Planner Hernandez stated that the applicant is proposing an exterior façade renovation of the existing building. She stated that the request for the remodel will not include any additional square footage. She noted that un-permitted work in the form of an awning and outdoor seating was done in mid 2006. The exterior site plan changes include the removal of the awning and seating, which will be replaced with new landscaping and a reorientation of the entry into the building. The entry will be moved to the west elevation, facing the parking lot. She noted that a conceptual landscape plan was submitted to staff showing locations of the new and existing landscape areas. A complete landscape area irrigation plan will be required to be submitted during the plan check phase of the project. The plans include drought-tolerant landscaping.

Associate Planner Hernandez noted that the existing building is currently a stucco finish with decorative cornice plate railing and face molding, running along all sides of the building. She stated that the black awning along the closed areas on the southern and eastern portions of the building will be removed. The new entrance along the western portion of the structure will consist of a series of windows and doors approximately forty feet in length. She stated that framing the windows in the entry doors is an architectural projection, which provides some relief to the façade and gives the appearance of a recessed entry. The façade is projected three feet, six inches out from the body of the building. Faux windows will be replaced at the northern most area of the east elevation, facing Harbor Boulevard, in order to give symmetry and mimic the windows that are on the southern portion. In the original drawings, the east elevation had tubing and steel grills, mimicking the window style placed at the center of the building. The metal tubing will be replaced with the faux windows located at the northern portion of the eastern elevation.

Associate Planner Hernandez stated the south elevation will include a series of three windows where the existing entry is now. The same architectural projection used on the eastern and western portions of the building will be used on the southern elevation to frame the window series.

She noted staff supports the project and believes the architectural detail is compatible with the surrounding structures. However, she noted staff feels the plate railing and the base molding running along the sides of the building should be retained and integrated into the new architectural features, which the applicant has done on the revised elevations provided at the meeting. She also noted that staff is requiring the applicant bring in a color pallet; a tan color exists currently on the structure, but is not what the applicant will necessarily use.

Chairman Hoban asked for Associate Planner Hernandez to clarify where the plate railing portion was on the plans, and Associate Planner Hernandez identified this area on the drawings.

Public hearing opened.

Roy Herbold, Applicant, stated that in response to staff's comments in the report, revised elevations are being presented. The exterior was modified to be consistent with the existing design for the upper cornice on the building and the intermediate banding. He stated the horizontal chair rail is added thirty-eight inches off the ground. The same color pallet as the shopping center is proposed to be used; however, only a single color is proposed for the structure and not the green banding used on the existing structures.

Mr. Herbold stated that Bank of America requested the railing on the east elevation be retained in the location instead of the proposed landscaping.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if he would have opposition to changing the foam down at the thirty inches to wood, lath and plaster as a more functional element of the building. Mr. Herbold asked if Chairman Hoban meant stucco over foam, and Chairman Hoban clarified that even if the foam is stuccoed over, foam poses a maintenance issue for the building, as it is easily damaged. Mr. Herbold asked for the Committees' preference of material, and Committee Member Lynch suggested a two-by-four or two-by-six member wrapped in lath and covered in plaster. Mr. Herbold stated that the building has vertical masonry elements, but if these elements are not part of the structural part of the building, then they were intending to put stucco over the masonry. Chairman Hoban stated that this would be fine, but asked if Mr. Herbold would be ok with turning the backer of the chair rail into wood, lath and plaster in lieu of foam. Mr. Herbold stated they have no problem doing a metal frame. Committee Member Lynch asked if the existing material is foam covered with plaster, and Mr. Herbold answered that the element at the bottom of the drawing is wood, but did not know about the above elements.

Chairman Hoban asked if the ATM was a 24-hour, indoor operation and Mr. Herbold answered affirmatively. Mr. Herbold stated that you need an ATM card to trigger a lock to go indoors. Vice Chairman Cha asked about security for the ATM and Mr. Herbold stated there are security cameras around the structure.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Silber stated he would support something other than the faux windows. He stated he did not want to put glass in front of a wall to imply a transparency that is not there. He stated a trellis element would be more appropriate, which he would make a condition of approval. Committee Member Lynch asked which windows were faux and Associate Planner Hernandez clarified that the faux windows would be placed on the northern portion of the building, on the east elevation, whereas the windows on the southern portion of the east elevation are real. Chairman Hoban asked if a pipe steel element was mimicking the store front and Mr. Herbold answered affirmatively. Senior Planner Allen stated that in the revised plans, the tubing was replaced with additional faux windows, making all but two windows faux. Mr. Herbold stated that the windows were for purposes of symmetry. Committee Member Silber stated he did not know why symmetry was important. Committee Member Silber asked if windows would also be closed in. Mr. Herbold stated that windows would be closed in on the southeast corner. Committee Member Silber stated that he was not happy with the concept of taking away windows and replacing them with fake windows in front of walls that are blank to begin with and in front of new blank walls. He stated he believed the layout of the floor plan did not allow for real windows in certain locations.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that because the east elevation is facing Harbor Boulevard, to mimic windows is ok, and is in favor of the design.

Chairman Hoban stated that it is very “Knott’s Berry Farm” to have faux windows and does not serve any function for the building. He noted that the roof line is not articulated, which is not preferred.

Committee Member Silber added that clear story windows could be incorporated if the floor plan would allow it.

Committee Member Lynch described the building as a “vanilla” box—a corporate, homogenized branding, with an elimination of natural light in favor of fake elements. He stated that natural light is always a more welcome element in a building versus artificial lighting. He stated he would encourage a Plan B design—something that maintains more natural light.

Public hearing re-opened.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant how much of the design can be attributed to the corporate brand, and which aspects stand apart from the brand. Mr. Herbold reminded the Committee that holes cannot easily be cut into the existing masonry structure, without preserving the integrity of the structure. He stated that if Bank of America designed the building, it would be even more corporate and plain in design, without as much fenestration as currently proposed. He stated his design gives relief to the elevation. He stated that even though he is favor of natural light, the design would not be appropriate for a bank.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if there was anything that could be taken from the Committees’ comments to further a resolution. Mr. Herbold stated if steel trellises are preferred instead of windows, then that would be fine, but he thought the design was clean and better than what was there originally. He stated that he was trying to match the existing architecture and not Bank of America’s architecture.

Committee Member Lynch asked Mr. Herbold if he did not want natural light for the Bank of America customers. Mr. Herbold stated that Bank of America has design standards down to the smallest detail, making it hard to accommodate this fenestration. He stated he did not think the bank would approve of the lighting the Committee was suggesting. Committee Member Lynch stated he was proposing to maintain the existing windows. Mr. Herbold noted they were adding forty feet of glass on the west elevation. Committee Member Silber emphasized that glass was able to be added when the floor plan allowed for it. Mr. Herbold added that for security reasons, glass should not be added in certain areas, such as the teller areas.

Committee Member Silber suggested the applicant come back with a Plan B design, as alternative designs had been successful in the past. Committee Member Silber stated he understood the applicant’s perspective, but if the floor plan would allow for greater design options and more natural light, and if symmetry did not drive the design to such a large extent, then the design may be more successful. Mr. Herbold stated he believed in his proposed design for the existing structure. Committee Member Silber noted that if corporations got their way, every building would be plain. He stated clear story windows are unable to be attained due to the floor plan, and wanted the applicant to consider designing for natural light on the boulevard in which people enter the city.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that the Bank of America has standard qualities they need to promote, so either the project is continued or it can be approved or denied.

Chairman Hoban added that he agrees that the building is better than the original, but the RDRC's intent is to make the best architecture possible. Vice Chairman Cha stated the Committee should ask the applicant if the project should be continued. Mr. Herbold stated he would want direction on the design if he were to come back. Chairman Hoban clarified that if the applicant does not continue his project, all the fees will have to be repaid and he will have to resubmit his plans. Mr. Herbold stated that he did not want to have to repay fees and wished to continue the project. Senior Planner Allen stated that a third option would be to appeal a denial vote to the Planning Commission. Carl Robertson, representative for the Bank of America, asked if the Committee denied a Plan B design, could the design be appealed to the Planning Commission, and Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively. Mr. Robertson added that it is a challenge to lay out a bank floor plan with numerous windows. He stated they worked with staff to create the best design possible.

Committee Member Silber gave an example, that he believed the Bank of America in Sunny Hills is a great design. He stated if the applicant came back with a design incorporating a box with solid walls and cornices, he would not see a reason to turn it down even though it is not his preference; however, when natural light in the form of clear story windows cannot be added because of the floor plan, he feels the design strategy is getting in the way. Mr. Herbold noted that windows were added. Committee Member Silber suggested the applicant has given up on making the design pedestrian friendly and inviting.

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Herbold noted he would want an opportunity to meet with the RDRC member's to discuss revisions to the plans, and Vice Chairman Cha noted that individual meetings with each member is an option.

Committee Member Lynch suggested sky lights to allow as an option for natural lighting, and Mr. Herbold stated that he will consider it.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, and SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of January 8, 2009 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 4

PRJ08-00058 – ZON08-00020. APPLICANT: JOHNSON'S HOME BUILDERS AND PROPERTY OWNER: TIM PEFFLY. A request for a Minor Development Project to construct two (2) new single family dwelling units within a Potential Landmark District on property located at 1213 Frances Avenue (generally located on the west side of Frances Avenue, approximately 200 feet north of Cannon) (R-1-7.2 zone) (Previously certified Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner: Heather Allen).

Due to the close proximity of his house to the project site, Committee Member Silber recused himself from the project and left the room.

Senior Planner Allen stated the property is located on two legal lots, vacated by the structure previously on the site. The location is in a Potential Landmark District, which is an area deemed a significant resource. There are no specific guidelines for the development on the site, as you would have with a Preservation Zone. Because of the location, and the demolition request that has gone before the Landmark's Commission, the construction of two new homes is coming before the RDRC to review the proposal in

terms of whether or not it is consistent with the characteristics of the Potential Landmark District. The particular Potential Landmark District is the Skyline Park Potential Landmark District. According to the Historic Building Survey, the area was deemed a Potential Landmark District because it was a neighborhood developed in the 1920's with quality custom homes and design elements that were authentic to the construction. She noted the applicant is proposing two homes on the property, referred to as Lot 68 and Lot 69. She stated both homes are two-story, with a setback of the second story behind the first.

Senior Planner Allen noted that both homes have their own style in terms of materials. Lot 68 is more of a Tuscan style with smooth plaster finish, a red tile roof, and a turret at the entrance. Lot 69 is more traditional with smooth plaster, stone, a shingled roof, and siding elements. The property is fairly sloping north to south.

Senior Planner Allen noted there are concerns for how the improvement on the site will drain and there a condition related to drainage in the staff report. She noted there is a requirement in the Building Code that regardless of this condition, when construction occurs on the site, drainage cannot be increased across the property lines. Staff has added to that requirement, that the hydrology and hydraulic study verify that not only the velocity not increase, but also the volume of water, as that is a definite possibility with the development on the site. Staff wants to make sure the project will not increase the water running south across the project. She noted that a letter in opposition to the project because of the drainage impacts was received. The neighbor that wrote the letter is in attendance, so she will allow him to present on his concerns during public comment.

She noted that Lot 69 is about 3,300 square feet, plus a 700 square-foot garage. Lot 68 is 3,100 square feet, plus a 650 square-foot garage. Both are within the development standards for the zone. She noted that because this is not a Preservation Zone, the maximum floor area ratio is 50%. Were this a Preservation Zone, maximum floor area ratio would be 40% or 35% where no existing dwelling is preserved. Currently, houses in the vicinity range from 1,200 to 2,500 square feet.

Chairman Hoban asked if some of the houses are utilizing, in split levels, the natural grade of the area. Senior Planner Allen stated that she has not seen the backs of the homes and suggested the neighbors could possibly answer the question.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the plans were showing all the existing trees. Senior Planner stated that not all existing are shown; some that will be removed are shown and some trees existing to remain are shown. She stated the intent is to preserve as much as the mature trees in the rear of the property as possible.

Public hearing opened.

Jeremy Johnson, representative for Tim Peffly, stated it has been the applicant's intent to preserve the natural trees in the area. He stated there are design concerns with the project because it is built into a deep lot. He stated they approached the project with the second story to obtain the desired square footage.

A resident near the proposed project stated he was concerned with the overall size of the buildings themselves. He stated that he went through ninety six records of homes in Skyline Park in the vicinity of the project and found the lowest square footage for the

homes to be about 870 square feet, the highest square footage to be about 5,326 square feet, and the average to be about 1,626 square feet. He stated one of the reasons he bought in the neighborhood was because of the unique architecture of the neighborhood. He noted the neighborhood is comprised of small, single family homes. He stated that he could understand from a commercial standpoint that square footage is important to recoup an investment; however, he felt the project was out of context for the neighborhood.

Richard Glassberg, 313 Cannon Lane, directly south of the project site, asked if the conditions in the staff report were suggestions from staff or requirements. Senior Planner Allen stated items in the staff report were recommended conditions. She stated that, should the RDRC approve the project, they can approve it with the recommended conditions, add conditions, or remove conditions. There is currently a recommended condition to comply with the Building Code regarding not adding more drainage to another property, and also to make sure the velocity and volume is not increased. Mr. Glassberg added that the project would be adding well over twice as much impervious hardscape to the site as previously there. He stated he lived south of the project for forty years, and when he designed his landscaping, he designed for what was currently there. He noted he has a three-inch pipe that goes from his backyard, to under his garage, to the street, and if he were to get more water than he currently has, his house will be full of mud. He cited Section J109.4 of the Code that addressed this issue and believed the City to have liability if the issue was not addressed. He also added that the proposed homes were completely out of scale for the neighborhood.

Dorian Hunter stated she has lived in the neighborhood for forty years and believed the neighborhood to be known for its charm. She stated she believed the proposed houses to be too large for the site. She stated she is disappointed the houses do not conform more to the topography of the site, and felt there is an opportunity to put split level houses on the slope. She stated it was disturbing to see that the side elevations are not articulated and have no interest. She added that she did not consider the homes to be quality custom homes, but were designs incompatible for the neighborhood. She stated the fireplace chimney on the side of the house is over thirty feet high and is aesthetically overwhelming. She felt the materials used for the proposed project were more for decoration and not integral parts of the home. She would like to see the proposed project further worked on to provide something interesting, specific, and charming to the site.

Robert Ashlock, resident near the project site, stated his property faces the backside of the proposed project. He noted that from his elevation, it seems he will be looking straight into the back doors of the proposed house. He stated the back deck of the new house would be sixteen feet off of his back fence, making everything pushed back towards him, in his perspective. He believed having a house that conforms to the topography of the land would make more sense. He noted the house seems extremely large as compared to any other house in the neighborhood and does not blend well with the style of the area.

A resident of the project site neighborhood added that she hopes the size and design of the homes do not set a precedent for the area.

Jill Ashlock, resident near the project site, stated she was concerned with the proposed house's lack of yard. She stated that for a single family to have such a large house, one

presumes there would be children, yet there is no yard to the houses. She stated the houses have a bigger driveway than yard, which seems incongruent with the rest of the family-oriented neighborhood. She stated she would like the houses to have a bigger yard, which would also preserve a few trees that are to be removed.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated he thanked the public for their comments and agreed with their concerns regarding the scale of the houses. He believed the houses to be too large for the neighborhood. He stated he would encourage the designer to consider downsizing the house and explore the vernacular of the neighborhood to come up with a design that is more unique and fits in with the character of the neighborhood.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he agreed with Committee Member Lynch. He stated that considering the zone and neighbors' concerns, the size of the house should be reconsidered.

Chairman Hoban referred to photographs of the current homes in the Frances neighborhood and stated that some of the homes are eclectic and some, if had to come through the RDRC, would not have made it through. He stated the homes are eclectic because they were not all built at the same time. He noted that houses, in general, can be designed as mansions because it is allowed. However, he noted that the RDRC is present to make sure the house design is appropriate for the surroundings. In regards to the drainage issue, he stated he felt it was a major concern. He stated it would be an issue for Engineering to address. He stated that in terms of massing, the proposed homes are large, but some of the current homes in the neighborhood already have similar massing, if not more with less space in front of the house with the same massing, which helps to drive the uniqueness of the area. He stated his major disappointment towards the design was the fact that the homes are not utilizing the topography of the land, which makes the house look like a spec home placed in an older neighborhood. He stated that the design could have been much more creative.

Senior Planner Allen read comments from Committee Member Dayell. She read he was concerned about the drainage being overreaching. He asked how the sewer system would work and if there would be a pump. He asked if the original house used a pump. She noted she was not sure how the original house dealt with sewage, but knew in the new houses, a pump to the street would be needed. She added that there are requirements that do not allow pressurized sewer entering the main. The civil engineer would have to address this design.

Mr. Glassberg asked what Committee Member Daybell meant by drainage being overreaching. Senior Planner Allen clarified that typically, the drainage condition is not addressed in the staff report. Typically, in the staff report there is a more general condition to comply with engineering and building Code requirements. The RDRC is not used to seeing such a condition. Due to concerns expressed, and an agreement on staff's standpoint, the applicant needs to be on notice, and a condition needs to be included in the report.

Chairman Hoban stated that the neighbors have to be aware of the fact that something will be built on the site. He stated he encourages the architect to look at the neighborhood at design something that the neighborhood will be happy with.

Committee Member Lynch stated that many neighbors addressed the fact the house should be split level. He stated using the topography would create interest.

Public hearing reopened.

Mr. Johnson stated that the two homes were hard to accept when the actual topography of the lot cannot be seen, as the house actually sits on a deep portion of the property. He also noted there is a setback of seventeen and twenty five feet for the neighbors across the street, whereas both houses have a thirty two foot setback, which is a constraint for a designer. He stated he is also constrained by the fact that the downhill slope of the driveway cannot be increased due to Code. He stated that sixteen hundred square feet makes for a quaint home, but is not economically viable. He stated that one of the daughters of the owner is going to be living in one of the homes with her children, and contested that one of the proposed yard is as big, if not bigger, than the yards of some of the houses across the street. Mr. Johnson added that other frontages are more mass than the proposed homes.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch suggested continuing the project to a later date and having the designer take everyone's comments into consideration. He encouraged the designer to return with a site plan showing the scale and color pallet of the houses to help encourage positive feedback.

Vice Chairman Cha agreed with Committee Member Lynch. He stated that it would be better for the designer to differentiate between the two houses with color schemes and material selection.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, and SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE UNCERTAIN to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 5

PRJ08-00004 – ZON08-00004. APPLICANT: JAMES BLUM AND PROPERTY OWNER: BP WEST COAST PRODUCTS LLC. A request for a Minor Development Project to reconstruct an existing Arco AM/PM gas station on property located at 401 North Placentia Avenue (generally located on the northwest corner of North Placentia Avenue and Chapman Avenue) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Heather Allen).

Senior Planner Allen stated that the site is an existing ARCO gas station. The applicant plans to construct a new convenience and combine all of the pumps into one large pump island to service the site. She stated the site is currently operating without a conditional use permit, as the permit was not required when the site was developed. She stated there are some requirements that the Engineering department has for a ten-foot dedication of right-of-way on Placentia and an eight-foot dedication on Chapman. In order to accommodate the circulation the applicant desires, site improvements and dedications, a variance is requested from the Planning Commission to reduce the landscape setback from ten feet to five feet. Due to the applications, a recommendation

will be made to the Planning Commission and not a final determination by the RDRC. She stated the building itself is rectangular, with the long side (the main entrance) oriented towards Chapman. On this side are the store front window systems. The building is a stucco building with tower features on both ends and a screen to hide mechanical equipment. She noted there are trellis elements and landscape areas on the elevation facing Placentia. The rear elevation backs up to the property line and the other side elevation backs up to the corner of the site.

Committee Member Lynch asked Senior Planner Allen to review the landscaping variance once more. Senior Planner Allen stated the variance will be a Planning Commission decision; the RDRC will recommend on the Development Project designed with the variance in mind. Senior Planner Allen clarified the details on variance. Committee Member Lynch asked if it was being done to accommodate more planting. Senior Planner Allen stated ultimately, it is being done to preserve more road because there will eventually be a right turn lane. Chairman Hoban asked why an improvement was not being done when a project was occurring. Senior Planner Allen stated that the requirements for the project, including having all necessary right-of-way, were not complete yet.

Vice Chairman Cha asked about a section next to the property line that he observed as not taken care of. Senior Planner Allen replied that the section was flood control and an undeveloped area of the freeway. Vice Chairman Cha asked if there was also a water channel in the undeveloped area and Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Public hearing opened.

Pat Foley, Area Development Manager for ARCO, stated they were enthusiastic about the project. In regards to the undeveloped area, he stated they had tried to acquire the property so a car wash could be constructed on the lot, but were unable to obtain the lot. Vice Chairman Cha asked who owned the lot. Mr. Foley stated the land owner owned nearly the entire block of land, including a family restaurant next to the ARCO and did not want to sell the area. Vice Chairman Cha stated the lot was horrible and unkempt.

Committee Member Lynch stated asked about the color pallet for the project. Erika Skeie, representative of the project Engineer and Architect, stated the exterior of the building will be pearl and dark pearl, with the AMPM signage. Committee Member Lynch stated he just wanted to make sure the colors were aesthetically pleasing.

Committee Member Lynch asked the applicant if they were open to using the smallest grain of sand stucco available. Ms. Skeie asked if it would be a separate application or if the entire building would consist of the small grain sand. Committee Member Lynch replied that it would be a condition of approval that all the stucco finish consists of the small gauged sand, as it minimizes the coarse look of the stucco. Senior Planner Allen noted that the fine grained sand keeps the building cleaner as well. The applicant answered that they were open to the idea.

Chairman Hoban asked if the expansion joints were aluminum channels or stucco joints. Ms. Skeie stated they are one-inch reveals.

Vice Chairman Cha asked about the 1 ½ foot clearance on the north side of the building, between the existing wall and the new building. Ms. Skeie stated there is a three-foot low

retaining wall that currently exists on the property and ARCO's building wall is two feet off of the property line. Vice Chairman Cha asked if the clearance from the end of the existing wall to the new wall is about a foot and a half. Ms. Skeie replied that the clearance is eighteen inches. Vice Chairman Cha asked how that area can be cleaned. Ms. Skeie stated it will be paved out to be a channel but the wall is not so high that one cannot get access to it. Vice Chairman Cha asked if one would need to go over to the next property to have access to the area. Ms. Skeie replied that one could stand on the wall and possibly hose the area down. Vice Chairman Cha asked how the area would be cleaned. Ms. Skeie replied that as part of the operations of the site, the area would have to be kept clean. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he has seen a lot of trash fall into the water channel. Ms. Skeie replied that the proposed site plan would improve that condition because the area where the trash falls will be gated off so nobody will have access to the area except for operations. The length of the property line will also be landscaped out.

Vice Chairman Cha asked what would be wrong with putting the wall to the property line. Senior Planner Allen stated that the area may be needed for drainage or it meets a building Code requirement. Senior Planner Allen also stated the existing wall will remain, and the footing of the existing wall goes onto the property about two feet. The start of the building is at the edge of the footing of the existing wall. Vice Chairman Cha stated he saw this, but was still wondering how the area would be maintained.

Cameron Irons stated that there is no purpose for the wall other than separating the restaurant from the wall. Ms. Skeie noted that it was a retaining wall and there was an elevation difference.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated that the project was a major improvement to the site and supports the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that overall it is betterment for the corner and for the neighbors. He stated he did not have a resolution to keep the back clearance clean and it should be restudied. He stated he supported the project.

Chairman Hoban stated he supported the project.

MOTION by Committee Member Hoban and SECONDED, by Vice Chairman Cha to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions, with an added condition that the stucco has a fine aggregate finish. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member Silber returned to the room.

Item No. 6

PRJ08-00481 – ZON08-00156. APPLICANT: CAMERON IRONS AND PROPERTY OWNER: JEAN PARKER. A request for a Miscellaneous Development Project to consider minor changes to the façade of an existing Local Landmark building (c. 1901; Masonic Temple). Requested changes include the painting of window trim; replacing a single storefront awning with two awnings (one per tenant); replacing existing ceramic wainscot with 3.5" slate tiles; and replacing an existing storefront door with an ornate

iron/glass door. Property is located in the Central Business District on property located at 201 North Harbor Boulevard (generally located on the northwest corner of Harbor Boulevard and Amerige Avenue) (C-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Jay Eastman).

Senior Planner Allen stated the structure is the former Masonic temple, identified as a local landmark. The applicant is proposing to remove the green tiles, add slate veneer, remove the fabric from the awning, create two separate awnings for the storefronts and replace the original awning fabric with black fabric. They are proposing to also paint the window frames and the existing door of a future tenant a grey color; the existing tenant will keep his door. The awnings on the Amerige side are going to be redone and the tile portion on the Amerige side will be removed. The windows would remain green in color on the Amerige elevation and everything else would remain as is.

Senior Planner stated that she spoke with Bob Linell, who said he likes the proposed changes. Although signage is not being considered, it is required that signage comply with the Central Business District Guidelines, and he wanted to reinforce this fact. Senior Planner Allen stated that she also spoke with Katie Dalton with Fullerton Heritage, who appreciates the changes and thinks the design looks good; however, she feels the modifications should be consistent throughout the entire building.

Staff feels the modifications are compatible with the guidelines for reviewing a local landmark, and staff recommends approval of the project.

Chairman Hoban asked if the cabinet signs will come down. Senior Planner Allen stated that the remaining tenant's signage will not change. There is a condition that new signage be compatible with the Code as well as Central Business District Design Guidelines.

Committee Member Lynch asked where the iron material on the plans will go on the building. Senior Planner Allen identified the location in which it is to be located. Committee Member Lynch asked if the existing tenant's space will be modified as well, so the design will be consistent. This question was deferred to the applicant.

Public hearing opened.

Cameron Irons, Applicant, stated that there are two uses in the building, retail and office. The office use is not concerned with window visibility like a retail use would be. He stated the retail tenant typically does not want iron grates in front of their doors because it prevents visibility. The office tenant has specific desires in terms of what they want their space to look like, which is what he is trying to accomplish with the iron doors. Mr. Irons stated the reason the design is not consistent throughout the building is the upstairs tenant has a lease that expires in March. Once they leave the building, he plans to take the entrance at the rear of the building and put a lobby in with a more ornate staircase leading to the upper floors. When this occurs, the awnings and other treatments on Amerige will then be changed to be consistent with the proposed treatments. He stated he has not proposed to change all the awnings on the Amerige side because he does not know where the awnings will be in the new entrance.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the new standard for the awnings would be black and Mr. Irons answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Lynch asked what the future was for the existing peach color of the building. Mr. Irons stated he wanted to take the paint off and have the building be the original brick underneath the paint, but the previous owners trashed the brick when the stucco was put on.

Mr. Irons stated that the design is being driven by the new tenant, The County Clerk Recorder, and it is a great opportunity to have them in the downtown.

Committee Member Silber stated there is a detail on the plans that is missing from the photograph. Mr. Irons stated that the elevation on the plans came off of the old plans from the 1990's, developed before the tenant spaces were installed. When the spaces were put in, the detail on the plans did not occur in construction.

Committee Member Silber clarified the number of doors on the Harbor elevation. Mr. Irons stated there are two doors, one for each tenant, and a third door, but that is to alcove upstairs.

Senior Planner Allen noted the existing awning covers the entire alcove door. She wanted to clarify that if they were splitting the awnings, the tenant door would not be covered. Mr. Irons stated the plan is to leave the awning structure as is, and just change the color. He added that the Clerk Recorder just wants to have a sign on the awning that reads their name. Senior Planner Allen noted the staff report reads that the existing awning will be removed and be replaced with two smaller awnings. Mr. Irons thought that did not make sense and did not intend to do that.

Chairman Hoban asked if there is an intention to remove the window air conditioners. Mr. Irons stated that the window air conditioners will be removed when the upstairs tenant leaves, and central air will then be installed. Chairman Hoban asked if he could condition that. Mr. Irons stated that the tenant was not gone yet. Committee Member Silber stated that it could be conditioned that the window air conditioners should be removed within six months. Chairman Hoban asked if they could condition the air conditioners be removed after the tenant's lease is up. Senior Planner Allen stated it seemed reasonable, but would be difficult to enforce, because it is unknown when the lease is terminated. Mr. Irons suggested it be a condition that as part of any improvements in the second story, the window air conditioners be removed. Chairman Hoban stated that he wanted to make sure the air conditioners were out if the tenant should come up with more money to renew their lease. Mr. Irons agreed.

Chairman Hoban asked if the previous owners completely changed the parapet because of the fire. Mr. Irons stated he did not know why.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he was fine with the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated he was fine with the project and thought the slate would be a nice improvement over the green tile.

Chairman Hoban stated he was fine with the project as well, but would condition that at the end of the lease, the window air conditioners be removed from both the Amerige and Harbor elevations.

Committee Member Silber stated that he just wanted to comment on his approval of the project, that he anticipated the windows will eventually be consistent in color and that this is a phase project.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber and SECONDED, by Vice Chairman Cha to APPROVE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Senior Planner Allen noted that members were provided with a copy of the ordinance indicating the details of appointing/reappointing members of the RDRC. Several members had questions on the appointment status. Senior Planner Allen suggested members follow up with the City Clerk but assume they should continue attending meetings unless instructed otherwise.

MEETINGS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant