

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

August 24, 2006

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:06 PM by Chairman Daybell

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Larsen
ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: Catherine and James Spray

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Senior Planner Allen, Acting Chief
Planner Eastman, Clerical Staff Leopold,

MINUTES: MOTION by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee
Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present
to APPROVE August 10 minutes AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ05-00565 – ZON05-00075. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: JOSE G. PEREZ.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a request to (1) Approve a 2nd unit converted from a garage without the benefit of permits, (2) Demolish a 360 sq. ft. detached garage, and (3) Construct a 400 sq. ft. detached garage on a property in a preservation zone located at 224 W. Brookdale Place (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (R-2P) (Continued from September 8, 2005 meeting).

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated the applicant was informed of the meeting, but was unable to attend.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated the RDRC reviewed the project previously but did not approve it because it did not meet code, in terms of parking. The applicant has worked closely with staff to have the project meet code.

The applicant has proposed a revised plan that will:

- Demolish the single car garage, which had access off of Brookdale
- Construct a new two-car garage, pushed behind the main house and turned 90 degrees
- Re-exterior the saw tooth building with portions of new siding.

Staff would recommend the entire building be re-sided and carry forward the details of the fascia and exposed rafter tails, and craftsman windows, in order to bring it to closer compliance with the design guidelines and to match the front house.

Staff discussed the saw tooth design and stated it is part of the original construction.

Chairman Daybell asked if it the structure was built without a permit? Acting Senior Planner Allen said the garage with the saw toothed roof was built with a permit. A conversion to make it a dwelling was done without a permit.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that at the previous meeting in 2005, there was an issue of having two entry doors, one on both sides. At that meeting the Committee indicated it would be better to remove one of the doors to discourage an illegal conversion into two units. The Committee's recommendation at that time was to remove the door on the east side of the building. Based on the current proposal and the location of the guest parking spaces, staff believes it better to move the entry from the west to the east side, eliminating the door on the west side.

Committee Member Cha asked if the two large trees noted on the plans were to be removed? Acting Senior Planner Allen said yes; there is a large avocado tree that would be blocking access to the required parking spaces. In order to meet the parking requirements, the avocado tree by the alley must be removed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said in order to meet development standards for two units on the site, it is not possible to preserve the tree.

Chairman Daybell stated the block wall in the alley should be removed in order to ensure use of both of the parking spaces. Acting Senior Planner Allen said staff was concerned with that as well and provided a condition that the applicant provide a minimum 16 ft. opening, which means they will need to remove the fence and a portion of the wall.

Public hearing opened.

David Bailey, an adjacent neighbor, had no opinion, but wanted to observe the layout of the project that is being proposed in his neighborhood.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Hoban said he was not at the previous meeting of this project, but asked about the vintage of the saw tooth. He believed that although it is not typical of the construction in the neighborhood, it is original, and was built in the 30's or 40's and is a piece of Fullerton. He stated although it's not typical of a California bungalow, it is a piece of history.

Committee Member Hoban and Committee Member Duncan asked staff for clarification of the connection of the new garage to the existing structure to remain. They felt the connection and roof detail would need to be worked out in the construction drawings.

Committee Member Hoban said he is in support of the project with the conditions recommended by staff.

Committee Member Duncan agreed with Committee Member Hoban and was in support of the project and conditions recommended by staff.

Committee Member Cha said he was in support of the project and noted that the prior comments are reflected in the current design. The removal of the existing unused garage door (along the alley) will make the project look good. He supported the saw tooth design because it is original.

Chairman Daybell stated one of the exterior doors has to be removed because if it is preserved, it will make it too easy to create another unit, as stated in the meeting a year ago. He was also concerned that if the patio area is used for parking, the avocado tree and block wall will need to be removed. Chairman Daybell suggested a condition to remove one entry door as well as the entire fence along the alley. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that Condition No. 12 in the staff report addressed the elimination of the west entry door. Staff had not recommended that the entire fence be removed. Condition No. 9 which addressed partial removal of the fence could be modified.

Chairman Daybell stated that he supported the project but also agreed with Fullerton Heritage when they expressed a year ago that possibly the whole building should be demolished. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said he received a voicemail from Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, stating he had reviewed the current plans and read the staff report. Mr. Dalton felt what was recommended was consistent with the discussion in September, should the building be retained, and did not have any objections.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban and CARRIED unanimously by all voting member present to APPROVE the project with staff's recommendations as modified to require that the block wall along the alley be removed in its entirety.

NEW BUSINESS:

PRJ06-00310 – ZON06-00050. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: RON HOLBORN.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a request for approval of a Minor Development Project to add 1,756 sq. ft. to create additional office space at 1441 Brea Blvd. (generally located on the west side of Brea Blvd., approximately 500 feet south of Marion Dr.) (O-P) (CID) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301)

Acting Senior Planner Allen said the addition is to convert the building back into a real estate office. It had become a banquet center and is now in escrow to become a real estate office again. Staff recommended that the proposed project be carried out as planned. Acting Senior Planner Allen said there are plan check comments as the applicant did submit concurrently to begin the process to get their building permits. She reviewed the main correction which related to the drive aisle width on the west side of the building.

Chairman Daybell stated the applicant was informed of the meeting, but was unable to attend.

Chairman Daybell asked about the removal of the trees on the east side of the building. Acting Senior Planner Allen clarified that this area is actually the adjacent property. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that this is the access drive to the University Heights/Elks project. The area along the driveway will be landscaped by the Elks although a prior owner of the subject site had done improvements in the area.

Committee Member Cha and staff discussed the parking lot layout and circulation.

Committee Member Duncan and staff discussed which walls were existing and which were proposed to create new landscaping areas.

Committee Member Hoban asked if there was a reason why the offices on the east side of the addition were not proposed with windows? Acting Senior Planner Allen was unaware of the reason. (After the meeting, Acting Senior Planner Allen clarified with the applicant that they originally planned to include windows. The Building Code, however, would not allow windows because of the proximity to the property line.)

Public hearing opened.

James Spray, resident, asked what the existing building will be used for? Acting Chief Planner Eastman said it is proposed as a real estate office, but could be another type of office, and will be a single story.

Staff discussed the required parking square footage for an office use, which is one space for every 250 square feet, which is 25 spaces. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said one of the parking impacts they had before was because the area was used for banquet facilities. The area behind the building will accommodate the expansion, but will be used for parking as well. He stated staff does not foresee any impact on the adjacent properties.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha said he is comfortable with the parking spaces and design. He stated not much has changed from the existing design and is in support of the project.

Committee Member Hoban is comfortable with staff recommendations and would recommend that the applicant put windows on the side of the building for energy efficiency.

Committee Member Duncan said he does not have a problem with what is being done to the building and parking. However, he does have a problem with the front along Brea Blvd. Committee Member Duncan said that the new handicap access ramp doesn't take into account the existing landscaping, curbing and walkway. There is an opportunity to make this work better and be integrated into the building street frontage.

Chairman Daybell asked what a possible resolution would be if the applicant works with staff to address the issue of the ramp? Committee Member Duncan said if they keep the ramp as is, the landscape around it needs to be reworked and at a minimum, shrubs should be used rather than just lawn areas. A second option is to do a more aesthetic ramp, something that may work in better with the landscape and grade change. This would also require the landscape to be reworked. Committee Member Duncan preferred the second option because it would be a nicer element out there. Chairman Daybell asked if a landscape plan has been prepared? Acting Senior Planner Allen said staff has not seen a set of landscape plans, but the applicant will need to prepare and submit one.

Committee Member Duncan suggested adding a condition that the landscape plans be provided for staff's review and approval and that these plans include a better design of the ramp in relation to the landscaping and topography.

Committee Member Hoban said he did not initially realize that the ramp was to be added. He agreed with Committee Member Duncan's comments and said it was not overly exciting as proposed.

Chairman Daybell asked about the requirements for access. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said they need ADA Access from the sidewalk to the building and they cannot use the driveway. He said the driveway can be used as long as it is clearly delineated and separate from the drive lane itself. In this case, they don't have the width to accommodate both. Additionally, the driveway is likely too steep to meet to meet ADA criteria.

Committee Member Duncan said there clearly is a significant architectural style to the building and would like the walls and ramp to complement the style and said it would be a nice element. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if Committee Member Duncan would see it as a benefit if the ramp was elongated along the property line. This would allow for more integration into the site and follow the lines of the sidewalk. Committee Member Duncan agreed.

Chairman Daybell stated he had no problems with the building; the handicapped ramp should be cleaned up. Committee Member Duncan asked if the landscape and the front should be conditioned to come back to the Committee. Chairman Daybell said it should. Acting Chief Planner Eastman recommended that it be approved by staff; he felt the Committee provided staff with sufficient direction to work with the applicant. Should staff determine that the applicant is not meeting the direction as conditioned, the plans can be brought back to the RDRC at that time.

Chairman Daybell said he was supportive of what the Committee Members and staff has said.

Committee Member Duncan added a condition:

- That the landscape plan be revised to re-work the ramp to better integrate it into the site and landscaping to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development; the RDRC shall remain available for comment.

Acting Senior Planner Allen reiterated Committee Member Duncan's comments and added the following as a condition:

- The materials and finish of the ramp shall match the building exterior and the railings shall be of a complementary material.

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE project with the added conditions.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Staff and the RDRC discussed the Amerige Court design, cultural resource aspect of the EIR and how the RDRC will act as a required "compatibility review body" for the EIR mitigation program.

The committee discussed the awning of Brickhouse Pizza. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the RDRC's recommendations on the project were not followed, and the City Council adopted

something different. The RDRC expressed concern regarding how the design change for the Brickhouse Pizza came about and the RDRC's involvement.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided an update on the City Council and Planning Commission meetings, and special RDRC meeting scheduled for September 21 regarding the Amerige Court project.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION made by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to adjourn meeting at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ruth Leopold
Clerical Support