MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday September 21, 2006 4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:07 PM by Chairman Daybell

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Daybell (7:00 p.m. session);

PRESENT: Committee Members Duncan, Hoban, Cha

and Larsen

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Daybell (4:00 p.m. session)

ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: Suzanne Alexander, Frank Bya, Katie and

Tom Dalton, John Killen, Larry Lazar, and

Jennifer Mattiace,

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting

Director Rosen, and Clerical Assistant

Leopold

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by

Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE August 24, 2006 minutes AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

<u>PRJ04-00919 – ZON06-00066. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: ACCRETIVE LAGUNA PARTNERS, LLC.</u>

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented a staff report for a request for determination of consistency with approved council plans, addressing revisions to the elevator shaft of the parking structure at Providence Center (Generally located at the SWC of Bastanchury Rd. and Laguna Rd., encompassing an area between Bastanchury Rd., Laguna Road, Laguna Drive, and Sunny Crest Drive) (C-2 General Commercial Zone) (Mitigated Negative Declaration)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the design is consistent with the building and is constructed with masonry block.

Staff recommended approval because the project achieves the intent and purpose of the council's approval, and staff believes the revision is consistent with the approved major site plan. No conditions have been recommended.

RDRC Minutes 1 9/21/06

The Acting Chief Planner stated the Building Code deals with separation of the shaft and parking area. He stated staff does not want to lose the vision into and out of the elevator, and recommends the glass is maintained un-obstructed.

The applicant John Killen explained it is almost \$90,000 above the original base bid to treat the structural steel of the Council approved project with an intumescent paint; whereas the proposed design is only an approximate \$30,000 add to the original base bid of the elevator core.

Committee Member Larsen said he could relate to the cost increase and why it needs to be changed. He stated he still likes the project and as far as what was done it works fine. Committee Member Larsen said he wasn't sure if having the whole thing in glass is worth the huge cost and the coordinating, but would prefer the glass if possible.

Committee Member Hoban said he was in support of the project as well, although he would've preferred the glass, but understands the panels are perforated and will provide shimmering light in the tower.

Committee Member Cha said he didn't have an argument and although it may look prettier to some people, it is reinforcing the fire requirement and doesn't have anything against it. Committee Member Cha said he is in support.

Committee Member Duncan agreed with Committee Member Cha's comments and said it still stands out as a prominent element as far as way-finding for people in the area, and the addition of the material being used will look really nice and he is in agreement with it as well.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Committee Member Larsen and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present, with a 4-0 vote to APPROVE project per staff's recommendations.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 2

PRJ06-00211 - ZON06-00036. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: LARRY R. GOOSS

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a Minor Development Project to (1) construct a 1,200 sq. ft. 3-bedroom second dwelling unit over two alley-accessed 2-car garages on a property currently improved with a single story single family residence and (2) demolish an existing 192 sq ft detached garage on an R-2P zoned property at 425 E. Amerige Ave. (Generally located on the north side of Amerige, approximately 160' south of Wilshire, 300' east of Lawrence, 250' west of Balcom.) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303)

The Committee did not have any questions for staff.

The applicant Frank Bva, B. Newton Construction, said this project will improve the area and keep consistent with what is going on around it.

Public hearing opened.

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, said he likes the idea of not putting up windows on the sides where people can look down into the yards of their neighbors.

Katie Dalton asked if the colors of both structures will match. The applicant said the colors would match the roof. She stated the colors are important on that block because it's an addition to the neighborhood and most of the houses are intact and historic and is very important.

Landscape changes to the front of the house were discussed.

Acting Senior Planner Allen said a standard condition for new construction requires that a landscape plan be prepared and this should include the existing front yard, especially since it is an R-2, an income property. There will be some work on the west side of the house, because they have to put in the sidewalk, more landscape can probably be done to the front at this location. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said there is no specific criteria in the code that they would have to go in and replace existing landscaping. It is up to the applicant to improve the existing landscaping. However, a landscape plan is required because it is income property versus a single family, and it is a requirement that existing landscaping be maintained in good condition.

Residents Suzanne Alexander and Mrs. Dalton expressed their concern regarding:

- Quality of maintenance of an additional rental in the neighborhood
- Tenant nuisance

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha said hopefully the design matches with the surrounding developed two story residences. If they match the front existing unit with the new development it will upgrade the area and upgrading the back unit might help the neighbors with the tenant situation. The design is conforming to the code and surrounding areas. Committee Member Cha is in support of the project.

Committee Member Hoban is in support of the project and thinks it's simple and straight forward and will help the neighborhood. He stated he appreciated the public's comments and would not condition the project, including landscaping in the front, with the exception of what the landlord wants and can afford to do. Committee Member Hoban hopes they do upgrade and take better care of the home, but thinks the theory of upgrading the back will get higher clientele.

Committee Member Larsen stated he does not think he would go as far as saying it was an improvement. He said if the Committee will be asked to review preservation zone projects, he hasn't heard about how this relates to the front house. Acting Chairman Duncan asked Committee Member Larsen what would he suggest. Committee Member Larsen suggested that the project be designed in a way that emulates the front. He said he won't disapprove the project because of that, because it doesn't warrant that kind of action.

Acting Chairman Duncan's comments were similar to Committee Member Larsen's and stated he knows it was talked about in the past, to match the post of the rear unit with braces to match the pilasters and tapered post on the front house in or near those locations. However, it works structurally, to bring the front house to the rear and bring that kind of element into it and start complimenting the front of the house.

Committee Member Hoban said he looked at this project as he did all the other projects from the street. He stated the Committee has had several projects that have been looked at from the driveway and he sees how the second unit looks from the house. He stated he was not opposed, but it would be an improvement on the back unit to have some of the elements match. Committee Member Larsen said that was an interesting comment because it opens up a whole other discussion if it can't be seen why does it have to match any of it? Acting Chairman Duncan stated the second unit is what was being reviewed and those elements should be reviewed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided some clarity regarding the role the RDRC has in reviewing projects. The historic preservation guidelines review process was discussed. He stated it was up to the Committee if they felt an additional design was needed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said from staff's perspective, it is a very simple design and very typical of something of that era, which would be most likely a simple design. However, the massing is such that it is probably not fully consistent with what would be built in the 20's and 30's, because four-car garages were not built at that time. It is also very typical of what we've had in the past throughout the 80's and 90's, in other parts of town. Staff is not in objection to what is proposed, although agrees it is not the most imaginative design the Committee could get, but doesn't believe it's a bad project in the context of being a detriment to the community and is not extensively prevalent from the street. Based on this criteria, staff would still recommend approval, but added if the need to incorporate the aspects or design of landscape in the front yard to help screen or provide more dimension, it is within the Committee's purview.

Committee Member Larsen addressed some of Acting Chief Planner Eastman's points, including space. The elevation does not show anything about what it's like to be inside. He stated he'd like to see that in the future, because the Committee continually looks at projects from the outside. He feels the design has to be cohesive, and the inside dictates the outside. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated applicants attend meetings to answer any of the Committee's questions and provide more information. He asked Committee Member Larsen if he had any questions regarding how the space works or what he would like to see done in the inside of the building. The contractor was available and would respond to his question. The Committee can condition the project appropriately as to how they see fit. Acting Chairman Eastman stated staff does not typically spend too much detail on the interior as it relates to high quality design. It is generally looked at in order to avoid detrimental design.

Public hearing opened.

Mrs. Dalton discussed working with staff and improving the design guidelines for historic preservation. Acting Chairman Duncan said the general philosophy is that good design is just that, and does not have to match the house in the front; It can be a quality piece of architecture that stands alone in the rear, in his opinion. He said as far as the guidelines go there are several options and the Committee wants things to be well designed. Committee Member Cha expressed his view saying his position was the same, but there should be a couple of characters that should match in terms of the preservation zone. He stated while looking at the existing development in the alley areas, he does not see any that are up to the point where he'd like it to be. Committee Member Cha stated he did not have an argument to make, at this point there are a couple of things that need to be done. He said unless he comes up with specifics, he cannot argue with the artistic point of the rear unit.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the project with staff's recommendations.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked to move the Staff/Committee Communication for the benefit of time rather than addressing it at the 7:00 p.m. session.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated there was a public workshop related to the Transportation Center Study. The Redevelopment Agency asked that the Committee consider appointing a couple of the RDRC members to attend the meetings and provide input. The Committee agreed to wait until the 7:00 p.m. session and have the discussion with Chairman Daybell.

The Committee discussed the historic preservation zone guidelines. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the intent of the design is to give guidance by which people can design things. He stated it is up to the Committee to decide how strict and they want to be.

Adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

Re-adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Item No. 3

<u>PRJ05-00606 – ZON05-00083. APPLICANT: PELICAN-LAING, LLC.; PROPERTY OWNER: CITY OF FULLERTON.</u>

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented a staff report for a mixed use project proposed on existing City parking lots. The proposal includes 1) a 9-story building, comprised of eight stories of residential condominiums above-ground floor commercial and parking, and two subterranean levels of parking; 2) a four-story building with residential units above ground floor commercial and live/work retail; and 3) a five-level (four story height) public parking structure, on property located in the 100 block of West Amerige Avenue (between Malden Avenue and Harbor Boulevard) (An Environmental Impact Report has been prepared pursuant to Section 15081 of CEQA Guidelines)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the following are requested approvals as part of the application. Major development project, two Conditional Use Permits (one to exceed the base floor area ratio; The other to allow shared parking between uses), A Tentative Tract Map and Abandonment application; and a 4 ft. abandonment along the north side of Amerige Avenue.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented an aerial photograph of the Downtown area. He clarified that the project site that is before the Committee includes parking lots and does not include the Commonwealth Building. The Commonwealth Building was included in the draft environmental impact report because at one point there was some consideration that the property owner would be included in the application. At this point the property owner is not interested in moving forward with his project as part of this process. The project being

presented today addresses the two city parking lots. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared to address the entire site.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented some background on the project and the July public workshops.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the EIR was prepared for this project and the comment period ended today at 5:00 p.m. Staff received some letters from members of the public in response to the document. Those will be compiled and will go before the Planning Commission next week.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented the site layout that was presented to the Committee previously, a nine-story project with penthouses on the top floors, six floors of flats with parking and commercial underneath, and two floors of subterranean parking for residents. Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented the previous elevations and compared them to what was being proposed. He explained the applicant has revised the site plan and the architecture.

Some of the significant changes at this location include:

- Removal of two units
- A courtyard space with stairs that go up to the second floor parking and also goes up to the second floor for access to the residential units, allowing direct stairs coming down to Amerige Ave.
- Cut through pedestrian path from short term parking has been relocated farther to the east to get closer to street crossing
- A cut back on commercial space on the first floor of the north building creates an arcade
- Portion of building removed at the corner to create a more open area, and creating a gradual terminus of the alley as it enters into the open space.

Some highlights of the pedestrian linkages include a lot of volume of pedestrian activity on the back side of building's fronting Harbor.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the design of the site is such that it really orients the buildings to be closer to Harbor and to place some of the activities on the east face of the building to take advantage of existing activity and pedestrian traffic.

Some parking was removed on the east side of the south building to provide for an open paseo and walkway versus cutting across the parking lot. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated he talked about some points including two revisions in terms of how the circulation works and some crucial intersections that have been added through the revisions to be more pronounced.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman pointed out the abandonment request for 4 ft. of Amerige Avenue on the north side. He explained the situation with the north lot which is currently a parking lot. In order to keep parking here and construct a parking structure, you are using what is basically there in removing the excessive landscaping to create space for the "wrap building". It will be a very narrow space for usable commercial and liveable space. The applicant has requested the 4-foot abandonment to get a usable/ marketable commercial space and habitable unit along the front of the parking structure. Staff would typically not be in support of an abandonment; however as part of the project the on-street parking is being moved into the parking garage. So, without the parking there, the drive lane stays the same in terms of width and dimension, the sidewalks go from an existing 10 ft. on both sides to 18 ft. and therefore the 4 ft. would reduce

the north side to a 14 ft. sidewalk (including pavement, landscaping and street trees). Staff feels because the parking is being accommodated on site, the City is getting an enhanced 14 ft. pedestrian environment along the street frontage and the 4 ft. adds a bare minimum dimension for creating a liveable unit and commercial space. Staff is supporting the 4 ft. abandonment on the north side of Amerige because it will provide a 26 ft. building depth instead of 24 ft. Currently there is not a request to abandon the south side.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the penthouses on the 8th and 9th floors have been moved back from the face of the building with setbacks between 12 and 15 ft., which is more than what was proposed before.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented revised elevations and compared them to what was previously proposed. Revisions have been made to the architecture and design on the north side of the parking garage with an entrance off of Wilshire. The height, scale, and proportion is the same on the east side of the building. He stated there are some revisions that have been made since it was provided to staff and clarified that staff has and continues to have comments on the buildings as it relates to the materials and design, but fundamentally believe it is going in a better direction of creating more identity and something unique.

Staff has been concerned with creating a super block, where an entire block is developed by itself at the same time, basically creating a project much larger than the scale and mass of some of the buildings that have been individually built along Harbor Blvd.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that there are plants indicated in the upper levels of the parking garage although it is difficult to place at the top of the parking level of the structure, they've indicated they would like to add some decorative feature, as well as some lighting. It provides for some interest in the pedestrian space below, and also the structure as seen from Wilshire becomes a more decorative backdrop.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the revisions that were made to the north side of the south building, which fronts on Harbor. He stated the previous building was very square and stalky. The applicant broke out the corner section of the building and made it more traditional and slender, as it relates to the architecture.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained some issues with height as it relates to the cultural issues in Downtown. Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated there was a line established that goes across the façade of the building to bring the visual weight of the building down. The delineation line will be darker or use heavier materials below it, and lighter materials and colors above. This will give it a visual illusion of being less tall. The upper floors will step back 12 -15 ft. He stated the applicant has tried to address some of the issues relevant to perceived height on the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained to the Committee that they are the body that makes a recommendation on architectural design to the Planning Commission and City Council. He explained that the EIR prepared for the project (in the cultural analysis section) identifies the RDRC and/or a qualified preservation architect as the authority of determining whether the project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that at this time the Draft EIR has not been adopted by the City Council and staff is not asking the RDRC to make the official determination. However, if the Committee feels it is a good design, but needs some revisions to be consistent with Downtown Area or the Secretary of Interior Standards, they should keep in mind what their recommendation is to the City Council.

If the project is to be approved by the City Council, it will come back to RDRC, for a final cultural determination and they will have to work within the parameters the Council approves.

Staff recommends that the RDRC recommend to the Council approval of this project based on some of the conditions identified in the staff report. The conditions stipulate that the details of the project will come back to the Committee for final approval, which includes materials, landscaping, color and some of the finite items that are not presented at this point.

Committee Member Cha asked about the North side sidewalk, is it 14 ft with south side 18 ft. wide? Acting Chief Planner Eastman said that is currently proposed, He stated with the proposal, the parking on the street would be removed and placed into the garage.

Committee Member Duncan asked about the drop off zones at the north and south ends of Amerige. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the original proposal did have drop off zones on either side, but staff requires additional space in terms of lane width to address operational issues of the Fire Department. An additional 2 ft. is needed in areas. Staff will likely recommend a 6 or 7 ft. loading/unloading lane. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that with the loading/unloading area the 18 ft. would be reduced by 6 to 8 ft. If it was parking it would be reduced by 8 ft., with a 10 ft. sidewalk next to the row of parking.

Committee Member Hoban asked about the shared parking issue and if it would be up to the Committee to discuss. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the applicant could go into the discussion as to how the parking is being distributed. There is a shared parking request in terms of the guest parking for the residents and parking that is provided on-site. The total quantity in terms of the parking that would be needed could be reduced in that manner. The code allows for that, and the City has approved it for the City Point and the Pinnacle developments, which have shared parking. He stated it is an issue of off-peak hours and the code recognizes shared parking through the issuance of a CUP. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated it is an issue the City Council and Planning Commission will consider. Chairman Daybell clarified as to the Committee not having to act on the EIR.

Dick Hamm, Pelican Laing, said he was very impressed with the staff report. He introduced the design team and stated the major design elements are now in place.

Paul Bettenhausen, spoke, saying he is responsible for the hardscape and landscape for the project, in response to one of the Committee Member's questions they have kept curbs throughout the project and do not have any non-curb conditions except for the pedestrian crossing at the fountain on Amerige.

Mr. Bettenhausen reviewed entrance to the project at Amerige and quality of spaces and the following points:

- Entry feature with sculpture feature that might be historically relevant in the plaza. Create unification of north and south plazas via continuation of hardscape from end to end and palm trees that help unify the space.
- Ballards that can be added/removed at both ends of Amerige and possible close street off for farmers markets and special events.
- Line both sides of the street with shade trees.
- Creating water feature at both ends, outdoor seating and dining.
- Shopping kiosks

- North-south pedestrian zone would be unified by some embellished and enhanced hardscape material that would run from end to end with historic murals, wall features.
- Enhancing the rest of Amerige through the use of planting and seeding.
- East-west pedestrian zone enhancing the paving. Vining parking structure with use of green screen or cable systems with planter pots at the base and opportunities for seeding.
- Special paving will pull into parking structure.
- Seeding is proposed light columns be planted at the base with light fixture at the top and panels.

Rocky Shen, reviewed the floor plans and stated the tenant space can envelope the entire area of the site and be closed with an enclosure device, otherwise it is opened up for outdoor dining. Mr. Shen reviewed the elevations and stated conceptually the thought was that the spaces in between the major building volumes would be recessed back not only in the vertical plain, but also horizontally. He stated these elements are only three stories tall and the rest of the building projects forward and higher. They tried to vary the architecture with a more urban edge toward Harbor, and the residential edge going west.

John Loomis, 30th Street Architects, stated the tower element that faces the corner toward Harbor and the amenities that have been mentioned are a great improvement over the previous elevation scheme.

Mr. Loomis said they received many good comments from the RDRC and PC in past weeks and one of the items discussed was having high quality, contemporary architecture that reflects today, and they have tried to do this, particularly with the south building.

Acting Director Rosen explained that conceptual landscape plans were not presented and the landscape architecture will be presented to the Committee some time in the future if the project is approved.

Committee Member Cha asked how much of the 30,000 retail space is office and retail? Mr. Hamm explained it is all retail space, and the 30,000 includes the lobby space and common area spaces of the condominiums. It is actually only about 15 to 20 thousand ft. of retail space, with no office space. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the code allows office space. There is no stipulation that it couldn't be office space, but given the developing uses in the area, staff anticipates it would be more retail.

Committee Member Hoban asked if there is a west elevation? What happens with access to the back doors of the buildings that currently exist? Mr. Hamm said they have not developed a west elevation for either building. There is a setback from the building on the South as you go up, on the building of the north, the parking structure is immediately adjacent to the building which is on the corner of Malden and Amerige on the north side.

Acting Director Rosen explained when the parking lot was developed and that property was redeveloped, there was an agreement signed by the property owner west of the north lot that if the parking lot property is developed they will be required to close those openings and create some type of access to those buildings.

Committee Member Duncan asked about the street level plan. He said the enlarged site shows loading on both sides of Amerige, north and south, yet on the reduced site plan it only shows it on the south side. Mr. Hamm stated that conversations occurred with staff after they were able to get the reports and exhibits for the Committee that requested that the loading on the north side be eliminated off the site plan. The revised site plan does not have a parking or loading zone on the north side of Amerige.

Public hearing opened.

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, provided a letter to the Committee explaining how Fullerton Heritage feels about the staff report and how the project has progressed. He stated that they have never opposed a project in this area. The original proposal was one they supported and endorsed. Since the project has morphed into the nine-story monolith, they have had reservations of the project because they are setting a precedent that is not going to be good for the historic downtown. They are in favor of high rise buildings outside the historic downtown, parking on the periphery historic Downtown it should pull people into the downtown and be pedestrian friendly, which is not what we're getting here. The parking requirement is a deterrent to good design and is pushing the project in the wrong direction. In reference to the Secretary of Interior Standards (SIS) there are some things better left to the professionals, with no disrespect to the Committee, and the SIS should be followed very closely.

The following people spoke about the project:

- Karen Haluzna, 335 W. Jacaranda Place
- Bruce Hostetter, 205 N. Cornell Avenue
- Fred Moury, 128 W. Wilshire Avenue
- Katie Dalton. 200 N. Cornell Avenue
- Susan Petrella, 2455 Cambridge Avenue
- Christy Sins, 2336 E. Brookdale Place
- Dorian Hunter, 400 E. Virginia Road
- Judith Kaluzny

The following comments were expressed:

- Developer did listen to comments made at the previous RDRC meeting.
- RDRC does not have adequate information for making a decision. Chief among the lack
 of information is the EIR's finding that a future study is adequate mitigation for potential
 aesthetic impacts.
- EIR is inadequate as a legal document and the RDRC should not rush in making a decision.
- Scope of details that are conditioned to be brought back to the Committee is unusual and too extensive for a project of this size.
- Preferred to have another study session
- Proportion of the mass of building in comparison is still too big.
- Impressed with the direction and work that has taken place in the iterations of the design.
- Developing space with fountain sculpture and steps is a nice change.
- Pedestrian egress going through parking structure there are wonderful opportunities for surprise.

- Articulations, setting back buildings, important incremental differences that will create a better sense of comfort near the alleys.
- North elevation of the north building at the west end, where the vehicle alley is, looked more like a Macy's or Nordstrom's than a residential building, It had nothing to do with the street elevation on the other side. That is an area where the design team should have some direction.
- Lighting treatment at the parking level is wrong should be at the street level.
- There should be a dedicated study to a lighting master plan for this area.
- Landscape plan is very interesting. Enhanced paving and arc in front of the Ross building doesn't enclose any meaningful space. Direction to landscape architect to go back and do some alternatives that will create a strong pedestrian link between the north and south sides of the plaza area will make a lot of sense and reinforce the terminal distance on both ends.
- Street trees should be shown on the plans. If you are looking for urban feeling, they need to be urban trees and there needs to be repetition and creating depth and acting as an architectural element in the space.
- Terrific builders, but not looking for another Disneyland.
- Beautiful design, but does not fit in Fullerton.
- Financing is not finalized.
- Mass and scale have a bearing on aesthetics and context (historical)
- Likes changes in design and commends architects for the effort being put into it.
- Who is target market for condos?
- Landscape, hardscape and old architectural elements are charming but causes more of a distinction between historic downtown and the project
- Disagreement with EIR's conclusion
- Too enormous and will overshadow historic Fullerton.
- Traffic and air quality will worsen on Harbor Blvd.
- Unnecessary years of construction disruption.
- Property too small for this project.
- Entertain another use for the property such as a park or open space.

Mr. Hamm addressed some of the questions from the residents. He stated market research is showing that it's probably 1/3 young singles, young married couples with no kids; and 2/3 emptynesters/moved out.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Director Rosen clarified for the public that the Draft EIR was not presented to the Committee and is not within their purview. They have not reviewed the report and will not comment on the report. The issue they will be addressing that is part of the report is the issue of the SIS. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the Committee was provided the cultural resources section and appendix E for their review, but not the entire DEIR.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the highest building in Downtown is the Chapman building, which is 69 ft. and 5 stories. Its ultimate height is 83 ft. to the top of the parapet.

Committee Member Cha said the SIS, financing standards, EIR study is not in his power to decide. The design comments heard during the past year, most are reflected here today, major comments are all reflected and minor comments that were heard today and can be incorporated in future time, because it is a big project that cannot design detail plans without the major big

plans first. The future of Fullerton will not be limited to 20 years ago or now it will move on as the population grows. We need to look forward 10 to 20 years from now. It is going to a very important part of Fullerton. When Council or other committees say it is improper size or building it will come back to us for review design. As far as design is concerned, most of the comments will be able to go on and complete with this current feature.

Committee Member Duncan said there has been wonderful knowledge in part of the applicant and architect to fulfill a lot of what they've heard from the public and staff in working on this project. The site plan is very good, he is interested in seeing more of the landscape. Everything stands in a positive point right now. The pedestrian level and activities and the relationships were worked out in excellent fashion. He looks forward to the draw from Harbor to this area and will be very positive with a little bit more work in the future. In general what is being proposed at the pedestrian level is exciting. The north building at north side needs to be looked at more specifically at the pedestrian level beyond that there are no real concerns. Committee Member Duncan stated he liked the simplicity of what is there and the perspective renderings really helped him out and wished the Committee had seen some of that earlier. It helped out quite a bit, but there is a little bit more that can be added to that one area. He said in regard to the south building, the solution is nice and conservative and gets the job done. He particularly liked the component of the respect line with the Chapman building and bringing the white band across and likes that because it ties it into something in the Downtown.

Committee Member Duncan said in regard to landscape, paving planters will be very important, the photograph from Harbor Blvd. looking down Amerige Ave. toward the project brought up the fact about the trees. What can be done with the trees on America Ave.? Can you add more trees? Remove unhealthy trees that are currently there and replace with trees of the similar size and kind that are being provided in the project. Committee Member Duncan said trees are important in Fullerton and people respond to that softness you see in Downtown, especially in the neighborhoods, this is something that can be integrated in. He stated that is something that he will be looking for in the future when the applicant starts developing the landscape plan. Committee Member Duncan stated he has issues with the western 2/3 of the north building as it fronts Amerige Ave. He quoted one of the points that was brought out in the EIR and the staff report to quote "without imitating the features of historic buildings the design of adjacent contemporary buildings shall..." He explained to the applicant that he understands what they are trying to do with two building components and breaking them up design wise, but one of them is mission style, which is an obvious imitation of Downtown and the other one, with the cornice at the top, responds to the Chapman building, or another building in Downtown. He stated that is too literal and obvious. The fact that it is going in front of a parking structure really diminishes what that kind of architecture is. He likes what the applicant did from the fountain plaza to the east and around the corner into the Ross courtyard area. That design is more contextual, inventive and responds to that area and is not copied. It matches flavor of vertical buildings downtown and is not so blatant.

Committee Member Duncan stated he has issues with that façade of the north building that faces Amerige. He stated he would personally like to see something else done there to change the style and keeping the building masses the way they are, but working out some different design for that area. He stated at some point he would recommend a physical 3-D model it will really help with people reviewing the project to understand the scale. Committee Member Duncan stated he doesn't have a problem with the heights on the project. He stated he likes the direction other than the front façade on Amerige.

RDRC Minutes 12 9/21/06

Committee Member Larsen agreed with Committee Member Duncan's comments on the south elevation. He stated he understands what they are trying to do when they explained the concept. At the same time, when you take the entire project in its entirety it seems really confused, as if there are on the east elevations for both buildings you have contemporary or modernist for half the elevations and then it turns into this Capitol building on the corner. It seems it is not committed to a direction like it is trying to satisfy 20 different entities and address each one. He stated that part is confusing. The north elevation of the south building is an improvement from the last one. The height issue and scale, to a degree, could be made even less intrusive, and that has to deal with materials. In some degree, it's trying too hard. For example, on the perspectives, which was very cool and helpful to get that viewpoint of the experience, he noticed on the east elevation what the people were doing, and not what the building and the signs were doing or the material. Committee Member Larsen stated that is what activates the space and what gives it character. You can't fabricate or manufacture that. In the end result, this needs to play more of a background role in this area. He said several people have mentioned historic Downtown and asked if that is a term that gets tossed around or is there literally a boundary (a defined planning zone that is historic Downtown)? Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated there is no historic boundary for Downtown; Technically speaking there is not a historic District and no established boundary. The issue is a contextual issue. To some degree there is a Downtown Central Business District which defines conceptually where the Downtown is. Committee Member Larsen stated as far as the historic context, it was touched a little on the south elevation, however it can be done better. He stated that in his opinion, a way to honor or respect something that is historic is to do something completely opposite of what that is. In some way, when you are emulating something you undermine that very thing that you like about the historic, which is authenticity and doesn't see it happening here because it's trying to pretend to be something else, as far as style.

Committee Member Hoban said he was not available attend the July 27 meeting, but read the minutes and the comments from the public. The biggest thing that he got from the comments, that has also seen addressed in the rendering, was the articulation of the new proposal. Vertically and horizontally it is a vast improvement on the articulation. He stated he doesn't mind what has been put into the project to fulfill the historic need is the flat façading on certain elements of the building to give a little character from the Chapman building, the jogging of the building on the northeast side closest to Ziings. When you are in that area, you don't feel like it is a big glass building and brick building. It is not done over the entire building. Community Member Hoban stated he does not mind that and thinks it fits and satisfies some of the community outcry about how the project is developed.

Committee Member Hoban expressed two of his concerns:

- The "Capitol" building that is on the corner can be easily done and be pulled off very well, but does caution that he has seen those elements in Niketown, Triangle Square and wants to make sure we don't end up with that look. Also, he thinks the Brea Walk has a similar look. He stated he wants to make sure that it is done well and will come back in some format to the Committee.
- 2. The barrel on the other building jumped out as the Capitol Records in Los Angeles, which is practically a historic piece over there. He wants to make sure they are not identifying this area with another monument in some other city. It has to be Fullerton's barrel or Fullerton's rotunda and should be very unique in the fact that we don't duplicate something else.

RDRC Minutes 13 9/21/06

Committee Member Hoban stated he really liked the way that the building is arranged with the residential toward the west side of the project, and the public activity tends to be more toward the Harbor side, and works well with the Downtown and all the energy is going to come from Harbor and emanate outward. He stated that in a recent study, there was discussion without opposition "to going up" in Fullerton. After hearing comments from the public, it was one of the RDRC recommendations to the developer to put height to those buildings, when the original project was in a very conceptual phase was lower. He stated he is not opposed to height. They have taken the challenge of mass and size going up and worked with it well so it's not overbearing on the surrounding historic buildings. There is a lot of hard work ahead of us because the other exciting parts are coming, if this is approved with finishes and stone and everything else that goes along with the design review process. He stated in response to the public's comments, you are absolutely right, the Committee does not have a lot of power and, what the RDRC is doing is making a recommendation. There are certainly other issues to be dealt with such as traffic, land use, but the fact that the Committee gets to provide input by making a recommendation to the Council is fair for him.

Chairman Daybell is concerned with the west elevations and that the back of building look as you approach this development from City Hall and Malden. He stated he would like to see these elevations "spiffed up," so it doesn't look like the back of a building. Some of the sharper edges in the back three corners may need to be softened in the final architecture. Chairman Daybell said he doesn't think he likes the dome and may add cost to the project. He thinks the cost has become an issue, not to the RDRC, but is being considered by the City. He doesn't think the dome is what is needed there and may need to be researched more. Chairman Daybell agreed with Mr. Hostettler's comments and agrees we need top quality, and well designed lighting throughout the pedestrian areas on the north and east sides of the building. Something a lot better than what we currently have in some places in Fullerton and encourages it to happen. He stated it will be very important that even the corridors in the parking structure be well lighted without being obnoxious and sees it as a need.

Chairman Daybell stated he thinks he may not be qualified to make the decision of the historic context. It would behoove the City or developer to get the architect recommended rather than the RDRC involved in this particular topic. The north parking structure elevation needs some work and something needs to be done differently. He thinks it is a background building situation that wants to recede into the appearance of things rather than standing out. Chairman Daybel said frankly, it is an alley that wants to be seen less. He stated that landscaping is something that we're a long away from and it will come back after the building is finalized. It is way too early in the proceeding to comment about the landscaping. He said in his opinion, as a resident, the nine stories has been driven by cost considerations, which in turn is driven by how many parking spaces we have to have, and doesn't want to see the City putting any more money into the project, whatever has to be built has to come out of the sale and if it takes less spaces or whatever has to happen to keep the City from adding more funds to the project. Chairman Daybell said entry signs similar to what's going up for the SOCO project on Amerige one on the east from Harbor and one from Malden coming in the other way. It would tie SOCO to Amerige Court if a similar design to the entrances is used. According to the staff review, he said there was good comment in first paragraph that needs to be considered.

Chairman Daybell said that the Committee has been asked to recommend approval of the project. He suggested that the Committee recommend, on a preliminary basis, that it be approved. There are many holes to be filled and may have to come back to the Committee.

RDRC Minutes 14 9/21/06

Committee Member Cha said since this is a preliminary design and the Committee has to look at decisions made by the Planning Commission and City Council. He stated this is very acceptable for a preliminary design. MOTION by Committee Member Cha to approve preliminary design to proceed on the designing process.

Committee Member Duncan said he is uncomfortable recommending approval of the project concept, because it is important to have the applicant re-work the south elevation of the north building, along Amerige, and is approving 5/8 of the project and would like to see more work done on that north building. He stated he wouldn't approve the entire project right now. Chairman Daybell asked if the Committee would like to continue the north building rather than approve or deny?

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained to the RDRC that they can make recommendations if they are okay with the project and design direction and can provide direction to the applicant in terms of their recommendation. He reiterated some of staff's concerns in the staff report, some of which reflect the RDRC's concerns.

Chairman Daybell reiterated Committee Member Duncan's comments and stated the Committee is not ready to approve the north building, the south building can possibly go forward in some form. Committee Member Duncan stated that conceptually we are looking at a mission style building and the middle building. In his opinion, the concept needs to be altered to reflect a different concept and not stay with either one of those themes. Chairman Daybell stated there was a motion on the floor, but no second. He requested another motion be made.

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, to continue project with condition that the architectural design or concept of the north building be revised based on his own comments. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked for clarity on the RDRC's recommendations. Chairman Daybell explained that the Committee sounds like they would like to continue the item.

Committee Member Duncan said the scale and mass is well worked out, but authenticity of both components can be re-worked and would like to see it at a later date.

Acting Director Rosen added another alternative for the Committee's consideration they recommend to deny project with recommendations on what they would support and direction for the applicant as it moves forward rather than continue the matter. Acting Chief Planner explained that a definitive answer is recommended as it relates to this project, rather than learning ambiguity.

Committee Member Cha stated the Committee has to decide if this grand picture is headed in the right direction and the preliminary design needs to be approved before re-working and approving the details.

Committee Member Hoban asked Committee Member Duncan if he would consider recommending this to the Council with the conditions that staff has recommended, as well as the condition that the south side of the north building be re-visited by RDRC? He asked, for discussion, if this would be a step in the right direction.

Committee Member Duncan said he thinks so and it is open for discussion. He explained that he liked the theme that was established on the east end of building and could be brought over along the façade in a different fashion and accomplish and create the authenticity of the north building versus imitating two different styles of architecture. Every point the architect has made

RDRC Minutes 15 9/21/06

in terms of scale, massing and building setbacks are working great. He does not want to hold up the project, but revisiting the project will help it.

Committee Member Hoban concurred that there are certain elements of this project that can be shifted and/or changed. However, he believes that in regards to the massing and all the concept things, he feels the committee is on the same page. He stated since the Committee is only making a recommendation, and do not have the power to approve, the recommendation is in relation to a concept, which is going in the right direction he is willing to recommend approval with conditions. It is great they have heard our comments especially on the west end, Spanish colonial style, he thinks they can get motion formatted here to satisfy everybody's needs as a recommendation.

Acting Director Rosen stated it was pretty close to a motion. Committee Member Hoban asked if there was a motion on the table. Acting Director Rosen said there wasn't a motion, but what Committee Member Hoban was stating was pretty close.

Acting Director Rosen said Committee Member Hoban said the project is going in the right direction; Committee Member Hoban agrees with the scale and mass of the project; the overall site plan is heading in the right direction; and the South elevation of the north building needs to be revisited as part of final review of the project. Chairman Daybell said, actually, the entire North, West and South side of the North building needs to be revisited along with the West side of the South building. Acting Chief Planner said staff agreed that the North building needs to be revisited and numerous elements of the north building need to be revisited as part of the final architectural review of the project.

Committee Member Duncan said "ditto". Committee Member Hoban said he needed a second and Chairman Daybell said he got a second from Committee Member Duncan. Chairman Daybell asked for any other input and let's have a vote. He asked for those in favor of the motion. Passes 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Judith Kaluzny clarified that what she read earlier regarding what the RDRC should be doing in the EIR section.

STAFF COMMUNICATION

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that during the 4:00 p.m. session, Chairman Daybell was absent. The Redevelopment Department is looking for, preferably, two RDRC members to attend the Transportation Center Study update meetings as representatives. Chairman Daybell stated he would be attending all of the meetings and told the members to decide if they would like to attend one or all of the meetings. Acting Chief Planner Eastman requested that the Committee let him know if they would be attending the meetings. Chairman Daybell, Committee Member Cha and possibly Committee Member Duncan or another committee member will attend.

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban to ADJOURN the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

RDRC Minutes 16 9/21/06

Respectfully Submitted,
Ruth Leopold
Clerical Support