MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
STAFF SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 9:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 16, 2006

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Eastman, Lopez, Petropulos, Thompson, St. Paul, Tabatabaee and Voronel

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Allen, Leopold and Nguyen

OTHERS PRESENT: John Gilbert, Matt and Michael Jones, and Omar Tadeo,

INTRODUCTIONS - COMMITTEE AND STAFF MEMBERS:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Thompson to APPROVE the October 19 minutes AS WRITTEN.

ACTION ITEMS:

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00502 – ZON06-00087. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: IRENE TORRES.

A request for a 20% reduction in the rear yard setback from 15'-0" to 12'-0" to accommodate a first-floor addition and garage expansion for property located at 212 Ventura Place (east side of Ventura Place, approximately 140 feet south of the centerline of Walnut Avenue) (R-1-6 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines)

Senior Planner St. Paul stated the architect, Omar Tadeo, is requesting that the project be continued to the next meeting because there are several issues and items that he wants to address before he brings this to the Committee.

MOTION by Committee Member Thompson, SECONDED by Committee Member Petropulos and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to CONTINUE the project to the December 7, 2006 meeting.

Item No. 2

PRJ06-00521 – ZON06-00091. APPLICANT: MICHAEL JONES; PROPERTY OWNER: MATTHEW O. JONES.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a request to construct an approximately 42,000-square-foot, free-standing addition to an existing approximately 100,000-square-foot industrial building on property located at 2325 Moore Avenue (north side of Moore Avenue, approximately 430 feet west of Gilbert Avenue) (M-G zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines)

Acting Senior Planner Allen distributed a memo to the Committee and the applicant, which includes recommended conditions of approval. The applicant, Michael Jones, asked about the undergrounding of the overhead utilities that may be required and what is the criteria to determine that they may not be required? Committee Member Voronel stated the applicant may want to contact Edison and request a cost estimate on how much it will cost to underground the utilities. The final decision will be made based on that. There is a process on how to waive this requirement, but it is a standard requirement.

Chairman Eastman asked if they were talking about on-site lines? Acting Senior Planner Allen said there are lines that are running along the property frontage and north-south along the western property line (staff was not certain if they were on the property). Chairman Eastman provided an explanation about the City ordinance regarding overhead utility lines.

Committee Member Tabatabaee explained that exceptions for undergrounding that have been granted in the past have been granted on a case by case basis.

Committee Member Voronel said there are a couple of different locations of poles that need to be underground. She said there are heavy power poles on Moore on the frontage. She said this one may be requested or not, depending on Edison's cost estimate. Committee Member Voronel stated there is another line of power along the alley and thinks it exclusively serves the applicant's facilities. She said everything that exclusively serves overhead across the applicant's property and serves their operations will be required to be undergrounded, unless there are some findings that Edison shows it serves more facilities and more sites and will be extremely expensive to do, Engineering may waive the requirements. Chairman Eastman explained to the applicant that it is in the code and considered a requirement. He explained to the applicant that he must find out the cost through Edison and if it is astronomical in relationship then perhaps there is justification to waive the requirement. Chairman Eastman asked who makes that finding? Committee Member Voronel said the Title 16 ordinance says that Community Development Director and Director of Engineering "make the call".

Mr. Jones asked if, with the 150 ft. access for reliable water service, they would need two fire hydrants across the back of the building? Committee Member Thompson said that it would have to be measured from the public fire hydrant and start at the driveway. He explained that the neighbor has a private system and staff discussed some options. Committee Member Thompson said the applicant should call Elaine Wise in Engineering to get more information.

Committee Member Thompson said an exit analysis plan is needed to show how the people are getting out from the exit doors to a public way. He explained there needs to be personnel gates to get people out of the parking lot.

Committee Member Thompson asked if there would be a separate underground water line for the building? Mr. Jones said yes. Committee Member Thompson said the FTC would require a public fire hydrant no closer than 25 ft. and no further than 50 ft. from the Fire Department connection. Committee Member Thompson discussed the fire hydrants and fire plan approval with the applicant.

Chairman Eastman stated that at the last meeting there was discussion about the front entrance and a signage issue. He said there was some concern with the new canopy that it was setback from the street and still did not look like the main entrance. There was some discussion as to whether or not it could be made bigger or more dominant in terms of appearance, perhaps a marquee. Chairman Eastman said there was some signage and other things that can be done to be integrated with the entrance to say "this is where you enter the building". He stated that staff included some language in the report that was a little vague, but it is to allow the applicant an opportunity to work with Acting Senior Planner Allen to come up with a design that really identifies it as the primary entrance.

Mr. Jones asked about the landscape plan and if it has to incorporate the entire site including the existing building? Acting Senior Planner Allen said it in terms of street frontage, it would encompass the entire site. In terms of the parking lot landscaping, it would encompass the new area. She stated she did not know what kind of opportunity the applicant has on the existing eastern portion to get some planters in there. Mr. Jones asked about the breaking up of the long parking. Acting Senior Planner Allen said yes, typically there are tree walls interspersed with the spaces, so that a mass of paving is not seen.

The parking requirement was discussed further.

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member Petropulos and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE WITHOUT PREJUDICE as conditioned with an additional condition that an Exit Analysis Plan shall provided to assure the safety of building occupants, such plans shall include access through personnel gates and shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development, prior to issuance of building permit.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process. He said that he had included a statement that it be without prejudice, typically that is done with denials and not approvals, but stated he wanted to give the applicant an opportunity that if he sees something in the report that is particularly onerous, he can come back to the Committee within a reasonable period of time and ask to reconsider it. Chairman Eastman's concern is that the applicant may not have had adequate time to review the conditions in detail. He said mostly technical issues have been included and doesn't anticipate it to be a problem.

MOTION by Committee Member Thompson, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul ADJOURNED AT 9:34 A.M. AS STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE.

BY: _____

Ruth Leopold, Clerical Support