MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE CHAMBERS

FULLERTON CITY HALL

July 27, 2006 7:00 PM Thursday

The meeting was called to order at 7:09 PM by **CALL TO ORDER:**

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Daybell; Committee Members

Cha, Duncan and Larsen PRESENT:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Hoban

ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: See attached list.

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Director Rosen, Acting Chief Planner

Eastman, Redevelopment Manager Ferrier,

and Clerical Assistant Leopold

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by

Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting

members present to APPROVE July 13 minutes AS WRITTEN.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

July 13, 2006

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

Item No. 1

PRJ05-00606 - PRE05-00060. APPLICANTS: PELICAN GROUP/JOHN LAING HOMES; PROPERTY OWNER: CITY OF FULLERTON.

A study session and community meeting to review concept plans for a mixed use project on the north and south sides of the 100 Block of W. Amerige Ave. The project will be constructed on existing City parking lots. The concept includes residential condominiums above commercial uses and parking, private subterranean parking, and a public parking structure. (An Environmental Impact Report is being prepared pursuant to Section 15081 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman presented an introduction of the workshop.

Redevelopment Manager Rob Ferrier presented an overview of the history of the project and community meetings conducted. He introduced the project's architects KTGY and 30th Street Architects.

Dick Hamm, Pelican Laing Properties, stated the intent for the evening was to show the change of the site plan from where they were in February to where they are today, based on the flipping of the site. He stated the architects would like to begin with a conversation regarding the building elevations, which has not been addressed until today. In order to get input from the public, the architects will show a number of slides with five different types of architecture on each slide that could be applicable or utilized for buildings of this type. He explained to the audience there was a scoring sheet in the handout he distributed. He stated each image has five elevations on each slide with each one labeled A - E and would appreciate input and participation from the public. They could rate each slide with a number from 1 (I hate it.) -5 (I like it.) and provide comments. He stated the architects will show at this meeting a first preliminary pass at architecture. The idea is to get the input received tonight and from the Planning Commission next week, and the architects will take the input and modify the elevations and plans accordingly to finalize the elevations with the site plan. Then proceed forward through the normal development process of a formal submittal. Mr. Hamm introduced the architects of the project.

Rocky Shen, KTGY, presented the site plan of the project. Mr. Shen stated the proposed parking will be available to residents. He stated they kept the parking entries off to the side in order to create a potential "free zone" on Amerige that can be closed off for special events such as a farmer's market or street fair. Essentially, Amerige Avenue could create a bulk of the event space than is readily desirable in Downtown Fullerton. He stated there are two levels of flats of the Commonwealth Building and referenced the locations of the retail, plaza and townhomes.

Committee Member Cha asked if the architects were going to use one design for all of the building or different designs for different buildings? Mr. Shen stated they are trying to give a diverse look to the building and would like the project not look like one big monolithic building. But, would like to keep the diversity within the range they consider quality and timeless characteristics of architecture.

Committee Member Duncan asked about the width of the residential units on north lot from front to back. Mr. Shen said the depth will vary between 21 and 26 ft. depending on whether there is a corridor behind.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the developer and the architect have been trying to problem solve many of the surrounding issues with the surrounding properties and to meet the criteria in terms of the design. Fundamentally, the layout that is before the Committee today is where the project is currently at and the architects are here to gather the comments from the Committee and the public.

Mr. Hamm explained they would present 10 slides with five buildings on each slide and labeled A-E. He stated he would like people's feedback about the buildings whether they liked or disliked them and told the audience to follow along in the handout.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman and Acting Director Rosen stated if the public had a difficult time viewing the slides, they would be made available on the City's website. Mr. Hamm said handouts of the slides can be mailed to those people interested and would appreciate any input that can be given.

Mr. Shen presented several slides on different styles of architecture. Some of the points presented were:

- Architecture
- Details in historic front windows
- Courtyards
- Bay window where building pops out to provide views up and down the street
- Mixed use with residential at bottom of building
- Intent of dividing mass to create space between buildings
- Distinct base and mid-level architecture
- Dividing mass horizontally and vertically
- Planters
- Lower base treatment with retail with courtyard above
- At street level, elements of landscape with furniture
- Canopies and use of more detail in architecture at base
- Project broken up horizontally by use of color and material, different detail and architecture. It gives the impression that not everything was built at once
- Balconies have way in and half way out with deep shadows recessed back
- Materials (brick, plaster, durable material at base (masonry, more refined plaster treatment, stone or metal)
- Building with cap and top of building is set off from middle of the building
- Articulation of individual window treatments
- Two building volumes create a u-shape and define a courtyard space in between
- Signage, banners, blade signs to help people with their way finding
- More glass at street level in order to give more display space for tenants
- Classically proportioned building with a base, defines edge at the top of the building
- Adaptive re-use building more of a commercial or industrial function before and now is being re-used as residential lofts. The look of the architecture is not residential, but use inside is residential.
- Bay window treatment with corner rutanda with canopies and street ballards
- Generous pedestrian sidewalk with enhance paving and decorative street grates and areas for outdoor dining
- Canopies that allow light in, but also provide shade
- Durable materials on the façade
- Examples of architecture that is characterized as more modern or contemporary with concrete frame and steel and glass
- Traditional architecture with durable materials (masonry).
- Building volume that is divided up with balcony and spaces that are recessed to undulate the building mass
- Abstracted version of a building with a base, middle and top with less detail and articulation with uses of bay windows and balconies recessed to give texture

Mr. Hamm stated there is a wide variety of architectural styles in the 50 buildings presented. There have been many comments in the community on the architectural style and it has gone from one extreme to another mimicking 1920's main street architecture. The architects purposely included modern and traditional buildings because they are trying to get feedback from everyone. He explained to the public there is ample time to study the images as much as

they like when the images are placed on the City's website. He requested they comment on anything from style to detail.

Mr. Shen presented the Amerige elevation facing South with the mid-rise building with both volumes and bridge component connecting them. He discussed the parking entry below grade, retail component with dining. He stated the building is articulated into three volumes breaking up the mass horizontally and vertically.

Mr. Shen stated the strategy was to create architectural features that were complementary and not necessarily the same. The attempt was to create three distinct masses that would break up the street scene.

Mr. Shen further presented the buildings with residential and live work areas on Amerige, which include outside dining areas with canopies, signage and other street architecture. He stated the units are more wide than deep and provide an opportunity for window glazing area. Parking was also presented.

Mr. Hamm stated this is a very first pass at elevations with the purpose of generating elevations to give something for discussion purposes. At this point, it is not a very refined plan. The idea is to get the input from as many people as possible and try and refine this design and go forward over time.

Public hearing opened.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained to the public that this was the time to provide their input and comments to the RDRC.

Frederick Moehrihg, 128 W. Wilshire, people show they can build good buildings expressed his concerned regarding parking, loud music and concern with City's \$5 million bond. He stated he would like to see a full disclosure of the cost, style of the design of the building and parking spaces. He is concerned that this project will ruin many businesses in the area. Mr. Moehrihg questioned who would incur any additional costs. He gave his opinion about disliking the selection process and that it should be a sound business decision that the building will fit in the downtown. He was not in support of the project he stated this project is not the answer.

Tom Dalton, Fullerton Heritage, said they have been following the Amerige Court project for over a year and has met with the developer and staff frequently and have supported the general project concept. They have also enumerated their concerns but there have been no changes to the most objectionable features, so he must request that the RDRC recommend denial of project and its current configuration. He stated the mass and scale is too big for the Downtown; the upper story setback is insignificant; the 150 percent parking requirement is arbitrary; and a parking study needs to be done. Mr. Dalton identified alternative plans that should be prepared, including the original RFP, an alternative with residential over the parking structure; and extending the south building east over the open parking. Mr. Dalton discussed a need for financial analysis of alternatives. He said Fullerton Heritage is not against a project, but does not support this design.

Mr. Dalton distributed handouts to the Committee.

Chairman Daybell stated the RDRC will not be making recommendations or approving the project they will only provide comment and feedback at this time. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said that is correct, the RDRC and the public comment provides feedback on the architecture.

Bruce Hostetter, 205 N. Cornell, thanked staff for making the public hearings available to allow the public to comment. He stated the project is being driven by parking and the total number of parking should be reduced and if a response to reduce parking is to have the units reduced, the Council should consider. He would like to see something that is not as massive and does not see the inspiration that went into the first pass.

Karen Haluza, 335 West Jacaranda Place, appreciates staff and the developers' opportunity to give early participation on the architectural design and understands that the role of the Committee is primarily design and architecture. She stated she thinks architectural quality is very important to get a great building that is unique to Fullerton. She understands that what she has seen tonight is not meant to be a definitive presentation on what the style of the building However, what was seen tonight she did not feel was up to that quality of architecture and unique quality that we should strive for in this project. The City Lights SRO project was a wonderful project. The City Point project and the Lemon and Commonwealth project did very well at the ground level. We need to understand how this building fits into its contextual relationships with the buildings that will be surrounding it. The visual survey that we're presented with tonight could be helpful if we really want to get meaningful input from that type of tool. However, the images need to be organized into categories. What we got tonight was not that helpful because you're just responding to images without understanding the context in which you are being asked to respond. Finally, the open space that is being referred to needs to be clearly articulated. We need to make sure we are adding commensurate levels of open space for people to have recreation opportunities particularly when we have residential in the area. Comments submitted for the notice of preparation requested a pedestrian shed study, to understand the pedestrian connectivity within the area. This project is meant to function as much from a pedestrian standpoint as it does from a vehicular standpoint.

Judith Kaluzny, 400 N. Malden, stated she would like to see more of an ambiance in Fullerton. She is not against a nine-story building, only the location. She recommended the back area from the Farmers and Merchants bank and also across Chapman Avenue from her property where there is now a parking lot. She was concerned about the additional parking being proposed and stated that an ordinance was passed in 2002 stating that the Restaurant Overlay District is within a reasonable distance of the City's existing ample public parking supply.

Edward Moorlach, 113 Rose Dr., stated all of the information should be on the website because all residents cannot attend the meetings. He stated the City should develop the Brookhurst and Orangethorpe area instead of the Downtown area, which is already vibrant. He expressed his concerns with requiring more than 150 percent parking, will require more parking with new businesses and residences in the area. He asked if there would be a doorman, residents' only for the open spaces or public accessible?

Lynn Chidester, 517 West Whiting, stated that when watching the slide show, she noticed the buildings that she loved were the ones already in Fullerton because construction today is with all the same materials. She gave an example of buildings she liked from Cuba. Ms. Chidester stated the comment most heard at the community meetings has been to go back to the original plan because it is not as massive as the current plan.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha commented that the project should be done according to the history and when they started. When the project was first started they promised to provide 150 percent parking space for the Downtown. With the added apartments and new businesses, these added developments need to provide more parking spaces; 150 percent plus of parking spaces need to be added since that is what was promised that needs to be kept. The courtyard in the middle of Amerige Avenue has disappeared we have to have the open space for some breathing room. A wider sidewalk will provide something unique for this project. This development will be the face of Fullerton for the future and our future vision of Fullerton.

Committee Member Duncan asked how this project fits into the Fullerton Downtown Study and how the community felt at that time about building massing, height, and density? Acting Director Rosen explained how the study update looked at various areas in the City with the infill development. This quadrant of buildings is a bit higher than were discussed in the Downtown Study, but the study only provided general guidelines. It isn't out of the scale of what is considered. The Council has reviewed preliminary concepts of this plan (DDA) and it didn't appear there was objection from the Council to move forward with this development.

Committee Member Duncan stated there were excellent comments from the public. The architects and applicant understand the project and architecture very well and will come up with a good solution. It is a very constraining project with many elements to consider. Committee Member Duncan stated he looks at constraints as opportunities to create more creative solutions and not so traditional. Many areas in this project lend themselves to force the design in a different direction. There are some transitions that need to be well thought out in detail. He stated he would like to see more creative solutions to the final design.

Acting Director Rosen clarified that the support was not unanimous among the Council, with a 4-1 vote, there was a Councilmember who was concerned about the scale of the development.

Committee Member Larsen stated that when he received the elevations the first comment that ran through his mind was incredibly average. I can show you 20 of these from where I'm from in Seattle, so to me it really says nothing about this place. If we can get the discussion away from simplifying architecture down to what it looks like on the outside and basically judging a book by its cover and ask the question - who is the audience? What is the lifestyle of these people who are going to live here and use this? Then go from there and generate what it's going to look like. I don't agree with getting so enamored with what's existing; I think a lot of times we get that confused with what we really covet. It is not necessarily the look of a building, but rather that it represents something authentic. I think we need to have something that is about our time right now and how we live here and not a series of sporadic images. A really good way to look at it is there's a quote from my undergrad school from one of my instructors, from Picasso, that "bad artists borrow and good artists steal:. Right now, what I see is borrowed."

Chairman Daybell stated he did not have a lot of faith from the feedback they would get from the slides seen tonight. He reiterated a comment from a year ago, made by Tony Bushala at one of the meetings "that we're looking for real, quality, current architecture for this project." Chairman Daybell stated that is what he would like to see done. He told the architects to come up with something they think is unique, something their grandkids could be proud of 100 years from now. He stated that taking a poll from the public won't get us very far. In the process, it is important to get back to some of the open space concepts that came the first time when the Committee first looked at the project. He remembered that on the Ross building, on the easterly entrance, to the project, there was some distinctive open space fountains. He expressed to the

architects they need to move on and come up with something else to look at. He stated he did not see anything that excited him on the slides.

Mr. Hamm commented on the design of the ground floor plain has been moving around so much that they have not spent enough time on it, other than conceptually thinking, have not spent time drawing how plazas and sidewalks work. Time has not been spent working with the landscape architect to design the public spaces. He stated now that there is a consensus we can go forward and study that and come back with some good comments.

Mr. Hamm clarified some issues that had been brought up by stating that the project will provide 800 parking spaces, of those 240 are private and 550 are public. The existing parking spaces are 297. The CFD issue of the \$5,000,000 bond is not a City bond. It is a bond on the property paid for by the project's new residents. The comments in regard to open space and architecture were great. Some of the comments about authenticity and needing the architecture to reflect the place and lifestyle are great comments that we'll take to heart. We will try to solicit input from Planning Commission at the same level, so we won't go back to the drawing board. We'll show the Planning Commission the same thing. Then we'll go back and retool this and try and come back with a design that everyone can be proud of. KTGY will get a formal submittal in and through the formal submittal process, then we'll return to the RDRC, Planning Commission and City Council.

Chairman Daybell stated to the public that some of the comments made tonight should be repeated with the Planning Commission next week.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION made by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Larsen to ADJOURN meeting at 8:58 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ruth Leopold Clerical Support