

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

January 25, 2007

4:00 PM

---

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

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Larsen  
ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: Rick Crane, Tom and Katie Dalton,  
Catherine Flores, Holly Lane, Bob and  
Molly Minor, Michele Powell, and Debra  
Redmond

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

**MINUTES:** The November 9, 2006 minutes were not available.

**APPOINTMENT**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the process for the appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman. Committee Member Hoban nominated Vice Chairman Duncan for Chairman of the RDRC. (Vote 4-0 with Committee Member Larsen absent) Chairman Daybell III nominated Committee Member Hoban for Vice Chairman. (4-0 Vote with Committee Member Larsen absent)

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00589 – ZON06-00102. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CAMERON IRONS.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a remodel of existing 6,000 square foot commercial building to create five (5) restaurant tenant spaces and interior public space while removing all on-site parking on property in the Restaurant Overlay District located at 133 west Chapman Avenue (north side of Chapman Avenue, approximately 350 feet west of Harbor Boulevard centerline). (C-3 / ROD Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided a brief description about Google style architecture.

Committee Member Hoban asked if the five restaurants have proposed dining locations inside or if the majority patio space will be taken by exterior tables? Acting Senior Planner Allen said it was her understanding that it will be a combination of both interior spaces and outdoor patio space for additional seating.

Committee Member Daybell questioned if the proposal is to eliminate all parking what are the code requirements for parking in these businesses? Acting Senior Planner Allen said this area is part of the restaurant overlay district (ROD) and explained the stated purpose of the overlay district. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said staff is looking for some clarification from the Planning Commission and City Council as to whether or not the intent of the restaurant overlay district was to eliminate parking. He explained the RDRC's role is primarily to look at the architecture and on-site circulation and aspects related to vehicle circulation.

Acting Senior Planner Allen requested the RDRC formulate their recommendation on the patio space, the exterior of the building, and the height of the structural elements, for example.

Chairman Duncan asked if the uses could change if they weren't able to do the plaza and had to keep 17 stalls of parking. Is it enough to provide what is needed based on the uses for the proposal? Acting Senior Planner Allen said not for restaurant uses. She said for 6,000 sq. ft. of restaurants they would need to provide 60 spaces. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said they currently don't meet the parking requirements for retail uses either, and are therefore non-conforming in terms of parking. He said the issue that will be in front of the City Council is clarification of the code requirement as to whether or not it was the intent of the ROD, which allows restaurants without parking to actually eliminate whatever parking is currently available. He stated that clearly the parking that is there now is not sufficient to meet the restaurant demand.

Committee Member Hoban asked if staff believes that these restaurants would be reasonably reachable by pedestrian traffic from the Downtown similar to how the rest of the restaurants operate? Staff identified that the public parking that would be used by the restaurant is the adjacent temporary parking lot; there is no ability to forecast a draw from downtown without knowing the tenants.

Committee Member Cha asked about the trash bin location. Acting Senior Planner Allen said the trash bin will either be placed on-site or on the adjacent public parking lot. One of the conditions is that it be worked out prior to building permits. She said it will be either on site, likely not in the current location, but probably in the north eastern corner if it would be accommodated on site, but served through the public parking lot. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said that the Redevelopment Agency will have to address that issue as well as trash access.

Chairman Duncan said the analysis noted the proposed sign out in front has a limit of 20 ft. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained the applicant is proposing structural elements along the eastern side of the property and all are proposed at a 30 ft. height. Staff is recommending that all structural elements be reduced to 20 ft. Chairman Duncan said the onsite elements are not signs and there is no height restriction on that. Acting Senior Planner Allen said the condition, as written, is that all structural elements be lowered to 20 ft., but if the Committee feels that the elements are architecturally unique to the Google style and should be bigger, the condition can be modified or removed.

Mark Blumer, Crane Architectural Group, presented background information on the project and Google architecture. He said it is very important for the quality of the space that the structural stay at 30 ft. His preference would be to use a 30 ft. structural element for the sign post, but lower the signage on it to 20 ft. in compliance with the maximum sign height limitation.

Committee Member Hoban asked about the size of the palm trees and if they were going to be mature trees. Mr. Blumer said they want palm trees that grow to 30 ft., and is not sure if the trees will be mature when installed. Acting Senior Planner Allen said staff has a recommended condition that a full landscape plan come back to the RDRC for review.

Cameron Irons, applicant, explained he is open to suggestions regarding the architecture and courtyard. He explained he would like to add a fountain and make it a friendly environment.

Rick Crane, architect, said one of the goals of this project is to get people to Downtown and utilize the outdoor space. He explained the more people they can get into the courtyard, the better.

Mr. Irons stated they have a long list of tenants that would like to be in that area. He said the tenants will have quick service, high quality food, and there will be no bars or fine dining.

Committee Member Daybell asked what is the applicant proposing to do for the trash enclosure because it is not on the plans. Mr. Irons explained it has to be placed in the City lot or accessed through the City lot.

Committee Member Daybell asked about deliveries. Mr. Irons said trucks cannot access the courtyard. He stated he did not want to go into depth about the parking and trash, since the Planning Commission and City Council will have to make a decision as to whether or not they would like to see restaurants there.

Committee Member Hoban asked what is between the canal and the north building? Mr. Irons said a slope. Committee Member Hoban asked if there is enough space at the top of the slope next to the building to add back doors to the units for access? Mr. Irons said it has been looked at and it might be doable. He explained that it is a very complicated because they have to deal with Orange County Flood Control. Mr. Irons said that what they could do is build a retaining wall with a walkway in the back for access. He said the problem is that the building is only 6,000 sq. ft. and it will get very expensive dealing with retaining walls and OCFCD.

Committee Member Daybell asked where it would put them in relation to the flood control property line? Would they be encroaching on the flood control? Mr. Irons said that the channel is on his property. Committee Member Daybell asked how close the back of the building is to the channel? Mr. Irons said it is about 10 ft on a slope. Mr. Crane added it is mostly slope with about 2 or 3 ft. of flat. Mr. Irons said he has spoken to the Orange County Flood Control and have said they can pretty much do what they want. However, they do have a depth reading apparatus behind the building and right now it is by three, dangerous wooden steps to get down there. He explained that he would build a walkway with stairs to the OCFD facility.

The applicant stated the drive approach would be removed from Chapman Avenue. Mr. Irons said the tenants comments have been they'd like to see some of the decorative concrete block moved away from the front of the first suite because it blocks the windows. He said he has considered moving it over so that it creates a more enclosed area of the vehicular entrance and make it a bit more of an intimate entrance. He said it will also provide cover for outdoor dining.

Public hearing opened.

The following spoke in opposition to the project:

- Bob Minor
- Molly Minor

Their concerns were:

- Increase of traffic flow
- Increase in sound and noise
- Hours of operation
- Not enthralled with 60s style of the building
- Landscaping more in conjunction with what is in the immediate area, such as magnolias, and not palm trees.
- Automobile exiting

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha said the building was originally built for offices. He stated the canopy in front can be removed if necessary. He said the proposed plaza should have more landscaping.

Committee Member Daybell said he feels the project is in front of the RDRC pre-maturely because there are a lot of decisions that need to be made in what will go there. The number one issue is going to be at Planning Commission or City Council level as to accepting or not accepting the parking proposed. Committee Member Daybell said he could not support this project in its present configuration. He stated he did not like to approve something where there is a very big question whether what is here is going to be agreed to at the next two levels. He said he would like to see it go through the process through Planning Commission and City Council and if they would like the RDRC to look at the architecture after they've made their decision, then it can be brought back with the landscaping and other things. Chairman Duncan asked Committee Member Daybell if the architecture style is a nice direction for this project? Committee Member Daybell said he did not have a problem with the architecture if it was just the building but "wiping out" the parking does bother him. At this stage, he is not ready to say yes to the project. He said something can be done to the building to sustain the same amount of parking and he could support that. Committee Member Daybell preferred the 20 ft. versus 30 ft. for the structural elements in that location.

Committee Member Hoban said the Planning Commission will have their hands full with the issues stated, but this building is getting an improvement with this facelift. However, a signage program, hardscape plan and landscape plan are needed. He said he really did not need to see anything else and thinks the structural bent elements need to be 30 ft. or not be done at all. He said he agreed with the architect and that is what makes it that style. The 60s building was done poorly in the 60s because they didn't take it to the full threshold that could have been reached. He said this project is almost there and should finish it off. He would like to see the hardscape and landscape plan. He explained that understanding the uses of the building, besides just saying fast serve foods will dictate how the plaza is used. He can easily see, depending on what is placed there, needing stages. He said he thinks the bent should stay at 30 ft. if this project is going to move forward in this direction and the signage needs far more detail. He said if they are going with this style, it is headed in the right direction. Committee

Member Hoban said he did not think it was near well developed enough to make overwhelming decisions on, and agrees with Committee Member Daybell that these types of things need to get their land use settled before they come before the RDRC. Committee Member Hoban said he did not need to know the off-site parking plan for these units because they are not on the site. He stated that those things should be settled; then the Committee will continue to look at the architecture. If the bent is a structural element, the signage can be brought down to conform to the signage requirements.

Chairman Duncan said he is in agreement with Committee Member Hoban on the structural bent elements. He agrees they should be maintained at 30 ft, lowering the sign cabinets to 20 ft. He stated he said it is definitely an improvement and it is going to be a cool space, but thinks a plaza should be developed. He would like to see the project come back to the Committee after more discussion with the City Council. Chairman Duncan said although it is 60s style, palm trees must be a minimum of 25 ft and they do need height to make it look like it is established and has been there since the 60s, versus it being small. He stated there should be a condition or criteria that a minimal height for palm trees and or trees and the bigger trees the better, but at least to give it the established look by the landscaping. He stated it should be continued after it has gone through its rounds, but everyone supports the architecture.

Acting Community Development Director Rosen recommended an action to give a sense of direction on the architecture.

Committee Member Daybell said if he were to make a motion it would be to continue the project to the next level in order to get clarification on the issues that are beyond the Committee's purview, and bring the architecture back to the RDRC afterwards.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Irons said he agreed with Acting Community Development Director Rosen's comments and understands that it makes sense to send it to Planning Commission and bring it back to the RDRC. But he encourage the Committee to provide some feedback on the architecture to see if the style was moving in the right direction.

Chairman Duncan stated that architecturally they are already there and there isn't a lot of modification that needs to be done there. In terms of landscaping, if they move forward with the plaza design, he explained they should hire a landscape architect to create that space because it is something that has not been done. Chairman Duncan explained that the landscape architect will pull from the architectural style. He said his approach would be to compliment the architecture which landscape that was typical for that period and style.

Committee Member Daybell stated the problem he has now is that he does not know what will come back to the Committee and explained it may be something different.

Committee Member Hoban explained that it is not in the Committee's purview or intention to design the project for the applicant. Acting Chief Planner Eastman added to the applicant and the Committee's concerns, stating it is not so much as designing the project, but what are some of the issues that are on the forefront of their concerns. Staff has concerns with the outdoor space. The patio is a very large space with a lot of hardscape and if it is not filled with people and seats, you end up with a lot of glare from the sun and void of area. The additional landscaping can be done in a variety of ways including providing grass areas that maintain the flat plain and perhaps accommodating people sitting on the grass, provide raised planters and

mounding, larger birds of paradise or other plants that provide shade and interest. Staff's concern is that it is a large space in proportion to the building and is a hard space and there is concern as far as what it becomes if it is not filled with people. It won't seem as desolate if there is activity or plants in that area.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman said if the Committee is comfortable with the conditions, they can support them and make a recommendation should it be approved as is that those conditions be adopted with the modification that the plans come back for their review. Mr. Crane added the modification or recommendation of the height on the structural elements be included.

Committee Member Daybell said he did not have a problem with sending it to the Planning Commission and thinks it is better that it come back to the RDRC.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE the project until a determination is made by the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the elimination of on-site parking. Vote 4-1 with Committee Member Larsen absent.

#### Item No. 2

#### PRJ06-00629 – ZON06-00109. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: HOLLY LANE .

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report for a request for a minor development project to demolish an existing garage and construct a 2-story second dwelling unit (1,518 sq ft) with ground floor and 3-car garage on a property with an existing dwelling unit (1,107 sq ft) to remain on property located at 216 Malvern Avenue. (Generally located on the south side of Malvern Avenue between 215 and 270 feet west of Malden Avenue.) (R-2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines).

Committee Member Daybell said he likes what he sees and did not have any issues with the project.

Chairman Duncan asked if the eave on the new dwelling will match the existing? Acting Senior Planner Allen said it will.

Committee Member Cha said the project looks very nice.

Public hearing opened.

Mark Blumer, architect, said the project is fairly simple and used the old elements from the house and is keeping with scale in similar developments along the alley. Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if he had any concerns with staff's recommendations? The applicant said no.

The following residents spoke in opposition to the project:

- Molly Minor
- Bob Minor

Their concerns were:

- The project will block their backyard view of any trees.

- House seems larger than the front house and it can be seen from the front house.
- Large houses change the character of the neighborhood.
- It is not craftsman style.

The following resident was in support of the project:

- Michelle Powell, stated it is a good design and looks great.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman addressed the resident's comment regarding that the house would not be visible from the street. Mrs. Minor stated it was referenced in the staff report. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the existing garage is what cannot be seen from the street. He had no recollection that the staff report stated that the new dwelling would no be seen. Staff believes that the new dwelling would be seen for clarity he explained the area is zoned for duplexes and does not prohibit two-story structures.

Committee Member Cha stated the committee is not here to change the code and explained that they review the design within the code.

Committee Member Daybell said this project is done very well compared to others he has reviewed in the past and matches the front house. He explained issues raised regarding allowing bigger buildings is something that goes beyond the RDRC level. He explained there are state regulations that mandate they allow this type of additions and construction sometimes referred to as "granny units". He stated the project is well designed and he will be supporting it.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman said there are some "granny units" mandates that apply to single family zones, however this is a duplex zone, which allows for two units on the property, and this proposal meets the code requirements. Committee Member Daybell said he did not see any code issues.

Committee Member Cha said he liked the style and design and explained to the public if they are concerned with how the area is going they could take it to the Council to require more limitations, but the RDRC reviewed the design and it is acceptable to him.

Committee Member Hoban said he supports the project with staff recommendations.

Chairman Duncan agreed with Committee Member Hoban's comments.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project with staff's recommendations. Vote 4-0, with Committee Member Larsen absent.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

Committee Member Daybell left the room at 5:25 p.m.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comments

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

**MEETINGS:**

Senior Planner Eastman provided a summary on the City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

**AGENDA FORECAST:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Ruth Leopold  
Clerical Support