MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday June 28, 2007 4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:24 p.m. by Vice Chairman Hoban.

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Vice Chairman Hoban, Committee

PRESENT: Members Cha, and Daybell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Duncan

ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior

Planner St. Paul, Acting Senior Planner Allen, Consultant Planner Wolff, Acting Associate Planner Kusch and Clerical

Assistant Flores

MINUTES: The June 14, 2007 minutes were not available.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ06-00091 - LRP06-00001, LRP06-00002, LRP06-00003

A review of architectural and landscape plans for the St. Jude Medical Plaza Phase 2, which includes a new 98,000± square foot medical office building and nine level parking structure (seven levels above grade, two levels below) in conjunction with a zone change, specific plan amendment and General Plan revision for property located at 2151 N. Harbor Blvd. (Generally located on the west side of Harbor, between Bastanchury and Valencia Mesa) (C-2 ZONE) (Environmental Impact Report). (JWO)

Planning Consultant Wolff gave a brief overview of the project. She explained that the first phase of St. Jude Medical Plaza was approved in 2002 and construction was completed in 2004. Phase 1 consists of a 72,000± square foot, 3 story medical office building. The proposed project consists of a new, four-story, 98,000± square foot medical office building, and a 9 level parking structure. Site access would be provided from Harbor Blvd., Valencia Mesa Dr. and Laguna Road. The plans the RDRC was now reviewing show emergency vehicle access only from Harbor Blvd. Recent discussion with eh Project Traffic Engineer indicate that full access from Harbor may be needed. If so, the applicant would be required to construct a deceleration lane along the Harbor frontage. A

deceleration lane would decrease the building setback along Harbor Blvd. to approximately 5 feet, reducing landscaping. The primary issues to review are the overall aesthetic character of the development, compatibility of the Phase 2 proposal with the existing Phase 1 construction, and the compatibility of the project design with the surrounding area. Staff was concerned that when a deceleration lane was added, the setbacks of the four story building may be reduced to five feet. Staff was also concerned because the building orientation created a development which "turns its back" to the community. Building entryways are not visible from adjacent properties, as the main access point is located in an interior courtyard facing the parking structures. Planning Consultant Wolff explained that lighting was an additional element for consideration. The owner of the adjacent medical office building expressed concern about the shadows the proposed buildings would cast during the day. Staff recommends the RDRC review, discuss and continue the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that Staff was in the process of addressing the transportation issues to see if a deceleration lane would be needed along the property's Harbor frontage. He stated that studies have not been concluded; if a deceleration lane was needed it would decrease the building setback along Harbor Blvd, to approximately 5 feet, consequently reducing landscaping. Staff believed the architectural style was consistent with what St. Jude had done with Phase 1 and the hospital expansion that was taking place.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the applicant had seen the staff report and if there was any further discussion with them. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff did not have a discussion with the applicant after the staff report was completed.

Public hearing opened.

Burnie Dunlap, Director Community and Government Relations for St. Jude Medical Center, stated they were looking at using southbound Harbor as an access point and were analyzing the issues associated with creating a deceleration lane on southbound Harbor. Mr. Dunlap explained that there were three portals of either entry or exit from the parking structure on Laguna Rd. If a deceleration lane were put in on Harbor; that would change the loading on Laguna and also on the easement off of Valencia Mesa. Mr. Dunlap stated that there wasn't an access point to the building for pedestrians on Harbor because Harbor was not designed for that, and believed that there were some valid considerations with the way the site and building were designed.

Michael Street design architect for St. Jude Medical Center, HDR Architecture explained that for pedestrian safety the main lobby for the Phase 2 medical office building was situated directly adjacent to the existing Phase 1 lobby. The main lobby utilized the same public drop off point, and also connected the two parking garages. Mr. Street stated that the primary pedestrian entrance from Harbor would be the bridge way coming across, but would be geared towards staff and less so to public and patients.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the bridge would have to be modified and extended if a deceleration lane was added. Mr. Street stated that the proposed deceleration lane would start after the bridge location.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if there was something that could be modified with the site or building if the deceleration was put in because of the setback. Mr. Street explained that

the current curb distance to the building at the lowest level was 22 feet and the existing 5 foot sidewalk would be moved inside of a 12 foot deceleration lane. The deceleration lane as proposed would fall where the building was already breaking away because of the curve of the façade around the corner. The building would step back at the lower level and the upper level would curve around behind that. The deceleration lane would be approximately 80 feet in length, so the 40 foot section falls within the portion where the ground plane steps back and the curve occurs. The declaration lane would then taper back to Harbor.

Mr. Dunlap stated that the length of the deceleration lane was still being considered because there were vaults situated on the site. However, the lane would be safe and would meet the minimum traffic requirements. Mr. Dunlap stated that landscaping was planned if the deceleration lane was put in and extended.

Bill Rabben, of Rabben/Herman Design Landscape Architects stated that they were the landscape architects for the Phase 2 building and were also the landscape architects for the Phase 1 project along Harbor. Mr. Rabben explained that one of the main issues was the limited area for landscaping and a deceleration lane would reduce the area of landscaping available. The current plan was to create continuity and consistency along Harbor with Phase 1 and Phase 2. The landscaping would need to be compatible with the deceleration lane so that people could recognize that there was an entrance element as they are coming from the north side, to access the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff was looking into the deceleration lane and still studing whether it is needed. He stated that Staff anticipates a deceleration lane would be needed, and there are issues of vaults and other criteria that need to be worked through. Acting Chief Planner Eastman noted that the applicant was requesting an expansion of their Specific Plan. The Specific Plan currently included Phase 1, and the Specific Plan would incorporate Phase II. The zoning requirements currently in place could be modified and addressed through the Specific Plan Process. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the current code required a 10 foot setback for landscaping.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the Harbor entrance was designated as an emergency drive. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that originally the project had a deceleration lane for southbound Harbor traffic. However, the idea of making it an emergency vehicle entrance only came up, and the plans were revised accordingly. After analyzing the project without the Harbor entrance, it was determined that it might be better to include the deceleration lane from a traffic standpoint. The plans provided to the RDRC show the emergency entrances.

Mr. Dunlap stated that in the approved master plan of the hospitals 2030 plan there was the possibility that there may be access off of Harbor to St. Jude Medical Center on the east side of Harbor. Mr. Dunlap also noted that putting the building back further, therefore making it smaller or raising it up was not feasible. He stated it was very problematic to meet the setback requirement by changing the design of the building.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked for clarity on why the building had its back to Harbor. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that when circling around the building, an identifiable building entrance was not apparent. He stated that the entrance to the building was in the internal courtyard. Staff prefers, as a matter of Community Planning, that people be able

to identify the entrance so when they are approaching this building they know where they are going. He noted that Harbor was not a pedestrian friendly environment which made it impractical to put an entrance on Harbor. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the south side of the parking structure had a pedestrian walkway with a canopy that expanded out toward Laguna. The project was designed with a pedestrian pathway and landscaping on the south side of the parking garage, and the southwest corner would have a trellis cover. The applicant had provided an alternative walkway that goes between the two parking structures from the main entrance. That walkway would be a more natural path of travel for employees and others going to the Providence Medical buildings and restaurants. The walkway south of the structure provides primary access as required by A.D.A.

Committee Member Cha asked if the brick parapet finish on the west elevation of the parking structure was plastered or painted. He also believed that the landscaping on the west and south side of the building was not appropriate when exposed to a lot of traffic and people.

Mr. Street, Project Architect stated that the existing parking structure was a large buff colored sheer wall, with the St. Jude logo on it, which was a concrete slab with natural color burnish concrete. Mr. Street explained that the mass of the required structural sheer wall would be subdivided into different zones and there would be different colors and materials. At the Laguna pedestrian access a split face brown concrete block has been incorporated and is being carried over on to the existing structures. So that the different colors and textures, painted concrete and terracotta color match the rest of the campus. At the top level of the garage there would be a natural gray concrete block to add layers, and bring down the mass to the garage. In addition, aluminum eyebrow forms which are on the existing medical building have been incorporated to the new medical building.

Tony Bushala, 2020 Conejo Ln stated that he liked the design.

Don Ludwig, 654 W Valencia Mesa Dr stated that his primary concern with the project was the traffic aspect of it. Mr. Ludwig did not like the 7 story parking structure.

Sandy Marshall, 925 Valencia Mesa stated that she was concerned with the appearance of the parking structure. Ms. Marshall stated that the Terracotta façade of the parking structure was ugly. Ms. Marshall was also concerned with the overload of traffic on Valencia Mesa and would prefer traffic to enter off of Harbor.

Elaine Denault, 1418 Marelen Dr believed that a deceleration lane and entrance off of Harbor were needed to relieve some of the traffic on Laguna. Ms. Denault stated that property values were being eroded because of overbuilding in the area.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the RDRC would not be the Committee to review traffic, or traffic impacts. Those issues would be reviewed by the Planning Commission. He stated that Staff would ask that the RDRC identify the design scope, compatibility with surroundings and things of a design stand point.

Public hearing re-opened.

Committee Member Daybell asked the applicants how they felt about the staff recommendations to continue this project. Mr. Dunlap stated that the recommendation to continue was reasonable given that the Harbor entrance was still in analysis. Mr. Dunlap wanted to clarify that the hospitals master plan was associated with St. Jude complying with a seismic safety senate bill. That was a separate plan that has been approved by the City and the construction of the hospital buildings on the east side of Harbor Blvd. fall under state jurisdiction. Mr. Dunlap explained that the medical office building was going to be three stories, but became a four story building based on the realities of medicine and the demands on service. Mr. Dunlap stated that an EIR has been published and the City has received comments on it.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha stated that he believed the north side of the existing parking structure looked half finished and would prefer the new parking structure not match it. He suggested that plantings be added to the high floors so the new parking structure would not look like a massive concrete structure.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked the project and the primary entrance from the interior made sense to him. He had concerns about the height of the new parking structure and would like to see consistency with the height of the existing parking structure.

Vice Chairman Hoban liked the design and complimentary nature towards the hospital and the other buildings in the area. He stated that the contemporary nature of the glass, and concrete did not bother him and believed that some elements could be softened with landscape.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE the project to allow the applicant time to analyze the Harbor entrance. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00250 - ZON07-00052

A request for a Minor Development Project to review the addition of a bay window to the front of the house and window replacements. (Generally located at 505 W. Jacaranda Pl, on the north side of Jacaranda, approximately 90 ft west of North Richman Ave.) (R-1-7.2P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (HAL).

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. The property was constructed in 1949 in a preservation zone. The request was to install replacement windows in the front of the house and also to install a bay window. The bay window would include some structural modifications to the front of the house to incorporate the bay window into that area. The window replacements have already been installed and retain the existing shutters on the home. The bay window would eliminate the shutters and widen the opening. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the existing home had double hung windows with no mullions and what was proposed were windows with a grid system across the top. The bay window was not consistent with the style of the home. Staff recommended continuation of the bay window and supported the replacement windows, which had already been replaced.

Public hearing opened.

Amy Alspaugh, 505 W Jacaranda Place stated that she did not know that replacement windows required permits. Ms. Alspaugh stated that the replacement windows were more efficient and believed that the bay window blended well with house.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that the bay window was inappropriate for this house because it's in a preservation zone and should be denied.

Vice Chairman Hoban noted that the house was raised on a concrete foundation and asked if the bay window would have its own concrete footing to sit on to match the window. Ms. Alspaugh stated that it would go down to the ground and have a concrete footing and clap board siding.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that a gable roof coming out over a bay window was not typical. He stated that in most of the bay window examples provided there was a flat roof or three part roofing. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that adequate information has been provided and it was up to the RDRC to conditionally approve the project or continue it for modification or review.

Committee Member Hoban stated that he had the same observation that staff had about the gable roof going over a bay window. He stated it was not traditional and did not understand how that would work.

Committee Member Daybell stated that a bay window was not appropriate for this particular property. He stated that the roof might be, able to expand outward if what the applicant wanted was a bigger room.

Committee Member Cha stated that he did not have a problem with a gable roof style for the bay window.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban, to CONTINUE the project to allow for revisions to the bay window design. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha, to APPROVE acceptance of the windows that have been installed. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 3

PRJ05-00269 - ZON05-00025

To consider site and architectural plans for a five (5) unit apartment complex located at 840 Magnolia Avenue (property located on the east side of Magnolia Avenue between approximately 167 and 263 feet south of the southeast corner of Magnolia Avenue and Olive Avenue) (R-3 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15332) (AKU).

Acting Associate Planner Kusch presented a staff report and gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that the request was to review site and architectural plans for a 5 unit apartment complex. Due to design concerns the Staff Review Committee conditioned their approval to include RDRC review and approval of the site plan and architecture. Staff believes that a landscape and hardscape treatment plan may alleviate some concerns associated with the site design. The development would consist of a three-story building

along Magnolia Avenue, behind which is a two-story building that steps back to a single-story unit on the east. The buildings would include a stucco exterior, fixed and sliding aluminum windows, and a clay tile hip roof with gables. Staff noted that the entrances were located on the side of the units. The proposed window sizes appear out of proportion and inconsistent with the rest of the building design. Staff requests that the RDRC provide direction to the applicant pertaining to design improvements and modifications, and continue the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that Staff had tried to work with the applicant on some of the code requirements in terms of design. There are development standard that identify height of buildings adjacent to a residential area. He stated that the buildings scale back away from the single-family residential area to the east and get taller as they go to Magnolia Avenue. The applicants have redesigned the exterior a couple of times and were looking for final review and approval by the RDRC. The SRC approved the project, with conditions, except for the architecture was referred to the RDRC.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the previous design had been a Spanish style stucco building. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the architecture, layout, and the number of units had changed over time with multiple versions of the plans.

Committee Member Cha asked what the parking requirements were. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the garage parking was for residents. He stated that all the garages were below the units except for the single unit at the back of the lot had an adjacent attached garage. All the open parking spaces were required for visitor parking.

Committee Member Cha asked if the landscaping on the east end of the lot was for a playground or landscaping. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the open space was a landscape area that was needed for the usable open space requirement.

Committee Member Cha asked what the purpose of the landscaping on the Magnolia Avenue side was for. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that area had to do with the 15 foot front yard setback on Magnolia Avenue. Parking was not allowed at the site's southwest corner because there was not enough back up space. The minimum requirement to back up was 25 feet and the driveway was only 20 feet. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the setback requirements for the units to the side property lines were based on windows, window types and what level they were at. The City also has window separation requirements between buildings.

Public hearing opened.

Robert Little, project architect, stated that the zoning for this property dictated the way the project was designed. The back part of the property could only have one story. Between 50 and 100 feet from R-1 zoned properties, there could be two stories and, beyond 100 feet from the R-1 zone, the remainder of the property could have three stories. Mr. Little stated that the applicant did not want the front doors facing Magnolia, but if that was Staffs recommendation they would go with that.

Committee Member Cha asked if the decks for apartments 3 and 4 were going to be located on the roof of the one story building. Mr. Little stated yes.

Sarah Gutierrez, property owner, asked if a street setback variance could be granted if the front entrances were oriented toward Magnolia Avenue. Ms. Gutierrez stated that they could stagger the buildings if they could get a setback variance. Committee Member Daybell stated that the RDRC did not grant variances from the code.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that a minor encroachment within the front yard setback required a Minor Site Plan. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that a minor encroachment would not be considered a variance; it would be considered a Minor Site Plan adjustment and it could be up to 20 percent of the code requirement for a 15 foot setback. Anything beyond 20 percent required a variance.

Joe Gutierrez, Property Owner stated that they were willing to make all the adjustments necessary.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell did not like the decks for the middle apartments going over the roof of the one story apartment and supported staffs recommendation to continue.

Committee Member Cha recommended that the landscaping in the front have large trees or shrubs so cars could not park in that area.

Vice Chairman Hoban would like to see some articulation in the roof line and would like to see consistency with the windows. He noted that the windows were gridded, non gridded, and diagonally gridded.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to CONTINUE the project for more variation, articulation and style of the building and to submit landscaping and irrigation plans for review. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 4

PRJ06-00586 - ZON06-00100 / ZON07-00001

A request for a Major Site Plan to construct a 14,560 square foot medical office building over a two-level, 75 space parking structure and a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the base floor area ratio (FAR) of .30 with a FAR of .40 on a property located at 1555 N. Harbor Blvd. (formerly 1601 N. Harbor Blvd.) (Generally located on the west side of Harbor Blvd. between approximately 1,180 feet and 1,360 feet north of Valley View Drive) (City Council-1 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15332) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a staff report and gave a brief overview of the project. She explained that the 14,300 square foot medical office building was situated over two levels of parking that started at grade then would go up to the second level structure. The area was located on a portion of Harbor Blvd that is a scenic corridor. The scenic corridor guidelines look at what the view from the street is, in the context of a development project and looks at what the improvements will do to the area. The guidelines recommend a step back of the building typically at the upper floors beyond the required setback. This project requires a ten foot setback. So rather than step back the upper floor they are setting the entire building back 20 feet doubling the minimum setback requirement. Additionally, the applicants are proposing landscaping in their 20 foot area to help screen the building and also add landscaping to the view from the street. One of

the other elements of this project is the view from above. Marelen Dr sits west of the project and would view the building down slope. The applicant has proposed screening that goes around the side of all the mechanical equipment and a louver system on the roof. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that when looking down on the project the individual mechanical equipment pieces would not be seen. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there were significant retaining walls in the design.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the floor area ratio would increase from 30 percent of the lot to 40 percent of the lot. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated yes. She explained the request was provided more as a context request for the RDRC and the actual action was through a conditional use permit which would be considered through the Planning Commission.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that in order to exceed the floor area ratio a traffic analysis and traffic report would be required to determine if there would be any impacts and if the City's traffic model could accommodate that increase.

Public hearing opened.

Mike Easton, Project Manager stated that they had requested an increase in the floor area ratio because of the setback requirements and the fact that they decided to double the minimum setback requirement. Mr. Easton stated that they developed a very attractive roof screening system. They have also provided equipment that is high energy efficient as well as quiet. Mr. Easton stated the proposal for the building exterior would be finished in slate tiles of a green/tan color that would blend in with landscaping and would be carried on to the inside of the building. The windows and features on the screening of the roof equipment are natural aluminum.

Committee Member Cha asked if there was an engineering water drain plan. Mr. Easton stated that they had done preliminary geotechnical engineering and drainage studies.

Elaine Denault 1418 Marelen Dr, was concerned with the size and scope of the building.

Helen Whitte 1448 Marelen Dr, stated that she was curious to know about the project.

Marion Reinert 1436 Marelen Dr, wanted to know what was going on with the project.

Marlene Cantrell 1412 Marelen Dr, was concerned about the traffic coming down Harbor. Ms. Cantrell was also concerned with the height of the building. She believed that the homes that sit above the proposed medical building would be looking down upon it. She did not want the proposed building to have a negative impact on the property value of her home.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that traffic was an issue for the Planning Commission. He stated that the floor area ratio would be under the purview of the Planning Commission because the applicant was requesting a conditional use permit. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the scenic corridor guidelines protected the scenic vistas.

Committee Member Cha was ok with the design and architecture of the proposed building.

Committee Member Daybell believed it was appropriate to exceed the floor area ratio in this case. He stated that architecturally the project was fine and the overall mass and the traffic would be referred to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Hoban liked the building and complimented the applicant's team. He stated that adding a massive retaining wall and taking the building back cost a lot of money, but was the right thing to do for the site. .

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to recommend to the Planning Commission APPROVAL of the project, with Staffs recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

None

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated a Spanish Style Duplex was approved by the Planning Commission on the corner of Lincoln and Wilshire. The garage door facing Lincoln was conditioned to use a wood like door. The applicant has come back to ask that he be allowed to use a steel door that would be painted to look like wood. Staff feels that should be ok unless the RDRC feels otherwise. The Committee supported Staffs determination.

The request for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a drug and alcohol treatment/counseling center was continued without public discussion.

The Planning Commission reviewed and approved a Parcel Map to subdivide one parcel into two lots on property located at 1226 Mesa del Sol.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave an update on 133 W. Chapman, and explained that the City Council was concerned with eliminating parking. The applicant presented and alternative of removing 11 of the 17 parking spaces. The City Council believed that the new project was consistent with the Restaurant Overlay District (ROD).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman notified the RDRC that there has not been an appointment for the Committees empty seat.

The Specific Plan for the Fullerton Transportation Center was given the ok to move forward. Staff has asked for policy direction to see if they should continue to include the

proposed Southern California Railroad Experience in the Master Plan, the Council provided direction to continue to include the SCRE until a more concrete fiscal analysis could be done.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be July 12, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 P.M.