

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

September 13, 2007

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Duncan.

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Duncan, Vice Chairman Hoban,
PRESENT: Committee Members Cha, Daybell, and
Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Director Godlewski, Acting Chief Planner
Eastman, Acting Senior Planner Allen,
Acting Associate Planner Kusch, and
Clerical Assistant Flores

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Chairman Duncan and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members
present, with Vice Chairman Hoban abstaining, to APPROVE the July
26, 2007 minutes AS WRITTEN.

Director John Godlewski introduced himself to the Committee and briefly talked about his background. The RDRC Committee Members also introduced themselves to the Director.

The following item was heard out of order.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

Item No. 3

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the Parks and Recreation Department was requesting that the Committee consider appointment of one of the RDRC Members to the Public Art Committee. The Art Committee serves under the Fullerton Museum Board and is funded by the Redevelopment Agency. The Committee makes recommendations on appropriate public art projects on public right-of-way or on private properties that are funded through a public art program. Traditionally, the Public Art Committee has included one Redevelopment Design Review Committee Member.

Public hearing opened.

Chairman Duncan asked if there was a general philosophy the board takes on for review.

Janet Buzan head of the Public Art Committee and Member of the Fullerton Museum Board stated that the Public Art Committee reviews various art projects that come up. In the museum's CUFFS funded program students produce public art murals under the direction of a guest artist. Ms. Buzan stated that the Committee was made up of diverse members

who look at available space, available money, artists and pieces of art that would be the best fit for the Fullerton Community.

Chairman Duncan asked if there was much debate at the Public Art Committee meetings. Ms. Buzan stated that there are debates and conversations, but never any hard feelings. She stated that every member was free to express their opinion.

Chairman Duncan asked if the Committee had any plans for three dimensional pieces or sculptures. Ms. Buzan stated that the Public Art Committee Members have been looking at incorporating a mosaic art piece; however that would be more expensive than the ongoing mural program.

Chairman Duncan asked if the Committee would like to see art displayed like what is in the City of Brea. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the primary role of the Public Art Committee was to review art rather than establish policy. It would be Council's direction to establish a program of that nature, and the Public Art Committee would be there potentially to review the art work. Danielle Mauk, Cultural and Events Manager, Parks and Recreation, stated the Committee makes recommendations to Director Joe Felz.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked how many members there were and what the funding was in a given year. Ms. Buzan stated that there were eleven board members. Ms. Mauk stated that the funding a year was \$25,000. Last year the funding was not spent on a mural, and has been saved for a three dimensional art piece of some kind. Ms. Mauk stated that there were about five projects on their agenda to complete.

Aimee Aul, Museum Educator, stated that the public murals are done through Project Cuffs. High school students submit art proposals and the Committee talks it over and comes up with what they think is the best design.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked how often the Committees recommendations have not been taken. Ms. Aul stated that they have not experienced that. They had a situation where the project went back to the drawing board because of the location, but it turned out to be better.

Committee Member Cha asked how often the Public Art Committee met. Ms. Buzan stated that it depended on how many projects they had. At the moment there are two projects that are on the table and the call has been put out to artists. The Committee will probably meet four times within the next 3 to 4 months. Ms. Buzan stated that they try to work around everyone's schedule when setting up a meeting

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked where the Committee met. Ms. Buzan stated that they meet in the Museum Center's meeting room. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the RDRC meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursday of the month from 4pm to 6pm depending on the amount of items on the agenda.

Committee Member Cha asked if there were any requirements to serve on the Committee. Ms. Buzan stated that the only requirement was a genuine interest and willingness to serve. Committee Member Cha stated that he was interested and would like to be considered for the position.

MOTION made by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Committee Member Daybell, to APPOINT Committee Member Cha to the Public Art Committee. Motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00258 – ZON07-00053 / ZON07-00085. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CAMERON IRONS A request for a Minor Development Project to remodel an existing +/- 6,000 sq. ft. commercial building to create individual restaurant tenant spaces with six (6) on-site parking spaces and a request for a Minor Development Project to construct patios for outdoor dining on private property located at 133 W. Chapman Avenue in the Restaurant Overlay District. (Generally located on the north side of Chapman Avenue, approximately 350 feet west of Harbor Boulevard centerline). (C-3 Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15301) (HAL)

(Continued from August 23, 2007)

Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that the applicant had concerns with some of Staffs recommendations on the prior Staff Report. The applicant met with Acting Chief Planner Eastman and discussed some of the recommendations and planned to make minor adjustments to the plans. The revised plans were not provided in time for review for this meeting. A further continuance was requested.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Hoban, SECONDED by Chairman Duncan to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of September 27, 2007. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00396 – ZON07-00093. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: STEPHEN M. LYONS A request for a Miscellaneous Development Project to demolish and reconstruct an existing 367 square foot detached garage on property located within a residential preservation zone at 225 W. Brookdale Place (Generally located on the north side of Brookdale Place, approximately 250 feet east of Highland Avenue) (R-1P Zone) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch presented a request for a Miscellaneous Development Project for the reconstruction of a garage within a preservation zone. The municipal code defers review of accessory structures that are in excess of 120 square feet to the RDRC for review and approval. The detached garage will be the same size as the previous garage and is located towards the rear of the house. Originally, the existing garage was going to be rehabbed and reconstructed. During a site inspection by the building division it was determined that the project was essentially new construction. The garage is adjacent to the east property line and the wall needs to meet the one hour construction fire rating. Staff believed that wood siding could be applied on all three sides of the garage to match the existing siding of the house. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the eave on the east side may need to be cut to meet the one hour fire rating separation. A slider window was indicated on the west elevation and typically slider windows are not allowed in preservation zones. Staff recommended that the window be replaced with a casement or a fixed window. The applicant's representative stated that the window may be removed.

Committee Member Cha believed that the roof line was beyond the property line. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that it was his understanding that the property line ended slightly beyond the wall to the east.

Committee Member Cha asked how tall the wall was behind the parking structure. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that it was a retaining wall because there was a slope condition. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the building division would have to verify whether the retaining wall was adequate or not.

Committee Member Cha inquired about drainage. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that Staff would require that the property be adequately drained during the building permit plan check process.

Vice Chairman Hoban inquired about the foundation for the reconstruction. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that any new footing and foundation would need to meet code.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the applicant could apply a one hour fire rating construction on the eave instead of eliminating it. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that he was not sure if they could do that. Staff would prefer that the eave not be eliminated if they can't meet code. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that an eave within 3 feet to the property line must meet the one hour fire rating, and typically, it would require a stucco application. Staff generally did not support applying stucco on a wood-sided building or a building with Craftsman-design features.

Chairman Duncan asked if the eave and the wall within the 3 foot setback had to meet the fire rating. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that previously one way a building has met code issues for one hour construction was to have a stucco wall. There have been concerns that a building with siding on three sides and stucco on fourth is inconsistent with what the design guidelines identify for the preservation zone. The Building Division has stated that it's possible to stucco the garage on all three sides and apply wood siding on top of it.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the RDRC could mandate that the building have wood siding. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the RDRC looks at the aesthetics of a building as it relates to the preservation guidelines and staff believed that the garage could be constructed to have wood siding on all three sides.

Vice Chairman Hoban did not want the eave to be eliminated. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the eave was small and the structure was far from the front property line and the street. Staff did not see any concern with removing the eave on an accessory structure, but would defer to the direction of the Committee.

Public hearing opened.

John Lyons, representative of the property owner, stated that it was his intension to have wood siding on all three sides of the garage; (forth side is a retaining wall) however he needed to meet the one hour fire rating adjacent to the property line. He stated that he could remove the slider window on the garage or replace it with something that matches the house.

Committee Daybell asked Mr. Lyon if he was waiting for input from the Committee and the City as to what kind of siding to use. Mr. Lyons stated he was. Committee Member Daybell referenced pictures and asked if the framing and roofing would stay the same. Mr. Lyons stated that he intended on using a double layer of 5/8 gypsums on the inside of the wall. Mr. Lyons asked if he could eliminate the window. Committee Member Daybell stated that he felt it was Mr. Lyons choice.

Committee Member Daybell asked Mr. Lyons how he planned on maintaining the drainage on the east side of the property to prevent it from going onto the adjacent property. Mr. Lyons stated that at the moment he was not sure. Mr. Lyons stated that he was trying to work with City Staff so his project can move forward.

Chairman Duncan asked if the property line had been verified. Mr. Lyons stated that to the best of his knowledge it was a couple of feet past the existing fence separating the two houses. Committee Member Daybell believed the property lines needed to be verified and the property owner would need to get a maintenance easement from the neighbor.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the building was a foot or two off of the property line. The building code would not allow for the building to be constructed over the property line. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the Building Official would require that the property owner hire a land surveyor to determine the boundary lines only if there were concerns. Staff relies on the information provided by the property owner in reviewing the building permit plans.

Bob Linnell, representative of Fullerton Heritage, believed that the project was within the preservation guidelines. He recommended that the owner include a couple windows on the building that match the existing house. He believed that adding windows would enhance the aesthetic and monetary value in the future.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha believed that the window should stay, but match the existing house. He stated that the property line issue needs to get resolved.

Chairman Duncan was in agreement with the project. He stated that condition #2 needed to be reworded to say that the roof shall match the material of the existing house and not just be similar. He stated that a condition should be added to not allow the window to be removed.

Vice Chairman Hoban was ok with the project. He believed that the roof should match the existing house and the eave on the property line should not be removed.

Committee Member Lynch was in agreement with the project. He liked the window, but believed the decision should be left up to the owner.

Committee Member Daybell supported the project with a couple windows that would not be sliders.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha, to APPROVE the project, as recommended by staff. Motion passed unanimously.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bob Linnell, Fullerton Heritage asked if the RDRC had commented on the outcome of 201 N Lincoln. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Committee had previously talked about it. Mr. Linnell stated that Committee Member Daybell presented comments that needed to be heard by the Planning Commission. Mr. Linnell mentioned that one of the windows had been removed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the window was removed so the builder can figure out how the issues would get addressed.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that applicant of 220 N Lincoln was building something that was not the same as what was approved on the plans. The original request included the demolition of an existing dwelling in a preservation zone which required Landmark Commission review and approval. The project included the construction of two new units, which went to the Landmarks Commission for review and approval. The RDRC had made a recommendation to the Landmark Committee on the project. Staff has placed the item on the next Landmark Commission agenda and was requesting feedback from the RDRC on the changes.

Acting Senior Planner Allen referenced the approved plans and stated that instead of the small round window on the front the applicant was proposing to make a small arched window to match the others. On the south elevation they had two windows framing the fire place and the other two stepping up. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there is a stair well that goes up across the wall. One of the issues is when it gets framed out there are plates that get constructed. So essentially they would run the top plate to the bottom floor and there would be a different framing system at that location. When they framed it they raised it to the same height and essentially matched it.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that on the turret they had proposed seven windows. They changed the window size and only framed four windows with a lot of space in between them. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that when there is a turret with windows they have either a wider window or a narrow window, but it is more symmetric in terms of the window and the spacing.

Acting Senior Planner Allen asked the Committee if they believed the modifications were consistent with the plans and the preservation guidelines and style. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the issue to consider is whether or not they built it to plan. The next issue was whether or not the project was consistent with what was reviewed and approved by the RDRC and Landmark Commission. If the RDRC determined that the project was different or inconsistent with the previous approval, then the question would be whether they felt it was consistent with the design guidelines.

Committee Member Cha asked if the windows got wider when they were changed from seven to four windows. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the windows got slightly wider, but what added more substantial concern to Staff was that the space between the windows increased.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that the applicant stated that when he went to purchase the windows he could not find 16 inch wide windows. He could only

find 2 foot wide windows, and they take up more space, which made the structural area between the windows harder to address.

Committee Member Daybell stated the windows were not consistent with what the Committee had approved.

Committee Member Lynch believed that it was a deviation.

Committee Member Daybell believed that the turret needed the seven windows that were approved.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that the modifications were not consistent and should have been brought back for consideration before the work was started.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the back unit's second story stairs as approved would have a stucco wall encasing a curved stair. The applicant was now proposing a straight stairway constructed of, steel and concrete, with no walls. Staff is not in support of the change. Acting Senior Planner Allen explained that typically exposed Spanish style railings have decorative railings and decorative tile; or they were enclosed with stucco walls as originally approved.

The RDRC Members believed that the project was not consistent with what they approved and would not support the modifications.

Committee Member Daybell requested that Staff provide the criteria for setbacks to property lines in preservation zones. He also requested that Staff set up a briefing on a future agenda for RDRC, Planning Commission and building inspectors to go over the "Preservation Guidelines" with help from Fullerton Heritage.

Committee Member Lynch requested an update on Jefferson Commons student housing project. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the project was pending and needed to go in front of the Planning Commission. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that she found color vinyl windows and aluminum windows on the internet, contrary to the applicant's statements.

MEETINGS:

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided a summary on two items on the City Council Agenda. He stated that Cherk Restaurant was requesting a Type 47 ABC license. As a result of that request Council requested that Staff prepare a modification to the Ordinance which would allow the City Council to approve restaurants in the Restaurant Overlay District requesting Type 47 ABC licenses.

The "SOCO Walk" has 26 units to construct. Due to the cost of placing the high voltage utility lines underground, the applicant asked Council for a deviation from that condition to provide alternative conditions instead.

AGENDA FORECAST:

Next meeting will be September 27, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:33 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susana Flores
Clerical Assistant