

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

September 27, 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: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting  
Senior Planner Allen, and Clerical Assistant  
Flores

**MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by  
Committee Member Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting  
members present, with Vice Chairman Hoban abstaining, to APPROVE  
the August 9, 2007 minutes AS WRITTEN.

**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 September 13, 2007)

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the original request proposed to eliminate all on site parking because the site plan was affected. City council decided that the applicant could not eliminate all on site parking, and approved a concept that retained 6 on site parking spaces. The existing single story building will be remodeled to individual restaurant spaces. There will be structural I-beams added that will support the structure, which will act as patio covers for all the tenant spaces. The applicant proposed an oval cabinet sign suspended from the patio cover for each of the interior spaces. A larger sign would be facing Chapman to identify the property. The Moratorium that was established requires that patios for outdoor dining on private property be reviewed as a Minor Development Project.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if they would be allowed to load service trucks from the public right-of-way parking area if the parking issue were to change. He also asked if the parking issue was the reason the element of the canopy area had been removed. Senior Planner Allen stated that the canopy was removed to facilitate deliveries on-site. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the previous project required that the delivery and service be provided on the City parking lot. When Council reviewed the revised site plan that included 6 parking spaces they approved the proposed parking spaces based on the fact that there would be parking, deliveries and access on-site.

Chairman Duncan asked if the on site deliveries was the reason for the removal of parking spaces. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the removal of part of the overhead was needed for delivery access.

Committee Member Daybell asked if Condition #8 regarding the hours of operations was in the purview of the RDRC. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the moratorium in place requires review of outdoor patio areas by the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that hours of operation are in the RDRC's purview as it relates to reviewing any project. When there are concerns with the design of a project which merits conditions of operation. However, the hours of operation are established in the moratorium, cannot be deviated from by the RDRC, and staff feels that what is provided through the moratorium is adequate and appropriate.

Committee Member Cha asked what the building to the west was. Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that it was a two story office building.

Committee Member Cha asked if there was a lighting plan. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff had not received a lighting plan. There is a code requirement that all lighting be directed to not have direct glare on a public right-of-way and street.

Public hearing opened.

Cameron Irons, Property Owner, stated that the tenant spaces were reduced to four (from five) because of the demand for more space from the tenants. The palapa roof addition was requested by Chronic Taco, the tenant in front. Mr. Irons stated that there are functional problems with the ingress and egress and at some point in the future he intends to try to get an approval to provide an egress driveway into the City lot. He stated that the 6 parking spaces are in a dead end and he anticipates back-up congestion.

Committee Member Cha asked what kind of landscaping was going in on Chapman. Mr. Irons stated that the landscaping would be minimal and the elevation shows a berm going up to the walls. Mark Blumer, Crane Architectural Group, suggested a star jasmine plant but stated that their landscape architect would provide input.

Chairman Duncan stated that it appeared there was a rise in the elevation between the sidewalk and the patio. Mark Blumer stated that there was an 18 inch rise between the sidewalk and the finished floor of the building. They would place an 18-inch high wall on the patio level, and the top would be about 36 inches above the sidewalk. There will be berming up above that.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked what the finishes involved were going to be. Mr. Blumer stated that there was going to be pre-engineered steel columns and the stucco patio covers

between them will have recessed down lights in them. There will also be a palapa covering and a wrought iron fence going around the patios.

Chairman Duncan asked what the doors and windows would be. Mr. Blumer stated that they would be aluminum store front. He informed the Committee that the structural engineer suggested a gunite spray to see if additional texture could be added to the outside.

Chairman Duncan asked if the existing block wall finish would get painted if the gunite did not go through and the existing block wall was kept. Mr. Irons stated that the block walls would stay no matter what, and the openings were going to be enlarged with storefront windows.

Chairman Duncan asked what was going to happen to the sections that were not opened up. Mr. Irons stated that they would be painted, sand blasted or clear coated. He also stated that they did not have a color scheme at the moment.

Mr. Blumer stated that he was leaning towards a color scheme that would reference the materials. The steel will be a steel gray or rust color and the masonry will be some sort of stone color. The store front window system will be a natural anodized aluminum.

Chairman Duncan asked Mr. Blumer what he believed was appropriate for an existing wall that was non-Googie architecture. Mr. Blumer stated that masonry walls of a stone product of natural range materials would match the architecture. Mr. Irons believed that sandblasted and then clear coated block walls would compliment the existing wall.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if the patio surfaces were concrete or asphalt. Mr. Blumer stated that the patio will be concrete. Mr. Irons stated that it would be stained concrete or would be sand blasted.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if they were remodeling in the fashion of authentic Googie architecture versus a resemblance of the time. Mr. Blumer stated that the architecture was a unique design, but the elements were taken out of that era. Mr. Irons referred to the project as a modern interpretation of Googie architecture.

Vice Chairman Hoban believed that the elements that were brought into the project were modern, but the structural look stayed in the Googie fashion. He liked the modern elements.

Mr. Irons stated that he was leaning towards a welded steel railing versus the wrought iron, in an effort to make it a comfortable place.

Vice Chairman Hoban believed that sandblasting the block and sealing it was not traditional and could lend itself to a modern look. Mr. Irons stated that Mr. Blumer has done a good job at making the building look modern.

Chairman Duncan asked if the palapa patio cover was palm frond or an African reed material. Mr. Irons stated that it would be a layered fire rated commercial frond.

Chairman Duncan asked Mr. Irons what his thoughts were on the trash enclosure in the front of the building. Mr. Irons stated that Council directed the trash enclosure box be located where the trash disposal truck can get to it. Mr. Blumer stated that the texture and

color of the trash enclosure would match the building and would have landscaping in front of it. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that staff has recommended a condition that the design, material, and finish of the trash enclosure shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Community Development.

Vice Chairman Hoban asked if there was anything that could be done to incorporate the trash enclosure into the signage. He suggested using a Googie architectural element on the trash enclosure. Mr. Irons replied that he did not want to draw attention to the trash enclosure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there was a condition in which the applicant would need to submit a sign program for review and approval by the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced a sign in the plans and asked if the sign was a tenant sign, multi-tenant sign or site identification sign. Acting Senior Planner Allen indicated that she believed it was a site sign. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that typically tenants want signage other than what is provided as part of their leasing situation.

Mr. Irons stated that he did not want the trash enclosure to be big because it would block visibility of the center. He stated that his original plan was to put the trash enclosure in the back, by the canal and have it accessed from the City lot. That would be his goal in the future. Mr. Irons stated that he would like to get the project opened and operating to assess how things will work out.

Committee Member Lynch referenced the plans and stated that he did not see landscaping around the trash enclosure. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that there would be landscaping.

Mr. Irons stated that he would require landlord approval of all the patio furniture to make sure it all matches and fits with the theme. He stated there would also be palm trees in the separations between the roof overhangs.

Committee Member Daybell asked how far back from the curb it was to the property line. Mr. Blumer stated that the site plan shows a couple feet of landscape before the sidewalk on City property. Committee Member Daybell stated that a property setback is usually 6 or 7 feet beyond the sidewalk. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the City code requires a 10 foot landscape setback in commercial areas. However, the Central Business District allows for a reduction or elimination of that setback.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the retaining wall was on City property. Mr. Blumer stated that the retaining wall was on private property. Committee Member Daybell stated that there was a lot of design consideration still going on. Mr. Blumer stated that what was being discussed usually gets worked out on the construction drawings. Mr. Irons stated that he has spent a lot of money designing and redesigning and would like RDRC input and direction before he moves on with the design plans.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he was concerned with what he was looking at due to a recent experience with something getting built that was not what the RDRC approved. He stated that no one liked the trash enclosure and suggested putting a palapa roof on top of it to cover it up.

Committee Member Cha stated that he liked this site plan layout better than the previous one. He did not like the trash enclosure, and suggested covering it with a canopy so that

water will not wash the trash out onto the street. Committee Member Cha referenced the plans and stated he would like to see planters at the end of the patio. He stated that without the materials and landscape plans it was hard for him to say if he liked the project or not.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that he liked the previous design with the plaza better, but realized that maintaining the parking lot was an issue. He stated that the trash enclosure needed to be addressed. He believed the project was difficult to look at because the site plans were not complete and understood the applicant's frustrations with the process. He stated that he liked what the applicant was saying he was going to do rather than what he saw on the plans.

For the record Committee Member Lynch stated that he had worked as an entertainer for Mr. Irons when Mr. Irons owned Rock'n Taco, but that was several years ago. Committee Member Lynch stated that he was a fan of "Googie" architecture. He suggested sandblasting the exposing block of the original structure and clear coating it. He asked if the structural design could be approved with a deferred submittal of the hardscape and landscape plans.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that as currently proposed the landscape plan needs to be submitted to the Director of Community Development for review and approval.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he would like for the RDRC to review and approve the landscape plans. Committee Member Lynch suggested that the applicant consider the wood siding as used at the Camp in Costa Mesa in lieu of the block, stucco and steel.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, to APPROVE the project subject to submittal of hardscape and landscape plans.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he would like to continue the project so the applicant can come back with answers regarding the railing and landscaping.

Mr. Blumer asked if the design could get approved and everything else would get answered in the construction drawings.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that staff would typically recommend a condition that landscape plans be reviewed by the Director. In the past, landscape plans have come back to the RDRC Committee for review at their request. Staff also recommends that a material board be brought back to the Director for review and approval. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that if the Committee wanted to approve the project tonight, materials and colors need to come back for RDRC review and approval prior to the issuance of permits.

Chairman Duncan stated that he liked the discussion on not trying to match the existing building to the new one, and making it more modern. He believed that the two buildings wings at an angle were set up nicely. He suggested that the palm trees be higher than all the elements on the project. He also recommended that the north wall of the trash enclosure that faces Chapman be curved in and pushed back forming a funnel in order to eliminate the box look. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there are space limitations based on code requirements for driveway widths and parking. Chairman Duncan stated that everything would stay the same, and the flat wall would just be curved in.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that staff would not recommend adding a roof or adding additional height to the trash structure out by the street, which would block the rest of the center, and make it difficult to place trash in the bins. Staff would look at the possibility of reducing the height of the trash enclosure so it is not as prominent. He stated that there are things that can be done with the shape of the wall as well as signage to potentially match the other side of the driveway.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban to APPROVE the project subject to staffs recommended conditions and final review and approval by the RDRC Committee of hardscape and landscape plans.

Vice Chairman Hoban stated that the trash enclosure details, and hardscape, and landscape plans need to come back for RDRC review and approval.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that conditions number 3 and 11 shall be modified so the plans come back to the RDRC Committee for final review and approval. There was also a condition added that material board and color palettes be submitted to the Committee prior to the issuance of grading and building permits.

Committee Member Lynch recommended a sandblasted, clear coated block as the main finish. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the RDRC can give the applicant direction as to what their concerns are via the prior discussions, and a motion does not have to be specific.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED by Vice Chairman Hoban to AMEND his motion to modify condition 3 and 11 to include final review and approval by the RDRC Committee. Motion passed unanimously with Committee Member Daybell abstaining.

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

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00403 – ZON07-00095. APPLICANT: JOHN J. SILBER. PROPERTY OWNER: JONATHAN E. LEGREE A request for a Minor Development Project to (1) demolish an existing 320 sq. ft. attached garage and construct a 685 sq. ft. addition including a 2-car attached garage and master bath, and (2) repair the existing front porch on property located at 423 E. Wilshire Avenue and 307 Newell Place in a residential preservation zone. (Generally located on the northwest corner of east Wilshire Avenue and Newell Pl.) (R-2P ZONE ) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303) (HAL)

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the site had two dwellings. The dwelling that fronts Wilshire was constructed in the 1920's and the unit that fronts Newell was constructed in the 1950's. The property is zoned R-2 and is in a Preservation Overlay. The request was to remove the existing undersized two car garage and replace it with a new garage. Currently there is a two car garage that attaches the two dwellings, and is accessed off of Newell. It is approximately 15 feet in length which is too short to accommodate a car. The applicant was proposing to build a garage that was the same width and would increase in length to meet the current standards for parking. The request also included adding a master bath and closet to the master bedroom to create a consistent roof line for the three buildings. The site plan currently shows a 19 foot setback from Newell of the garage, which does not meet the code requirement of 20 feet. Staff was in support of continuing the project to allow for re-notice of the application to include a Minor Site Plan setback

reduction request, that would allow the 19 foot setback rather than the 20 foot that is required.

Acting Chief Planner clarified that staff was recommending a 19 foot setback for the garage versus 20 feet because it makes more sense from a design standpoint. Staff was in favor of the one foot reduction. Nineteen feet is adequate to allow on-site parking.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the existing elevation that connects the dwellings to the garage on Newell Place has a sliding glass door. That door will be removed and a window will be constructed to match the adjacent window on the Wilshire dwelling. There are also windows proposed on the west side of the structures, and there is a condition that the trim detailing be consistent. The applicant is also proposing repair of the front porch, and damaged siding on the dwelling where needed.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the Committee could approve a 19 foot setback at this meeting. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that a 19 foot setback could not be approved at this meeting because the public had not been noticed for the 19 foot setback reduction. Staff is recommending a continuation to allow notice pursuant to State Law.

Public hearing opened.

John Silber, Architect, stated that Mr. and Mrs. Legree agreed to all the recommended conditions including the 19 foot setback. He stated that the suggestion of the ribbon driveway was a good idea even though it was not a condition.

Committee Member Cha asked if the parking space on the side of the driveway was needed. Mr. Silber stated that it was a temporary condition until the applicants can have a practical garage.

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage stated that the project looked good. She had concerns with the sliding glass door until she found out it would be replaced with a window. She believed it was reasonable to ask for a reduction on the setback to make the garage functional. She believed a ribbon driveway was important in this case so it can break up the mass of the cement element that was not typical of the 1920's.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha, to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of October 11, 2007 to allow for noticing of the 5% garage setback reduction. Motion passed unanimously.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Katie Dalton, Fullerton Heritage thanked Chairman Duncan for writing a letter to the Planning Commission on the 201 N Lincoln project. She also thanked Committee Member Daybell for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the RDRRC Committee. She also stated that the 218-222 project was reviewed by the Planning Commission. Ms. Dalton believed that the RDRRC's comments that the original elements were important were helpful

in the Planning Commissions decision. She stated that those two projects were very important test cases of the process and design guidelines in Preservation Zones.

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman informed the Committee that he had discussed with the Director of Community Development for in house discussion and training of the building inspectors for preservation areas. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the plan check process and changes to the process, including highlighting the plans and stamping them "Historic Preservation Area".

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the Self-Realization Fellowship Church, Remax Building at 1441 Brea and the Providence Center Phase 1, which were reviewed by the Committee, were complete.

**MEETINGS:**

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Planning Commission had concerns about the lack of landscaping on the wall at the Elks Lodge. The City is holding temporary certificates of occupancy on some of the units until the problem is resolved.

**AGENDA FORECAST:**

Next meeting will be October 11, 2007

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Susana Flores  
Clerical Assistant