

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

June 26, 2008

4:00 PM

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

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Cha, Committee Member Daybell, and Committee Member Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairman Hoban and Committee Member Silber

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman and Clerical Assistant Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present, to APPROVE the May 8, 2008 and May 22, 2008 minutes AS WRITTEN.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Item No. 1

PRJ08-00123 – ZON08-00040 APPLICANT AP FUNDS I, INC AND PROPERTY OWNER: SUNRISE VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER A request for a Minor Site Plan application to remodel the façade at Sunrise Village Shopping Center at 1801-1895 N Euclid (located on the southwest corner at the intersection of N Euclid and Rosecrans) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that the project previously came before the Committee on April 24, 2008; the RDRC had expressed concern with the architecture of the design. Acting Planning Manager Eastman referred to the two prior project designs and stated that the Committee had asked the applicant to prepare an alternative "Plan B" design of a more rural, country, or equestrian nature. The project architect prepared a Plan B design that came back to the RDRC on June 12, 2008. The Committee expressed concerns with the design and asked the applicant to consider revisions again. The most significant concern was related to the tile roof. Acting Planning Manager Eastman referred to the middle elevation on the plans and stated that the roof was shown as a Mediterranean tile (orange color). He stated that the property owner is planning on using the existing tile (grey, flat tile). Acting Planning Manager Eastman referred to a photo of the site and stated that the RDRC was concerned with the pitched roof and stone not matching with the Mediterranean style architecture and preferred a metal roof instead of the tile roof. There was also no resolution from the previous meeting for the two corrugated metal tower features. As a solution, the applicant has provided revised elevations; the tower elements were removed and there were changes

to the gables in the middle of the project. Where the tower element was before, the structure profile would show a gable. There was also some reduction in the stone to reduce the weight of the mass in the middle of the structure and some of the coopula's (little roof structures on top) have been removed. The revised design is a simpler architecture and gets back to the core of what the building is. The architect has also expanded the amount of wall face on the major tenant space. The middle elevation had very little stone between the columns and the roof, and the revised design has provided more wall for signage. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that the applicant has pulled an existing roof tile and has brought it in for the RDRC's consideration. He has also brought in a new veneer sample, which is greyer in color.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that staff is recommending support of the project. This project is not located in a redevelopment area, so it is not a Community Improvement project. He stated the project has been brought before the RDRC because it is an important site for the community. He stated that the use of the metal roof, from an aesthetic standpoint, would reflect a unique architecture and reflects back to a rural setting. The existing tile has a neutral pallet and is a good alternative to the metal. The applicant also has concerns with the cost of putting the roof in. Staff recommends approval of the submittal, likes the simplification of the design, and thinks it fits with the residential character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lee, Project Architect, stated that he met with the owner of the property; the owner was concerned with the construction cost because the original design was more cost effective than the other two revised designs. The owner thought the corrugated metal roof looked cheaper than the existing roof material and wanted to keep the existing roof material; he did not want to use corrugated sheet metal on the building. Mr. Lee stated that because of the owner's concerns, he simplified the design and eliminated the corrugated towers. He also revised the elevations to accurately show the existing grey tile. He referred to a sample of the cultured stone and stated that the new sample was a little grey, but thought the original sample was better than the new one. He also stated that the color pallet is reflective of the original design.

Vice Chairman Cha thanked the architect and stated that he wished to hear from the public.

Public hearing opened.

Denny Bean, Fullerton resident, asked if the Committee solely dealt with appearances of redevelopment design projects and Vice Chairman Cha answered affirmatively. Mr. Bean asked if the Committee dealt with signage and if signage could be bi-lingual. Vice Chairman Cha replied that staff could address the signage issue. Acting Chief Manager Eastman clarified that there were legal limitations in terms of regulating content in signage. He stated that City Code does not specify what language can be put on signage, nor limits the content of signage. Mr. Bean asked if he would be able to distinguish one business from another when driving by the shopping center. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that these concerns have been expressed to staff by other residents, and that staff has indicated these concerns to the property owner and sign contractor; staff believes the property owner understood the concerns of the neighborhood. He stated that a sign program has not been included yet for this project and the City is restricted, based on the First Amendment, which limits staff's ability to tell the property owner what language can be displayed on the signage.

Mr. Bean stated that his wife attends one of the spas in the shopping center and there is a no-competitive clause in her contract. He stated that the shopping center is putting up

another spa and he wanted to discuss the issue of breaking leases. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated it was not within the purview of the RDRC to discuss the breaking of leases, which is a civil issue between two private enterprises. Mr. Bean stated he had not heard about any lawsuits regarding leases, but asked that if a lawsuit were to come up, would the redevelopment of the center be stopped. Acting Planning Manager Eastman answered that the façade remodel would not be stopped. Vice Chairman Cha stated that the Committee is to review the design itself; the issue of cost is not within the purview of the RDRC.

Mr. Bean stated that the neighborhood desperately needed a market. Acting Planning Manager Eastman clarified that concern had been expressed to the property owner and the project architect. The property owner is aware of the community's desires for a higher-end market, such as a Trader Joe's or Whole Foods. There has been a discussion with the Redevelopment Agency in regards to encouraging or shopping around for market tenants. The site has one major tenant space (the Imperial Spa, which is in Plan-Check) as well as a CVS, which has an on-going lease with the center. Mr. Bean stated that his understanding was it did not matter if the lease was expired; tenants were still going to be pulled out of the center. Committee Member Daybell stated that it is not an issue for the RDRC.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were any more comments from the public.

Paulette Marshall, Fullerton resident, asked if it was within the purview of the Committee to discuss the size or the placing of signage. Vice Chairman Cha stated that the sign plan would be separately treated by staff and staff can decide, under the limit of the City Code, what can be done with the signage.

Ms. Marshall asked about the trees on the property and stated they were severely trimmed, which impacts the starkness of the parking lot. She asked if there was a plan to trim or remove the trees. Acting Planning Manager Eastman clarified that the landscape issues have not been submitted for review by the RDRC, but a condition has been recommended that if any changes were made to onsite landscaping, it should require the submittal of landscape plans to the Director of Community Development. A recommended condition provided to the RDRC states that the existing mature trees should be preserved to the greatest extent feasible and new landscaping should be designed with consideration to reduce water consumption. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated he understands the property owner has no intent to remove the existing trees or landscaping and has recognized they are established, mature trees. He stated that the trimming of the trees is the property owner's responsibility. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated he had not visited the site to observe if the trees have been severely trimmed.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Marshall asked if the façade remodel design carried over to the existing CVS tenant space. Acting Planning Manager Eastman replied that the property owner does not know what will happen with the CVS because there is a lease on the space. He was told that if CVS wants to be released of their lease, there needs to be another tenant to replace them. Without knowing what the new tenant and design is, it is still unknown what will happen with the space. It is up to the Committee to provide direction to staff on whether the design for the CVS space should come before the RDRC. The design theme provided can easily be carried over to that building, should it be remodeled.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated that the design is much improved from the previous designs; while it is not his ideal project, he stated there are some cost concerns and budget constraints, so the project design looks to have come as far as it will go. He stated it was acceptable for the neighborhood and is better than not having anything happen to the center. He stated he would like to condition that the CVS be remodeled, if it should change tenants in the future, so that it will be consistent with the rest of the project. With that condition, he would like to move forward with an approval.

Committee Member Daybell stated he had doubts with what will be accomplished and does not see a revitalization of the shopping center. He stated he will not stand in the way of what the applicant wants, but does not see the design as an effective way to revitalize the center. He stated that the comment Mr. Bean made about signage is a tender issue; while the City cannot make the owner include signage that everyone can read, it will be to the benefit of the applicant to listen to what the public is telling him. He stated that the property is presently distressed and not an inviting place for the public to go and may continue to be this way when the remodel is finished. Committee Member Daybell stated he will support Committee Member Lynch, but is doubtful of the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated he agrees with Committee Member Daybell, that the remodel won't revitalize the design like the Committee was hoping, but if the owner wants to spend money on the center, he should try to remodel the structure.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he agrees that this is not a major remodeling of the structure, but more of a "face-lift". He stated that he likes the changes made; the tower is becoming part of the building and the color scheme is consistent with existing. He stated he thought this design is better than the existing design.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman asked if the Committee had any comments on the stone that has been provided, or feel that either samples are appropriate.

Committee Member Daybell stated he has no comments because it will be a "patch-job" regardless of what is done and will leave it up to the owner.

Committee Member Lynch stated he thinks the stone with the shiny flecks gives an extra dimension but still has his doubts on the project; he does not feel that needs to be a condition of approval.

Committee Member Daybell stated he would support Committee Member Lynch's condition regarding the CVS building.

Committee Member Lynch motioned to approve the project with the condition that when CVS changes hands, the exterior needs to be redone and the tenant improvement plans are to come before the RDRC.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project, subject to the CVS condition and staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman clarified that the change of tenants would not be within the purview of the Community Development Department because it is a change of business license. However, prior to issuance of any building permits for the tenant improvement, the CVS would come back for review by the RDRC for a façade remodel.

Committee Member Daybell stated that any exterior modifications to the building should come before the RDRC for approval.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Committee Member Lynch thanked the public for their comments and stated that he wished there was more the Committee could do in regards to the signage and landscaping. He stated that as a resident, he shared the same concerns.

Mr. Bean stated that when he moved to Fullerton 29 years ago, the shops were more enticing and provided a bigger selection of merchandise as compared to the stores today. Shops that have recently occupied the center have often failed, and he stated he does not hold a lot of hope for the center. Committee Member Lynch stated that commercial space is dominated by familiar, national brands and the small shops tend to fail more frequently. Mr. Bean stated that markets don't survive in the neighborhood but the community needs one. Vice Chairman Cha stated that the RDRC cannot adjust what is going into the center. Committee Member Lynch stated that if there is a particular store that the public wants to see come into the center, call the store and let them know the public wants them to come to their neighborhood.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that when a shopping center solicits a tenant, the store has certain demographics they look for (density, economic range, competitors, etc). Trader Joes, for example, uses very unique criteria as a guide for opening a new store. They do not locate stores within a certain distance of an existing store. Most of the Fullerton people shop at the Brea store so they will not relocate in Fullerton. Mr. Bean stated that this occurs by happenstance because if there was a Fullerton Trader Joes, the Fullerton people would shop at the Fullerton location. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated the concern was that when a property owner goes to a store, trying to fill tenant spaces, it is not really showing demand from the store's clientele. If the City approaches the store, it has a different weight because the City represents the public. However, many Cities are trying to maintain a certain expectation that may not actually be there. It is better when residents approach the stores and tell them they want the store in their location and would shop there. The City will do their part to make contacts and encourage the property owner to open his doors to spaces that local tenants would frequent, but he encourages residents to become organized and tell the retailers there is a public demand. Mr. Bean stated he has made it known to the manager of Trader Joes that the public wants a Trader Joes in Fullerton. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that the City has spoken with Trader Joes in regards to them coming to Fullerton. Mr. Bean stated there are high-income areas in Fullerton that would frequent high-end retail stores. Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that retailers can't be forced to come to the area but the desire has been expressed that the neighborhood needs a market and there is a certain synergy that a market can bring.

Ms. Marshall thanked the Committee for spending the time to go through all the details of projects. She stated that all the effort speaks highly of the time and quality of comments the Committee is able to give. She stated she believes the remodeling of the

center is going to make it look much better and the neighborhood is very thankful that there is a commercial center on the site rather than more condominiums.

Vice Chairman Cha thanked the public for their comments.

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that the Planning Commission meetings will now be televised. The City Council adopted the budget for fiscal year 2008 and 2009 at the last meeting and funding was included for a person to sit in the video room and handle the camera. The taping of the meetings will start in July and will be videotaped/web cast simultaneously. Committee Member Lynch asked if there will be archives on the web of the televised Planning Commission meetings and Acting Planning Manager Eastman answered affirmatively.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that Planning Commission Staff Reports are available online on the City Council webpage.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that an email had been sent out regarding vacations for summer. A meeting in July will potentially be canceled.

**MEETINGS:**

The Planning Commission reviewed the Amerige Court proposal. There were four members present and three absent. The Commission voted 4-0 to recommend approval of the addendum to the Environmental Impact report, but voted 3-1 to not approve the development project. Acting Planning Manager Eastman discussed the votes.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman stated that the Landmarks Commission approved a demolition of an existing building on Francis Ave, near Hillcrest Park, which is in a potential Landmark area.

Committee Member Lynch asked if it was a residential unit and Acting Planning Manager Eastman answered affirmatively. He stated it was one house built on two lots. He said the demolition was approved; however, the two buildings originally submitted to go along with the demolition didn't meet code and the architectural style was not good enough for staff to review and approve over the counter. The RDRC will need to review the project in relation to the architectural detail and the compatibility with the Potential Landmark District.

Acting Planning Manager Eastman discussed the other three items on the Planning Commission's Agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 6:18 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Nadia Muhaidly  
Clerical Assistant