

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

August 28, 2008

4:00 PM

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban  
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner Allen, Planning  
Consultant Wolff, and Clerical  
Assistant Muhaidly

**MINUTES:** MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by  
Committee Member Silber and CARRIED unanimously by all voting  
members present, that the minutes of the regular meeting of July  
24, 2008 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

The following items were heard out of order.

**ITEM NO. 1**

**PRJ07-00354 (ZON07-00077, ZON07-00086, ZON08-00077, LRP07-00010, LRP07-00011) PROPERTY OWNER: EASTSIDE CHURCH** A request for a site, architecture and preliminary landscape review of a proposed church expansion adding approximately 30,000 sq. ft. net building area (62,000 sq. ft. new construction less 32,000 sq. ft. demolition) on property located at 2505 Yorba Linda Blvd. (northwest corner of Yorba Linda Blvd. and Almira Ave.) (R-1-10 Zone) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner Wolff)

Planner Wolff gave a brief overview of the project. She stated the project is an expansion of Eastside Church. The property is 8.35 acres. Several applications have been filed in conjunction with the request and will be reviewed by City Council and Planning Commission. These applications include a Conditional Use Permit for a Master Plan to expand the church (resulting in a 30,000 net square foot increase in size), a Major Site Plan to consider the site and architectural design, a Variance to allow a reduction in the required setback along Almira Avenue, a General Plan revision to re-designate two residential properties from low density residential to religious use, and a

Development Agreement to assure project implementation over an extended period of time. The RDRC will focus on the site plan and will review the landscaping, architectural and site design. The property contains about 90,000 square feet of development. The project will not change the sanctuary structure, but most of the remaining structures (the classrooms and other gathering areas on site) will be demolished and replaced. The development will take place in four phases, over a period of 12 years. The first phase includes the demolition of two residential structures that front on Almira Street, construction of a 12,000 square foot children's worship center, a fellowship plaza, and a change in parking and vehicular access. Phase two includes a demolition of the two remaining church owned, former residential structures and construction of a new fellowship hall. Phase three includes the demolition of an existing fellowship hall, classrooms, and replacing a modular classroom building with new classroom buildings. Phase four includes the construction of two new education buildings. Planner Wolff passed the presentation along to the applicant, who presented the details of the church remodel.

Tom Leatherby, Eastside Church Planning Committee, referred to a photo of the present campus and identified the present location of the auditorium, the fellowship hall, the parking lot, and four residential structures. He stated the current location of the auditorium will not change, the fellowship hall will be removed, and new buildings will take the place of the fellowship hall and the existing parking lot. The parking will be relocated on-site, adjacent to Almira. The church asked the architect team to go around Fullerton and examine which buildings were cherished in the city, successful in Fullerton, and were new coming into the community.

Mr. Leatherby stated that the church wanted to come up with a look that would fit with the community. The church didn't want the future design to look like a collection of buildings, but be warm and inviting. There will be access into the second floor of the auditorium. Mr. Leatherby presented a video of the church property through the four phases of construction. The children's facility, with the in-door-out-door, meet-and-greet area on the first floor, will be the first structures built. The outdoor area will progress up through the main paseo. There will be a water feature in the congregating area. Through the paseo, there will be a community area/natural congregating area. Mr. Leatherby stated that the church will contain many shading areas and planting to provide a warm and friendly area to congregate, as well as a new community center around the main paseo. The community center will be a multi-purpose building and will take the place of the fellowship hall. With this center, there will be less noise bleed than at present. A children's facility will be constructed in phase one. Inside, will be all the new amenities available in children's worship. The facility will be a warm, safe, and stimulating design to better enable children to learn. Exiting the children's center, will be Palm Court, which will be a nice area for shade, with many plantings that will buffer sound and light. The court will be a warm and inviting place for the campus.

Committee Member Daybell asked if there would be parking along the street and in the parking lot when it is relocated closer to Almira. He asked if the parking situation would be an issue for the neighbors when there are large gatherings. Mr. Leatherby stated that, currently, there is parking along Almira (as there has always been). Limited parking will exist along Almira Avenue, but most people will be using the church lot, California State University's parking lot, and the College of Optometry's lot. Committee Member Daybell stated he had asked this question due to the elimination of the driveways in front of the houses. Mr. Leatherby addressed the situation. He stated that when entering Almira off of Yorba Linda Blvd, in reference to the church's main driveway, cars make a left into the

driveway and a right out of it. He referred to a photo of the four residential homes that are owned by the church. He stated that a berm will be implemented, with ground plantings and trees. Mr. Leatherby stated the church wants to mitigate a parking look for the area as much as the neighbors do. He stated that the Planning Committee tried to view the project from the neighbors' perspective, because if the church owned a home in the neighborhood, they would want a nice drive coming up the street. Going up the street, there are two homes that are presently in the way of the view, but once they are removed, the parking will be on level with Almira.

Mr. Leatherby stated that the church had consulted the neighbors before the planning process because they wanted to know what kinds of things the neighbors would be interested in before starting the project. He referred to a photo of the view from one of the neighbor's houses. Mr. Leatherby stated that one neighbor was concerned about her long-range view because on a clear day she can see Catalina Island, as well as the Disneyland fire works at night. Consequently, the church wanted to leave the view untouched as much as possible. Neighbors were also concerned about the sight lines, equipment, power lines, services, and general look of the roof tops, which the church wants to alleviate as much as possible. Noise was also a concern. Currently, the noise is amplified off of a parking lot, but the project architect came up with a new design to mitigate noise. Mr. Leatherby referred to a photo of the new site design. He stated that the long-range sight line remains the same, everything is at the base of the steeple or below, with the exception of one tower. Everything is removed from the rooftops with the exception of one roof top, which has been dressed up with sound baffles, and an architectural feature, which would mitigate air conditioning noises and other mechanical equipment on the rooftop. One small architectural feature will remain on the rooftop, with everything else left nice and clean to eliminate eye sores. Secondly, the community area, paseo, and congregating area is inside the building, which will block sound more than trees and landscaping; although, landscaping will be utilized as well. The church wants the site to be a jewel in the neighborhood and not an eyesore.

Mr. Leatherby referred to the expanded view of the church, looking from north to south.

Committee Member Silber asked if the view of the photo before the last was taken from the parking lot level and Mr. Leatherby answered affirmatively.

Vice Chairman Cha referred to a photograph of the overhead view of the church and asked if an air conditioning unit would be placed on one of the rooftops. Mr. Leatherby stated that only the rooftop on the far right would contain an air conditioning unit. Mr. Leatherby stated he would defer further questions about the air conditioning units to the architect.

Terry Jacobson, Project Architect, stated that the roof top equipment would be shielded by screen walls, trellises, and sound mitigation. The central form that was referred to by Vice Chairman Cha would be the location for some equipment.

Mr. Leatherby referred to photographs of the neighbor's homes from east to west elevations, and photographs of the church from east, west, south, north elevations. He referred to a photograph reflecting three of the four phases of construction; the highlighted blue sections represented the first phase construction areas. He stated that, currently, the pre-school area is located on the east side of the campus; the preschool would be removed and relocated on the west side, adjacent to other school areas and activities. This relocation, plus the relocation of the welcome greeting area (currently under a large, white tent) would also free up the space to create the in-door-out-door-meet-and-greet area.

Committee Member Silber asked if the parking across the bridge was the church's property. Mr. Leatherby stated that the church owns approximately 20 feet out from the creek and California State Fullerton owns the rest of the lot. Committee Member Silber asked if the parking across the bridge was paved and Mr. Leatherby answered no.

Mr. Leatherby stated the other two construction phases shown on the photograph would be completed as funding permits. Mr. Leatherby deferred any further questions to the lead architect, Terry Jacobson.

Mr. Jacobson stated that the design materials and colors used exhibit a warm, craftsman-like treatment to the building. The natural stone would be used on the existing and new building to match. The enhanced pavers are used in the landscape plaza, and an enhanced exterior room is created between the buildings.

Committee Member Silber asked if Mr. Jacobson could comment on the choice of shading devices as gone from the phase one to the phase two building, going up through the central space on the second floor level, facing west. Committee Member Silber stated that there is a trellis structure on the south facing side, and overhangs on the first floor; on the second floor there are small awnings over fenestration, but there are deeper shading devices going further back. Mr. Jacobson stated that the theme of this structure was to be a village of buildings. While there are threads of continuity in terms of coloration and other elements, there is also a variety in terms of these treatments. Along the balcony promenade there are different treatments as one proceeds from the south to the north end of property. There is another structure that is like a trellis, a pergola element, as well as the slope drifts, and the awnings. There are also shade sails, which are at the main entrance (the meet-and-greet area) and at the paseo itself, where the awnings are stretching between the two buildings.

Committee Member Silber asked if the decision to use the green and the blue was because the architect didn't want to take away from the corner treatment. He asked for the reason the design is more restrained in the phase one shading device. Mr. Jacobson stated that the phase one is clearly much more developed, and that is one of the reasons phase one contains large elevations. He stated that a lot of time had been focused on the phase one elevation, and so it shows a lot of maturity in the development of the design idea.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if that tower at the entrance is a bell tower. Mr. Jacobson stated that it was not a bell tower; it houses a staircase that winds up to the second level. It is a theme tower and gives some visibility from the corner of Yorba Linda and Almira. He stated that trees along the creek bed hide the church. Consequently, the tower was made to be a landmark element and ties the church into the more important structures in Fullerton.

Committee Member Lynch asked what material the balustrades in the phase one building will be built out of. Mr. Jacobson stated that the columns, or extension of the columns, is a pilaster with a pre-cast cap, and the infill is an ornamental iron infill.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the overhang on the east side, that looks like a wood trellis structure, would be wood. Mr. Jacobson clarified that the overhang was on the south side, and that it would look like a wood trellis, but actually be painted tube steel.

Committee Member Silber asked if there is a retaining wall along the edge of the building on the east elevation. Mr. Jacobson stated that the grade of the parking lot is ascending from south to north, and it parallels Almira, which is also ascending. There is a retaining wall condition against the building in that area. As the design has developed the wall

was eliminated. In the new 2007 code, the number of exits out of the A2.1 occupancy down below went down by one, so they could simplify that.

Mr. Jacobson referred to the parking that is just to the south of the church, and added that the church has a reciprocal agreement with California State University Fullerton for, the property across from Yorba Linda, and the grass lot south of the creek. The School of Optometry also has a documented reciprocal agreement. The church has well beyond the required parking onsite, in conjunction with these additional agreements, which should reduce the need for people parking on the street.

Committee Member Silber stated that one of the nicest aspects of this location in the city is the fact that it is hidden. He stated that the grass parking lot seems to work really well for the church and the city. He asked if there were any discussions about using something other than asphalt for the lot, especially for the kind of use where it is intensive at certain time of the week; he suggested using turf block. Committee Member Silber also asked if any green or sustainable design-LEED type principals were applied to the project. Mr. Jacobson stated there has been a number of green type products applied to the project. In terms of the parking lot, it is out of the church's control because it is California State Fullerton's property. Committee Member Silber said he was reversing his question, and asked if the church could use something other than asphalt on their lot. Mr. Jacobson stated that the church had considered using permeable asphalt, but haven't come to that point yet. He explained that in Phase one-A, the main lot on Almira is not even part of the scope, but it will be evaluated from a green standpoint and durability standpoint at a later time. Turf block has been considered, along with green roofs and other approaches, but it has to be sustainable and work economically.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he would hate to see the lot across the street from California State Fullerton paved. Even though the area is dry currently, the lawn softens the entry to the City of Fullerton, and it would be a mistake to make it into hardscape. Committee Member Lynch stated that he concurred with Member Daybell.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he saw construction and concrete parts in the water channel and asked who had the responsibility of maintaining that area. Planner Wolff stated that she was not sure who had that responsibility, but would check with the Engineering Department. Vice Chairman Cha stated that it was important to keep the area clean, especially if there was going to be a construction process near by. Committee Member Daybell clarified that the channel area was controlled by Orange County Flood Control. Mr. Jacobson added that Fish and Game has influence on that area as well.

Public hearing opened.

Sylvia Marder stated she is representing her parents, Helen and Phillip Sands, who live on Almira Avenue. She stated that her parents' home overlook the church. Her parents have lived there for many years, and they will be over looking all of the construction and new buildings. Her parents are in their 80's, they like their house, and they like their view. She stated that there are many issues with the project that pose a concern for her and her parents. She stated that besides all of the lovely water treatments, there are a lot of buildings jammed into one section and it begins to look like a shopping center. She stated that she is concerned about the awnings, the flags, the finished lighting, and the noise 12 years of construction would produce. One of the main concerns is safety. There is no street light in the corner of the street, and there is a crossing guard every Sunday. If the area was safe, there would be no need for a crossing guard. She stated that the

last time lighting was addressed with church, the answer was very vague. With the warm and inviting place the new church will be, it will attract a larger congregation, and with more people, will come more cars and more parking. Ms. Marder stated that another problem is the parking due to the narrowness of the street. She presented photographs exhibiting the parking issues to the RDRC. She acknowledged the demolition of the four residential houses, but stated this issue is a problem for the residents that still live in the neighborhood. She noted that there have been a few times when people have driven down the street at a high speed and run into a neighborhood fence; she believe this to be due to the narrowness of the street. Ms. Marder added that the Almira street parking is supposed to be restricted to two hours only, but the public does not respect this limitation. Consequently, during Sunday family gatherings, there is no room to park. Her parents are concerned at their advanced age that they will have to put up with 12 years of noise, construction, etc. Her parents also look right over the building with the HVAC unit, and she is concerned with this aspect.

Senior Planner Allen clarified that while parking is a concern, it will be more in the purview of the Planning Commission and the City Council. The RDRC deals with the site plan and architectural design, such as the location of the buildings on the site and how the air conditioning will be screened.

Bob Shrader, Almira Avenue resident, stated that he lives on the north side of Almira. He stated he was not contacted about the church project, and believed the church only contacted the neighbors who overlook church. He stated he was concerned with the church site plan. His main concern was sight distance; he noted that when cars drive around the street corner, there is a driveway very close to the curb as well as a downstream driveway. Cars do not tend to acknowledge the driveway and the fact that there are homes down that street. He stated that when leaving the neighborhood, residents slow down at the entrance to church, but it doesn't seem like non-residents know there are homes down that street. It is a large concern, as it is the residents' only way in and out of the neighborhood. Mr. Shrader stated he would like to see the que of the left turn pocket, and maybe a signal in the future, with a traffic study. Right now everyone would rather park on the north side near the church, as opposed to across the street on State College and have to walk the street. He noted that the houses have a current setback from the street, with landscaping in between the sidewalk and the houses. A ten to fifteen foot berm is being proposed. He believed the berm would make the area look more industrial, as opposed to residential. Mr. Shrader stated that even though the buildings are nice, and he likes the church, there is an aesthetic concern about viewing the neighborhood.

The meeting was stopped in the City Council Chamber and resumed in the Council Chamber Conference Room.

Kimberly Greco, Fullerton resident, stated that she lived on a side street off of Almira Avenue. She stated one of the reasons for purchasing her current home was because of the secluded and welcoming characteristics of the neighborhood. She stated she had many concerns with the project. Two major concerns were parking and safety issues, but stated she understood it was not within the purview of the RDRC. She was also concerned with problems entering and exiting her neighborhood due to the increased traffic brought on by the future church. Ms. Greco stated that this was the first she had heard of the plans for the church and was not contacted before the RDRC meeting regarding the church reconstruction. She stated a 1930's home was taken down in her neighborhood and it ruined the structure of the area. She would not want to see that happen to the rest of her neighborhood. The berm sounded like a good idea, but she

asked if it would really keep the neighborhood intact. She hoped the parking area shared by California State Fullerton and the church would stay intact due to the wildlife and nature preserved by the greenery. She is concerned that the area is departing from a quaint neighborhood, which is the reason she was brought to Fullerton.

Vice Chairman Cha thanked Ms. Greco for her comments. He clarified that the RDRC is limited to discussing the landscape and architectural design aspects and that the parking issues are within the Planning Commission's purview. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he had driven through Almira Avenue and did not see a "No Outlet" sign until after he had reached the end of the street. He suggested having at least one side of the street restricted to residential parking only and was confident other solutions could be attained through the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairman Cha asked the architect if he wanted to respond to the public comments and Terry Jacobson, Project Architect, answered affirmatively.

Mr. Jacobson addressed Ms. Marder's comments. He stated that the roof top air conditioning units would be shielded from view and mitigated in terms of noise. He stated that the unit is located farther over from the resident's house than indicated by the resident.

Bill Thompspon, Administrator, referred to a photograph exhibiting the future church layout and indicated the location of the rooftop in which the air conditioning unit would be located. He stated it would be located much further west than implied by the resident. The building located closer to the resident would not contain an air conditioning unit.

Mr. Jacobson addressed another concern in regards to the landscape. He stated the client is going to meet with the neighbors located uphill from the church to ensure screening is provided where they prefer and no screening is provided where they want their distant view to be preserved. He stated that in prior comments, the residents indicated they were interesting in low-scale landscaping, while other residents were interested in larger scale landscaping on the slope. He stated they will be addressed individually and provided mitigation accordingly.

Mr. Jacobson stated he would not address traffic issues and parking because they were not within the Committee's purview. In terms of safety issues, he stated he intended to have a clear access in and out of the parking lot adjacent to Almira, which would moderate safety issues for those residents rounding the corner of Almira and coming down the hill. The church is also open to restricted parking along Almira, which was included as part of the traffic study. In regards to the berm and landscape treatment along Almira, berm, hedges, and trees will be used as landscape, which is 17 feet in width from the back of the pedestrian sidewalk to the parking lot. By keeping the sidewalk continuous along the edge of Almira, the 17 feet of landscape is able to be maintained. The owner has discussed the idea that during phase two, when the landscaping and parking lot are constructed, he would be interested in under-grounding the utilities, which would eliminate the poles and such things that would obscure views and require the sidewalk to "zigzag" in and out.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were anymore public comments.

Bill McCormack, Fullerton resident, asked if there would be intentions of putting another building on the northwest corner where there is an existing playground. Mr. Thompspon replied that there were no plans to construct a building in that location.

Another resident asked how it would be safer when driving around the corner because there is not adequate sight-distance coming around the corner. Mr. Jacobson asked Planner Wolff if sight-distance was studied by the traffic engineer. Associate Planner Wolff stated that she believed the engineer did look at site distance. Vice Chairman Cha stated that these concerns could be discussed with the engineer.

Joan McCormack, Fullerton resident, asked how many parking spaces were going to be in the new development. Mr. Jacobson stated there will be approximately the same number of spaces as there are presently. The church has relationships with California State Fullerton and the School of Optometry in terms of parking and is in negotiations with the grass lot area, which is immediately adjacent to the bridge access across the creek. Mr. Jacobson clarified that the seating capacity of the sanctuary and the size of the school are not being changed. The new facilities are for ministry to children and replacing an obsolete fellowship hall building. Essentially, they are duplicate buildings that are being demolished and replaced. He stated that even the houses function as offices for the church, and through this new development, the offices would be consolidated and put into a building.

Vice Chairman Cha thanked Mr. Jacobson for his explanation and stated that any further concerns with parking need to go to Planning Commission.

Committee Member Silber asked if the back edge of the new building, that would replace the fellowship hall in phase four, was closer to the residential neighborhood than the previous building. Mr. Jacobson stated that it will be further away from the residential area than the previous building. Committee Member Silber asked how much further the building was from the residential area in comparison to the previous structure. Mr. Jacobson answered that there are 35 vertical feet between the residences above the slope and 123 horizontal feet from the top of the slope. Committee Member Silber asked for the net difference in distance between the two buildings. Mr. Jacobson stated he did not have that information. Mr. Thompson referred to a current photograph of the church and clarified that, presently, the road in back of the fellowship building that goes around the church has a single lane with no parking. When the building is complete, there will be approximately 40 feet of additional parking, as well as a double lane to provide further distance from the new building to the residential area.

Committee Member Silber asked if the existing slope would be changed and Mr. Jacobson stated that the slope would not be changed.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were any other questions.

Committee Member Silber asked what the net build-out would be in square footage. Planner Wolff stated that the net additional build-out is 30,000 square feet.

Committee Member Silber asked if the parking met code. Associate Planner Wolff stated that the parking for the sanctuary is parked per code on their site. Once the California State Fullerton lot is paved, it will accommodate more vehicles.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked the expansion plans but said there needed to be another traffic study for an alternative to entering and exiting Almira Avenue. He stated he sees a lot of traffic in that area already with college in session. He stated that he did not want the grass lot on Yorba Linda Blvd. paved because it is would be detrimental from a green standpoint. It is the only area on the property suitable for low impact development. There is no other place to soak water into the ground other

than the creek and the grass area on the south side of the street, where the slope area would pose a problem. He stated that other than those factors, he liked the architecture of the buildings. He stated he does not know if there is alternate solution to the safety issues with Almira, but it should be studied further.

Committee Member Daybell asked how many people attend the church. Mr. Thompson stated that approximately 2,200 people attend the church over four services each week. Committee Member Daybell stated that something needs to be done about the access and egress, because the character of the Almira area is being altered from a residential to a village character.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he could support the overall land use and site plan. He stated that it was not the church's fault that many people want to attend the services and need to park on the street. Committee Member Lynch stated that he does take exception to the design of the structures because they seem out of character in comparison to the existing structures. He stated that the mid century modernist low roof line integrates well with the landscaping and provides an enclave characteristic. However, the other structures resemble a large retail center. He stated he would recommend to Planning Commission to approve the land use, but condition that the project return back to the RDRC for further design review.

Committee Member Silber stated that he feels the site planning is trying to be sensitive to the neighbors. He stated that moving the buildings more towards the center to create an interior public space for the community is nice. He noted that the strength of the project is at the site planning level. He stated that the existing sloped roof building of the fellowship hall is not particularly great, but a gabled roof building with metal instead of a parapet might not be an attractive view for the neighbors.

Committee Member Silber stated that the reason he was asking about the treatment of shading devices on the phase one building is because there are many shading and softening devices exhibited throughout future phases, but few treatments on phase one. During the first phase, the building seems to pop up out of the arcade walk-way system at the base of the building. He suggested that perhaps there can be a different profile for moving through the phases, but realizes there are cost issues.

Committee Member Silber stated he is glad to see the final landscape plans conditioned to come back to the RDRC. He suggested using landscape to soften the parking lot areas, such as permeable pavement, grass crete, sufficient tree wells and trees that will screen the parking area. He suggested implementing some of the arbor and trellis elements into the landscaping. He stated that he liked that the landscape is set into the site and the use of change in topography. He liked the landscaping of the temporary parking lot the church and the university share, because it is landscape during the week as well as a parking lot for the church events.

Committee Member Silber stated that the future fellowship hall will have a more attractive roof profile than what is there now. He noted that the structures in Fullerton, such as Plummer Auditorium, should not drive the architecture too much, as they are not from this time, and he does not place a great deal of importance on them in relation to this project. The things that should drive the architecture are things like the roof scape, trees, and trellises. Committee Member Silber stated he is not opposed to see the project approved with the landscaping conditioned to come back, but would be interested in hearing thoughts about whether the roofline should change (either to a gable roof, eco-roof, have different material colors, etc.)

Committee Member Silber stated that the overall site plan is good, and if the first building will not intrude into the neighborhood too much, then the project will be incremental. Because there is a lot of time to refine the project, as the church raises the money, features such as an eco-roof or an attractive roof profile should be incorporated into the design. He stated that his advice would be to not rush through the construction phases, get the building up, and wait a bit longer until the church can afford an eco-roof or an attractive roof profile.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he is confident the residents will find a way to keep the "village" characteristic of the neighborhood as well as resolve the safety issues through the other committees. Vice Chairman Cha stated that he loved the design of the project, and thought it was very beautiful. The change of the church will take time to get used to, but because the design is so beautiful that it should not take long to adjust. He stated that an HVAC unit on the roof is always an eye sore. It should not be exposed at all from the resident's side. It should be a high parapet or cased in. He stated that the asphalt should be softened from the resident's view, whether it is by coloring part of it, or adding landscape. He stated the parking lot plan should come back to the Committee along with the landscaping plans.

Committee Member Silber stated that he realized these kinds of projects are always tough for the neighbors when there is an interface between the uses; however, he is pleased to have a religious/cultural institution come before the Committee. He stated he would move for approval of the staff recommendations and conditions and would be interested in other members who would second discussing the roof design, or take note of recommendations for future phases.

Committee Member Lynch asked to see the rendering of the building.

Committee Member Silber stated he thought the roof of the sanctuary was better than the roof of the new buildings. Committee Member Lynch stated he liked the slope of the sanctuary, its low roof line, and low eaves for shade.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he would second Committee Member Silber's thoughts and would agree that there should be a less harsh looking roof; it would be a better view for the residents above the church. Committee Member Silber stated that the idea is to set up the entrance sequence with a one gable roof, which he appreciates. He stated that he thinks the second floor shading devices over the doors are a little too thin. He asked if they should have the architect address that one issue.

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Jacobson stated that he thought shading devices on the westerly façade would enhance the look of the building. He stated that coming back with each phase and taking into account what was heard today, in terms of the treatments, would enhance the structure.

Senior Planner Allen noted that each phase is not conditioned to return to the RDRC. She suggested adding a condition that each phase comes back to the RDRC for approval of the architectural detail and to address issues as the project evolves.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the project was over a 12-year span and Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively. Committee Member Lynch stated that he thought that conditioning each phase to come back to the RDRC was a great idea because things change over the years. Committee Member Silber stated that he thought that was a great idea as well.

Committee Member Silber asked if the landscaping of the parking lot was already conditioned to come back to the RDRC and Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Silber motioned for approval of the project, with staff conditions stipulated, with the additional conditions that the future phases come back to the RDRC for review, the treatment for the shading devices for the west elevations of the phase one building be reexamined, and the roof profile of the main building in phase one be reexamined.

Committee Member Lynch stated that the last time the Committee was this perplexed, they asked the architect to come up with a Plan B building design, and it significantly helped the situation. Committee Member Silber stated that was a good idea. Committee Member Lynch asked if the architect could come up with a Plan B for phase one that encompasses the comments discussed by the RDRC. Committee Member Silber noted that the Plan B should just focus on the cross section through the main building in phase one.

Committee Member Lynch stated he believed that the Committee is recommending to move forward with the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that they were moving forward and asked if anyone was against the project.

Senior Planner Allen asked if plan B should come back to the RDRC before or after the Planning Commission meeting. Committee Member Lynch stated that the Plan B design should come back to the RDRC after the Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations and the one additional condition. Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner Allen stated that this was a recommendation to the Planning Commission and the decision was not appealable. She noted the project was scheduled to go before the Planning Commission on September 24, 2008, and Consultant Planner Wolff can answer any questions.

The Committee took a five minute break.

## **ITEM NO. 2**

**PRJ08-00303 – ZON08-00093 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: LETICIA MONTALVO** A request for a Minor Development Project to add a 2nd dwelling unit and 2 enclosed 2-car garage structures on property located at 221 W. Valencia Drive, in a Community Improvement District (located approximately 300 feet east of Highland on the north side of Valencia Drive) (R-3 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner Allen)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. She stated that the project is in a Community Improvement District and on an R-3 lot, which permits more than two dwelling units. Mr. Montalvo is proposing to add a second dwelling to the property with the existing dwelling to remain. The lot offers some unique opportunities because it has street and alley access. The existing house is situated to allow for access off of Valencia to get to a garage in the back. The project is able to provide a four-car garage situation in two garages--one coming off of Valencia, and one coming off of the alley, which gives

the opportunity to have a better massing than typically seen on second dwellings off of the alley.

Public hearing opened.

Ignacio Ochoa, PE and partners with the property owner, stated that they were looking forward to the site plan and architecture of the original design, but could not conform to the development standards at the R-3 zone. He stated that they redesigned the project and then they came back to staff. Through staff's guidance and direction, they came up with the proposed plans. He stated that he was thrilled to have worked with Senior Planner Allen, who was wonderful in assisting them with the process. He stated he had developed many properties in Orange County and other cities, and it was seldom for him to work with someone as refreshing as Senior Planner Allen. Mr. Ochoa stated they had read and concurred with the recommended conditions of approval. They are looking forward to working with the City to ensure the project is approved and constructed quickly. In terms of construction, they intend to begin construction immediately--the funding is approved and there is a licensed contractor ready to start working on the project.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked that the existing house is going to be preserved and would support the project as presented.

Committee Member Lynch asked if they were willing to use all siding and no stucco. Mr. Ochoa stated that they were willing to use all siding; the cost is relatively the same. He stated they proposed to use stucco to reduce the monotony of the design, but if the Committee would prefer to use all siding, then they will comply. Committee Member Lynch stated that he thought it would be a better fit for the design to use all siding.

Committee Member Silber referred to the plans and suggested squaring off the entry door so the powder room would not be visible, but stated that this would not effect the approval of the Committee. Mr. Ochoa stated he appreciated the comment and would take the suggestion into consideration.

Senior Planner Allen stated she had discussed in the staff report incorporating clear-story windows on the side elevations. Currently, the windows are designed so there is not a privacy issue; they are facing away from the side, which means there are no windows on the side elevations. Clearstory windows could be installed 6ft or 8ft above the ground, which would still allow for light, ensure privacy, and add something to the sides.

Committee Member Lynch stated he would take no exception to the clearstory windows.

Mr. Ochoa stated clearstory windows were originally proposed in concept, and believed they would greatly enhance the building. They will take away from the long, wood siding walls. Committee Member Silber stated the windows will bring light in during the morning. Mr. Ochoa agreed and noted that they will also provide more light in the afternoon.

Vice Chairman Cha apologized for discussing the item second and Mr. Ochoa stated that it was no problem.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell moved to approve the project. Senior Planner Allen clarified that the added conditions were to add clear story windows and the wood siding.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED, by Committee Member Lynch, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner Allen explained the ten day appeal process.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comments.

**STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:**

None

**MEETINGS:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 5:37 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Nadia Muhaidly  
Clerical Assistant