

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

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

January 8, 2009

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:13 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS None
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner Eastman, Associate
Planner Hernandez and Clerical Assistant
Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Vice Chairman Cha, SECONDED by Committee
Member Silber and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members
present, that the minutes of the regular meeting of December 11, 2008
be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

The following items were heard out of order.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

**PRJ08-00439 – ZON08-00149. APPLICANT: ROY HERBOLD JR. AND PROPERTY OWNER:
FULLERTON METRO CENTER AND INLAND WESTERN FULLERTON METRO CENTER.** A
review of site and architectural plans for a proposed remodel, including building façade and
landscape improvements, of a commercial building located in a Community Improvement
District on property located at 1401 S. Harbor Boulevard (generally located on the west side of
Harbor Boulevard, approximately 250 feet north of Orangefair Avenue) (C-2 zone)
(Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Christine
Hernandez). (Continued from December 11, 2008)

Chairman Hoban noted that the applicant is not present, and asked staff if the proposed project
could be heard at this time, or if it should be continued. Senior Planner Eastman identified that
it was the RDRC's purview. He suggested that if the RDRC desires to approve the project with
substantial changes or major conditions, it would be in the best interest to do so with the
applicant's consent, or at least have the applicant's understanding of the restrictions. None-the-
less, any action by the RDRC is technically sound since the applicant has the right to appeal the
RDRC decision to the Planning Commission.

Associate Planner Hernandez presented the project and stated that the applicant was proposing two different schemes (Scheme A and Scheme B), which both took into account the comments made on the December 11th meeting. She discussed both schemes.

Associate Planner Hernandez referred to Scheme A and stated the scheme contained alterations from the original design, mostly in the east elevation, as a result of the Committee's concerns. She described the Scheme A changes and design features. She added the applicant did not provide the color pallet as asked.

Associate Planner Hernandez stated skylights were added near the calling cube area to create more natural light, but the RDRC's suggested clear story windows were not added to the design.

Associated Planner Hernandez referred to Scheme B and stated the applicant kept the faux windows on the east elevations and brought the windows up so that they are above the banding that goes around the building. She stated the applicant implemented the pronounced entry way and recessed lighting, as in Scheme A, as well as added natural lighting in the calling cubicles.

Chairman Hoban asked how many skylights were incorporated and Associate Planner Hernandez answered two.

Chairman Hoban asked if landscape plans incorporated trellis elements without any planting. Associate Planner Hernandez stated that staff had asked the applicant to consider removing the trellis elements because the applicant wanted to incorporate vines with the trellis. Staff has found that unless the vines are maintained, the vines become a maintenance issue.

Chairman Hoban asked if any RDRC members met with the applicant individually. Vice Chairman Cha and Committee Member Silber stated they met with the applicant. Vice Chairman Cha stated he had asked the applicant to have a window style design on the elevation facing Harbor Boulevard, versus a door design. He thought the revisions were good.

Committee Member Silber stated both schemes were improvements from the previous design. He stated he still did not care for the faux windows and thought Scheme A was clean and simple, and prefers it over Scheme B.

Chairman Hoban asked what about Scheme A was different from the original design. Committee Member Silber stated that the faux windows were eliminated, which was what he wanted to see. He stated he did not like elements that imply a false transparency to be incorporated in a design just to solve a compositional problem. He noted that if one pays careful attention to the windows, they may realize the transparency is false, and if the windows are not paid attention to, then there is no point in incorporating them in the first place.

Chairman Hoban agreed with the elimination of the windows, but stated he did not see a "reinvention" of the building by the applicant. Committee Member Silber stated he agreed, but accepted the design because it was cleaned up. He thought the project was small and the design competent.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he observed that other Bank of America buildings do not incorporate much detail, and work although unadorned and simple. He also noted foot traffic on Harbor was something that people should be concerned with, in terms of the design. He stated he preferred Scheme B or over A, but thought something in the middle would be ok.

Committee Member Silber stated that the proposed building faces obstacles due to the fact it is an existing building, is in an existing center, and has design parameters.

Senior Planner Eastman suggested there are some details, such as light fixtures, that could be added to the proposed building to create interest on the blank façade. Committee Member Silber suggested the applicant could have planted vertical trellis elements, or be creative with the landscaping and foreground.

Committee Member Lynch suggested continuing the meeting to the next meeting date and wished to study a similarly designed Bank of America on Valencia Mesa.

Committee Member Daybell stated he agreed with Committee Member Silber on the issue of the faux windows, but asked how Members felt about the foam cornice. Committee Member Lynch stated that he did not like foam but most people thought it was ok due to its high location. Committee Member Silber stated the applicant took most of the foam off of the original design due to the Committee's concerns over using foam material.

Chairman Hoban asked how limited the applicant was by the property owner. Committee Member Silber believed the applicant was more limited to the existing vocabulary of the center. Senior Planner Eastman stated that, historically, the property owner has tried to maintain the same identity in the center, and the property owner is likely dictating some of the architecture of the building.

Committee Member Daybell suggested continuing the meeting. Senior Planner Eastman stated it may be helpful to the applicant to provide comments as to what scheme is preferred and suggest enhancement for that scheme.

Committee Member Lynch stated he preferred Scheme A.

Committee Member Silber stated he preferred Scheme A as well, and also would prefer a more interesting landscape on the foreground in front of the building's blank wall. Chairman Hoban stated he also preferred Scheme A, but would like to see the design in context with the landscaping, as well a color pallet.

Committee Member Daybell suggested continuing the meeting until the landscape plan can be seen with the architectural plan. Associated Planner Hernandez stated the landscape plans are mostly sod and low-dwarf type shrubbery and plants. Senior Planner Eastman suggested ways to improve the landscaping.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he had the impression the applicant was just looking for ways to receive an approval from the Committee. He stated that it sounded like the RDRC, in general, preferred Scheme A, and if the desires of the Committee are expressed to the applicant jointly, he mostly likely will address these suggestions.

Committee Member Lynch suggested implementing mature landscaping into the design. Committee Member Daybell suggested continuing the project until landscaping plans, that would compliment the building and make the Harbor Boulevard side of the building more attractive, could be incorporated.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of January 22, 2009 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise landscape plans. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

The issue of reappointing RDRC members was discussed. Senior Planner Eastman stated the City Council decided to change the election process. He discussed the new election process with the Committee. He stated that applicants for the RDRC would be interviewed and ranked in terms of qualification by two members of the Council and the RDRC Chair. The ranking would be distributed to all the Council Members and RDRC Members will be voted in by the entire City Council.

Senior Planner Eastman stated the Code identifies that RDRC be requested to continue to serve in the Committee until reappointed or the position is filled.

Senior Planner Eastman stated that the code states a Chair and Vice Chair must be chosen at the first meeting in January.

Due to expired terms, Senior Planner Eastman clarified that the issue of electing a Chair and Vice Chair may be short term. Chairman Hoban asked if the Committee could vote anyone into Chair and Vice Chair, and then in a few months elect new members. Senior Planner Eastman answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Silber suggested the structure of the Committee should remain the same until it is decided who is to be appointed by Council.

There was discussion about the Council appointment process and RDRC terms.

Senior Planner Eastman clarified there needed to be an election of RDRC Chair and Vice Chair. Chairman Hoban asked if the Committee could look at reelecting the Committee in three months when it is determined by Council who will be on the Committee, and then appoint a Chair and Vice Chair. Senior Planner Eastman answered that the RDRC could vote to elect a temporary Chairperson and Vice Chair. He reiterated that their needed to be reappointments presently.

Chairman Hoban asked if Vice Chairman Cha would like the Chair. Vice Chairman Cha asked if Chairman Hoban was reelected as Chair, would it be considered his second term. Senior Planner Eastman answered affirmatively. Vice Chairman Cha stated he would like to stay Vice Chairman until the Committee Members are appointed by the Council, and the Committee re-elects the officers. He stated that because nobody new had been appointed yet, it would make more sense to stay in their current positions.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch NOMINATING Chairman Hoban for the short term position of CHAIRMAN. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch NOMINATING Committee Member Cha for the short term position of VICE CHAIRMAN. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Senior Planner Eastman discussed the changes of a previously approved project regarding the screening of Southern California Edison transfer station. He stated metal fencing around the substation is no longer possible due to the inability to ground the fencing, which is required for safety purposes. However, Southern California Edison indicated they would be okay with block wall screening, which staff is looking into. He stated there were also concerns that the public art should be flush with the block wall to prevent anyone from climbing over the wall to the facility.

Committee Member Silber provided suggestions as to what type of art could be incorporated in the screening, such as cast pieces. He described methods of creating alcoves in the wall using a 4-inch block within an 8-inch block "window".

Committee Member Daybell stated a railroad scheme incorporated into the art would be appropriate for the location.

Senior Planner Eastman stated Parks and Recreation previously suggested creating a metal frame that could be bolted onto the metal wall, which would make installation and removal much easier, as well as allow artists to design within a pre-determined parameter.

Committee Member Silber suggested fiberglass as an alternative to using metal material.

Committee Member Silber stated he preferred a light installation be used. Committee Member Daybell suggested using all fiberglass instead of block material. Senior Planner Eastman stated it may be difficult to get approval from SCE for a material other than block. He stated Southern California Edison has told him block is acceptable and they do not want lights on the wall. He stated staff will move forward with designing something that is of benefit to the community.

MEETINGS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant