

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FULLERTON PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL

WEDNESDAY

July 12, 2006

7:00 P.M.

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Savage at 7:00 p.m.
- PRESENT:** Chairman Savage, Vice Chairman Francis, Commissioners Bailey, Fitzgerald, Hart, and Musante, Thompson
- ABSENT:** None
- STAFF PRESENT:** Acting Director of Community Development Rosen, Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior Planner St. Paul, Acting Senior Planner Allen, Senior Civil Engineer Voronel, and Recording Secretary Pasillas.
- FLAG SALUTE:** Commissioner Hart
- MINUTES:** MOTION made by Commissioner Musante SECONDED by Commissioner Bailey and CARRIED unanimously that the Minutes of the June 28, 2006 meeting be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

ADJOURN AS PLANNING COMMISSION
CONVENE AS LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Items 1 and 2 were heard in reverse order.

ITEM 1

PRJ05-00730 – ZON05-00102. APPLICANT: MATTHEW HOWE; PROPERTY OWNER: ERNESTO R. SAVEDRA

Staff report was presented pertaining to a request for a minor development project to demolish an existing dwelling in a preservation zone and construct a 1,298-square-foot, two-story residence and a 450-square-foot dwelling unit above a two-car garage, on property located at 220 and 220-1/2 North Lincoln Avenue (east side of Lincoln Avenue, approximately 273 feet north of Wilshire Avenue) (R-2P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL).

Acting Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. The request included consideration for demolition of the existing dwelling. She explained that the two-story main dwelling will front on Lincoln Avenue. The main dwelling would total 1,298 square-feet, with a rear, alley-accessed dwelling of 450 square-feet over a two-car garage. There would also be an additional two open parking spaces. The existing building, that would be demolished, had some Craftsman elements, but many of the original details had been removed. As such, it did not contribute to the preservation zone neighborhood. An aerial view and elevations were shown as she explained the details of the project.

Acting Senior Planner Allen further explained that the Redevelopment Design Review Committee (RDRC) had reviewed the project three times, and ultimately unanimously recommended approval.

Staff presented the recommended findings. The new construction would be compatible with the College Park area, and the project met or exceeded the R2-P standards and criteria for evaluation of a development project.

Staff recommended the Landmarks Commission adopt the resolution approving the project, including both the demolition of the existing structure and the new construction.

Chairman Savage asked about the stucco finish, and Acting Senior Planner Allen responded that the finish was not a condition, but it could be added. Chairman Savage stated he would not like to see a rough finish. Commissioner Bailey agreed, and Vice Chairman Francis added that he did not think the applicant would use a rough type of finish on this style of building.

Public hearing opened.

The property owner, Ernesto Savedra, clarified that he intended to use smooth finish stucco.

Public hearing closed.

Commissioner Bailey stated that he had reviewed the project carefully and felt the architecture was important. He liked the details and design, and would support the project.

Commissioner Musante felt it was a good project and would be in support.

Vice Chairman Francis thought it was a nice improvement; he liked the architecture, and did not think the applicant would use any type of rough finish. He was in full support of the project.

Chairman Savage would like to add a condition requiring a smooth stucco finish, and Vice Chairman Francis and Commissioner Bailey agreed.

Commissioner Hart thought the project fit the lot well and would be better than the current structure. She would support the project and agreed to the added condition for smooth stucco.

Commissioner Thompson thought it was a good design, and did not want to condition the stucco finish, but since that was what the owner stated he was planning on doing he did not have a problem with it. He would support the project.

The title of Resolution PC-06-19 APPROVING a request to demolish an existing dwelling in a preservation zone and construct a 1,298-square-foot, two-story residence and a 450-square-foot dwelling unit above a two-car garage on property located at 220 and 220-1/2 North Lincoln Avenue was read and further reading waived. MOTION by Commissioner Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Commissioner Musante and CARRIED unanimously that said Resolution be ADOPTED AS AMENDED.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the appeal process.

ITEM 2

PRJ06-00185 – ZON06-00033. APPLICANT: BILL ANGELL; PROPERTY OWNER: DOUGLAS KNUDSON

Staff report was presented pertaining to a request for a major development project review of plans to demolish an existing 400-square-foot residence and construct two residential units with attached garages on property located at 201 N. Lincoln Avenue (northwest corner of Lincoln and Wilshire Avenues) (R-2P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. A diagram of the area and photographs of the existing dwelling were shown. He explained that the building had been modified, including the removal of the original windows and their replacement with sliders, and was nondescript with a lack of architectural details as typically seen in other homes within the preservation zone. The proposed site plan and elevations were also shown.

He further explained that the Redevelopment Design Review Committee (RDRC) reviewed the project on June 29, 2006 and recommended approval subject to staff's recommendations. There was no public opposition at that time. Fullerton Heritage was in attendance, and they were not in opposition to the demolition and they supported the single-story project as conditioned by staff.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that conditions were oriented toward the Wilshire/Lincoln intersection, as this was a prominent intersection in the College Park area. One recommendation was to create a front courtyard area with a low wall. The driveway with the garage fronting Lincoln would be a ribbon driveway with small bands of concrete and green landscaping in between to reduce the 16' dimension to something compatible with the code, and as recommended in the guidelines for a Preservation zone. Also, a decorative garage door, such as a "carriage house" style, was recommended. Staff typically would not recommend a garage as a main focus on Lincoln, but due to the corner location staff thought it would be acceptable here. Staff also recommended a feature tree on the corner as a decorative accent.

Staff recommended the Landmarks Commission adopt the resolution approving a major development project subject to staff's recommended findings and conditions of approval. There would be no adverse impact on the City's cultural resources, the proposed structure was consistent with the neighborhood characteristics and complied with the design guidelines for a residential preservation zone, and the proposed project was reasonably compatible with the area.

Chairman Savage asked what the Landmarks Commission was to decide; the demolition, the new structure, or both. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it would be both.

Commissioner Hart asked the coverage ratio on the lot, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it was substantially less than required by code. Lot coverage was 60% allowed. Commissioner Hart stated she had calculated 32%. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that lot coverage included the garage, driveway and footprint of the building. The floor area ratio, which was limited to 35%, included only the square footage of the habitable area. It did not include the garage or driveways.

Commissioner Hart asked what the setback requirements were. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the setback requirement for the side yards were a cumulative of 10', with a requirement for a street side setback of 5', which dictated a north side setback of 5'. Commissioner Hart

asked if it should be 10' on Wilshire, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that in a commercial zone it would be 10', but in a residential zone only 5' was required. Commissioner Hart asked if that was from the front of the house and Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that it was from the side street (Wilshire). Commissioner Hart asked if Wilshire was a fronting street and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that Wilshire was a 15' minimum front yard setback, but the house fronted on Lincoln. Commissioner Hart felt that Wilshire was an open street and the property fronted Wilshire as well. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the code dictated the front yard was the minimum street frontage, therefore, if there were two street frontages the one with the minimum dimension would be the front. Acting Director Rosen further explained that the narrowest portion of the lot was the front; therefore, the widest was the side yard on a corner lot. The code dictated the minimum required setback on Wilshire to be 5'.

Commissioner Hart asked if existing homes on Wilshire were set back further. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the code minimum on a side yard was 5', but the Landmarks Commission may require a greater setback in order to approve a project. The code-required minimum side yard was defined by default based on the definition of a front yard.

Chairman Savage asked about the open space calculation and if driveways were included. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that the driveway, the front and the side setbacks were not counted.

Chairman Savage asked the reason for the ribbon driveway. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that code required a maximum driveway width in a preservation zone of 9'; therefore, for a two-car garage two driveways would be needed side by side. A ribbon driveway allowed the applicant to meet the intent of the code by minimizing paving. The second reason was that the design guidelines for preservation zones encouraged front driveways to be ribbon driveways. Code for a preservation zone required only a one-car garage and one open space parking area, as an alternative. This could be done with a 9'-wide driveway, but it might not be as aesthetically pleasing.

Chairman Savage asked if the exterior would be stucco, and if so, what style of finish would it be - smooth or rough. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained a condition in the staff report that recommended smooth stucco; that condition had been further modified by the RDRC, who did not want a float finish or a dash finish (blown on).

Chairman Savage stated he was thinking of a Mission type finish. Vice Chairman Francis commented he thought that type of finish was called a Santa Barbara Mission finish. Chairman Savage stated he liked the look of some smooth and some rough. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the finish tends to be an artistic expression by whoever applied the stucco. The project will have a smooth, hand-applied finish, not a contextually rough finish.

Commissioner Bailey wanted to clarify that it would not be chicken wire and stucco blown on, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman confirmed that it would be a hand applied finish.

Public hearing opened.

The applicant, Bill Angell, from Blue Ribbon Design Building Contractors, stated he was available to answer any questions the Landmarks Commission might have.

Commissioner Hart asked why the plans indicated the front windows would be double hung while the back windows would be sliders. She wanted to know why the windows were not

consistent throughout the house. Mr. Angell explained that the wooden type window was typical of this architectural style. For cost reasons, since the rear of the building had no exposure to the public, it was decided to use a more economical style.

Commissioner Hart stated that the RDRC required all windows in a preservation zone to be double hung windows. Mr. Angell agreed with that requirement if the windows would be exposed to the public. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified staff's position, that the design guidelines discussed windows exposed to the street, and the need to maintain a community aesthetic, rather than true preservation. Staff typically required that windows in a preservation zone be "non-sliders". In this case, consideration was given due to the changes that had been made in the architecture and the other recommended conditions for the front of the building. Staff was willing to accept sliders because they would not be seen by the public. Fullerton Heritage had agreed with this trade-off, and they were normally the biggest critics of windows in a preservation zone.

Public hearing closed.

Commissioner Hart stated she was concerned with the long frontage and the setback on Wilshire, and she would like to see the windows consistent throughout the building. She felt that other properties were made to adhere to the design guidelines, and it was only two windows. She was agreeable with the rest of the project.

Chairman Savage was concerned with the setback on Wilshire as well, but after reviewing the plans and the way the buildings would stagger back towards a deeper set-back, and listening to staff's comment, he was no longer concerned.

Commissioner Thompson thought this was a great project, it was a vast improvement on the current building, and he was not concerned about the windows. He thought the preservation zone was intended to preserve the character of the building, not completely preserve the original building.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with Commissioner Thompson and would support the project.

Vice Chairman Francis thought it was a great project and would support.

Commissioner Bailey would support the project as written, although he would like to recommend to the applicant that they match windows throughout the home.

Commissioner Musante believed it was a good project and would support.

The title of Resolution PC-06-20 APPROVING a request to demolish an existing 400+ square-foot residence and construct two residential units with attached garages on property in a preservation zone located at 201 North Lincoln Avenue was read and further reading waived. MOTION by Commissioner Fitzgerald, SECONDED by Commissioner Musante and CARRIED 6-1, with Commissioner Hart voting no, that said resolution be ADOPTED AS WRITTEN.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the appeal process.

Chairman Savage called a recess at 7:36 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 7:38 p.m.

ADJOURNED AS LANDMARKS COMMISSION

RE-CONVENE AS PLANNING COMMISSION

OTHER MATTERS

COMMISSION/STAFF COMMUNICATION

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the Amerige Court project was moving forward. This was the project on West Amerige, the City parking lots. The elevations were coming to fruition, and a site plan and floor plan were close to being presentable. Two community meetings had been scheduled: one with the RDRC on July 27, 2006 at 7:00 p.m., and another meeting with the Planning Commission on August 9, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. This would be a workshop type meeting.

Chairman Savage asked if the public would be invited, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that in both cases the people on the mailing list and surrounding property owners would be notified.

Chairman Savage asked if parking was now more than proposed a year ago and Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the applicant hoped to provide 150% of the spaces that were currently available. The applicant was trying to accomplish this, although at this point the exact count was unknown. Chairman Savage asked how many spaces were currently available and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded 297, plus or minus.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there would be a regular RDRC meeting on July 27, 2006 at 4:00 p.m. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that regular items would be heard at 4:00 p.m. and the Committee would reconvene for this specific project at 7:00 p.m. so the public could attend.

Commissioner Bailey asked if the RDRC meeting would be a workshop or an actual approval process. Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it would be a workshop (study session and community meeting).

Commissioner Bailey asked why the project was moving at such a slow pace, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the developer was trying to meet many needs.

Chairman Savage asked what the format of a workshop would be versus a Planning Commission hearing. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that generally with a hearing, the developer would present the project and then the community would have an opportunity to express its interests, concerns, objections, etc. A workshop provided an opportunity for dialogue between the applicant and the community, as well as to ask the Planning Commission to provide feedback on the project.

Chairman Savage asked who would run the meeting and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that staff would moderate the meeting and run it as a community meeting, not a formal procedure.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman added that the August 9, 2006 meeting would have one item on the agenda for the 4:00 p.m. session, and the community meeting for the Amerige Court project would be held at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Thompson asked if Tuesday's City Council meeting would be at 7:00 p.m. and Acting Director Rosen responded that the meeting would begin at 7:30 p.m.

REVIEW OF COUNCIL ACTIONS

Acting Director of Community Development Rosen gave a brief report on recent City Council meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no one from the public who wished to speak on any matter within the Commission's jurisdiction.

AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be July 26, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Janelle Pasillas
Secretary