# MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL THURSDAY. 10:00 A.M., MAY 17, 2007

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order

at 10:16 a.m.

<u>COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT</u> Eastman, Lopez, Voronel, St. Paul, Petropulos,

Tabatabaee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT Allen, Kusch, Wolff, Pasillas

# APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the May 3, 2007 minutes.

The following items were heard out of order.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

PRJ07-00173 – ZON07-00032. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: IN C. HAN. A request for a minor site plan for a 9% reduction of the required front-yard setback (from 43'-0" to 38'-4") for a proposed 1,733-square-foot, single-story addition to an existing residence located at 122 Ramona Drive (between approximately 700 and 800 feet south of Arroyo Drive) (R-1-10 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Continued from May 3, 2007) (AKU).

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief background on the project and explained the concerns that the Committee had expressed at the previous meeting. He presented drawings the applicant had provided, in which the requested front yard setback had been increased from 34'-4" to 38'-4".

The Committee Members compared the old drawings with the new drawings presented today, and were unclear on the location of the decreased building dimensions. A linen closet had been removed, the hall had been narrowed, and possibly the bedrooms had been reduced in size. There were several discrepancies on the plans, which made them difficult to read to understand the request.

Public hearing opened.

In Han, the applicant explained that he had worked with his architect to reduce the setback reduction. He had spoken with his architect about the possibility of a split level floor plan, as discussed at the previous meeting, but had decided it would not work for his family. He was unsure of where the building reductions had taken place, and was unable to answer the Committee's questions regarding the changes made to the drawings.

5-17-07 1 SRC

## Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman explained that the current front yard building setback requirement was 43'-0", and the applicant had asked for 38'-4", although this was not reflected in the floor plans. He clarified that the minimum front setback for this zone was based on the average of the adjacent properties. The residence to the north has a 34'-0" front yard setback, and the residence to the south has a 51'-0" front yard setback. The average front yard setback for the adjacent properties is 43'-0". If this proposal was not before them at this time, and the applicant's neighbor to the south proposed a building addition, their residence's minimum front yard setback would be based on the adjacent property's 56'-0" and 18'-0" front setback, resulting in a minimum average setback of 37'-0". If Mr. Han waited until after his neighbor built an addition to the average front setback, the allowed setback for Mr. Han's property would be the average of 37'-0" and 34'-0", which would be 35'-6" and below the 38'-0" requested today.

Chairman Eastman stated that the Pico-Carhart design guidelines were important to maintaining the neighborhood, and the applicant had made every effort to meet the guidelines. The proposed addition was single-story, the garage was not moved up to the street, a hip roof was included to reduce the building mass, a front porch created a sense of activity and open space, and the revised plan reduced the building height. He believed the design was sensitive to the guidelines even though the applicant was proposing a large home.

Committee Member Tabatabaee agreed that the applicant had made an effort to meet the guidelines by changing the roof pitch, and based on the scenario presented by Chairman Eastman, he would support the project.

Chairman Eastman clarified the requested conditions: 1. Clarify that the Committee was approving a single-family residence, 2. Require landscaping along the frontage due to the extended height of the single story and raised foundation, 3. The project be in compliance with the discussions as related to the plans, i.e. hip roof, etc.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the project with conditions as stated.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00118 – ZON07-00019. APPLICANT: EUGENE VORTMAN; PROPERTY OWNER: SUE LIU. A request for a minor site plan review to operate a small collection recycling facility behind the Target store at the Fullerton University Shopping Center on property located at 2910 Yorba Linda Boulevard (southwest corner of Yorba Linda Boulevard and North Placentia Avenue) (C-2 zone) Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE) (Continued from April 19, 2007).

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief background on the project. This was the third time the project had come before the Committee, and at the previous two meetings opposition from the neighbors had been expressed. At the previous meeting it had been suggested that the applicant look at locating the recycling facility at the Albertson's, since that would be the center of the convenience zone. Planning Technician Jenkins explained that he had reviewed the property and it appeared that there was room to locate the facility there, but the applicant had stated that he

spoke with both the property management company and the property owner and both were not interested in having the facility on their property.

Acting Senior Planner Allen described the conversation she had with the State regarding their requirements.

Public hearing opened.

The applicant, Eugene Vortman, described the steps he had taken since the last meeting. He had spoken with the property owner at the Albertson's location, and had chosen not to speak with Ralphs since he did not believe it was a suitable location for a recycling facility. He explained the convenience zones and how the Target location would serve both Ralphs and Albertsons.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what would happen if this location was not approved, and Mr. Vortman stated that the convenience zone would be unserved, meaning that all beverage retailers in the area would be required to redeem recyclable beverage containers within their stores, provide an onsite recycling facility, or be fined \$100.00 per day by the State.

Public hearing closed.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that during her conversation with the State they had mentioned some of the perceived problems cities encountered and the typical conditions that were used with this type of facility. One in particular was to have the recycling facility closed on the day of trash pick up so as to not encourage people going through the trash looking for recyclables.

Committee Member St. Paul commented that there was no one from the public present, and asked if the public had been re-noticed. Planning Technician Jenkins responded affirmatively. Committee Member St. Paul supported the location and believed that requiring the facility to be closed on trash day was a good idea.

Committee Member Voronel supported the proposal.

Committee Member Lopez believed this was the best location.

Committee Member Petropulos did not agree with the location and believed the facility should be located at the Albertson's since it would be serving them.

Chairman Eastman believed that this was the best location for a facility that was mandated by the State. He did not think that the neighbors concerns would be significantly heightened because of this facility.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez and CARRIED 5-1, with Committee Member Petropulos voting against, to APPROVE the project with conditions as stated; 1. Limit the facility to two bins, 2. Facility will be closed on trash day, 3. Graffiti will be removed in a timely manner, 4. A 24-hour contact phone number will be posted at the facility, 5. No additional bins or equipment will be stored on site, 6. Facility will comply with all ADA and Building Codes.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

Committee Member Tabatabaee left the meeting.

PRJ07-00209 – ZON07-00040. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: ROBERT M. KOONTZ. A request for a 20% reduction of the rear yard setback from 15 feet to 12 feet, for a detached habitable pool room, on property located at 1625 Tyler Drive (north side of Tyler Drive, approximately 300 and 375 feet east of the Tyler Drive cul-de-sac center) (R-1-7.2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

Chairman Eastman gave a brief description of the project. He explained that the home was located in the Presidential Collection, a gated neighborhood. The applicant had prepared a plan and submitted to the City for a detached pool room, and in reviewing the proposal as a habitable space it was too close to the rear property line. The pool was existing and created a site constraint. Code would require a deed restriction to be recorded that this would not be a second dwelling unit as they did not meet the criteria for a second dwelling unit; this was not intended to be a second dwelling unit. The neighbors had been noticed and no complaints had been received.

Public hearing opened.

Lori Koontz, the applicant, requested to change from nine foot walls to ten foot walls.

Committee Member Voronel asked if there were any public easements on the property, and Lori Koontz, the applicant, responded that there was an easement for a well in the backyard, but that would not have any effect on this project.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman believed there was justification for the reduction in setback, he did not have a problem with the ten foot height, and the windows all faced the interior of the lot so there would not be a noise issue with the neighbors behind.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that based on the constraints of the pool, he was in support of the setback reduction. Committee Member Lopez, and Committee Member Petropulos were also in support.

Committee Member Voronel was agreeable with the request as long as nothing would be built over a public easement.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Petropulos and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the project with conditions as stated.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

**PRJ07-00193 – ZON07-00039**. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: YUNG S. KIM. A request to install a security fence on property located at 701 S. Harbor Boulevard (southwest corner of South Harbor and Elm Avenue) (C-H zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU).

5-17-07 4 SRC

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project. Pictures of the property were shown and the existing fence that was in question was identified. The adjacent neighbors had been notified and no concerns had been expressed.

Public hearing opened.

Yung Kim, the applicant, stated that there had been a fence on the property and he had replaced it as a way to prevent vandalism and graffiti.

Committee Member Voronel asked Mr. Kim if he had added the driveway, and Mr. Kim stated that it was an existing driveway. Committee Member Voronel asked if there was a gate in the previous fence, and the applicant responded that there was not a gate.

Committee Member Lopez asked if there would be a lock on the gate at night. The applicant stated that the gate would not be locked.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what type of lighting was on the property, and the applicant responded that there was lighting near the entrance and between the buildings.

Chairman Eastman asked the applicant if he intended for the gate to remain open or closed, and the applicant responded that it would remain open unless he was going to be away from the business for an extended period of time.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Voronel expressed concerns with cars entering through the gate on Harbor Boulevard creating a traffic problem. She believed it would be best to keep the gate closed and post a "No Entry" sign on the gate.

Committee Member Lopez indicated that a pedestrian gate would be required to allow unobstructed egress to the public right-of-way.

Committee Member St. Paul was concerned with having a gated entrance on Harbor Boulevard and creating a vehicle stacking problem. He also did not believe a three foot fence would provide security, and thought security needs could be better met with additional lighting.

Committee Member Petropulos would like to see a fence only with no gate at the Harbor Boulevard driveway.

Chairman Eastman believed that the gate on Harbor Boulevard would likely be opened from the inside, as an employee arriving at the business would probably enter through the alley. He commented that allowing a gate on Harbor Boulevard would set a bad precedent. He also expressed concern with Elm Avenue gate blocking the sidewalk or required building access door. He thought that this gate would help prevent unauthorized people from using the trash dumpster.

Committee Member Lopez stated that the side door may not be required for access.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the project with the following conditions: 1. Fence surrounding property was allowed by Code, gates on the side and rear of the

5-17-07 5 SRC

property were agreeable, but there would not be a gate at the Harbor Boulevard driveway, 2. Required to meet Code regarding outdoor lighting., 3. Standard Fire Department Knox Box and address provisions apply.

## OTHER MATTERS

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** 

Chairman Eastman invited the Committee Members to Joel Rosen's going away party. He also updated the Committee on recent City Council action regarding outdoor dining permits.

None.	
Adjour	ned at 12:44 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.
BY:	
	Janelle Pasillas Secretary