

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., AUGUST 16, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:16 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Eastman, Lopez, Voronel, Rebert, St. Paul, Tabatabaee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Allen, Kusch, Pasillas

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE the July 19, 2007 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ07-00359 – ZON07-00082. APPLICANT: GM ASSOCIATES; PROPERTY OWNER: ARTHUR R. NEGRETE. A request for a minor site plan to allow a reduction in the side-yard setbacks, not to exceed 20% of the requirement, on property located at 243 East Valencia Drive (north side of Valencia Drive, approximately 155 feet west of Lemon Street) (R-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (BSP)

Committee Member St. Paul explained the request and explained that the existing family room, bedroom, and office were not permitted. The applicant proposed to keep the same footprint and rebuild the family rooms to current Code. The west side of the building would not be touched. The property complied with lot coverage requirements.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how long the residence had been non-compliant, and William Gillespie, the applicant, responded probably more than thirty years.

Chairman Eastman asked if the office had a fireplace, and Committee Member St. Paul responded that it did, but it was not permitted. Chairman Eastman asked for clarification regarding the reduction would be, and Committee Member St. Paul stated that on the east side seven feet was required and the applicant had requested six feet. On the west side five feet was needed and the applicant had requested four feet six inches.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Gillespie explained that, during an electrical upgrade on the property, a City building inspector noticed the unpermitted rooms. The purpose of this request was to bring the property up to Code. The property additions had been done by the now deceased property

owner, and the current owner wanted to make sure everything was straightened out so there would not be any problems in the future.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Tabatabaee did not see a problem with the request since the existing footprint would not change and therefore it would not have an effect on the neighbors.

Chairman Eastman believed that some precedent had been set, no public concern had been expressed, and the applicant was acting in good faith.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez and CARRIED 5-0, with Committee Member St. Paul abstaining, to APPROVE the project.

Chairman Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00336 – ZON07-00071. APPLICANT: MORTEN MUNSER; PROPERTY OWNER: JACK C. CHOU. A request for a minor site plan review for a temporary 50' tall steel cell tower and a future cell site for Sprint/Nextel in a proposed building at the Jacaranda Apartment site on property located at 1900 Camino Loma (south end of Camino Loma, approximately 200 feet south of Rosecrans Avenue) (O-P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

This item was being heard with PRJ07-00339 – ZON07-00072, as they were the same request, just different carriers.

Chairman Eastman explained the request was to temporarily relocate the cell tower during construction of the Jacaranda Apartments to maintain cell coverage for the area. Permanent cell equipment had been approved and would be integrated with the building. The temporary location would be at the north-west corner of the property, near Rosecrans Avenue. The pole would be approximately fifty feet in height, and would be in the form of a "Cell on Wheels (COW)".

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how long the COW would be used, and Chairman Eastman stated it would be used during construction. Code allowed the Director to approve temporary structures up to two years, and staff recommended approval for eighteen months, with a six month extension if needed. Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how far it would be placed from the neighboring residences and Chairman Eastman responded approximately twenty feet.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the COW would be screened from Rosecrans Avenue, and Chairman Eastman explained that the entire project would be fenced and screened during construction. Committee Member St. Paul asked what type of noise the COW would emit, and Chairman Eastman responded that it would be hardwired, therefore a generator would not be used and the noise would be minimal.

Public hearing opened.

Jim Todaru, a representative for the applicant, explained that all equipment would be on the COW, and the only noise would be from a fan that was used to cool the system.

Morten Munser, from Sprint, stated that the location had been chosen because it was out of the way for the construction; it would work for the carriers, and was not too near the neighboring homes.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the COW would need to be tied down and Mr. Munser responded that it would be anchored with guy wires and their structural engineer would submit calculations.

Committee Member St. Paul asked how they would get power to the COW, and Mr. Munser responded that they would use a temporary power pole from the construction site.

Chairman Eastman stated that he had spoken with the Water Engineering Department and they had expressed concerns with the location as it might interfere with trenching for the water lines.

Chairman Eastman asked the applicant if eighteen months with a six month extension would be agreeable and Mr. Munser responded that it would. Derek Empey, the developer, asked what the start date would be and Chairman Eastman responded it would be the date cell tower permits were pulled.

Committee Member Lopez stated that fire access would need to be maintained.

Gail Dias, 1836 Camino La Vista, explained that her home backed up to the construction site. She stated that there had been digging in their cul-de-sac during the past week and wanted to know if it had to do with this project. Chairman Eastman stated that he did not know who was doing the work, but if it had to do with power it would be Edison. Committee Member Voronel explained to Mrs. Dias that she could go to the Engineering counter and find out who had pulled a permit for that work. She added that ATT had a project going in the City where they were installing more than one hundred cabinets for fiber optic equipment.

Mrs. Dias asked when permits would be pulled and construction started. Mr. Empey explained that they were in plan check now, and estimated they were sixty to ninety days from beginning. Mrs. Dias asked if there would be fencing around the COW and the construction site, and what type of barrier there would be between the site and the homes to the west. Mr. Empey explained that the site would be fenced, but there was an existing block wall between the site and the homes to the west. Chairman Eastman explained that there were certain procedures the developer must follow to prevent excessive dust and dirt.

Richard Dias, 1836 Camino La Vista, asked what type of security would be used at the construction site. Mr. Empey responded that there would be onsite management during the day, and night security would also be used.

Mrs. Dias expressed concern with the COW tower falling over into her pool. Mr. Munser explained the safety features of the COW and how it would be anchored to the ground.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Tabatabaee believed that the COW was temporary, stable, and did not emit much noise, and he did not see any problems with the relocation.

Chairman Eastman recommended the following conditions; approval for eighteen months with a six month extension, must comply with Building Code requirements, and the standard cell conditions.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez and CARRIED 5-0, with Chairman Eastman abstaining, to APPROVE the project with conditions as stated.

Chairman Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00339 – ZON07-00072. APPLICANT: T-MOBILE; PROPERTY OWNER: JACK CHOU. A request for a minor site plan review for a temporary 50' tall steel cell tower and a future cell site for T-Mobile in a proposed building at the Jacaranda Apartment site on property located at 1900 Camino Loma (south end of Camino Loma, approximately 200 feet south of Rosecrans Avenue) (O-P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA)

This item was heard with PRJ07-00336 – ZON07-00071, as they were the same request, just different carriers.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez and CARRIED 5-0, with Chairman Eastman abstaining, to APPROVE the project with conditions as stated.

Chairman Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00351 – ZON07-00076. APPLICANT: DENNIS CROGHAN; PROPERTY OWNER: STAN RHODES. A request for a minor site plan review for private golf lessons within a golf club assembly and retail business, on property located at 1841 West Commonwealth Avenue (north side of Commonwealth Avenue, approximately 650 feet west of Brookhurst Road) (C-M zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (BSP/MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins explained the request. The property was located in a light manufacturing zone, and the building was approximately 8,000 square feet, with two tenant spaces.

Chairman Eastman asked if there was adequate parking, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that he and Committee Member St. Paul had gone out to the property in the afternoon, and staff believed there was enough parking. Planning Technician Jenkins also noted that the plans indicated more parking than was actually there. He clarified that the site plan would need to be revised to reflect the Code and existing conditions.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the site plan presented was for 1871 W. Commonwealth Avenue, not 1841 W. Commonwealth Avenue. The site plan needed to be corrected, as did the drawings.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the building was sprinklered, and Stan Rhodes, the property owner, responded that it was not.

Public hearing opened.

Les Taylor, the applicant, described the proposed business. There would be three bays for golf instruction, which would be used by a maximum of two people per bay at a time, and one bay for the golf club manufacturer to test clubs. The business would provide indoor golf education, along with club manufacture and sale. The proposed hours were 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m., including weekends.

Chairman Eastman did not see a problem with parking, given the limitations on parking identified by the applicant.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to CONTINUE the project to the September 6, 2007 meeting, to allow the applicant time to revise the plans to reflect Building Code.

Committee Member Tabatabaee left the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

PRJ07-00356 – ZON07-00079. APPLICANT: ARCH ANGEL GROUP, LLC; PROPERTY OWNER: RREEF MANAGEMENT CO. A request for a minor site plan to operate a martial arts training facility in an existing industrial complex on property located at 4080 N. Palm Street (southeast corner of Imperial Highway and Palm Street) (M-P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins described the request. The property was located in a light industrial area, and the building was approximately 6,400 square feet. The building currently contained three offices, two restrooms, and a loading dock that the applicant intended to use for storage of a “tour” bus.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what the business hours would be, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on Saturday. Sunday would be open for special events only.

Public hearing opened.

Fred George, the applicant, described the proposed business. Class size would be small, usually less than twenty five students, and would mainly serve adults. He would like to have an option to expand the hours if the business warranted it.

Jeff Allen, a representative from Rreef Management, stated that their company used a parking ratio of 3/1000, and this use met that requirement. The major tenant in the complex was normally gone after 5:00 p.m.

Mr. George stated that he believed this type of business was needed in the area. His clients were well behaved and respectful, and proper etiquette was stressed during their training.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if any additional equipment would be brought in and Mr. George responded that a boxing ring might be added later. Chairman Eastman explained that staff had identified the proposed business as a trade school, but if additional equipment were brought in it would become a gym, which required a CUP. Some equipment was allowed for

warm-up and conditioning, but the applicant would need to work with staff to formulate a condition limiting the amount of equipment.

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

Chairman Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00355 – ZON07-00078. APPLICANT: WON KIM; PROPERTY OWNER: GIVISH MEHTA. A request for a minor site plan to operate an educational tutoring facility on property located at 2000 East Chapman Avenue (southeast corner of Mountain View and Chapman Avenue) (O-P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (BSP/MJE).

Planning Technician Jenkins described the request. The property had eighteen parking spaces, which included one handicapped accessible space. The business hours were proposed as 3:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., and there would be no use of the second floor (a CPA office was located on that floor).

Committee Member Lopez asked if the offices would be used for tutoring, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that the ground floor offices would be used as classrooms. Committee Member Lopez asked where the gates were located, and Planning Technician Jenkins explained there were one gate which opened into the alley, and one gate off Mountain View. Committee Member Lopez stated that a Knox keypad would be needed at the gate on Mountain View.

Public hearing opened.

Won Kim, the applicant, stated that parking would not be an issue, since part of their business would be to pick up and drop off the students. There would be approximately six students per classroom, and the small office would be used as an office.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what the maximum number of people at the business at one time would be. Mr. Kim responded twenty five; one teacher and six students per room, plus a receptionist.

Chairman Eastman asked the age range of the students, and Mr. Kim responded grades six, seven, and eight, with the possibility of adding high school students later. Chairman Eastman expressed his concern with parking, and stated that high school students tended to drive themselves, and he was concerned that there would not be enough parking.

Chairman Eastman asked what the “open area” would be used for, and Mr. Kim responded it would be a waiting area for the students. Committee Member St. Paul asked is there would be an overlap of students, and Mr. Kim responded that there would not be an overlap because they scheduled their classes with a twenty to thirty minute break in between.

Committee Member Lopez asked what the group occupancy was. He stated that if it was an E occupancy than the first floor would need to be separated from the upper floor, and an

alarm system and sprinklers would be needed. He believed the applicant needed to hire an architect to determine the occupancy.

Chairman Eastman was concerned with closing off the exit at the rear of the building due to students being in class at the end of the corridor.

Committee Member St. Paul left the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Sunny Song, 1710 Vista Lomita, had used a similar facility and only noticed one car in the parking lot.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman recommended the applicant hire an architect that was familiar with E occupancies and work with the Building Department. Planning was agreeable with the activity at this location, but clarification was needed on the occupancy.

MOTION by Committee Member Lopez, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to CONTINUE the project to the September 6, 2007 meeting.

PRJ07-00335 – ZON07-00070. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: SUNNY SONG. A request for a minor site plan to review the addition of tennis court lights on property located at 1710 Vista Lomitas Place (southeast corner of the property, 750 feet south of the Acacia Reservoir) (R-1-20 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU).

Chairman Eastman explained that the request was to add lights to a tennis court at a single family residence. The plans show the proposal was for three light standards, each eighteen feet tall. The court would have a ten foot chain link fence with a netting-type screen around it. Code allowed for the construction of the tennis court, therefore this Committee was only reviewing the addition of lights. The applicant had already run the electrical conduit for the proposed lights.

Public hearing opened.

Sunny Song, the applicant, explained that when she bought the lot from the developer she had made sure that a lighted tennis court would be allowed. She had spoken with former Community Development Director Rosen, who had approved a shoebox light for the tennis court.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the original plans referenced a future court, but did not specify lighting.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the court was existing, and Ms. Song responded that the slab had been poured and the poles for the fencing were in place. Committee Member Voronel stated that there were a number of easements on the property that were not shown on the plans. Ms. Song stated that the easement was on the south side of the property, away from the tennis court.

Committee Member St. Paul returned to the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Chairman Eastman asked the height and location of the proposed lights, and Ms. Song responded there would be six lights. Acting Associate Planner Kusch clarified that the plans indicated three lights on the south side, but the applicant had proposed six, therefore the plans needed to be revised.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated he had received calls from several of the neighbors who were concerned with the hours the lights would be used. One neighbor had recommended a condition that would require the lights be turned off at 9:00 p.m., while another neighbor would like to see them turned off at 11:00 p.m. Chairman Eastman asked Ms. Song if she had spoken with her neighbors regarding the hours, and Ms. Song said she had not.

Chris Park, 1714 N. Acacia Avenue, stated that his family did not want the court to be used at night because the echo of the balls hitting the court would carry to their home.

Barbara Wald, 1700 Vista Lomitas, was also concerned with the noise. She described the court as being in a gully, which created an echo chamber. She would be agreeable with a 9:00 p.m. curfew.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that Code allowed residential noise up to 55 decibels per hour between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., and up to 45 decibels after 10:00 p.m., both for an average of thirty minutes per hour.

Chairman Eastman expressed concern with engineering comments regarding the location of the easements and the need for the lights to be relocated. He stated that a shoebox type light could be aimed downward, but he would prefer a fifteen foot pole. He also believed that the screening material used on the fence would help to baffle some of the noise.

Committee Member St. Paul would like to see the pole lowered.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Rebert, to APPROVE the project subject to the following conditions; the pole height be limited to fifteen feet, verification of the location of any easements, the light were not to be installed on any easements, and lights would not be operated after 10:00 p.m.

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, to re-open the public hearing to allow the applicant to respond, CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present.

Public hearing opened.

Ms. Song indicated she would prefer to continue the project to allow her time to speak with her architect and verify that fifteen foot light poles would provide adequate coverage of the court.

Ms. Wald asked if the project were continued would she need to come to the next hearing to state her concerns, and Chairman Eastman responded that she would not. Her comments from today were on record and would be included as part of the discussion at the next meeting.

Public hearing closed.

Substitute MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Rebert, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to CONTINUE the project to the August 2, 2007 meeting.

PRJ07-00181 – ZON07-00035. APPLICANT: ERIC MEURS AND VERIZON WIRELESS; PROPERTY OWNER: HOPE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY. A request for a minor site plan to construct a temporary 60' wooden monopole, six proposed antennas, four equipment cabinets, three GPS antennas, and one microwave antenna for Verizon Wireless, on property located at 2501 East College Place (east side of Commonwealth Avenue, between East College Place and Nutwood Avenue) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL).

Chairman Eastman explained the request. The request was to temporarily relocate a sixty foot monopole at the Hope International University site. Currently the pole was located on the building, and would be integrated into the parking structure during construction.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that a temporary structure bond would be required to ensure removal of the temporary pole within six months of completion of the project.

Public hearing opened.

Eric Meurs, the applicant, explained the timing of their project and stated that their temporary pole would be removed within 120 days of completion.

Brian Meurs, the applicant, explained how the permanent structure would be integrated into the JPI parking structure.

Acting Senior Planner Allen stated that the standard cell tower conditions would apply to this request. She added that the requested pole met setback requirements.

Chairman Eastman explained that when the building permit was issued for the JPI project they would be able to pull the permit for this project. Mr. E. Meurs responded that the pole would be moved after demolition was complete.

Committee Member Lopez stated that a Knox keypad and fire extinguishers would be required.

Committee Member Voronel clarified that this pole would not be in the way for the JPI project, and Acting Senior Planner Allen confirmed that it would not be.

Committee Member Rebert asked that the pole be secured with chain link fencing with a barbed wire top. Chairman Eastman added that there would be fencing around the site during construction.

Committee Member St. Paul asked why they were not using a COW, and Mr. B. Meurs responded that it would be too large.

Committee Member Voronel stated that structural calculations would be required.

Chairman Eastman suggested the following conditions; permits could not be pulled until the JPI project was approved and through plan check, the temporary pole be removed within six months of final inspection of the parking garage, fencing will be placed around this facility, including barbed wire at the top, if the construction site was not fenced, and a bond will be posted in an amount reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development.

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

Chairman Eastman explained the ten-day appeal process.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Adjourned at 12:45 p.m. as Staff Review Committee.