

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., OCTOBER 4, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Eastman, Lopez, Voronel, King, St. Paul, Yang

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kusch, Jenkins, Pasillas

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to APPROVE the September 6, 2007 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ07-00435 – ZON07-00098. APPLICANT: JAI YANG, YANG ARCHITECTS; PROPERTY OWNER: JOHN CHOI. A request for a minor site plan review to construct a new 25-foot light pole for a sports court on property located at 901 West Las Palmas Drive (north side of West Las Palmas Drive, approximately 100 feet east of Flintridge Drive) (R-1-20 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE).

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief overview of the project. The home was currently under construction, and this request was to place a twenty-five foot pole light at the end of a basketball court on at the north side of the property. One neighbor had called and expressed concern with light spilling onto other properties.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what grade this area of the property was at, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that the court was at a 418' elevation, the property line was at 416', and it descended from there to 414'. The property to the west was at 426'.

Public hearing opened.

Jai Yang, the applicant, stated the light pole would be lower than the building and would not be seen from either the street or on the back side from the neighbor's property.

Chairman Eastman asked if a twenty-five foot pole was necessary, or if a lower pole might work. Mr. Yang responded that he wanted to keep the twenty-five foot pole. John Choi, the property owner, explained that the hoop would be ten feet four inches, and he had chosen the twenty-five foot light pole in order to spread the light over the court. Chairman Eastman asked if they had considered multiple, lower lights, and Mr. Choi responded that they had not.

Committee Member Yang asked about the recreation room shown on the plans, and Mr. Choi responded that they did not intend to build it.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the lights would be adjustable, and Mr. Choi responded that they were adjustable and would be concentrated on the court. Committee Member Voronel asked if a twenty-five foot light pole was really needed, and Mr. Yang stated that the light needed to be higher than the hoop so as to not interfere with play and to prevent the light from getting in the player's eyes.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if this court would be used for tennis or other activities, and Mr. Choi responded that the court was not large enough for tennis. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the court would be used for social events, and Mr. Choi responded that it would not.

Chairman Eastman asked if the court was fenced, and Mr. Yang responded that there was a six foot fence around the court.

Sonia Shah, a neighbor from 915 W. Las Palmas Drive, asked why a twenty-five foot pole was needed and if any alternatives had been looked at. She also wanted to know if the bulbs would be shielded so she would not be viewing the bulbs from her property. Mr. Choi provided the brochure for the proposed light fixture.

Mrs. Shah stated that her finished first floor was at 426', and the court would be at 422' finished. She did not have any problems with the construction, she was just concerned with the lights. Mr. Choi responded that the lights would not be used every day, and they would be adjustable. Mrs. Shah asked if it would be possible to place the lights on the other side of the court.

Chairman Eastman explained that there were a variety of issues that impacted the type of light used, such as shadow and depth perception. A higher light would make less of a shadow, and if the light was placed behind the hoop only one end of the court would be obstructed.

Committee Member Lopez asked what size pole would be used for the basketball hoop, and Mr. Choi responded it would be a sixteen-foot pole, with the hoop at approximately ten feet.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul was concerned with the height of the light pole, and thought possibly a twenty-foot pole would work. He also suggested conditioning the hours the light could be used, based on the City's Noise Ordinance.

Committee Member Voronel believed a lighting engineer needed to look at the site and determine the minimum pole height that would be needed for this court.

Chairman Eastman commented that there were several ways this court could be lighted, and various pole heights that would work. A light engineer could provide recommendations on the best way to light the court with the least impact on surrounding properties, although he thought a lighting engineer was not necessary.

Committee Member Yang asked if the hoop and light could be moved to the other side, and Chairman Eastman responded that they could, but it would cause problems with the sun being in the player's eyes.

Chairman Eastman stated that it made sense to him to lower the pole and relocate to the side of the court, possibly even one light on each side.

Committee Member Voronel was not comfortable with making this decision without hearing the recommendations from a light engineer.

Committee Member Lopez believed the lights needed to be relocated.

Committee Member King believed that maybe a light engineer could provide a recommendation that would work for everyone.

Committee Member Yang commented that the court could be used during daylight without lights, and Chairman Eastman added that previously, in situations such as this, the Committee had limited activity to 10:00 p.m, based on the City's Noise Ordinance.

Chairman Eastman believed that the Committee could come to a decision on ways to minimize the impact of the light, although a light engineer could be helpful. The property owner had gone above and beyond in trying to accommodate everyone. The cost of a light study would be minimal in comparison to the whole custom home project, but a light study would not typically be required in a normal residential tract neighborhood.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that most of the homes in the area were custom homes, and as such, each decision needed to be looked at carefully. He would like to see a light study completed prior to making a decision.

Committee Member Voronel stated that the cost of a light study would be very minimal. Both the applicant and neighbor would benefit from the study.

MOTION by Committee Member Voronel, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, and CARRIED 3-2, with Chairman Eastman and Committee Member Lopez voting against, and Committee Member Yang abstaining, to CONTINUE the project to the October 18, 2007 meeting.

Committee Member King left the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Adjourned at 10:55 p.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Janelle Pasillas, Secretary