

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., OCTOBER 18, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

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 October 4, 2007 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ07-00435 – ZON07-00098. APPLICANT: JAIYONG 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) (Continued from October 4, 2007).

Planning Technician Jenkins explained that this item had been continued from the October 4, 2007 meeting to allow the applicant an opportunity to research various lighting options. The home was currently under construction, and the sports court would be located on the north side of the property with the hoop facing the home. The original proposal was for a twenty five foot light pole approximately fourteen feet from the property line. Previously the Committee had requested the applicant look at various alternatives, and possibly hire a light engineer to determine the proper pole height and lighting needed.

The applicant had consulted with a photometric expert and provided three options and comments for each from a lighting distributor:

- A twenty-five foot pole with four lights – would provide the most light, but also the most glare
- A twenty-five foot pole with two lights – would provide less light, but the same amount of glare
- A twenty foot pole with two lights – recommended as adequate for a court this size, and would have the least amount of glare

Director Godlewski asked where the basketball hoop would be located, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that it would be located on the same size as the light pole.

Chairman Eastman commented that, according to the drawings provided by the applicant, there appeared to be more light in the top right corner with the lower pole. He believed there were

two parts involved in making this decision; the actual illumination levels, and the visual illumination and glare.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what part of the pole the neighbor would be looking at, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that based on the elevations the neighbor's property was higher, 426', and the court was at 422'. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the lights would be shielded and Planning Technician Jenkins displayed the brochure for the proposed light which indicated they would be shielded.

Public hearing opened.

Jai Yang, the architect, explained that a backing could be added to the light fixture to help reduce glare to the neighbor's home. He also stated that the light would be aimed towards the owner's house.

Sonia Shah, 915 W. Las Palmas, questioned why three light fixtures were needed. She was confused by the various numbers provided by the applicant, and wanted to know what the industry standard was for this type of court. Mr. Yang responded that the industry standard was five foot candle, and Chairman Eastman added that brighter would be better as it related to use, but they needed to address the impact on the neighbors.

Ms. Shah stated that she did not want to see the bare bulbs from her home, and John Choi, the property owner, responded that he would add shields to the light fixtures to prevent this type of problem.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Voronel was satisfied with the research done by the applicant, and an expert had indicated that a twenty-foot pole would provide adequate light for the court and at the same time accommodate the neighbor.

Committee Member St. Paul was in favor of option three, and wanted to add the following conditions; the lights would be shut off at 10:00 p.m., cut-off shields would be used, and any modification to the pole or the lights would have to come back before the SRC for review.

Chairman Eastman was concerned that the lower pole would change the trajectory and illuminate the property to the east. He believed a higher pole would direct more light down, onto the court.

MOTION by Committee Member Voronel, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, and CARRIED unanimously, that said project be approved with conditions as stated.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Adjourned at 10:41 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Janelle Pasillas, Secretary