MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 15, 2007

CALL TO ORDER	Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT	Eastman, Lopez, Petropulos, St. Paul, Voronel, Yang
COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT	None
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT	Kusch, Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St Paul, SECONDED by Chairman Eastman, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to APPROVE the November 1, 2007 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ06-00509 – ZON07-00111. APPLICANT: CARLOS WESTIN; PROPERTY OWNER: MB INVSTMENT GROUP, LLC. A request to install security fencing on property located at 1830-1838 West Commonwealth Avenue (south side of Commonwealth Avenue between approximately 400 and 700 feet west of Brookhurst Road) (C-H zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Acting Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that the request was for security fencing at the Sunset Point Inn which had already been installed. He stated that there were three driveways providing access to the property. The side driveways have a sliding gate, and the middle driveway has a gate that swings inward. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that the west and middle gates have a man gate and the east just has a sliding gate. A key override switch has also been installed for Fire Department access. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that Water Engineering did not support the fencing along the right-of-way because it hampers access for maintenance to the water and utility meters. Staff noted that there were periodic access gates with locks on them to possibly provide access. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that MG Disposal requested that on trash day the gate remain open for a minimum period of four hours. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the applicant could not attend the meeting but the applicant stated that he was directed by the property management company to install gates in order to deter drug sales on the property.

Chairman Eastman stated that the issue before the Committee was primarily the security fencing and not the landscape fencing. He stated that Staff did not prohibit landscape gating but access must be maintained for the meters. Chairman Eastman stated that the issue was the access gate and a condition can be added so the fencing along the landscape is removed for meter access.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the gates remained closed throughout the day. Acting Chief Planner Kusch stated that he was not sure. Committee Member Lopez stated that he has

notified the Sunset Point Inn that they get permits for the fencing and that the gates stay open until permits are finalized.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the gates were automatic. Committee Member Lopez stated that the east and west gates were automatic sliders and the center one was a swing gate. Committee Member St. Paul asked how a tenant gets into the property if the gates remain closed throughout the day. Chairman Eastman believed that tenants used a clicker because there was no room for a call box or key pad.

Committee Member Yang asked how guests and potential tenants would get in. Committee Member Voronel asked if there was room for a car to park in front of the gate. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that a car parked in front of the gate would block the sidewalk. Committee Member Voronel stated that the Engineering Department did not support the gates.

Chairman Eastman stated that there was a lack of vehicle stacking and queuing for guests. He explained that the gates hamper existing nonconforming emergency access. Chairman Eastman stated that there were other methods to controlling drug transactions like enhanced lighting, better management, better screening of tenants, and better security.

Committee Member Lopez stated that adding the fence made the situation worse and the Fire Department was not in support of the fence.

Committee Member Yang asked if the applicant was proceeding with the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) proposal for the property, and if the gates would be a factor with the SRO request. Chairman Eastman stated that the applicant has filed an application and it did not make a difference if the fencing was not approved because the SRO still needs to meet Code. Chairman Eastman explained that the proposed SRO is separate issue than the current application before the Committee.

Committee Member Lopez stated that a month ago the Fire Department responded to a call at the property. The Fire Department had problems with access. He believed that the access problem needed to be addressed now.

Committee Member Yang asked if the applicant could widen the driveway to get something to work. Chairman Eastman stated that the applicant would have to move the gate to get stacking but there was no turn around or access for guest parking.

Committee Member Petropulos stated that all the problems the applicant was trying to address by putting up the gates were making it harder for the Fire and Police Departments.

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to DENY the project.

Chairman Eastman stated that the findings for the denial were as follows:

- Gate hampers emergency access for Fire Department under a situation that is already restricted. The Fire department currently has problems with access and meeting the minimum requirement.

- Hampers the response time for the Police Department for incidents at the location.

- Gate hampers adequate stacking for vehicles entering the facility and would potentially create a problem for the sidewalk and pedestrians as well as potentially impact circulation of vehicles.

- The gating location eliminates any ability to have on site guest parking.

- The justification of providing gates for reducing drug related activity is likely minimal, since access to the site for drugs will probably be provided regardless.

Committee Member St. Paul recommended that the fencing along the landscape area be redesigned to not include the spike head design that may be potentially hazardous. Chairman Eastman believed that the landscape fence screens the landscaping, which defeats the purpose of providing the landscaping that is there today.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

MOTION by Committee Member Lopez, SECONDED by Committee Member Petropulos, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present that the fence and gate be removed immediately upon expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

OTHER MATTERS

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the medical marijuana project, and the Planning Commission deliberation and discussion. A discussion regarding the project followed.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the St. Jude project was recommended for approval and JPI Development had appealed the denial decision by the Planning Commission of the student-oriented housing project, and they were modifying the plans.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Adjourned at 9:56 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.