

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., JANUARY 17, 2008

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kusch, Allen, Jenkins and Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to CONTINUE the December 20, 2007 minutes.

The following items were heard out of order.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ07-00549 – ZON07-00121. APPLICANT: A-PLUS RECYCLING; PROPERTY OWNER: WILLIAM J. WINTTER. A request for a minor site plan review to operate a small collection recycling facility behind an existing convenience store on property located at 327 West Orangethorpe Avenue (northeast corner of West Orangethorpe and Ray Avenues) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. The applicant proposed two recycling bins with no kiosk at the rear of the property. The facility would be staffed by an employee and all associated equipment would be stored in the bins. The hours of operation will be 9-5 Monday through Saturday and 9-4 on Sunday. The project does not meet code based on parking, and Planning Technician Jenkins explained the parking requirements. Planning Technician Jenkins explained that the lot was subdivided and is two lots; so there are not a lot of options to possibly re-stripe for parking spots because it is two properties.

Chairman Eastman asked if staff had a copy of the subdivision map, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes.

Chairman Eastman asked what side the garage door faced, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the door faced south towards Orangethorpe.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there were any parking spaces along Ray Avenue and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that there was not.

Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the ground floor was a massage establishment and the top floor was a residence, and the square footage for both floors requires 15 parking spaces.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the garage could accommodate two parking spaces, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that building permits indicate two garage spaces. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the two garage spaces were calculated in the required parking, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no.

Chairman Eastman asked how the recycling facility would deal with the collection, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the attendant would collect the cans and produce a voucher for the customer.

Chairman Eastman stated that additional parking would be needed for the attendant and customers.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the site was integrated and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the property was integrated along Orangethorpe.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that parking stall 13 did not comply with handicap standards, and does not meet the disabled access requirements. Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the bins were on wheels, and asked if the bins were approved. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the bins were roll out bins that would be replaced when full.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman asked if the roll out bins were stand alone or contained within a design element, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that there were two bins and no kiosk. Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the roll out bins had to be structurally stable in case of an earthquake.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if a sanitation facility was proposed for employees, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that he did not have that information.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the loading and unloading was going to be on site, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the applicant proposed everything to take place on site.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if there was an access agreement for the two properties. Chairman Eastman questioned whether the parcel map showed joint reciprocal access.

Public hearing opened.

Jose Bautista, A-Plus Recycling, stated that he was proposing to add a brick wall along side the containers. Mr. Bautista stated that his employees always help handicap customers, and he has a security company on payroll that monitors his centers for loitering. Mr. Bautista stated that he would be able to provide a reciprocal agreement for parking.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the recycling center was already operating and Mr. Bautista responded no, and stated that he has recycling centers in other cities that are operating.

Committee Member Bastreri asked what kind of security was performed and Mr. Bautista stated that he had security that patrolled all of his centers on an hourly basis. Committee Member

Bastreri asked if there was a cash exchange on site, and Mr. Bautista responded that cash was provided on the spot and that was the reason for hiring security. Committee Member Bastreri asked how much cash was usually on site. Mr. Bautista responded that it was between \$200 to \$250 dollars and a normal transaction is about \$4.00 dollars. Committee Member Bastreri asked if the employee would keep the cash on their person and Mr. Bautista responded yes.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there was a restroom facility for the employee, and Mr. Bautista stated that normally they have an arrangement with the main business on site. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the employee closes the doors and walks away at break time and Mr. Bautista responded yes and stated that there is equipment that a customer can use while the attendant is away. Committee Member St. Paul asked how that would work, and Mr. Bautista stated that it was similar to a vending machine that would provide a voucher. Committee Member St. Paul asked where the vending machine would be located and Mr. Bautista stated that it would be integrated into one of the containers. Committee Member St. Paul asked if all the containers had the vending machines integrated into them, and Mr. Bautista responded that only the aluminum can and plastic container did.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the automatic vending machine was not shown on the site plan, and asked where it would be located. Mr. Bautista stated that the vending machine would be located on the side of the container closest to the alley. Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the customer would have to access the alley and Mr. Bautista responded that there was about 3 ½ feet where the customers can stand and deposit the cans.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the self-serve access was in one of the doors or the side of the container, and Mr. Bautista stated that it was on the side of the container. Committee Member St. Paul asked why there was going to be two bins and Mr. Bautista stated that one of the bins was for aluminum cans and plastic and the other bin was to process glass.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how often the bins would be replaced and Mr. Bautista stated about every two weeks. Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how big the containers were and Chairman Eastman stated that the containers were 8 x 20 and had wheels (per plans). Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the containers were about 90 cubic yards.

Chairman Eastman asked if the containers had a logo, and Mr. Bautista responded no. Chairman Eastman asked Mr. Bautista how he dealt with signage and directing people to the facility. Mr. Bautista stated that he advertised in the Penny Saver and by word of mouth. Chairman Eastman asked if there would be temporary or permanent signage at the street. Mr. Bautista said no.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the containers were going to be on concrete or asphalt, and Mr. Bautista responded that the containers would be on concrete.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the containers were going to be stabilized. Mr. Bautista stated that he will secure the containers with wedges (chaulks) that are approved by the Department of Transportation.

Committee Member Voronel asked how the bins would be replaced. Mr. Bautista stated that he has a trucking company that will pick up the bin and exchange it with an empty bin. The trucking company will pick up the glass bin and will dump it and bring it back. Committee Member Voronel asked where the truck would enter from and Mr. Bautista responded that the

truck would turn in from Orangethorpe. Committee Member Voronel asked if the trucking company would park the empty container during the exchange, and Mr. Bautista explained that the truck had a two system trailer with two containers on it.

Committee Member Lopez stated that the truck would have to set the empty container down somewhere during the exchange.

Committee Member Voronel asked Mr. Bautista if he was going to be operating on another property, and Mr. Bautista responded yes and stated that he would provide a joint access agreement. Committee Member Voronel asked if the drive thru dairy operated with access from the alley. Committee Voronel asked if the drive thru dairy pavement was stripped and Mr. Bautista responded that the pavement was not stripped. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that there were stripped arrows, but no stripped parking spaces.

Ron Counts, 1112 Oakdale, Owners Agent, stated that the owner fully supported the project.

Chairman Eastman asked if it was one or two properties, and Mr. Counts responded that it was two properties. Chairman Eastman asked if the owner would have an objection to a reciprocal access agreement, and Mr. Counts responded no. Chairman Eastman asked if the landlord would be able to require the tenants to accommodate restroom facilities, and Mr. Counts responded that there was a permanent restroom facility in the garage. Acting Chief Planner asked how many parking spaces the garage accommodated, and Mr. Counts responded two.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the restroom in the garage was ADA compliant, and Mr. Counts responded no. Mr. Counts stated that the restroom facility in the massage facility was ADA compliant and access would be arranged.

The following people spoke in opposition of the proposal:

- Peter Schneider, 400 W Porter
- George McCoy, 300 W Porter
- M. Rhodes

Their points of opposition were:

- Over twenty police calls in the alley because of homeless people or drunks
- The alley is twenty feet wide and there is no turnaround room
- The dairy has two u-haul trucks that will block access to the containers
- Will be very noisy
- A petition was signed by neighbors in opposition of the proposal
- Not against recycling, but not at this location
- Trash problem in the alley
- The concrete is broken up
- Potential for smell from the cans being recycled
- Recycling center at the corner of Orangethorpe and Euclid
- Not good for the neighborhood and will bring quality of life down
- Possible trash and shopping carts left at the vending machine area
- Potential for a tremendous amount of signage

Eugene Vortman, 526 S Alameda St., Los Angeles, asked if Mr. Bautista was proposing 320 or 420 sq ft, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded 470 sq ft. Mr. Vortman asked if the vending machines were electrical or battery operated, and wanted to know if Mr. Bautista could provide addresses for some of his local recycling centers. Mr. Vortman stated that he ran a location list for A+ Recycling and provided photos for the Committee of some of those locations.

Mr. Schneider asked what the zoning of the location was, and Chairman Eastman stated that it was a commercial zoned property.

Mr. Bautista stated that he was willing to take care of the alley by cleaning up the trash and taking care of the loitering. Mr. Bautista stated that the pictures provided to the Committee were not his recycling centers.

Alma Castaneda, A+ Recycling, stated that they have a cleaning crew that cleans their locations on a daily basis. Ms. Castaneda explained the state requirement for recycling facilities.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that there were several issues with the site plan including no trash enclosures, civil access routes, and parking was not adequate so he could not support the project.

Committee Member Voronel stated that the recycling center would be in very close proximity to the alley and believed the alley would be blocked by customer and bin pick-up activity. Committee Member Voronel stated that she could foresee conflict between the existing operation and the proposed facility, and was not in support of the project.

Committee Member Bastreri stated that there were a lot of street area crimes that occur in that general area and was concerned with the attendant carrying cash. He believed that the attendant could become a target for a street robbery, and at a minimum there would need to be a full time security guard there.

Committee Member St. Paul was concerned with the reduction of parking and explained that the parking ratios and the calculations are based on optimal use of the square footage. Committee Member St. Paul was concerned with security and lighting and stated that he was not support of the project because he believed that the site could not accommodate the recycling center.

Committee Member Lopez stated that he was concerned with blocking of the alley and believed that the drop off and pick up of the containers would take place in the alley. Committee Member Lopez was not in support of the project.

Chairman Eastman stated that the Planning Division supports recycling, and recycling needs to be accommodated on a policy level. Chairman Eastman stated that the site plans have not been adequately prepared to address ADA requirements, adequate information had not been provided to address the machinery and loading and unloading. He believed that with revisions it is a bad location, poorly oriented to the street for both access and use, and was not in support of the project.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee to DENY the project. Motion passed unanimously.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

PRJ07-00499 – ZON07-00112. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: BRIAN MEURS. A request for a telecommunication antenna and equipment, including a monopole (in the form of a pine tree) measuring approximately 41 feet tall on property located at 3300 North State College Boulevard (east side of State College Boulevard, approximately 400 feet south of Imperial Highway) (P-L zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Chairman Eastman stated that the applicant requested a continuance.

MOTION by Committee Member Lopez, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of February 7, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ07-00542 – ZON07-00119. APPLICANT: RON STERRY; PROPERTY HUGO J. FABRIS. A request for a 20% reduction in the front yard setback from 58 feet (based on the average of the adjacent properties) to 46.25 feet, on property located at 717 West Valencia Mesa Drive (approximately 168 feet and 253.5 feet west of Richman Knoll) (R-1-20 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (BSP)

Senior Planner St. Paul gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. The applicant was proposing a second floor addition to create a fifth bedroom, and code indicates that five bedrooms or more in an R-1-20 zone requires a third enclosed parking space. The applicant was proposing a 20% reduction in the front yard setback to accommodate a garage in the front of the house to meet the parking requirement. The applicant was also proposing a circular driveway and Valencia Mesa is indicated in the General Plan as a rural street so the design of the circular driveway is being sensitive to the streetscape. Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the grade of the property slopes down from Valencia to the back yard, and there is a discrepancy in the graphic map and proposed site plan (topo).

Chairman Eastman asked if the circular driveway had met the required minimum distance, and Senior Planner St. Paul stated that both the circular driveway and the addition meet all codes.

Chairman Eastman asked if the ability to get the third parking space was limited by the existing conditions, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded yes. Chairman Eastman asked if the setback reduction would only apply to the non-habitable garage, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded yes.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked what the minimum setback requirements were, and Chairman Eastman stated that the minimum setback is 25 feet. Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the topo map was different from the site plan, and Senior Planner St. Paul stated that he informed the applicant about the discrepancy and they were researching it. Senior Planner St. Paul stated that the Water Engineering Division had given code requirements regarding the meter and a line.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the applicant was aware that Valencia Mesa is a rural street and Senior Planner St. Paul stated that the applicant was aware and will preserve and maintain the streetscape.

Public hearing opened.

Ron Sterry, Project Designer, stated that there might be minor topo map changes to correct the existing drainage problems.

Chairman Eastman asked if there was a storm drain on Valencia Mesa, and Senior Planner St. Paul stated that he did not see one.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the drainage would be looked at during the design process.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the 2007 California codes needed to be used and drainage plans need to be submitted.

Chairman Eastman stated that the request was reasonable, and recommended that the paving in the front yard be done to match the existing pavement.

Committee Member Voronel stated that she would like to see the edge of the pavement integrated on the site plan. Mr. Sterry stated that a landscape architect will enhance the materials of the circular driveway.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that drainage grading plans and a soils report would need to be submitted.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, to APPROVE the project subject to a landscape plan consistent with adjacent neighborhood, identification of edge of pavement in relation to the property lines, grading drainage plans, and a soils report.

Mr. Sterry stated that plans were submitted before the end of the year, and Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that a soils report was not needed if they were in plan check.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel to AMEND his motion to not include a soils report. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ08-00005 – ZON08-00006. APPLICANT: RICHARD FINLEY; PROPERTY OWNER: FAIRWAY VILLAGE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION. A request for a minor site plan review to widen the landscape median at the Bastanchury exit to Fairway Village and reduce lanes from three to two on property located at 2701 Fairway Village Drive (intersection of Bastanchury Road and Fairway Village Drive) (PRD zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief overview of the project, and explained the request. The applicant proposed to widen the median to fourteen feet and reduce the exiting lanes onto Bastanchury from three lanes to two. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that Traffic Consultant Mark Miller stated that a 50 foot long, 8 inch wide white line needed to be stripped, and the arrows of the left turn, and right turn lane would need to be painted. The Water Engineering Division stated that the applicant needed to show the City's 8 inch water main line on the site plan and trees could not be planted over the existing water main line. Planning

Technician Jenkins stated that a resident called and was concerned about Fire Department Access into the development.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if only the exiting lanes would be affected and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if there was a condition for three lanes, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that a 1979 tract map shows the existing layout, but he did not see a condition for three lanes.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if a landscape plan was submitted and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the Fire Department presently used the egress as there ingress to the property in emergencies. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the comment was made by a resident and not the Fire Department.

Chairman Eastman asked if the applicant was proposing new gates, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no.

Public hearing opened.

Richard Finley, 666 Brookline PI, stated that the HOA was proposing to widen the median to enhance the appearance of the community. The median is narrow and the HOA is not able to sustain any planting in that area because the trees take the water and nutrition away from the plants. The board voted to fund this project and then surveyed the community and received 86 responses. Forty six were in favor and 18 were not in favor and 22 just asked questions, and with that in mind the HOA decided to proceed. The present center lane will be there as a left turn lane which will give an easier left turn onto Bastanchury.

George Guerrero, 511 E Westchester PI, stated that there was access into the development at Fairway Isles Drive. Chairman Eastman clarified that what was being proposed was the removal of the dedicated left turn lane and not the access gate at Fairway Isles.

The following people were in opposition of the project.

Russ Juergens, 438 Westchester PI
Don Anderson, 420 Pebble Beach PI
Ken Patchett, 628 Augusta Ct
Charles Pierocy, 539 Riviera Ct
William Rhoades, 549 Brookline PI

Their points of opposition were:

- Trees at current planter will not be balanced if the median is widened
- U-Turns are very dangerous and an expanded median will make it worse
- There is a dip and low profile vehicles bottom out so all three lanes are used so that does not happen because they go out at an angle
- The sign located on the hill side west of this exit lane should not have been taken down
- Sign will probably block view to make a left turn

- During emergencies people park in the 3rd exit lane if they cannot get into the development
- There are 281 residences so all three exiting lanes are needed in case of an emergency
- Possible backup impacts
- No U-Turn sign needed
- Fairway Village Sign should have been put back at the same location
- No formal vote by residents for the request

Chairman Eastman asked Mr. Patchett if he had spoken to the Engineering Division about a no u-turn sign and Mr. Patchett stated that it was his understanding that someone in the HOA was told that the City will not put up the sign.

The following person spoke in support of the project.

Hermie Fox, 613 Murfield Ct, made the following comments:

- The back gate is an emergency gate that has nothing to do with the request
- A dangerous intersection, but CA drivers should drive safely
- Low profile vehicles can use two lanes to exit Fairway Village
- The third egress lane is not for parking
- Extension of median will improve the looks of Fairway Village
- Good looking sign
- Many of the residents do not attend board meetings so they do not know what is going on

Toni Davis, 418 Westchester Dr, made the following comments:

- The original sign had dry rott and was termite ridden
- Enhance the development by widening the median and placing a modern sign there
- The trees are stressed because they are in a small area, and are taking up all the nutrients and it cost between \$500-\$700 to re-plant

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lopez stated that the proposed access width met the minimum Fire Department requirement, and stated that the Fire Department should already have a key for the back gate. Chairman Eastman explained that the proposal was not for the gate in the back, and stated that the Committee was only discussing the median proposal.

Committee Member Tabatabaee believed that all the City requirements had been met, and stated that he would like to see the location of the proposed sign. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the sign would be approximately 33 feet back from Bastanchury.

Chairman Eastman stated that the City's traffic engineer had reviewed the application and did not indicate a concern about removing the lane. Chairman Eastman asked about the grading at Bastanchury and a bottoming out effect. Committee Member Voronel stated that at that intersection there is a cross gutter that is constructed in accordance with standard plans and a bottoming out effect should not be a problem.

Committee Member St. Paul was concerned about the history of the three lanes stated that he would like to hear more information on why the egress was wide enough for three lanes.

Committee Member Lopez asked if there were two lanes going into the development and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes, but not stripped.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez to re-open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously.

Don Anderson, 420 Pebble Beach Pl, explained that the entrance into the development was at a higher grade than the exit.

Richard Finely, 666 Brookline Pl, stated that the lanes will be 11 ½ feet wide and there would be plenty of room to exit from the development.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman explained that projects are designed on information such as anticipated traffic impacts. In this case two lanes have been considered for adequate back up space and signalization will accommodate it, and the traffic engineer indicated that it would.

Committee Member Voronel explained that widening Bastanchury was under design with the Engineering Division. She stated that the traffic engineer believed that widening Bastanchury would not affect the project. Committee Member Voronel stated that if Bastanchury was reconstructed the gutter that is there will also be reconstructed with standards that accommodate vehicles.

Committee Member Bastreri stated that u-turns are dangerous anywhere in the City, but the speeds on Bastanchury could pose a problem. He stated that he would defer to the Traffic Engineer for traffic flow.

Committee Member Voronel stated that the traffic engineer said that prohibiting the u-turn at that intersection could worsen the situation for the HOA because motorist would turn into the development and would maneuver through the development.

Mr. Finley stated that he would preference that a u-turn be prohibited.

Mr. Guerrero stated that originally the egress width was there, but it was not stripped. He stated that due to development in the area the City had the three lanes stripped.

Chairman Eastman didn't understand how the proposed project would not impact the u-turn issue. He stated that he recognized the need to do a diagonal cross turn with a large vehicle to avoid dragging, and it seemed possible that the driveway did not meet current code requirements.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that he would like to see a motion to continue the item to see what conditions might exist for the egress from the development.

Committee Member Voronel was in support of continuing the item. She stated that the Water Engineer Division believed there is a water main line at the median location, and would not

allow any additional trees. Committee Member Voronel stated that she would like to see where the water main line is to make sure that the sign in the median will not be constructed over that.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that he was in support of continuing the item, and would like to see the HOA and home owners discuss the situation.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of February 7, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Adjourned at 1:20 p.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant