

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., FEBRUARY 7, 2008

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kusch, Jenkins and Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ACTION ITEMS

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) (Continued from January 17, 2008) (MJE).

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief overview of the project. The Fairway Village Association was requesting to widen the median at Fairway Isle Drive off of Bastanchury, and reduce the exiting lanes from 3 lanes to 2. The item was continued from the January 17, 2008 meeting to determine where the City's water line was and to obtain additional information on street widths. Since the last meeting the Engineering Department determined that the proposed widening of Bastanchury would not affect the existing curb locations because the new lane will take place in the existing street width. So this would not reduce the traffic lanes of the development or the slope of the left turn exit. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that applicant has submitted a drawing depicting the angles of the slopes of the three exit lanes, and four property owners submitted letters requesting the denial or the extension of the Committees decision. Planning Technician Jenkins explained that the City's 8-inch water line is constructed nine feet off the center line of the Fairway Isle Drive, and would be on the west side of the median, and would be directly under the proposed widening of the Median. The Water Engineering Department has determined that the widening of the median will not be a problem, but asked that the project be conditioned so that no trees be planted or permits issued for a block wall or monument sign over the water line.

Chairman Eastman asked if the applicants plan with slopes has been reviewed by the Engineering Department, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the widening of the median would only take one lane, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the reasoning behind widening the median was to create a monument sign, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the water line runs underneath the proposed sign. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the sign permit for the proposed block wall/monument sign would not be permitted in its orientation. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the proposed sign was perpendicular, and could go linear as long as it does not cross over the water line. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that it could cross over the water line, but could not be parallel to the water line. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the sign could not go over perpendicular to the water line or run parallel with the water line, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that it could not run parallel with the water line. Committee Member St. Paul clarified that the sign could run over if it is perpendicular and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes.

Chairman Eastman asked if there was a specific distance that the sign and trees need to be located from the water main line, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that he was not sure. Chairman Eastman stated that it's typically eight feet. Committee Member Voronel stated that the water engineer indicated that the monument sign could not be constructed directly above the water line. However, the monument can be constructed perpendicular to the water line, and must be reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Chairman Eastman clarified if the water line was located 9 feet off the center line to the median, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that it was 9 feet from the center line to the street based on a tract map and water tract map.

Chairman Eastman stated that there might not be a potential conflict if there is a required 8 feet setback from the water line, but the water line is nine feet from the center line. He stated that the sign as proposed runs parallel with the street lane on the center line as proposed. He believed that staff would have to make sure that it's not within that 8 foot setback, if that is the correct water line setback. Committee Member Voronel stated the thickness of the sign and thickness of the foundation of the sign would have to be considered. Chairman Eastman agreed but clarified that the sign was not before the Committee for consideration.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the median were widened into the left hand turn lane if there would be more of a slope or angle to it then the other two lanes. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the left turn lane has a greater slope then the straight lane or the right hand turn lane. The left turn lane is going to be eliminated as proposed.

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. Mr. Finley stated that the median was narrow and the HOA was not able to sustain any planting in that area because the trees take the water and nutrition away from the plants. He stated that the City has approved the developments on the south side of Bastanchury and the HOA would like to fit into what the City has already done. Mr. Finley stated that when the Board voted to widen the median they thought they would be able to put the sign in the median, but could relocate the sign on either side of the entrance if necessary. He explained that that the Board sent out a survey to members of the community and received 100 replies and 59 were in favor. Mr. Finley requested that the Committee grant the HOA request.

Don Anderson, 420 Pebble Beach Pl, stated that the community was canvassed in the area and there was only one person in favor of widening the median. He believed that the survey was not accurate. Mr. Anderson stated that people with motor homes or low profile vehicles would have a difficult time exiting the development if they could not exit at an angle.

Ken Patchett, 628 Augusta Ct, stated that he was against removing a lane, and stated that he had not heard if the lane could be removed. Chairman Eastman clarified that the Committee had not deliberated. Mr. Patchett stated that the plants and shrubs would look nice but he did not want to see a lane removed.

Pat Perkins, 532 Riviera Ct, stated that the entrance had two lanes and that was the only place where there is congestion. She stated that there is never congestion when exiting the development and she did not see why losing one lane would make any difference.

Arby Moore, 540 Brookline Pl, explained that he has a motor home and when he pulls out of the development he uses all three lanes to get the right angle otherwise the rear end of the motor home drags because of the dip. He believed that the current plants at the median could be revived by taking out the trees that are there. Mr. Moore believed that traffic turning right would be tied up because people with low profile vehicles will use both remaining lanes to turn east. Committee Member Bastreri asked Mr. Moore how long his motor home was and Mr. Moore responded 34 feet.

Mr. Patchett stated that with all the developments and street widening around Fairway Isles it does not make sense to remove a lane. He stated that the City put in the striping because there were problems when exiting, and Mr. Patchett believed it would be unsafe to take a lane out. Chairman Eastman asked if the problems had to do with queuing or stacking. Mr. Patchett stated that the problem was because people were in the wrong lanes due to no striping. He believed the community could be enhanced without taking out a lane. Committee Member St. Paul asked if Traffic Engineer Miller had made a determination those three lanes should be stripped, and asked who paid for the stripping. Mr. Patchett stated that the City paid for the stripping. Mr. Patchett stated that he spoke to Dave Langstaff in the Engineering Department and he arranged to have Traffic Engineer Miller go out there to stripe the lanes.

Mr. Finley stated the entrance and exit was not originally striped. In early 2000 the HOA decided to stripe the lanes because they had a problem with people exiting. He believed that eliminating the left lane would not have a negative impact on anyone. He stated that the median would not interfere with people making wide turns onto Bastanchury, and explained the slopes of the lanes.

Mr. Anderson stated that he had a 40 foot motor home and he uses three lanes to exit the development. He stated that going west on Bastanchury and turning right into the property currently allows people to go in at an angle. Mr. Anderson stated that as proposed, when exiting and going straight there is no way to angle across the drainage ditch so there will be dragging.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there was a proposal to fix the slope of the other two lanes. Mr. Finley stated that it would not be possible to reduce the grade or the slope. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the residents and the HOA had a discussion between meetings. Mr. Finley stated that there was a Board meeting and the Board tried to mitigate with

the residents but they were in a position of not wanting to spend the money to widen the median.

Rus Juergens, 438 Westchester PI, stated that there was a Board Meeting and no effort was made to discuss the problem. He stated that he and three other people walked to just about every house and from their comments 70-80% of the people believed that widening the median was unnecessary.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Voronel explained that after researching and inspecting the area an inspection was done to consider the slope of each lane. She stated that the situations on Bastanchury and Fairway Isle were looked at, and she and the City Traffic Engineer did not observe a problem with a dip. Committee Member Voronel stated that it was a steep slope however Bastanchury is as flat as can be. She stated that it was also determined that the lane being removed is the steepest lane and the widening of the median will not negatively impact bottoming out at this area. Committee Member Voronel explained that the Traffic Engineer stated that the three lanes were striped only because there was room for them, and did not see a problem with removing a lane. Committee Member Voronel clarified that Bastanchury had been widened at the intersection of Fairway Isle and there will only be striping of three lanes, and a widening of Bastanchury will occur further west. Committee Member Voronel clarified that the center line of the median as proposed will be two feet from the water line. She stated that there will be a condition that no monument is constructed, and no trees are planted, on top of water line.

Chairman Eastman asked if a setback to the water line was 8 feet, and if that was considered on top, at grade. Committee Member Voronel explained that in case of breakage there has to be about 5 feet on each side for repairs. The water line is located two feet from the median center line, and is concerned if a sign is constructed in the middle of the median. Chairman Eastman clarified that in previous projects, part of the concern was the root system with trees so the water engineer has indicated 8 feet minimum in the past. Committee Member Voronel stated the center line of the median was 2 feet from the water line.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that there was no code requirement for three lanes. He believed that having three lanes was better than two for safety issues in case of an emergency. He stated that this was not something he would be supporting.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that he was thinking about the difference in a separation from the public right-of-way which is City property and the driveway which is the Fairway Village property. He stated that he understood that there is difficulty turning left, but larger vehicles are a recent phenomenon. He believed that widening the median was an HOA and resident issue. He stated that he was in support of widening the median because as a group the HOA and homeowners should be able to work this out and resolve the issue internally.

Committee Member Bastreri stated that he deferred to Traffic Engineer Mark Miller. He stated that he has not seen traffic back up to where the reduction from 3 to 2 lanes would pose a problem, and was in support of the project.

Committee Member Lopez stated that he was in support of the project because the Engineering Department went out and determined the widening of the median would not be a problem.

Chairman Eastman stated that he was concerned whether or not a Fire apparatus would have an issue entering and exiting. His concern was based on the premise that Fire trucks are similar in length to motor homes. Committee Member Lopez stated that there has not been an issue with that.

Chairman Eastman stated that the HOA was requesting that a lane be removed to allow for the widening of the median. He stated that there was an issue as to whether or not this is a private question; a civil issue or a public issue. Chairman Eastman explained the purpose of the Staff Review Committee. Chairman Eastman stated that he had a hard time not supporting the removal of a lane when the Traffic Engineer has indicated that it doesn't have to be there. He stated that the Engineering Department has been out there, looked at it and determined the grade is adequate, and the Fire Department does not have concerns with emergency access. Chairman Eastman supported the property owner's request based on the following conditions:

- That striping will be done to the Engineering Departments satisfaction
- Any new trees be planted at least 8 feet from the water line as indicated above ground.
- The Fire Department must run an apparatus through there and come in and out of the facility presuming that the additional lane is not there.
- No monument/structure can be placed within 5 feet from the water line

MOTION by Committee Member Voronel, to APPROVE the project, subject to the listed conditions.

MOTION by Committee Member Eastman to AMEND the motion to include that a landscape and irrigation plan be submitted for review and approval, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul. Motion passed (5-1).

Chairman 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) (Continued from January 17, 2008) (AKU).

Acting Associate Planner Kusch displayed an aerial photograph and gave a brief overview of the request. He explained that the property owner, County of Orange, deferred the application to the City for review and approval. Chairman Eastman clarified that it was City jurisdiction and County property, so it is not a deferral.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch referenced the aerial photo and gave the location of the antenna. The proposal included trenching of a conduit through the park to an electrical hook up. The presented site plan indicated an existing storage structure adjacent to what would be the enclosure of the equipment for the telecommunication antenna. The project requires that an existing tree be removed and the County is requiring that the applicant replant it elsewhere on the property. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the antenna will be designed to

resemble a Canary Island Pine Tree at 41 feet in height, and the enclosure will be painted to match the enclosure adjacent to the proposed enclosure. Acting Associate Planner Kusch explained that the Municipal Code suggested a 5:1 setback to height ratio for the antenna as it related to an arterial street. The proposed setback was slightly less than 200 feet from State College Boulevard. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that State College Blvd was designated as a scenic corridor and there was concern with the line of sight of the antenna from the street. Acting Associate Planner Kusch presented the Committee with photo simulations of the proposed antenna. He stated that the existing Eucalyptus trees are higher than the proposed antenna. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that staff spoke to some neighbors that received the public notice and after conferring with them and presenting the project they did not have an issue with the project. Staff is recommending approval subject to the standard telecommunication frequency notes as it pertains to the County's emergency network.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the antenna could accept co-location, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch did not know, and deferred to the applicant.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if all the neighbors were notified including the City of Brea, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that all properties adjacent to Craig Park were notified.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the proposed monopine will be developed east of State College Boulevard, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch responded yes.

Chairman Eastman asked what the setback to State College Boulevard was as shown on the plans and Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that it was not indicated on the plans. He stated that based on the aerial photograph State College Boulevard is a minimum of 100 feet in width.

Committee Member Lopez asked if there was an access walkway to the storage area from within the park. Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the proposal did not include a path to the equipment.

Chairman Eastman asked Associate Planner Kusch if he had been out to the site, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch responded no. Chairman Eastman stated that there was no fence along the public right-of-way, and he believed there was a slope. Chairman Eastman stated that there was the ability of taking access from the public right-of-way, if there were concerns to provide a pedestrian walkway.

Committee Member Bastreri asked if there was a replacement program for the tree, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that part of the agreement between the County and the applicant was to replace the tree somewhere else on the property.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how far the pole was to the north property line, and Acting Associate Planner Kusch stated that the setback from the fence on the north property line to the enclosures was about 12 feet.

Public hearing opened.

Eric Meurs, Applicant, stated that the facility would be available for co-location, and would be constructed to handle an additional tenant that would be below Verizon's antenna. Mr. Meurs

explained that the monopole design would include simulated bark. Mr. Meurs explained that the landscaping was to soften the facade of the shelter, and additional landscaping could be added.

Chairman Eastman asked what Verizon's agreement was with the County about relocation of the tree, and Mr. Meurs stated that the tree needed to be saved and relocated elsewhere. Chairman Eastman asked if any other trees would be planted and Mr. Meurs responded that the County has not asked them to do so.

Chairman Eastman asked what area the applicant was trying to target with the antenna, and Mr. Meurs stated that the coverage objective area was to offload traffic of other sites around Imperial Highway and State College.

Chairman Eastman asked if they would be trenching to the sidewalk, and Mr. Meurs stated that they would be trenching to the transformer in the park. Chairman Eastman referenced the plan and asked what the "T" was, and Mr. Meurs stated that it was power and telephone. Chairman Eastman asked if the utilities would be underground and Mr. Meurs stated that the utilities were in a conduit placed underground.

Chairman Eastman stated that at that corner of the park it slopes down to the street, and asked Mr. Meurs if he knew what that grade difference was. Mr. Meurs responded that he was not sure, but it undulates.

Committee Member Voronel asked if any work was going to be done within State College, and Mr. Meurs stated that he was not aware of any work. Committee Member Voronel stated that if any trenching was done at State College an encroachment agreement must be obtained.

Mr. Meurs stated that Verizon was in the final stages of finalizing a lease agreement for the location and one of the requirements was CEQA clearance.

Chairman Eastman believed the project as being exempt under the guideline section 15301.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if building permits would be issued by the City and Chairman Eastman responded yes.

Committee Member Lopez asked if there was a walkway to the storage area, and Mr. Meurs stated that there was a pedestrian path that is used by the park.

Chairman Eastman stated that ADA access was needed to the facility even though it's not used. Mr. Meurs stated that it was ADA exempt, and Committee Member Tabatabaee responded that it was not. Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified that a project can be exempt for the workplace inside, but there would need to be access to the site.

Committee Member Lopez stated a walkway would be needed for the Fire Department requirements.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that he was in support of the request. He was concerned about security lighting. He stated that not a lot of pine needles or branches were being used and it looked like the tree was sick. He recommended that there be additional branches and

pine needles added. Mr. Meurs stated that the reason the Canary Pine was proposed is because it's fuller.

The Committee supported the request based on the following conditions:

- Access to the facility must be provided pursuant to the approval of the Building and Fire Departments
- Adequate illumination must be provided for security purposes as determined by the Community Development Director
- Landscape and irrigation plans must be submitted
- Relocation of the tree pursuant to County agreement
- The new building must be painted to match the existing building
- All encroachment and licensing requirements with the City must be met
- All utilities must be placed underground
- Proposal must be consistent with the plan submitted
- Community Development Department shall review and approve the architecture and design during plan check and prior to occupancy
- Must meet any standard conditions as identified by staff

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul **SECONDED** by Committee Member Tabatabaee to **APPROVE** the project with conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

PRJ08-00026 – ZON08-00011. APPLICANT: EUGENE VORTMAN; PROPERTY OWNER: NAM K. SHIN. A request for a minor site plan review of a small recycling collection facility on property located at 311 West Orangethorpe Avenue (north side of West Orangethorpe Avenue, approximately 200 feet west of Highland Avenue) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins gave a brief overview of the request. The proposal was for a small collection recycling facility with two bins and a front kiosk at the rear of the property. All the associated equipment would be stored in the kiosk in the bins. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the 4500 sq ft liquor store requires 18 parking spaces. He explained that site plan shows that the applicant is reducing four parking spaces, and replacing them on the east side of the building, providing 18 spaces. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that he received two letters, forwarded by Peter Schneider an adjacent neighbor speaking in opposition of the project. One of the letters was from the Department of Conservation to the liquor store owner notifying him of the convenient zone requirements and the need to provide a CRV buyback.

Committee Member Lopez referenced a photo and asked if those were the bin style going in. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that it would be the same design but the orientation of the bins would be parallel to the kiosk. Committee Member Lopez asked if the bins would be emptied from the back. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the bins would be accessed from the side, and the two bins would be parallel to the kiosk.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if staff had a floor plan of the proposed kiosk. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the site plan that was routed referenced the proposed kiosk.

Chairman Eastman stated that the bins in the photograph provided were accessed off the back, and would roll into that position. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the picture provided was just an example of what the kiosk is to look like, and was not depicting the orientation of the bins. Chairman Eastman stated that the site plan provided showed both.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the kiosk and the bins were two separate structures, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the applicant indicated that he had two plans for how the bins are to be oriented and integrated with the kiosk. However, the original submittal did not show the revised orientation of the bins, and how they would be integrated.

Chairman Eastman asked who had provided the letters, and Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the letters were provided by a neighbor who could not be present. Chairman Eastman asked what Mr. Schneider's reason was for providing the letters. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the letter from the Business Owner dated August 30, 2007 indicated that the Business Owner believed he could not provide a recycling service. Chairman Eastman read the letter from the tenant to the Department of Conservation. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that Mr. Schneider had indicated that the letter was proof that the business owner did not want the recycling center to be there.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the handicap area was existing, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes.

Chairman Eastman asked if the minimum 18 parking spaces required for the liquor store included the parking necessary for the person operating the facility and the person coming to use the recycling facility. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that the applicant had not identified any parking spaced for the recycling facility or the attendant.

Chairman Eastman stated that the applicant was proposing to add four new spaces with a 12 foot backup which did not meet code. He asked if the applicant was proposing a one way lane to accommodate the parking, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that it would have to be a one way lane. Chairman Eastman asked if the applicant was proposing landscaping on the site, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no.

Chairman Eastman clarified that the applicant was proposing to put in a recycling bin, provide for four additional spaces, and not provide any landscaping or other improvements for the site.

Public hearing opened.

Mike Pierce, California Recycling, stated that the kiosk was going to sit in front and the bins in the back will have side entry doors so the attendant can go through the side entry doors to store the material. Chairman Eastman asked if the part of the kiosk that wraps around the side of the kiosk would not obstruct that. Eugene Vortman, California Recycling, stated that there was a swing door that would open up so the bins can be pulled out. Mr. Vortman stated that the operation would be conducted through the front of the kiosk, and the employee would use the side doors through the bin to dump the material so everything is enclosed inside.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked where the handicap ramp was located and Mr. Vortman stated that it was not included in the plan, but the plans could be revised to address ADA requirements. Mr. Vortman stated that there was room behind the store to stripe three stalls, and he could install landscaping if recommended by staff.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked where the handicap stall would be installed for the kiosk, and Mr. Vortman stated that there could be an access path from the existing handicap stall to the facility ramp. Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that code does not allow for the disabled to walk behind cars. Mr. Vortman stated that the facility was a non-conforming use when it was established. Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified that the existing business was a non-conforming use, but the proposed recycling facility would be a new use.

Chairman Eastman asked if building permit plans were looked at to see if there were any site plan on file, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no. Chairman Eastman stated that he had concerns with the ADA space meeting the code requirements. He stated that there was only 23 ½ feet for back up, and the code requires 25. Chairman Eastman stated that there was no landscaping, and believed that parking went all the way up to the side walk. Chairman Eastman clarified that staff does not allow parking in the street setback.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how far the structure would be to the property line and Mr. Pierce stated that it would be 10 feet back to the property line on the west side.

Committee Member St. Paul requested clarity about the landscape planter on the site plans. Mr. Pierce stated that the landscape planter was a strip on the adjacent property to the west. Planning Technician Jenkins stated that it was not a raised planter.

Chairman Eastman asked if staff received a landowner's affidavit with the application, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that he had the notarized master application form.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that there would be one hour fire rating construction issues because there was no setback from the property line.

Chairman Eastman stated that he had concerns with the site parking, signage for one way traffic, and the lack of landscaping. He explained that code identifies that a non conforming structure or use cannot be added to without meeting code.

Committee Member Tabatabaee referenced a photograph and stated that the driveway does not line up with what is shown on the site plans. Mr. Vortman asked it would be okay to access parking from the rear of the alley. Chairman Eastman clarified that parking needs be on the east side facing the building, because parking cannot just be accessed from the public alley. He stated that the site is required to have 18 parking spaces based on the square footage of the liquor store. Chairman Eastman explained that there are at least 20 spaces needed to include parking for the additional development.

Chairman Eastman asked the applicant what his concerns were at the last meeting for requesting denial of the small collection facility on the adjacent property. Chairman Eastman stated that the applicant had indicated a couple issues regarding the other operator in terms of how he operates and manages his facilities. Mr. Vortman stated that he was not sure what the other applicant was proposing because he had indicated that he was going to have machines when the site attendant takes a break. Mr. Vortman stated that he was basically arguing the fact that he was confused on what the other applicant was actually proposing. Chairman Eastman clarified that the other application was denied because there were concerns with the site meeting code, circulation, and parking. Mr. Vortman asked if his project could be continued

until the next meeting so he could make the appropriate revisions to the plan to meet all the code requirements.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that there were issues with the handicap restroom facilities for the tenant at the previous meeting for the adjacent property. He stated that Mr. Vortman had not resolved that issue at this location. Mr. Vortman stated that he would have authorization from Mr. Shin and the liquor store operator to utilize the existing restroom facility at the liquor store. Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the liquor store owner was against the project. Chairman Eastman clarified that the business owner was explaining to the State in the letter provided that he could not provide the service. Clearly this proposal would provide Mr. Shin the required service.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that a path of travel to that restroom would need to be shown on the floor plan. Mr. Vortman stated that he would make those revisions, and has had to do that in similar projects.

Committee Member Lopez asked what the total depth of the liquor store was. Mr. Vortman stated that it was 90 x 50.

Mr. Vortman stated that in Mr. Sun's letter to the State he was explaining that he couldn't provide a recycling facility to meet the requirements.

Committee Member Bastreri stated that he had security concerns with the attendant carrying cash in that area of town, and the possible increase of homeless people congregating in that area. He stated that one idea that was discussed at the last meeting for the adjacent property was the necessity for a security guard. Mr. Vortman stated that he had a voucher agreement with Mr. Sun where he would redeem receipts from the recycling facility, so there would be no handling of cash in the parking lot.

Public hearing opened.

The following people spoke in opposition of the project:

Mark Case, 337W Porter Ave
George McCoy, 300 W Porter Ave
Ross Rice, 306 W Porter Ave

Their points of opposition were:

- Everyone in neighborhood is against the recycling center at that location (25 signature petition was submitted)
- Close proximity of site to residential houses
- Limited amount of space on site to support additional vehicle traffic
- Loitering
- Dumping or buildup of trash
- Recycle Facility will not have restroom facility he has indicated he will not provide them
- No room for additional parking
- Noise
- Bring down quality of life and property value

- Recycling is important but not at this site
- Graffiti will be increased
- Concerned with potential blocking of alley during emergencies
- The alley is dangerous and lighting is needed
- Go to a place where traffic is the norm

Mr. Vortman stated that the site plan indicated how the truck would come in to remove and exchange the bins. He stated that his draftsman, Mr. Pierce, used a bus simulation that is 57 feet in length and the roll off truck will be about 20 feet shorter than that. Mr. Vortman stated that the plans will be revised to show that when the exchange is conducted the exchange will be conducted on the property and not the alley. He stated that the kiosk could be painted to match the color of the exterior of the store for graffiti purposes. Mr. Vortman stated that he has a crew that goes out and pressure washes his sites and removes graffiti. He stated that the recycling attendant can help clean the debris in the alley since that was an issue raised by the residents. Mr. Vortman stated that he could work with Mr. Shin as far as adding some lights to the back of the liquor store to point towards the appropriate directions.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that there are a lot of corrections that have to be done on the site plan, and recommended continuing the project to see what can be done.

Chairman Eastman stated that if there is not a desire to approve the project that decision should be made clear so the applicant does not make revisions to something that the Committee has significant concerns on and would likely not approve.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that there are parking issues, handicap access issues, and issues with the orientation of the building. He believed the recycling facility was not appropriate for the site and was not in support of the project.

Committee Member Lopez stated that he was not in support of the proposal based on the neighbors concerns. He also stated that he was not sure why the applicant was proposing something he was against at the last meeting that is only a little different, but is in the same area.

Committee Member Bastreri stated that he was in support of recycling, but not at that site. He stated that it's a challenge for the residents to keep the neighborhood up to the standard where it is, and adding a recycling center there is going to add to their problems. Committee Member Bastreri believed it was a bad location for security reasons, and was not in support of the project.

Committee Member Voronel stated that she agreed with Committee Member Bastreri. She was concerned about circulation and blockage of the public alley, and was not in support.

Chairman Eastman stated that he agreed with the Police Department that there is a strong potential for problems and issues with the facility. He stated that the Police Department has a good understanding of what the issues are as it relates to security in that area. Chairman Eastman stated that the Planning Division was in support of recycling, but there were concerns with putting this facility in the alley particularly because it's too close to adjacent residential. He

believed this was a different issue in many ways than the immediately adjacent property in that there just wasn't enough room. Chairman Eastman stated that if the project was approved it would need to meet code, which would include landscaping, additional parking, an ADA restroom facility, and security lighting. Chairman Eastman stated that he would be in support of moving the facility closer to the front of the site than at the back of the site. The front provides for visibility, and moves it away from the residential uses. Chairman Eastman stated that there were a lot of things that need to be resolved, and was not sure if he could support the project because of the adjacency with the residential single-family properties. He believed the recycling facility would increase noise and traffic. Chairman Eastman stated that staff could condition the applicant to clean up the facility and maintain some of the trash issues and be responsible for that. Chairman Eastman believed that the facility would not create additional crime, but stated that crime was a concern of the Police Department and they are the experts on that.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Bastreri to DENY the project based on the findings of the adjacency to the residential single-family properties, circulation concerns, current ADA access and traffic issues. Motion passed 4-2 with Chairman Eastman and Committee Member St. Paul voting against the motion.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

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

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant