MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday June 12, 2008 4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Vice Chairman Cha

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban and Committee

PRESENT: Members Daybell, Silber, and Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior

Planner Allen, Associate Planner Kusch, Clerical Assistant Flores, and

Clerical Assistant Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by

Committee Member Silber and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present, to APPROVE the April 24, 2008 minutes AS

WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

The following items were heard out of order.

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00344 – ZON07-00073 APPLICANT:JPI DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY OWNER: PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE Review of landscape and hardscape plans for a student-oriented mixed-use development on property located at 2545-2565 E. Chapman Ave, 501 N. Commonwealth Ave, and 2450 E. College Place. (Northwest corner of Commonwealth & Chapman Avenues, south of E. College Place; excluding 2550 E. College Place) (SPD Zone) (Previously Certified EIR) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project and stated that in December of 2007, the City Council approved the student oriented housing project (Jefferson Commons/Fullerton Campus Village) on the northwest corner of Chapman and Commonwealth Avenue. The project had come before the RDRC for review and approval of building plans and was now conditioned to come back before the RDRC for final review and approval of the streetscape/hardscape plans, subject to recommended conditions. Senior Planner Allen stated that there were three landscaping areas within the project: (1) onsite landscaping for the residents of the project, generally in the interior of the spaces; (2) streetscape, which is a cornerstone of the education district. It had been the City and Staff's intent to provide a pallet, or a menu of choices (materials, colors, designs, and street furniture), that could be replicated in the larger education district; and (3) a median, which the project is required to construct on Chapman Avenue, as well as upgrade the planting in the existing Commonwealth median.

Senior Planner Allen stated that there was a cohesive theme between the on-site trees and plants as well as what was being carried forward in the street. Staff reviewed the recommended conditions of approval with the RDRC.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the applicant had seen, and was in agreement with, the recommended conditions of approval. Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Daybell asked if Staff was recommending approval of the plans given to the RDRC. Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Senior Planner Allen turned the presentation over to the Applicant and the landscape architect.

Public hearing opened.

Lance Hanna, Applicant, gave a background review of the project and an update on project status. He stated JPI had come before the RDRC for review and approval of the building plans and was now seeking review and approval for the hardscape and landscape plans. He stated they were going out for final construction pricing and were in the process of building permit plan check and procuring financing for the project. He stated that if the RDRC found the plans sufficient and to their satisfaction, a final City approval may be obtained, and the project could move forward. He stated that there are a variety of design elements that future projects in the education district can pick and choose from. The present design can complement the future-build out of the future education district, while still providing some flexibility and uniqueness for the build-out of subsequent projects. He stated that Staff provided the proposed project's plans to the stake holders and the education district. Mr. Hanna introduced the design team: Rick Pollhamus, Landscape Architect; Kamala Klein, Landscape Architect; Kara Sutch, Project Architect; Greg McCafferty, Planner; and John Ciccarelli, Bicycle Consultant.

Mr. Polhamus stated that the goal was to provide a fun, urban, contemporary, pedestrianoriented frontage on the streetscape. He identified the landscape areas and introduced Ms. Klein.

Ms. Klein stated that the residential portion of the project is on the west side of the vehicular entrance; the Chapman commercial, mixed-use portion of the project is on the east side of vehicular entrance. She stated that the residential portion of the project contains unique elements, which highlight the streetscape, such as decorative unit pavers and light colors that depict the proper albedo percentage ratings for the Build-it-Green program's sun reflection requirements. Contemporary style tree grates also accentuate the contemporary building. The east side of the vehicular entrance, the commercial area, is designed to activate the space and provide fun seating nodes (colorful and geometric shapes). Ms. Klein referenced the plans and stated that the corner focal point consists of seat walls to help accentuate the paving pattern and protect the pedestrians from the street, and it is designed using raised planters.

Ms. Klein stated that on the softscape for east Chapman Ave there were three levels of hierarchy within the trees: (1) the skyline tree (Date Palm) (2) the street tree (London Plane tree); (3) the pedestrian-scale patio tree (Crape Myrtle) planted within the seating nodes. There is also a median tree (Liquidambar). The North Commonwealth streetscape,

coming around the corner from east Chapman to north Commonwealth, is a mixed use/commercial portion of the project with different designs on the street to highlight the area. Unit pavers are used within the public right-of-way and colored concrete is used within the ten-foot setback portion at the walkway. There are two other designs for the seating nodes with more choices of colored concrete and different textures of sandblasting to make the seating nodes fun elements. Ms. Klein referenced the plans and stated that a focal point is the pattern on the corner of East College and North Commonwealth. She stated that the pattern was designed to accentuate the architecture and provide a nice entry way into the leasing office/amenity. Ms. Klein stated that the trees on the softscape on the North Commonwealth side will follow the three-tree hierarchy and consist of the sky line tree (Date Palm tree), the street tree (Chinese Tallow tree), the pedestrian tree (Chitalpa); and a median tree (Tabebuia ipe).

Ms. Klein stated that all of the street furniture items on the streetscape were stainless steel. She referenced the Staff Report and explained that there were more items of street furniture on the attachments as well as the proposed street light. The public gathering areas and the terminus of East College Place and Universities is a meet-and-greet area with decorative paving and canopy trees for shade and for the residents to enter into the project. There is a commercial courtyard, denoted by decorative paving leading into the courtyard, which is activated by the people using the retail garage parking. An intimate garden is provided for the public use. Facing East Chapman Avenue are two interior courtyards, which are passive courtyards for the residents. In the Northern part (near East College Place, by the second fitness center) there is a large, passive courtyard that has a large, artificial turf area. The middle courtyard is passive and a central gathering area. On the sides of the gathering area are two small, semi-private courtyards. The southern most courtyard is passive and has a gathering space as well as smaller spaces for different uses, like studying or seating. There is a pallet that accentuates the sidewalk of East Chapman Avenue and a new median is being constructed on North Commonwealth.

Vice Chairman Cha inquired about the parking lot area between the garage and the residential units, and asked whether the landscaping would only be along the commercial area. Ms. Klein asked Vice Chairman Cha which side he was referring to. Vice Chairman Cha clarified that he was asking about the north and west side of the parking garage. Mr. Polhamus stated that the parking lot area is adjacent to the structure and there is no planter space, but the garage is adjacent to a walkway, so tenants can walk from the parking stall to the hallway.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there would be any landscaping in the middle of the parking lot. Mr. Polhamus answered that there is some difficulty locating landscaping in a parking garage with multiple levels (one would have to open the garage for sunlight).

Committee Member Silber asked for clarification on the southwest corner, which he stated looked like a loading dock area, and Ms. Klein explained it was the fire access.

Committee Member Silber asked if there was an accommodation at the entry points of the mixed-use areas for people who rode their bikes and needed to lock them up. Ms. Klein stated that there were bike racks on either side of the seating nodes along the street setbacks, and in the East College Place terminus, all the way around the perimeter.

Mr. Ciccarelli, Bike Consultant, stated that customers and visitors using the retail spaces will arrive through the entire mixed-use frontage. There will be individual bike racks and

small groups of bike racks interspersed throughout the area. Mr. Ciccarelli referred to the plans and stated that for those who work in the business, there will be clustered parking within the edge of the parking garage, behind the interior landscape area.

Committee Member Silber asked about the relationship between the square paver and the tree grate. He stated one looked a little more rustic than the other. Ms. Klein clarified that the tree grates did have a more modern finish and the pavers were modern and square. Committee Member Silber stated he thought the choices were handsome. However, he stated the tree grate was metal and precisely cut with a certain scale and the unit pavers were square; he was concerned about an awkward transition when the paver and tree grate were right next to each other. He stated that if there was a concrete band around the tree grate, then it would be fine. Ms. Klein noted the tree grate had a unit paver band (rectangular band), not a square band.

Committee Member Silber asked about the parking garage and whether it would have a green-screen element or a trellis element along the vertical face of the openings of the parking garage to soften the face of the parking garage along the southern edge. He asked how the landscape worked along the openings of the parking garage. Senior Planner Allen replied that there will be more of a trellis and less of a green-screen design. She stated that on the east side of the parking structure there are structural members of the garage where wires would be attached; however, it is different on the southerly side. The vertical members are set within the garage so there is no support for a screen. In the commercial building's plaza, the planters are pushed up against the garage so there are both low plants for the commercial space and some bamboo and palms to give vertical height. There will be planting on the east side of the garage and, if feasible, on the south as well. Committee Member Silber wanted to clarify if at grade plant material would be along the south side and would work roughly at the scale of the parking structure. Ms. Klein answered affirmatively.

With no further public comments, the public hearing was closed.

Committee Member Silber stated he was pleased with the direction of the project. He asked if the previous ideas discussed were being communicated to the stakeholders and the University. Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively. Committee Member Silber said he was pleased and thought the project was carefully done.

Committee Member Daybell stated he liked what he was seeing, as well as the variety of design (colors and patterns) in different locations. He stated he hoped he would not see project details change in the future due to cost effectiveness, after the project was approved. He stated he hoped to see the project built as designed. Otherwise, Committee Member Daybell stated he was very supportive of the project.

Committee Member Lynch stated he likes the project and would liked to see it built as designed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he liked the mix of bike racks and variety of trees inside the landscaping. He stated he wanted to see the landscaping plan completed.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Committee Member Silber to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 2

PRJ08-00154 – ZON08-00049 / ZON08-00050 APPLICANT RUSSELL A. KHOURI AND PROPERTY OWNER: UNIVERSITY PLAZA LTD Review of site and architectural plans for a two-story commercial building measuring approximately 12,875 square feet on property located in a Community Improvement District at 2720 Nutwood Avenue (generally located on the southeast corner of Nutwood Avenue and Langsdorf Drive) (O-P Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch stated that this project was continued from the previous RDRC meeting on May 22, 2008. He stated that there had been changes made to the design to accommodate the Committee's concerns. He referred to the plans and stated that a plaster cornus molding had been replaced by a metal coping around the top and metal cladding added to curvature portions of the building. There was a revised trellis design and treatment on the building, and a metal band was added on the north and south elevations. There is steel trowelled plaster with accent colors at the base of the building, and at the east side of the building, the exterior stairway has been enclosed. The footprint of the building has been shifted towards the parking lot to accommodate the minimum building setback and envisioned patio space fronting Nutwood Avenue. The driveway located on the west side of the building was reduced to accommodate a wider sidewalk, (previously at 4 ½ feet, now at 8 feet wide) with tree wells in grates to attract pedestrian movement from Nutwood. He stated that Staff believes this contemporary design compliments the California State University building located across Nutwood Avenue.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that on the back of the building, metal cladding was provided on the round structure to give accent and focus to the building that relates back to the front.

Public hearing opened.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant if he had comments and if he had seen the staff recommendations. The applicant, Russ Khouri, answered affirmatively. He stated that raised planters will be incorporated in the landscaping. There will be planters with the tree wells, complimenting JPI's landscaping and the landscaping of the benches has also been recessed. The entire project is envisioned to be identified by the University Plaza sign, which will be a focal point and lead pedestrians towards the walkway.

Project Architect, Doug Ely, noted that the trellis elements were contemporized with a series of concentric bands. Some of these elements were also added on the south side of the building.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the RDRC had expressed concerns with the northeast corner of the building, so trellises have been added for detailing. Mr. Ely referred to the plans and noted that a curved element had been added to the building. He stated that a pedestrian area had been created with trees and tree wells and wished to replicate the area on the street. He stated that the outdoor patio space is a combination of low planter walls and wrought iron fences—a fairly controlled area for restaurant use and patios.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that Staff recommended a condition that the landscape plans come to the RDRC for final review and approval; however, conceptual

landscape plans have currently been provided in the plans to obtain feedback from the RDRC.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that he liked the design. He stated that he thought Staff and the applicant could review the project's landscape for final approval because the project did not look large enough to bring back to the RDRC. He stated he appreciated the effort to make the structure friendlier on the Nutwood side.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that he really liked the new design and that it was much improved from the previous design.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he liked the design and how the Committee's comments were implemented into the revised design.

Committee Member Silber stated he was pleased to support the proposed project but would prefer to keep the landscape in the review process. He stated that the proposed project is going to be a more leasable building and will benefit the adjoining building with the improvement of the landscape paseo and the addition of outdoor seating spaces.

Chairman Hoban stated he agreed with all of the comments. His only concern was the ADA parking in the front of the building. He stated he would prefer the parking to be in the next closest spots and then fill in the parking space with expanded courtyard area, but did not know if that would comply with Code.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, SECONDED, by Vice Chairman Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00123 — ZON08-00040 APPLICANT AP FUNDS I, INC AND PROPERTY OWNER: SUNRISE VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER A request for a Minor Site Plan application to remodel the façade at Sunrise Village Shopping Center at 1801-1895 N Euclid (located on the southwest corner at the intersection of N Euclid and Rosecrans) (C-2 Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (JEA) (Continued from April 24, 2008)

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave a brief overview of the project. He stated the project was a façade remodel of the existing Sunrise Village Shopping Center that was continued from April 24, 2008. He referenced a picture of the previous façade remodel reviewed on April 24, 2008 and indicated the remodel consisted of stucco, cultured stone veneer and a color pallet of yellows and greens. He stated the RDRC had expressed appreciation for remodeling the existing shopping center but did not feel the previous proposal was consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, which was identified as country, rural or equestrian in character. The applicant was asked to take a different approach and incorporate more rural characteristics into the shopping center design. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and stated the applicant had revised the architecture and used more cultured stone and applied it to entire facades (applied at major key focal points) instead of solely using stone at the columns. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and stated there was more jogging in the building than what is shown in the drawings. He referenced the revised building color scheme and

stated the new scheme was more saturated in color than what was previously presented. The new colors were thought to be more "Country" in character, and the scheme reflects the basic colors of the color wheel (reds, yellows, blues, and greens), which is more traditional (suitable for a farm-type of environment).

Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and indicated there were various "farm" characteristics included in the proposed project: (1) "vaulted dormers", which are seen in farm houses to provide light in the attic space; (2) faux windows were incorporated to provide residential character to the building; and (3) two tower elements are included, which consist of corrugated metal and somewhat reflective of a "water-tower" (round structure sitting on top of a square pedestal with a roof covering). The towers have punched openings to provide interest. He stated Staff recommends that if water tower features were to be provided, they should reflect a true water tower in character and perhaps be used as a marquee for the Sunrise Village Shopping Center.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and stated there was a concern with how much signage would be allowed in the "Major Tenant A" space. There is limited signage and typically larger tenants would have more wall face to have larger signs. It is recommended to increase the wall height or to provide a raceway design that would allow for decorative mounting of signage in the front, in a manor that would be appropriate for the quality of the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated Staff had recommended conditions of approval (included in the Staff Report) which includes: (1) the submittal of a sign program, consistent with the architecture of the building; (2) the accent tower and façade features must be three-dimensional in design so that a "back of parapet" view is not visible from public streets or any portions of the shopping center; (3) any modification to the established landscaping be considered through submitted landscape plans and be reviewed by the Director of Community Development; (4) All lighting shall be approved through plans approved by the Director of Community Development. Soffit lighting shall be installed in the center arcades to ensure a safe environment is established; (5) the stone columns supporting the walls should be wider (6" to 12") and more substantial to provide visual support of the stone walls; and (6) construction documents should accurately reflect existing conditions.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that the Committee did indicate at the previous meeting the applicant look at the surrounding neighborhood before developing the design, which the applicant did. Staff believed the use of stone and residential character is better implemented in the revised design than the previous one. The RDRC expressed desire for pedestrian areas and plaza space provided. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and indicated an area where a pedestrian area could be provided; however, the area would require relocation of drive lanes, removal of mature trees, and would have to be deliberated on by the Committee.

Committee Member Lynch inquired about the water tower element and asked if Staff was proposing to remove the windows to give more of a natural "water tower" look. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that the "windows" would need to be removed to make the feature look like a more traditional tower, which was more in lines with the authenticity of the neighborhood, as an equestrian neighborhood, and less of a contemporary interpretation. It would also be an opportunity for signage in the shopping center.

Committee Member Lynch asked if the tower would resemble an actual water tower with legs. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied that the tower would not necessarily have legs. Staff will work with the applicant in looking at historic photographs of water towers to see if something can be developed. It was felt that something more traditional would be appropriate instead of the contemporary approach.

Committee Member Lynch stated he was pleased to see galvanized corrugated metal, which was a nice departure from the previous design.

Committee Member Silber asked if the tile roof would be retained. Acting Chief Planner Eastman answered affirmatively, but would let the applicant discuss the technicalities.

Public hearing opened

Jason Lee, Applicant, stated he did not view the tower feature as a water tower. They were designed to make a bold tower statement. He stated the proposed tower was about 700 square feet. He did study other shopping centers but still found it hard to design this center differently. He stated having a round tower was a good idea, but making the towers all round would be too heavy, so he would incorporate windows and lighting inside the tower at night. He stated he would like to have a three dimensional mass and not just a flat wall panel. Mr. Lee referenced the plans and indicated the elevations of the towers were a depth of more than 10 feet. He stated that the previous tower design and the current proposed tower design were different in volume.

Vice Chairman Cha asked Mr. Lee to clarify what type of tower would be incorporated in the design, if not a water tower design. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that Staff viewed the tower as similar to a water tower feature, but the applicant was stating it was not his intent to make the feature a water tower. Mr. Lee stated he was looking for a focal feature and felt a round element would create more attention and focus, rather than providing another square element. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the applicant did not agree with Staff's recommended condition and was looking for a strong focal feature, in which the result was a corrugated metal, pitched roof feature. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the plans and identified the elevations that showed the corner with the tower.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there would be openings in the tower. Mr. Lee answered affirmatively. Vice Chairman Cha asked if this opening would lead to a problem with birds. Mr. Lee replied he wanted to make a deeper opening than what was presented. Vice Chairman Cha expressed concern that the birds would be trapped in the tower.

Committee Member Silber asked if the proposed round towers were set back about four or five feet from the edge of their square platforms. Mr. Lee answered affirmatively. Committee Member Silber asked if they would retain the tower. Mr. Lee answered affirmatively.

Vice Chairman Cha asked to hear from the public.

Catherine Lancaster, a resident of Fullerton, stated she supported Staff with their concern of the shopping center complementing the character of the neighborhood. She expressed concern with the tower feature and stated that a round element (such as the water tower feature) can be used to make a differentiation but does not necessarily add to the

aesthetics of the environment. She expressed concern with the maintenance of the existing landscape and wished to encourage the City and the property owner to be more sensitive to the health of the center's landscape, as well as consider adding or renewing landscape to provide the Center with a "mountain feel". Ms. Lancaster stated she hoped the City would be cognizant of how any lighting would affect the houses directly above the center's parking area, so as to not provide any hardship for those individuals trying to sleep at night. She stated the previous signage in the center has made it difficult for its retailers and tenants to carry on their business. The signage has been poor historically, which has contributed to the center not being as economically successful as it could be. She asked the City to pay attention to the signage and make sure it was practical and compatible with the look of the center, clearly written, and had at least one of the languages be in English, so the Community knows what is being offered. Ms. Lancaster stated parking spaces in the plaza are not compatible with the center; people want to park conveniently and have big enough spaces to accommodate their cars. She stated she appreciated the color pallet and thought it looked traditional and would go nicely with the community.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the signage plan was going to come before the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied it was not recommended to come back to the Committee, and would come back to the Director of Community Development as recommended.

Acting Vice Chairman Cha asked Mr. Eastman if all of Ms. Lancaster's comments were heard. Acting Chief Planner Eastman answered they were and that there has been discussion with the owner about the English language and the signage; there are some First Amendment issues that limit the application of restrictions on signage; and the Code does not prohibit advertisement in foreign language. However, it has been made clear to the owner that there are people that don't read Korean, and accommodating them in the advertising would be better for the Community. There also has been discussion with their sign program person.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the landscaping plan would come before the RDRC. Acting Chief Planner Eastman replied landscaping would go before the Director of Community Development, if the existing landscaping is modified. He stated that the existing landscaping consists of well established Pine trees and nothing was recommended in the proposal to remove or modify any of the existing landscape. Staff has requested the submittal of landscape plans if there is to be any removal or modifications to the landscaping.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch inquired about Committee Member Silber's comment regarding the retaining of the tile roof. Committee Member Silber replied his concern with the tile roof was that it is out of a different tradition that does not relate to the alternative design's approach. Committee Member Lynch stated he noticed the tile roof was out of context and stated an excellent choice for roofing would be corrugated material. He inquired about natural stone versus cultured stone and stated he was concerned with the "shelf-life" of cultured stone. Acting Chief Planner Eastman referenced the stone materials and stated the applicant believed the actual cultured stone is thicker than the sample provided. He stated the biggest concern was how it is terminated; Staff would like it terminated on interior corners and have it wrap around the exterior corner appropriately. Committee

Member Lynch expressed concern that when the cultured stone becomes chipped it looks like plaster casting and loses its appeal.

Chairman Hoban arrived at 5:14 pm.

Committee Member Silber stated the Community's comments on the previous project elevation was not to take a South Orange County, Mediterranean approach, and some people have felt that approach was reflected in the previous design. He stated it was not customary to see a tile roof in an architectural design that may have come out of northern Europe or a rustic form that is more North American in style. The tile, as a material, is competing against the revised design's approach. Committee Member Silber stated that the tower elements with the metal, as implied in the structure, are not working because of the relationship of scale and the shift of materials, which makes the structure look awkward. Committee Member Silber stated the colors in the color pallet are more complimentary than the previous pallet. He stated he did not mind the previous color pallet, with the exception of the "Hot Sun" color. He stated the safer architectural design is the first scheme; however, the first scheme does not meet the aspirations of the neighborhood. He stated signage was an opportunity to create greater depth; if there were monument signs in the landscape in front of the complex, and the design was creative and vertical, it would create greater depth. He stated he believed other elements of signage would help this project, despite the fact signage is typically discussed after the architectural design is completed. Committee Member Silber stated if the metal is used on top of those two or three tower elements, the relationship to its base has to be resolved better. He stated one would not put a tower up if using this architectural vocabulary.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the stone material is a grey color. He asked Member Silber that if there was less of a contrast in color between the roof and the stone material, would this change be moving the design in a better direction. Committee Member Silber stated that it might help, but the tile material and stone material come from two different places and are trying to resolve themselves on the same building. They are two different ways to waterproof something, set for two different environments, which are arriving together on the same building.

Committee Member Daybell stated his concern was that the applicant was wasting his money trying to do a patch job. He stated he didn't think the current design was going to make the shopping center vibrant and attract people to come and shop there. He stated he did not really like what he saw; however, he did not have solutions because the budget probably didn't allow for an effective re-vamping of the shopping center. He stated he did not see anything designed to liven up the individual store fronts behind the façade to entice people to go there.

Vice Chairman Cha stated it was hard for him to comment because he did not know what the towers would look like.

Committee Member Daybell stated he was very reluctant to see the proposed project approved.

Chairman Hoban stated he didn't know if it was appropriate for him to comment because he was not present to hear the present and past testimony on the project. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that an RDRC member should not deliberate and vote unless he's heard the testimony on the project; however Chairman Hoban is a member of the public and is entitled to express an opinion on what he observes.

Committee Member Daybell asked Committee Member Silber if he agreed with his standpoint on the current design. Committee Member Silber stated he thought the first design worked better with the shopping center than the revised design.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the normal process for a project that is not in the Community Improvement District is to be reviewed by Staff at an administrative level. Staff brought the project before the Committee because there is a lot of history within the center and it is within the community's interest to have the RDRC comment on the design. Even though a complete demolition and reconstruction of the center might be preferred, the applicant cannot be forced to reconstruct the center entirely, so the Committee is to review the design as is presented.

Public hearing re-opened.

Ms. Lancaster stated she thought the community would be disappointed to see the center designed as the first proposed design, which resembles a "typical" commercial design. She also stated that the current roof was not brand new so it may be a better decision to not make a determination on a roof that might have to be replaced in a few years.

Vice Chairman Cha asked the applicant if he had any comments and Mr. Lee stated he did not.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he would like to hear Acting Chief Planner Eastman's comments on how to proceed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the decisions that are within the purview of the Committee. The Committee options: (1) If the design falls short for a façade remodel, the Committee can deny the project, and the applicant has the opportunity to appeal the decision, or the applicant can be asked to consider additional changes before it is denied; (2) the Committee can approve the first presented design, as it is within the application, or (3) either of the presented projects can be amended and approved with conditions and design revisions. He stated that, in regards to combining stone with tile, many European and Mediterranean countries have used a combination of tile and stone. The revised architecture, with gables and windows, is probably more appropriate for a residential community.

Committee Member Silber stated that he could support the second scheme, if some issues were resolved. The tile should be replaced with standing seam metal and the two towers resolved in a circular form with materials uniform from the top to bottom. There needed to be a more uniform choice of material from the ground and up. The two towers needed to be metal all the way to the ground or no metal at all. He stated that if the tile roof was going to remain, then the color pallet needed to be revisited.

Committee Member Lynch stated he agreed with Member Silber, that he did not like the tile on the proposed project and would like to see the roof material change either to standing seam or corrugated metal. He stated that he did not like the first scheme at all and would not consider approving it; however, he was in favor of approving the second scheme with conditions.

Committee Member Daybell asked if one of the conditions would be to replace the roof. Committee Member Lynch answered affirmatively. Committee Member Silber noted the visible portion of the roof should be replaced with corrugated or standing seam metal. The corrugated towers needed to be a simple form, terminating into a gable or a hipped roof, so it reads as one element and not two or three. The material at the top should be the material at the base, or within three feet of the base. In regards to cultured or real stone, the cultured stone will be a maintenance issue. Committee Member Lynch referred to the plans and stated that the corrugated metal is a nice relief from the stone.

Committee Member Daybell clarified that the motion to approve was subject to: (1) the tower being one material and be extended to the base; and (2) the roof is a simplified massing that holds it together vertically (either standing seam or corrugated metal roof).

Vice Chairman Cha stated the applicant should be asked to either continue or take the recommendations.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the applicant may not be able to speak on behalf of the owner because it is potentially a budget issue, but the current motion is to approve the second design with conditions. The conditions would consist of removing the round turret on the tower elements and providing consistent material from top to bottom; the galvanized metal was recommended to come down lower and change the tile to a metal roof.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that Mr. Lee may discuss the recommendations with the owner of the property, and may request the project to be continued to the next meeting, or the Committee can approve the proposed project, subject to the recommendations.

Mr. Lee stated he would like to speak with the owner of the project before a final decision is made.

Vice Chairman Cha asked Mr. Lee if he would like to continue the project to the next meeting and Mr. Lee answered affirmatively.

MOTION by Committee Member Silber, and SECONDED by Committee Member Lynch to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of June 26, 2008 to allow the applicant the opportunity to talk with the property owner or revise plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 4

PRJ08-00030 – ZON08-00013 APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: STUDIO 1016 LLC A request for a review of modifications for consistency with a previously approved Minor Development Project to remodel an existing single story commercial structure on property located at 1016 N. Harbor Blvd. (Generally located approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of N Harbor and Berkeley) (C-3 ZONE) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. In February of 2008 the Committee approved the project, which remodeled an existing building into an architect's office. She stated that due to cost constraints, the applicant requested modifications to the approved remodel design. Modifications include phasing construction of the addition to the

existing building, creating a larger courtyard between the two existing buildings. She referred to the plans and stated that the applicant wished to expand a portion of the existing building in order to add restrooms (formerly envisioned in the addition building). The glazing and plaster is mostly eliminated on the elevation facing the street, and a fixed screen wall would be provided, enclosing the courtyard. The applicant is requesting "iron wood" (decking material) as a potential alternative to the cement board. The project modifications will slightly increase a portion of the building, bringing it forward to the street somewhat, but still within the ten foot setback. The applicant is also requesting to replace 36" box Palo Verde trees with 24" boxes. There is also change in landscape material in the public right-of-way from native grasses to seed mix.

Chairman Hoban asked Senior Planner Allen to point to the two locations where cement board might be used. Senior Planner Allen replied that cement board would be placed wherever the wood slats are (the area of the building facing the street) as well as the north and west side of the new building that would be added. She clarified that the applicant is requesting "iron wood" in place of the wood slats and a mechanical equipment screen will be on the roof.

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Coles, Applicant, stated he apologized for bringing the project back to the Committee; however, the first design was too expensive to complete with the current financing constraints. He stated he was hoping to bring the project back to the RDRC in the future to complete the design originally shown, after the business has had a chance to expand.

Chairman Hoban asked how the iron wood would be affixed. Mr. Coles replied it would be affixed with stainless steal and that there are counter sunk screws. Chairman Hoban clarified that they are exposed screws but are stainless and counter sunk. Mr. Coles replied the same screws used for the cement work would be used for the iron wood. He stated that the cement board slats are more costly than buying pre-made planks.

Chairman Hoban asked if the iron wood sits off the building. Mr. Coles answered that it would not; it would be a slight reveal off the face of the building—purely decorative in nature. The water proofing of the building would be behind it.

Chairman Hoban asked if the block building, with the exposed aggregate, was going to be blocked behind the screen. Mr. Coles answered affirmatively. He said the screen was the means of connecting the two buildings. Chairman Hoban also questioned the elimination of the slats extending off the end of the building. Mr. Coles explained that these were proposed to screen a new mechanical unit which was now not going to be installed. Mr. Coles referred to the plans and stated that the block is intended to be sandblasted, sealed and accented with natural materials in terms of the glass and the wood.

Public hearing closed.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he liked the first design better than the second; however, this one was fine with him.

Committee Member Daybell stated he would support the change.

Committee Member Lynch stated he was disappointed that the budget was not allowing for the first design, but would support the second design.

Committee Member Silber stated he would support the alternative design.

Chairman Hoban stated he preferred the additional infill on the first design, but liked the iron wood and how it picked up different colors in the block on the second design. He stated he would support the second design.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Cha, SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 5

PRJ08-00203 – ZON08-00065 APPLICANT: PJ CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY OWNER: CHRIS DUNCAN A request for a minor development project to construct a 320 sq.ft attached patio cover to the rear of the house at 239 W Malvern, and the northeast corner of N Highland and W Malvern (generally located on the northeast corner of N Highland and W Malvern) (R-1P Zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen gave a brief overview of the project. The applicant is proposing to add a large patio cover to the rear of the dwelling (added to the existing dwelling in 2004). The structure will be an approximately 300-square-foot, patio cover, extending off the rear of the house and visible from Highland Avenue. The house has gable roofs, varying in height, so the addition will follow that style, adding another variation in the roof line. Photos are attached to the Staff Report, which show the addition and the plans for the patio. It is noted that the records show another dwelling was approved for the rear of the property that was not constructed. That approval expired and the patio will encroach into that area. Staff has recommended conditions to ensure the patio cover is compatible with the dwelling and reviewed those listed in the staff report. Senior Planner Allen stated that an email was received from Katie Dalton with Fullerton Heritage informing that she read the Staff Report and feels that the proposed project is compatible with the dwelling as well as the Preservation Design guidelines.

Chairman Hoban referred to the plans and asked if the patio would come off of the back additional dwelling at a lower roof line. Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Chairman Hoban asked about the relation of the patio structure height to the roof. Senior Planner deferred this to the applicant.

Committee Member Lynch referred to the plans and asked if the patio would be open.

Senior Planner Allen answered affirmatively.

Public hearing opened.

Paul Johnson, Project Contractor, stated that the recommendations he received for the project were consistent with the intended building design. When drawings are submitted

for permit approval, the issues will be addressed. He stated that the line drawings were scaled basically to provide a general idea for the proposal. Height and other details were not included but will be included when the drawings are submitted for a permit.

Chairman Hoban asked how tall the beam was going to be at the end of the rafter tail. Mr. Johnson replied that the end of the rafter tail would be at about seven feet, six inches tall. It will be above the existing door for a water heater, which is 6 feet, 8 inches tall, plus the distance from the bottom of the door to the ground (estimating 7 feet, 6 inches). The overhangs will have a one-by-six ruff saw and cedar to match existing elements.

Committee Member Daybell asked if he would be using tongue-and-groove. Mr. Johnson replied that he would be using shiplap, or whatever the existing is.

Committee Member Silber asked if Mr. Johnson was planning to have posts set up against the existing house. Mr. Johnson said that he was not planning on having posts against the house, but inside the existing wall. Chairman Hoban asked if the post would go through the window. Mr. Johnson answered no; he referenced the plans and stated it will be on the two opposite sides. Committee Member Silber asked if he would have the four-by-twelves extended and attached inside the wall but not the center post. Mr. Johnson answered affirmatively.

Michelle Duncan, Applicant, stated there was not a picture of her front porch present, but the plans were depicting the same style as her front porch. Chairman Hoban wanted to clarify if she meant there was a gable and the front porch protrudes below it. Mrs. Duncan answered affirmatively. It was very common with the porches in the neighborhood.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lynch stated the structure was appropriate for the neighborhood and the preservation zone and supports the project.

Committee Member Silber stated the clarification that the structure would reflect the front porch makes it appropriate and he supports the project.

Chairman Hoban stated that he was concerned with the porch, but because the structure would resemble the front porch, he supported the project.

Committee Member Daybell stated he agreed with Chairman Hoban and Silber about the front porch and stated he supported the project.

Vice Chairman Cha stated he supported the project.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Cha, SECONDED, by Committee Member Daybell to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that when Staff reviews the application they will be looking at design material of the front porch to make sure it is compatible in terms of scale size, materials, style of supports etc.

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

None	
PUBLIC COMMENT:	
No public comments.	
STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:	
Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that there has be Planner position has been changed to the Planning Man asked if there was a difference in classification and Acting no, that it was just a change in title.	ager position. Chairman Hoban
MEETINGS:	
None	
ADJOURNMENT:	
Meeting adjourned at 6:18 P.M.	
	Respectfully Submitted,
	Nadia Muhaidly Clerical Assistant

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS: