MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., APRIL 17, 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	Jenkins, Kusch, Flores, Coats

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to APPROVE the March 20, 2008 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

PRJ08-00118 – ZON08-00038. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: RONALD J. CORREA. A request to construct a retaining wall adjacent to the rear property line and exceeding the allowable height limit within the required rear yard building setback. The proposed wall would measure up to 12 feet high on property located at 1101 La Mesa Drive (west side of La Mesa Drive, between Valencia Mesa Drive and La Mesa Place) (R-1-20 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15304 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU).

Associate Planner Kusch referenced an aerial photograph and explained the request. The request was for a 12 foot retaining wall outside an existing utility easement, which is five feet from the rear property line. He explained that the drainage currently sheet flows to the drainage swell in the back and the retaining wall was strictly for landscape purposes. Associate Planner Kusch noted that staff was concerned with drainage and permits that expired in the 70's.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what the height of the wall is that faces the neighbor. Associate Planner Kusch responded that the neighbors may see the top of the wall.

Committee Member Tabatabaee referenced the site plan and asked about the drainage swell. Associate Planner Kusch explained that the drainage swell was for properties that front Valencia Mesa, and referenced the original tract map. Chairman Eastman clarified that the drainage swell collects flow from the adjacent properties and farther up stream.

Committee Member Voronel stated that the basin has to be sized. She noted that the Engineering Department would require a hydrology report to verify the run-off quantity and will require a velocity reducer and rip rap in the outlet area to eliminate erosion.

Public hearing opened

Inderjit Chauhan, stated that the applicant wanted to build the retaining wall because the slope is failing and would like to use the area for landscaping purposes.

David Espinoza, Contractor, stated that they did not have a problem putting in the catch basins. He stated that the wall was eroding and the applicant would like to put in the wall to prevent future problems.

Mr. Chauhan explained that on the southwest corner the west property owner will not see the wall, and the property on the northwest corner will see 4 to 5 feet of the wall.

Randall Clement, 1224 W Valencia Mesa Dr., requested to see the site plan and asked what would be changing. He did not agree that the slope was failing. Associate Planner Kusch referenced the site plan and explained the request. Mr. Clement believed that hydrology was a big problem because of all the water in the area, and did not believe that catch basins were adequate. He believed that affecting the water flow was a public nuisance and should not be encroached in any way.

Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified that the applicant was proposing the catch basin in his back yard. Chairman Eastman referenced the site plan and explained where the catch basins were proposed at. He clarified that the proposed wall was in the applicant's property and would not encroach into the public easement.

Gregory Howie, 1216 W. Valencia Mesa Dr., stated that he would be looking at all sides of the proposed wall from his property and provided photographs for the Committee to view. Mr. Howie believed the slope was not eroding because there were concrete barriers at the bottom. He believed that on a rainy day all the water would go into his property if the wall was put up. Chairman Eastman clarified that there was a drainage easement that goes across the applicant's property, and the wall would be on private property outside the easement.

Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified that the applicant was not building on the property line, and it appears from photos that the chain link fence on the adjacent property was blocking drainage.

Chairman Eastman stated that the issue was the retaining wall, and there is a revised plan, which cuts the corner of the retaining wall.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the easterly existing block wall was a retaining wall. Mr. Chauhan responded that it was a garden wall, and explained the proposed wall would abut it.

Chairman Eastman clarified that the proposal was not a diversion, and the water flow would remain the same. He stated that he would defer to the Engineering Department and the Building Division to determine if there is a hydrology problem.

Mr. Chauhan noted that the difference in elevation from the south side to the north side is only a 6 foot difference.

Public hearing closed

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed wall. He stated that the drainage from the back yard would have to be split so there is less of a concentration load. Committee Member Tabatabaee noted that a hydrology report and a soils report would be needed. He explained that the wall should be moved back into the existing slope about 2 feet to allow for rip raft.

Committee Member Voronel stated that she was concerned about the swell being obstructed because of the wall. She stated that a hydrology report must be done and she would like to see the skew changed to reduce area of volume reduction. Committee Member Voronel explained that by moving the proposed wall away from the easement it creates an open area for the flow.

Committee Member St. Paul stated that he would like to see how the height will affect the neighbors if the wall is moved back 2 feet.

Chairman Eastman believed that a reduction of volume should be accommodated by an addition of volume at the base of the wall without pushing water onto the neighbor's property. He asked if pushing back the wall could divert or create an edie effect that could create additional erosion on adjacent properties.

Committee Member Voronel drew a sketch and stated that she would prefer that the slope is maintained and a rip rap is constructed to prevent erosion. She stated that she could not support the project until she sees a hydrology study showing how the water flow would be affected.

Chairman Eastman believed that if the applicant was altering one side of the slope, the applicant would be responsible for altering the other side on the base. He stated that the item can be continued until a hydrology report is provided.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, to CONTINUE the project, based on the following conditions:

- Applicant must provide a revised plan splitting the drainage
- Wall must be moved back two feet
- A hydrology report must be provided

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member Bastreri, to RE-OPEN the public hearing.

Public hearing re-opened

Chairman Eastman asked Mr. Chauhan if he had any objections providing a hydrology report, and he responded no.

Public hearing closed

Committee Member St. Paul stated that he would like to see a visual of what the height would be as the wall is moved back.

Chairman Eastman stated that the Committee Members can take a visit out to the site between now and when the item comes back.

Committee Member Voronel stated that when the hydrology report is prepared the swell needs to be taken into consideration on the entire area.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Lopez, to CONTINUE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ08-00129 – ZON08-00041. APPLICANT: TERRA UNIVERSAL, INC; PROPERTY OWNER: G. H. SADAGHIANI. A request for a minor site plan to permit outdoor storage containers with screening along the north side of the building on property located at 800 S. Raymond Avenue (southeast corner of South Raymond and Kimberly Avenues (M-P zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (HAL)

Senior Planner Allen referenced site photographs and gave a brief overview of the request. She noted that there was a railroad spur that came in front of the north side of the building to serve a loading dock. The railroad spur was removed with prior approvals and the applicant now desired to use the loading dock as a location for outdoor storage of containers. Senior Planner Allen stated that the municipal code does not permit outdoor storage including containers, which are visible from the public way. The applicant was proposing to paint the containers to match the building, and planting additional trees. Senior Planner Allen recommended that the project be continued for additional information.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the containers were on the dock, and Senior Planner Allen responded that the containers were on the dock. He asked if the area was fenced out and Senior Planner Allen responded that it has a low chain link fence.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that he would like to see the item continued to check the exit plan and structural support of the containers.

Chairman Eastman noted that the issue of painting the containers fell into the idea that they are permanent, and would be more integrated into the building.

Committee Member St. Paul asked how the middle containers would be accessed. Senior Planner Allen responded that there were 5 roll up doors, and access would be from inside.

Chairman Eastman believed that the floor area ratio and lot coverage issues would need to be verified.

Senior Planner Allen stated that staff had an overall concern of setting a precedence of using storage containers as a permanent addition.

Committee Member Lopez stated that he was concerned about exiting and fire access.

Chairman Eastman asked if the grading plan indicated what the setback is from the loading doc to the property line. Senior Planner Allen responded that request would put a 20 feet setback about two feet into the loading dock.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the trees would be planted on private property and Senior Planner Allen responded yes.

Public hearing opened

George Sadaghiani, Terra Universal, stated that they have planted about 3 times as much trees as are required. He stated that the loading dock could not be utilized any way except for storage. Mr. Sadaghiani stated that the code allows for storage containers, but they have to be screened. He noted that his intention was to make the containers acceptable to the neighborhood by planting trees, fencing and painting the containers. Mr. Sadaghiani believed that the building meets all Fire Code requirements. He explained how the containers would be utilized.

Chairman Eastman asked how the containers were brought in. Mr. Sadaghiani stated that they worked with the telephone company to remove the cables and then the containers were moved in with a crane.

Chairman Eastman asked if the containers would be removed and replaced when the stored materials are used up. Mr. Sadaghiani responded no, and noted that the containers are permanent and that when shipments come in they are loaded directly into the storage containers. He noted that there is no access from the street.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated that the Building Division would need to know how the containers are structurally supported. Mr. Sadaghiani stated that the containers were designed to interlock. Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified that the containers will need to comply with the California Building Code.

Mr. Sadaghiani stated that in a fire access simulation by his engineering team, it was determined that the containers meet all the fire access requirements. Chairman Eastman clarified that the Fire Department would make the determination as to whether the project meets Fire Code.

Chairman Eastman believed that a site visit from the Building and Fire Departments would be needed.

Mr. Sadaghiani believed that the containers made the building safer because all materials would be stored outside versus inside. Chairman Eastman clarified that the requirements for the applicant are stipulated by Code and not arbitrary opinions.

Chairman Eastman noted that there were floor area concerns, screening, stacking, and traffic calculation concerns.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, to CONTINUE the project to A DATE CERTAIN of May 1, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS

Chairman Eastman gave a brief overview of the Downtown Alcohol regulations that go into effect on April 18th.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Adjourned at 11:20 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant