MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., MAY 15, 2008

CALL TO ORDER	Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT	Eastman, Drew-Craig, St. Paul, Voronel, Tabatabaee
COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT	Lopez
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT	Jenkins, Kusch, Flores, Coats

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to CONTINUE the April 17, 2008 and May 1, 2008 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

The following items were heard out of order.

PRJ08-00174 – ZON08-00055. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: GLORY CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. A request for a security fence plan review for property located at 3700 West Valencia Drive (southwest corner of Magnolia Avenue and West Valencia Drive) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Chairman Eastman noted the applicant requested the item be continued to the June 5, 2008 meeting.

Public hearing opened/closed

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel, to CONTINUE to a DATE CERTAIN of June 5, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ04-000143 – ZON04-00019. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CIE N. FRANZIA. A request for an extension of a prior approval for vehicular security gates at a residential condominium complex on property located at 1706-1848 East Commonwealth Avenue (southeast corner of Commonwealth and Acacia Avenues) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (R-3 zone) (HAL)

Senior Planner St. Paul gave a brief overview of the request. He noted the project was approved in 2005 for security fencing on the perimeter of the property. The applicant was requesting Resolution 443 be extended for a year. Senior Planner St. Paul noted the conditions of approval would not change.

Public hearing opened.

Mary Andrews, 1760 E. Commonwealth #102, asked if the project would be on hold for 6 months to a year. Senior Planner St. Paul responded the request was to extend the approval for one year.

Joe Vitolo, 1832 E Commonwealth #104, asked how long the extension was for, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded the extension was one year from today's date.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Drew-Craig, with Committee Member St. Paul abstaining, to APPROVE the one year time extension. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ08-00183 – ZON08-00060. APPLICANT: SEIWON CHOI; PROPERTY OWNER: PU KI CHONG. A request to review site and architectural plans to construct a building measuring approximately 2,000 sq. ft. and redesign a parking area on property located at 2419-2425 East Orangethorpe Avenue (north side of East Orangethorpe Avenue, approximately 350 feet east of State College Boulevard) (C-M zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch noted a site plan application for the subject property was previously approved by the Staff Review Committee in December 2006. He explained the proposed site plan application included retention of two buildings (a liquor store and restaurant) and a building addition located at the rear of the liquor store, adjacent to the west property line. Associate Planner Kusch explained the floor plan and stated that staff had suggested modifications, and was recommending a continuance. He noted staff proposed conditions that were included as part of the previously approved site plan application.

Chairman Eastman noted the submitted building elevations were mislabeled in terms or building orientation.

Associate Planner Kusch referenced the site plan and explained staff's concerns. He explained along the north side of the proposed building was setback to avoid encroachment into a utility easement along the north property line. The area would not be readily visible. Staff was recommending a wrought iron gate that would secure the area, but still allow for access of the utility easement. Associate Planner Kusch noted any necessary transformer should be located in the proposed landscape planter, directly east of the proposed building. The landscape planter would allow for landscaped screening of the transformer. He further noted staff was recommending modification of the walkway located in the landscaped area in front of the liquor store building. The suggested modification would include providing a walkway aligned with the building entry and perpendicular to Orangethorpe Avenue. Associate Planner Kusch explained there was a concentration of compact parking spaces in the area adjacent and north of the proposed trash enclosures. Staff was recommending standard-sized parking spaces for this area. He noted the landscape planter adjacent to the parking spaces was wide enough to allow for a parking space overhang to accommodate the standard parking spaces. Staff recommended relocation of the trash enclosures and identified suggested alternative locations. Associate Planner Kusch noted staff recommended making all the parking spaces along the north parking line standard spaces. He stated the applicant would need to provide a title report

that would clarify the easement along the north property line, and whether or not the easement could be utilized for landscape purposes. Associate Planner Kusch explained the applicant was proposing one driveway to serve the property. He noted that the landscape planter, located west of the driveway entry, would need to be extended in length to match the planter east of the driveway entry. Associate Planner Kusch noted staff was recommending placing a required turnaround area adjacent to the restaurant at the east end of the property. This would allow for standard parking spaces and a landscape planter adjacent to the sidewalk along the north side of the restaurant building. Along the east property line, staff was recommending a landscape planter to soften the wall at the edge of the property, and to prevent graffiti.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked what kind of manufacturing was allowed. Associate Planner Kusch explained the zone was commercial manufacturing, which allows for light commercial manufacturing uses.

Committee Member Tabatabaee noted there was only one restroom facility shown on the site plan, and stated an additional restroom may be needed.

Committee Member St. Paul referenced the centered driveway proposed and asked if there was any discussion about moving the driveway for better circulation. Associate Planner Kusch explained the applicant was concentrating the driveway at one location in order to maintain adequate on-site circulation.

Public hearing opened

Sungjun Yoo, Applicant, explained the property owner would like to have new development on the property due to the changing economy. He noted he would look into revising the parking layout. Mr. Yoo noted he could move the trash enclosure to the west side of the landscape area. Mr. Yoo was concerned about adding a security gate because of the existing utility easement. He believed the existing restaurant tenant was looking into remodeling it in the future. Mr. Yoo believed industrial use was not different from commercial use in design. He noted the owner was proposing the same architecture of the restaurant and liquor store.

Associate Planner Kusch referenced the elevations and asked what the STL notation meant. Mr. Yoo responded STL represented steel roofing.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked what type of use was being proposed and Mr. Yoo stated he was not sure.

Public hearing closed

Chairman Eastman stated the earlier concept had multiple entry drive lanes and this was an improvement over that. He believed the design of the building could have been more flexible than what was provided. He believed there was no frontage on the street for a quasi retail use, and there was limited access for manufacturing use. Chairman Eastman was concerned about the compact spaces at the end of the lanes not being used by compact vehicles; thereby possibly extend into the minimum turn radius. He noted there was someone interested in purchasing a part of the property, and a parcel map would become a factor in considering the new parking layout. Chairman Eastman believed two parking stalls could be converted to accommodate the trash enclosures. He noted the facade of the liquor store would not match the building that is proposed.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, to CONTINUE the project for a revised site plan. Motion passed unanimously.

PRJ08-00177 – ZON08-00057. APPLICANT: TRILLIUM TELECOM SERVICES; PROPERTY OWNER: FULLERTON MANUFACTURING, INC. A request for a minor site plan review to construct a new 65'-0" tall monopalm and six equipment cabinets on property located at 311 South Highland Avenue (approximately 600 feet west of South Highland Avenue and 131 feet south of Walnut Avenue) (M-G zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Chairman Eastman explained the monopalm was proposed on the south side of the railroad tracks between Truslow and Walnut, west of Highland. He noted the site was currently used for industrial manufacturing, and is an industrial zoned property.

Planning Technician Jenkins entered the room and provided photo simulations. Chairman Eastman asked if any existing parking spaces would be used and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no. Planning Technician Jenkins referenced an aerial photograph and noted the location of the monopalm cannot be seen from Walnut.

Chairman Eastman clarified the monopalm would be located next to a City trail.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if the applicant would be providing trees. Planning Technician Jenkins noted a date palm was shown in the photo simulation.

Public hearing opened

Jason Kozora, Trillium, stated the purpose of the site was to provide coverage for the surrounding community. He noted plants and trees would not live in the soil and was proposing a concrete foundation. He explained a Phase II environmental study would be done on the site to see if there was any soil contamination. Mr. Kozora noted there was no irrigation in the area and trees would not live next to the antennas due to the bad soil.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there would be an enclosure for the equipment and Mr. Kozora responded yes.

Public hearing closed

Committee Member Tabatabaee recommended a continuance for possible revisions.

Chairman Eastman was concerned because the area was right next to a future City trail. He believed compatibility should exist between the industrial area and the trail. He noted a chain link fence was proposed around the property with no screening of the mechanical equipment from the trail. Chairman Eastman clarified the Committee has always been concerned about the adjacency of public spaces to cell antennas, and has regularly required additional trees and landscaping. He questioned the argument that there may be soil contamination, which would prevent trees from growing. He believed irrigation was easy to accommodate.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked how long it would take to get the results of the Phase II environmental study. Mr. Kozora responded it could take 6 months to a year. Mr. Kozora stated he would like to move forward with an approval with conditions.

Chairman Eastman noted he would like to continue the project to look at the following:

- Site Plan revisions
- Landscape plan to address screening
- Landscaping buffer between the equipment and the trail
- Addition of palm trees

Committee Member St. Paul stated he would like to see two trees at different heights.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated he would like to see the Phase II Environmental results.

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

PRJ08-00135 – ZON08-00042. APPLICANT: DAVE HAPROV; PROPERTY OWNER: W & D SUNRISE LTD PARTNERSHIP. A request for a small collection recycling center in the shopping center at 1885 North Euclid Street (northwest corner of Euclid Street and Rosecrans Avenue) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE)

Planning Technician Jenkins explained the request was to permit an existing small collection recycling facility located at Sunrise Village. He noted it was a reverse collection kiosk with two storage bins. The hours of operation are from 7a.m.-9p.m., seven days a week. He further noted the center provides vouchers, which can be redeemed at CVS. Planning Technician Jenkins explained the recycling facility takes up four parking spaces in the center. He stated there was a recent change of ownership for the center, and there are applicants in plan check for newer uses, which might increase the demand for parking at the center. He noted there was a spa in plan check and if approved the Sunrise Village Center would require 499 parking spaces and there are only 494.

Chairman Eastman asked if the parking spaces behind the roll off bins were included in the parking calculations, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded yes. Chairman Eastman noted the use of the parking spaces would be limited because a truck would need to maneuver to roll off the bins. Planning Technician Jenkins indicated that he did not count the access to the bins in his parking tabulation; therefore the number of available status would be less.

Chairman Eastman clarified the facility was existing but not permitted and there is a pending code enforcement case.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if any other locations might accommodate the recycling center, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded he did not look for other locations.

Public hearing opened

Joe Perez, Applicant, explained the recycling center was a manned facility with two reverse vending machines on either side. He noted the attendant's hours were 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and the machines run until 7 p.m.

Chairman Eastman stated permits or approvals were not obtained from the City, and Mr. Perez responded affirmatively.

Committee Member St. Paul asked how many times a week the bins were emptied, and Mr. Perez responded twice. Committee Member St. Paul asked what time of the day the bins were emptied and Mr. Perez believed they were emptied before or after regular business hours.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if there was a restroom facility. Mr. Perez stated the recycling facility employee can use the CVS restrooms, and they get a half hour lunch. He noted the front doors of the kiosk can be shut for breaks and the reverse vending machines would be available.

Chairman Eastman asked if the recycling facility was to accommodate CVS requirements for recycling and Mr. Perez responded yes. Chairman Eastman asked if there was a contract with CVS, and Mr. Perez responded they had a contract with CVS for voucher cashing.

Committee Member Tabatabaee left the room at 11:25 a.m.

Public hearing closed

Chairman Eastman clarified the Sunrise Village Shopping Center was approved for a CUP for a reduction of parking, otherwise it does not meet the code requirements for the number of parking spaces. He stated CVS uses only half their tenant space, and will likely be leaving when there lease runs out. Chairman Eastman clarified that approving a facility that does not meet parking requirements is not allowed by code. He stated there was a façade remodel in the process and parking is being re-evaluated. Chairman Eastman clarified there were building concerns about restroom facilities and if approved there should be an established non-revocable agreement to provide for restroom facilities. Additionally, the facility would have to meet building codes as it relates to being secured to a foundation. He noted the recycling facility could not be permitted without prohibiting other tenants that are in plan check from being finalized.

Committee Member St. Paul stated the property should be explored for alternative locations.

Committee Member Voronel asked if there would not be sufficient parking for the spa if the recycling facility stays on site at its current location. Chairman Eastman responded that it does not look like there would be enough parking.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the facility could operate on a temporary basis until the center is fully operating with tenants. Chairman Eastman clarified the recycling facility was obligated to meet code requirements.

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, to CONTINUE the project to an unspecified future date, so the applicant may look at an alternative location. Motion passed unanimously.

<u>PRJ08-00186 – ZON08-00058. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: RICARDO O. DORREGO</u>. A request for a minor site plan review for a 17% reduction in the front yard setback from 35 feet to 29 feet on property located at 406 Truman Avenue (east side of Truman Avenue,

approximately 115 feet north of Chapman Avenue) (R-1-7.2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (BSP).

Senior Planner St. Paul gave a brief overview of the request, and explained a 15 foot setback was required. He stated the only issue was an enclosed porch addition that would be added on to the house. The porch was proposed in the center of the house and the front door will be reoriented. Senior Planner St. Paul stated there was a centerline issue that pushes the property line back five feet. He noted the actual reduction would be 20 percent, and staff recommended approval.

Chairman Eastman asked if the dimensions on the site plan that say 35 feet should be 30 feet and Senior Planner St. Paul responded yes. Senior Planner St. Paul noted both houses on either side were 30 feet as well.

Senior Planner St. Paul noted he had two calls from neighbors in support, but wanted to verify the applicant was not pushing out the entire front house and enclosing for square footage.

Senior Planner St. Paul referenced photographs and noted the location of the existing porch and the door entries on the side of the house and the door entry at the center of the house.

Public hearing opened

Paul Paniayala they want to get more use out of the living room by adding the porch it gives them the option to expand the living room out a little.

Chairman Eastman asked if there was any thought of having the porch stairs on the south side, toward the driveway. Mr. Paniayala stated it did not come up.

Chairman Eastman stated the driveway gates must be maintained as operable to provide for access to the garage.

Public hearing closed

Chairman Eastman stated he did not have a problem with the 20% setback reduction.

MOTION by Chairman Eastman, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel, to APPROVE the project. Motion passed unanimously.

Senior Planner St. Paul noted the plans would have to be revised to indicate the new property lines.

OTHER MATTERS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Adjourned at 11:45 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____

Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant