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

CALL TO ORDER	Chairman Eastman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT	Eastman, St. Paul, Voronel, Tabatabaee, Lopez, and Bastreri
COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT	None
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT	Jenkins, Flores, and Coats

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to APPROVE the June 5, 2008 minutes AS WRITTEN.

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Chairman Eastman, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to CONTINUE the July 3, 2008 minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

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) (BSP) (Continued from May 15, June 5, and July 3, 2008).

Senior Planner St. Paul explained the project was continued from the May 15, 2008 SRC meeting. He noted the wrought iron fence and gate was located off of Magnolia and Valencia. He further noted the wrought iron gate on Magnolia is five feet away from the property line and there was discussion about vehicle stacking at the previous meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul noted the storage bin in the handicap parking stall has been removed from the site, and the dispersion areas have been resolved as it relates to Code requirements. Senior Planner St. Paul referenced a letter written by the applicant indicating the 35 members only use the Church on Sundays. The applicant was requesting to keep the gates closed from 12-2 p.m. for the safety of the children whom play outside while attending Sunday school. He noted staff had a meeting with the applicant and contractor to discuss how the gates might be tied to the use at some point in time. He recommended that the Committee discuss whether or not to keep the gates.

Chairman Eastman asked if the gates would remain closed when the facility is not being used. Committee Member St. Paul noted the applicant would like the gates to be closed at certain times, but they did not indicate the times.

Committee Member Tabatabaee was concerned with the location of the gate and noted a man door is required, but was not proposed. He was also concerned because the applicant has not applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to occupy the entire building based on the discussion from the previous meeting.

Chairman Eastman asked if the gate on Valencia was a swing gate. Committee Member St. Paul responded affirmatively, and noted it swings inward toward the property.

Committee Member Lopez was concerned that the gates did not have a man door.

Public hearing opened.

Yun Roe, Contractor, stated the applicant was proposing to close the gates after business hours because of cut through traffic, and people parking overnight. Mr. Roe noted the Pastor agreed with staff that the fence on the Magnolia frontage did not comply with the corner cut off requirements in the Municipal Code.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the gate would be closed on Sunday only, between 12-2 p.m. and at night during non-business hours, and Mr. Roe responded affirmatively.

Committee Member St. Paul asked when the gates would be opened. Mr. Yun believed the gates would be open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Chairman Eastman asked if the church had office hours, and Mr. Yun did not believe so.

Chairman Eastman asked if the applicant was willing to setback the gate on Magnolia to avoid the stacking of vehicles. Mr. Yun believed parking lot space would be lost if the gate was setback. He believed the gate on the south side could be setback two or three feet and then turned 45 degrees.

Mr. Yun stated he had to check with the applicant to see if the church could financially afford to setback the gate. Committee Member Voronel believed it would not be too expensive to add another panel to the gate.

Mr. Yun noted the applicant was willing to work with the City and was preparing a CUP application to occupy the entire building.

Chairman Eastman explained there was an opportunity for the Magnolia gate to remain closed at all hours.

Committee Member Tabatabaee clarified the Magnolia gate could remain closed, but a man door must be provided.

Mr. Yun noted there was an entrance door at the corner of Magnolia and Valencia, which could be used instead of providing a man door.

Chairman Eastman explained the Code requires that all exiting from a building must be onto a public right-of-way. He noted the man gate was required because there was a door on the back of the building to the parking lot.

Chairman Eastman asked if the congregation would have a problem if the gate on Magnolia was permanently closed. Mr. Yun believed it would not be convenient, but it was a good idea to solve the Code problems and traffic concerns.

Chairman Eastman noted the applicant needed to file a CUP application so staff can look at the assembly area, and the occupancy of the building.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman believed there was adequate exiting of the building with a man door applied. He stated there was adequate stacking distance to open the gate on Valencia, and believed the Magnolia access might not be needed.

Chairman Eastman recommended the gate on Magnolia remain closed at all hours and should be used for emergencies only. He also recommended a man door on the gate or fence with a Knox pad lock.

Committee Member Voronel recommended extending the gate and installing a man gate, and removing the driveway on Magnolia.

Committee Member Lopez asked what the width on Valencia access was, and Committee Member St. Paul responded about 20 feet. Committee Member Lopez recommended the Magnolia gate be opened for exiting of vehicles only with proper signage. Committee Member Voronel believed the exit only gate on Magnolia would help circulation.

Chairman Eastman asked how an exit only driveway would be monitored, and Committee Member Lopez responded with signage. The Committee discussed possible solutions for the gate.

Committee Member Voronel believed the closure of the Magnolia would be beneficial from a traffic standpoint.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated the gate should be included in the CUP process to control the needs of exiting.

Committee Member Bastreri believed the gate was too close to Valencia and would not allow for safe access. He noted the building itself was very close to the curb line on Magnolia, and stated there were generally high speeds on Magnolia. Committee Member Bastreri believed Valencia would be a lot safer to pull out on, and recommended that the gate on Magnolia be closed permanently.

Committee Member Tabatabaee recommended the following conditions:

- Applicant shall install a man door on the gates
- Knox pad lock on Valencia and Magnolia
- Magnolia gate shall be kept closed at all times, without exception
- Signage to identify the gate is to be closed at all time
- Applicant shall file a CUP application within 30 days
- The Valencia gate shall remain open during business hours except on Sundays between 12-2 p.m.

- Applicant shall be given the opportunity to return to the Staff Review Committee (SRC) with an alternative if permanently closing the gate on Magnolia is not acceptable to the congregation

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel, to APPROVE the project, with staff's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

Committee Member Tabatabaee left the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

PRJ08-00235 – ZON08-00074. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: ROGER T. REYES. A request for a security fence plan review to construct a rolling gate at the front of a six-unit apartment complex on property located at 1320 Peckham Street (east side of Peckham Street, approximately 375 feet south of West Orangethorpe Avenue) (R-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE) (Continued from July 3, 2008).

Planning Technician Jenkins noted that at the previous SRC Meeting the applicant was proposing a sliding gate to secure the front of the property along Peckham. The item was continued to allow the applicant time to consider an alternative solution for security and a different location of the security gate. Planning Technician Jenkins noted the applicant was now proposing to move the gate inward along the building, and deleting the rolling gate along Peckham. The revised proposal is a gate with a 3 foot wide man door.

Chairman Eastman clarified that at the previous meeting the sliding gate did not provide for any access to guest parking. He noted the applicant was concerned about people cutting though the property and vandalism. He further noted the request was continued to allow the applicant time to look into security cameras, and additional lighting to help provide for security needs.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the gate was interior to the site, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the gate was going to block off all the units, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded all the units except for units one and two.

Public hearing opened.

Zorina Reyes, Applicant, asked if cars could park in the driveway. Chairman Eastman clarified the Code identifies that all parking spaces be accessible, but cars are allowed to park on driveways leading to a garage. He responded to the applicant saying they can post fire lane signs, but they are not enforceable by the Fire Department. Mr. Reyes noted he was trying to prevent people from parking in the driveway.

Chairman Eastman clarified that the code identifies that garages be used for parking purposes, and keeping the garages clear for parking is enforceable by the Community Preservation Department. Mrs. Reyes asked if she could get a copy of the Municipal Code Section addressing garage parking, and Chairman Eastman responded that Planning Technician Jenkins can give her a copy.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Lopez recommended a Knox key pad and an inspection from the Fire Department when the gate is complete.

MOTION by Committee Lopez, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel to APPROVE the project, with the recommended Fire Department inspection condition. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process. He noted a building permit was not required, but the gate still needs to meet ADA (handicap) Code requirements. However, building permits must be pulled if the gate is over 6 feet. Committee Member Lopez explained the Knox key pad application process.

PRJ08-00262 – ZON08-00081. APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS AND CORE COMMUNICATIONS; PROPERTY OWNER: REGENCY CENTERS. A request for a minor site plan review to construct a 58-foot monopalm with 12 panel antennas, one microwave and four equipment cabinets with four GPS antennas on property located at 1040 East Bastanchury Road (southwest corner of Brea Boulevard and Bastanchury Road) (C-1 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (MJE).

Planning Technician Jenkins explained that the applicant was requesting to construct a 58-foot monopalm with 12 antennas, and four equipment cabinets with GPS antennas at the rear of Morning Side Plaza. He noted there was an existing 48-foot T-Mobile monopalm east of the proposed site. Planning Technician Jenkins explained that in 2005 the SRC approved two light standard antennas to be constructed, but the entitlement expired. In 2006 an administrative approval for additional radio equipment was approved, but he could not find a permit on file for that. He further noted that in 1996 there was a building permit to construct a telecommunications facility in the bell tower on the southwest corner of the shopping center.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the existing monopalm belonged to Verizon and Planning Technician Jenkins responded it belonged to T-Mobile.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the T-Mobile monopalm was available for co-location, and Michelle Felten noted that typically monopalm co-locations tend to look funny.

John Koos, Applicant, stated that Verizon's monopalm has to be 10 feet from T-Mobile's monopalm for interference reasons.

Committee Member Voronel asked if any work would be done on the public right-of-way, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded the equipment cabinets would be located on top of the roof.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the applicant would have to trench. Chairman Eastman referenced the site plan, and believed the applicant would be utilizing all existing connections on site.

Chairman Eastman referenced the site plan, and noted the conduit was proposed going up and over the parapet. He asked staff if there was any conversation with the applicant about penetrating through the parapet, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded no.

Chairman Eastman asked if the equipment on the roof would be screened. Planning Technician Jenkins responded that the cabinets and the GPS antennas are setback approximately 6 feet from the parapet and are 6 feet tall. He noted that there was a difference of about 18 inches from the top of the GPS antenna and the top of the parapet.

Committee Member Lopez believed that the applicant might not be able to penetrate through the parapet because it goes 30 inches above the roofline.

Planning Technician Jenkins noted that the applicant indicated that the equipment cabinets were placed closer to the front of the building because Verizon's engineer believed it was the best place based on his structural calculations.

Chairman Eastman asked if the applicant would be screening the equipment above the parapet line. Planning Technician Jenkins responded there would be no additional screening.

Public hearing opened.

Michelle Felten, Applicant, explained that Verizon was deficient in coverage in the area, and that was why they were proposing the 58-foot monopalm. Ms. Felten noted there would not be interference issues, and the equipment would be located on the roof. She further noted the equipment was setback from the parapet so it is out of sight as much as possible. Ms. Felten explained the monopalm would be ground mounted with no fencing around it and referenced the photo simulations.

Committee Member St. Paul asked why the equipment on the roof had to move forward rather then closer to the pole. Ms. Felten explained that based on the architects structural calculations and to use the parapet for screening purposes. Verizon believed the equipment was proposed at the best location.

Chairman Eastman believed that from a screening perspective it would make more sense to put the equipment in the back of the roof closer to the antenna. Ms. Felten noted that currently the equipment cabinets open away from the street and can be flipped and moved back so they open toward the parking lot.

Chairman Eastman referenced the site plan and noted the only place on the roof without vents was where the equipment is proposed. He thought the existing roof infrastructure was the reason for the location, more so than the structural considerations.

Committee Member Voronel referenced the photo simulations and asked if the equipment would be seen from a line-of-sight standpoint. Ms. Felton referenced the site plan and noted there was a tree that may block the equipment. She explained that someone would have to be across the street to see the equipment and at that point it would be hard to discern what it is.

Committee Member St. Paul asked how much of the equipment protrudes above the parapet and Ms. Felton responded it was hard to tell.

The Committee and the Applicant referenced the site plan and discussed adding a landscape planter, but believed there was not enough room.

Chairman Eastman asked if the applicant considered putting the equipment in the existing bell tower, and Mr. Koos noted there was no room.

Chairman Eastman asked if there was an opportunity to do a cupola on the tower for additional height. Mr. Koos believed it would have to be reconstructed.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if panels could be placed on the outside of the bell tower, and Mr. Koos responded no, based on the description provided by Committee Member St. Paul.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman recommended that the mechanical equipment on the roof be painted to match the building. He noted there was landscaping in the parking lot that would help obscure the equipment.

Committee Member Lopez believed that the Code did not allow penetrating through a parapet on a separation wall. Chairman Eastman believed it would be fairly easy to penetrate through the parapet, and run a conduit through it. He noted the existing holes in the parapet at the drainage scoopers.

Committee Member Voronel noted an encroachment permit would need to be pulled if the applicant was going to encroach onto the public right-of-way. She believed the equipment on the roof was beneficial if it was screened.

Chairman Eastman asked Committee Member Voronel if she believed the proposed screening was adequate. Committee Member Voronel believed it was not, and recommended approving the project subject to the applicant providing a line-of-sight study.

Chairman Eastman believed the equipment would not be noticeable if it is painted to match the building, and didn't think a line-of-sight study was needed.

Committee Member St. Paul recommended the following conditions:

- A line-of-sight study must be provided
- The conduit shall penetrate through the parapet wall, if possible
- Applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit, if necessary

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel, to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommended conditions, plus the standard conditions for wireless commercial antennas. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

OTHER MATTERS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Adjourned at 11:40 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant