

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., AUGUST 7, 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, Rebert, and Zelinka (Item No. 2)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Zelinka, Jenkins, Kusch, and Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present, to APPROVE the July 3, 2008 minutes AS WRITTEN.

ACTION ITEMS

Item No. 1

PRJ08-00290 – ZON08-00089. APPLICANT: STEVE WILLIAMSON; PROPERTY OWNER: LUSIFINA CORPORATION. A request to consider site and architectural plans for construction of a drive-thru restaurant located in a parking lot within an existing commercial center, replacing a smaller coffee kiosk previously approved and construction at the same location, on property located at 130 Imperial Highway (southeast corner of Imperial Highway and Harbor Boulevard) (C-2 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303(c) of CEQA Guidelines) (AKU)

Associate Planner Kusch explained that the Staff Review Committee previously approved a development at the project site which included a vehicle drive lane and order/pick up window on two sides of a building. The building has since been removed. The proposed development provides for a singular order/pickup window that is accessed by two merging vehicle drive lanes. Staff was concerned with the adequacy of the vehicle stacking distance and potential impacts on the vehicle circulation of the existing parking area. Staff believed there was a conflict with the merging of the two drive lanes. Associate Planner Kusch noted the plans reflect concrete paving towards the front of the building. He requested that the applicant identify the intended use of the space. He indicated that if used for outdoor dining purposes, then staff would need to know the quantity of seating to determine the required amount of parking. He further noted a current deficit of parking for the adjacent shopping center. The proposed development would require at least six parking spaces. Associate Planner Kusch explained, if the project was approved, a landscape and irrigation plan would need to be submitted for review and approval. Staff recommended widening landscape planters adjacent to the building to provide vertical specimens to provide relief to the building's side elevations. Staff recommended that the project be continued, to address staff's concerns and those of the Committee.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the applicant was proposing a restaurant, and Associate Planner Kusch explained it was a “juice kiosk”.

Committee Member Tabatabaee noted there was a kitchen facility on the plans. Chairman Eastman clarified that the juice kiosk is considered a restaurant, but typically restaurants with 12 seats or less have less of a parking requirement. Associate Planner Kusch referenced the concrete area on the site plan, which is for outdoor seating, and noted that at least 6 parking spaces would be required.

Committee Member Tabatabaee noted a grease interceptor would be needed if the proposal was a restaurant establishment.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there was a parking requirement for the previous kiosk, and Associate Planner Kusch responded that the Committee did not require additional parking because it was a smaller coffee kiosk and there was no on-site dining. .

Committee Member Lopez referenced the plans and asked if the applicant was proposing a hood. Associate Planner Kusch responded that he was not sure.

Associate Planner Kusch explained that there would be a potential for pedestrians crossing the drive-thru if the concrete area was for dining purposes, and believed an identified walkway would be needed.

Public hearing opened.

Steve Williamson explained that the proposed building was double in size from the previous building, but all the parking would remain the same. He noted the only changes were the footprint of the building and the drive-thru direction. Mr. Williamson further noted there would be no seating inside, and only proposed tables with umbrellas on the concrete paving staff referred to. The applicant intended to have vertical landscaping to break up the stucco of the building, and liked staff’s idea of a wider landscape area as long as it fits within the wider driveways. Mr. Williamson clarified that he would include landscaping between the leased area and the parking, and had not done so because he was not sure if the area was within his lease. He referenced the site plan and noted there would not be a hood in the establishment. He believed the building had a kitchen look, but has a lower restaurant classification. Mr. Williamson noted that under the Health Department Code, Robeks Juice is considered a food establishment. The applicant proposed a walk in freezer/refrigerator unit because everything is brought in fresh to accommodate the juices. Mr. Williamson believed that the “Y” drive-thru would eliminate the stacking of cars on both driveways, and would establish a good amount of car queuing. He stated that he wanted to have the best establishment for the City.

Phil Notaro, Robeks Juice, explained that the turn around time for the “Y” drive-thru would be 3 minutes. He noted there would be two pre-order menu boards, and believed the queue line would move quickly. Mr. Notaro further noted that some of the walk-up customers would be utilizing the six parking spaces and would enter through the front of the building. He stated there was a wide drive in the back that would accommodate two parallel parking spots if needed.

Mr. Williamson explained that he extended the landscaping all the way to the front of the building on both sides to discourage people from crossing the drive-thru area to enter the

building. He believed this would be the first juice kiosk drive-thru in the United States. Mr. Williamson referenced photographs of the proposed building and explained the intended building color palette.

Mr. Notaro explained the delivery process, proposed operations, and referenced concept drawings of what the building would look like.

Chairman Eastman asked how the drive-thru line would be managed if there were cars stacked up on the west side and cars were coming in from the south side, and cutting into the line. Mr. Williamson responded there was no way, but believed that people are generally courteous enough to know that whoever gets there first, goes in next. Chairman Eastman cited a recent personal experience at a neighborhood drive-thru wherein the courtesy of drivers was non-existent. He did not agree with Mr. Williamson.

Mr. Notaro stated that he has done several "Y" drive-thru's and found that most of the time people are courteous. He stated that the "Y" drive-thru was proposed in an effort to draw people in from both sides of the building.

Planning Manager Zelinka believed it would be like a four way intersection, and recommended a yield sign.

Associate Planner Kusch asked if the lease included a shared parking agreement, and Mr. Williamson responded that he believed so. Associate Planner Kusch asked what the typical hours for delivery were and Mr. Notaro responded that they can be scheduled at any time. Associate Planner Kusch asked what the proposed business hours were, and Mr. Williamson responded they would open at 6 a.m. for the breakfast crowd.

Committee Member Voronel requested clarity on the circulation of the driveway, and asked how wide the driveway was. Mr. Williamson referenced the site plan and explained the circulation, and noted the driveways are existing.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked about the trash enclosure and Associate Planner Kusch noted the existing location. Committee Member Tabatabaee noted that a path of travel to the trash enclosure must be provided and the applicant must meet all the ADA requirements.

Committee Member Tabatabaee further noted a grease interceptor would be required. Mr. Williamson stated there would be no grease. Chairman Eastman clarified that the Committee was approving the building layout and the 2007 California Building Code requires a grease interceptor for any food establishment. Mr. Williamson asked if they could install a 40 lb grease interceptor. Committee Member Tabatabaee responded that the Building Department can work with him on that, and noted that grease interceptors are now designed based on flow.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Eastman believed the detailing on the back of the building needed to be accentuated or addressed. He referenced the site plan and believed that the tower elements should be more 3-dimensional. Chairman Eastman was concerned because the Committee did not know what the actual parking requirement was, but believed 6 parking spaces were adequate for a drive-thru establishment.

Committee Member Tabatabaee stated the applicant would need to comply with all code requirements at plan check, if the project is approved.

Chairman Eastman was concerned with the “Y” drive-thru because he believed additional access was not picked up, from the south, especially when it might be needed to provide for additional parking spaces. He believed the single drive-thru lane had enough queuing and stacking to make it work and noted that if additional queuing is needed the Committee could later consider approving the second lane as an overflow. He recommended that the interior space should be reduced so seating is not added, and was in support of adding landscaping throughout the building site. Chairman Eastman stated that signage shall be provided after the window that says “watch for pedestrians” on the site plan, and provide for a yield sign so people are not driving out into the drive lane.

Committee Member St. Paul was not in support of the “Y” drive-thru, and believed it was a conflict waiting to happen.

Committee Member Lopez asked if there were fire hydrants on-site because a water source was needed within 150 feet to the building. Mr. Williamson believed there should be one, and noted that they would just have to locate it.

The Committee discussed possible drive-thru alternatives and the Engineering Department’s concern that the drive-thru orients towards Imperial Highway, but ultimately decided to continue the item so the applicant can address the landscaping and circulation concerns.

Mr. Williamson stated he agreed to a continuance to the next meeting.

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member St. Paul, to CONTINUE the project to a DATE CERTAIN of August 21, 2008. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member Tabatabaee left the meeting at 11:01 a.m.

For the record on Item 2, Chairman Eastman noted that he would like the in lieu fee for the block wall to be in writing as to identify when and how the funds are going to be used. Chairman Eastman noted a stealth monopole with a slim line would be okay, but he would prefer a monopalm with additional palm trees. Chairman Eastman asked Committee Member St. Paul to Chair in his absence, and indicated that Planning Manager Zelinka would fill Committee Member St. Paul’s seat.

Chairman Eastman left the meeting at 11:05 a.m. to attend another meeting.

Item No. 2

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)

Planning Technician Jenkins noted that the project was continued from the May 15, 2008 meeting to address screening of the equipment from the future City trail. He explained that the

applicant shall provide the Parks and Recreation Department with a bond for future construction of a block wall to screen the equipment. He noted the block wall will be approximately 160 feet on the south side, next to the trail.

Committee Member Lopez referenced an aerial photograph and asked if there would be a new entrance gate opening, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Zelinka referenced the site plan and asked if the applicant was proposing a monopalm or monopole. Planning Technician Jenkins noted the applicant was proposing a monopole because it meets the code requirements for setbacks to arterial and residential zones, and would be more cost effective. Staff believed a monopole in the industrial area could be screened better against the future City trail. Committee Member St. Paul asked if the applicant was providing live palm trees. Planning Technician Jenkins responded that he discussed adding two live palm trees and an irrigation system with the applicant.

Public hearing opened.

Jason Kozora, Trillium Telecom, stated that the proposed site would provide coverage for the surrounding community. He believed that the proposed monopole design would fit best with the surrounding area. Mr. Kozora noted the monopole could be painted a sky blue color so that it blends better with the sky. He further noted that Trillium would provide payment to the Parks and Recreation Department for the future block wall. Mr. Kozora explained that a chain link fence will screen the wireless equipment at the base of the pole until the block wall is built.

Committee Member St. Paul noted that a signed agreement would be needed from the property owner for the construction of the block wall and Mr. Kozora responded that Trillium had a lease with the property owner and could provide staff with a letter.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if a slim line monopole would be sufficient. Mr. Kozora explained that there would be a reduction in service. He noted the Committee could recommend a condition requiring Trillium to slim line as much as physically possible. He noted the pole would be equipped for co-location.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if 65 feet was the minimum height needed and Mr. Kozora responded yes. Committee Member St. Paul asked what the height of a co-located antenna would be. Mr. Kozora responded there would be a 10-foot difference, and noted that every networks coverage gap was different.

Committee Member Zelinka asked where the future City trail was and Mr. Kozora referenced the trail on the site plan.

Committee Member St. Paul asked how close the antennas would be to the pole and Mr. Kozora explained that he would have to confirm that with his engineer. He believed there would be a 6 foot mass line instead of a 9 foot mass line.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Zelinka believed that a decade from now the area might not be an industrial zone. He believed that there was a great potential for the district to become very desirable.

Committee Member Zelinka noted he would prefer a monopalm with live palm trees because the setting would be better looking.

Public hearing re-opened.

Committee Member St. Paul asked the applicant what type of screening would be provided if the Committee approved a monopalm versus a monopole. Mr. Kozora stated that monetarily the cost would have to stay at a certain point so that it remains economically feasible to build the site. He noted that there was a huge cost associated with putting in two live palm trees and an irrigation system. Mr. Kozora stated a monopalm and block wall were feasible if Trillium did not have to provide an irrigation system for the two live palm trees. He explained that the Committee could condition that the project be reviewed in 5-10 years to determine if the site would be better suited as a monopalm and not a monopole.

Committee Member Zelinka asked if landscaping was proposed along the future City trail, and Planning Technician Jenkins responded that he was not sure. He noted that a portion of the trail to the east had landscaping and an irrigation system.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul clarified that typically when trails are constructed there is DG and some hardscape material for Fire Department access. Committee Member Lopez noted the Fire Department can access the site from Walnut.

Committee Member Zelinka asked if there would be an opportunity for palms and an irrigation system for the future City trail, and Committee Member St. Paul responded yes. Committee Member Zelinka asked if there was the opportunity for Trillium to add an interpretive sign on the block wall/fence that informs the public how cell towers work, and Committee Member St. Paul responded yes.

After a brief discussion the Committee recommended the following conditions:

- The applicant shall construct a monopalm at a maximum height of 65 feet
- A 5-10 year review of the project for possible improvements within the lease area
- The applicant shall make a cash deposit to the Parks and Recreation Department for future landscaping, construction of a block wall along the southern edge of the property, an irrigation system, and an interpretive sign
- The applicant shall install interim screening with slats along the chain link fence
- The Monopalm shall be equipped for co-location
- A 20 ft minimum fire access lane shall be maintained from Walnut to the cell site lease area and a turn around shall be provided if more than 150 ft. from Walnut

Public hearing re-opened.

Mr. Kozora stated that he would like to provide a deposit for either the block wall or the 2 palm trees and irrigation. Mr. Kozora noted that the deposit amount from the Parks and Recreation Department for the 164 foot block came out to be \$18,040.

Committee Member St. Paul stated the City would be improving the trail sooner than later. He recommended that the applicant provide an in lieu fee, which is to be determined by the Parks and Recreation Department, and used for a block wall or the palm trees.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION by Committee Lopez, SECONDED by Committee Member Rebert to APPROVE the project, subject to the Committee's recommended conditions. Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member St. Paul explained the 10-day appeal process.

OTHER MATTERS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Adjourned at 11:47 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Clerical Assistant