

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., JULY 16, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Chair St. Paul called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Eastman, Kusch, Voronel, Hughes, Lopez, and Tabatabaee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Hernandez, St. Paul, and Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member Tabatabaee, SECONDED by Committee Member Voronel that the minutes of June 18, 2009 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

ACTION ITEMS

Chairman St. Paul recused himself from the Committee. Acting Committee Member Eastman assumed Acting Chair, staff member Kusch assumed acting member.

ITEM NO. 1

PRJ09-00168 – ZON09-00036 – ZON09-00037. APPLICANT: MILES FOLSUM; PROPERTY OWNER: ESPINOZA FAMILY TRUST. A request for a minor site plan for construction of a one-car detached garage, and conversion of an existing storage room in an existing garage into a studio apartment; and a zoning adjustment to increase the allowed lot coverage from 60% to 62% on property located at 328 West Truslow Avenue (between approximately 263.5 and 305.8 feet west of Highland Avenue (R-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15303 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Christine Hernandez)

Associate Planner Hernandez gave a brief overview of the request.

Chair Eastman asked if the proposed studio was existing. Associate Planner Hernandez referenced photographs of the site, and noted the existing storage area would be converted into the studio.

Chair Eastman asked if the existing fence on the east side of the property would remain or be replaced with a block wall. Associate Planner Hernandez responded that the plans did not indicate if the fence would remain.

Chair Eastman referenced the site photographs and asked if the garage doors were double loaded (both sides of structure). Associate Planner Hernandez responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Tabatabaee noted that the request would need to comply with 2007 California Building Codes and shall provide one hour fire-rated construction. He further noted he was in support of the request.

Committee member Tabatabaee left the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

Public hearing opened.

Miles Folsom, Project Architect, noted that his client was in agreement with staff's recommended conditions. He requested something in writing confirming that he can remove the handicap loading zone. Mr. Folsom explained that the garage would be moved to the north so vehicles can easily back out of the driveway.

The Committee and applicant discussed vehicles backing out of the driveway, and a turn radius solution for pulling out of the driveway in a forward direction.

Committee Member Voronel asked how far north the garage would be moved. Mr. Folsom responded approximately 8 feet if the handicap loading zone would be eliminated.

Committee Member Kusch noted the one-car garage would have to meet the 12-foot unit window separation Code requirement. Committee Member Kusch was concerned about vehicles backing out of the driveway.

Chair Eastman clarified Mr. Folsom's statement that the property owner was not concerned about vehicles backing out of the driveway.

The Committee and applicant discussed the open space between the garage and the unit if the proposed garage was moved north.

Committee Member Lopez asked if guest parking was required and Associate Planner Hernandez responded affirmatively.

Chair Eastman noted the floor area ratio was over by 2 percent. Associate Planner Hernandez explained that if the one-car garage were reduced to the minimum size identified by Code, a zoning adjustment would not be needed.

Mr. Folsom explained that his intent was to build the one-car garage at the least expense possible. He identified the cost associated with shear walls. Mr. Folsom believed that costs would go up exponentially if the garage was reduced from 13 feet 6 inches.

Committee Member Kusch asked if there was a garage door on the back side of the garage towards the alley. Mr. Folsom responded affirmatively, and noted the door could be removed.

Committee Member Voronel questioned why the garage would be moved north 8 feet. Associate Planner Hernandez noted that Code requires a 12 foot separation between the living room window and the garage; therefore 6 additional feet are required. Eliminating the ADA loading area provides 8 feet.

Committee Member Voronel believed that moving the garage was a conflict for maneuverability. Mr. Folsom noted that this was not a large project with a high volume of traffic. He further noted that people were currently backing out of the driveway.

Chair Eastman asked Mr. Folsom if he considered designing the project without the parapet design. Mr. Folsom believed the parapet design was consistent with the neighborhood. He noted he was amenable to eliminating the parapet design if the new design met 2007 California Building Codes and the Building Division was in support. Mr. Folsom noted he would like to apply siding to the block wall for architectural purposes if permitted by the Building Division. He further noted that his client would be willing to incorporate staff's recommended conditions into the design.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Kusch was concerned with the lack of a turn radius. He noted that a site plan requirement was to create a circulation system that avoids conflicts between vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic. Committee Member Kusch was concerned with visibility of vehicles backing out of the driveway. He was in support of removing the parapet with a caveat that the Building Division would allow for siding along the edge. Committee Member Kusch did not see the justification for the zoning adjustment, and recommended that the site plan accommodate a turn radius on site.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the guest parking was assigned. Chair Eastman responded that staff does not require assigned guest parking, and clarified the spaces must be maintained and open for guests.

Committee Member Voronel was concerned about the maneuverability in the driveway if a conflict occurs.

Chair Eastman noted it was a Code requirement to have a 12 foot separation between the unit and garage. He noted that eliminating the window could not be an option based on the floor plan design.

Chair Eastman believed that some of the turn around requirements can potentially be eliminated if access for the two-car garage was maintained off the alley, and from the driveway for the one-car garage. But he clarified that a substantial redesign would be needed, and that was not what was before the Committee at this time.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the Planning Division had any turn around regulations. Chair Eastman explained that a 25 foot wide drive lane was required to allow a car to back out of a parking space. However, the 25 feet does not consider a 360 degree turning movement. He said he would like to see some landscaping on the side of the garage, near the guest parking.

Chair Eastman recommended eliminating the 8 feet handicap zone and relocating the garage 6 feet north to meet the Code requirement for a 12 foot separation. He was agreeable with the applicant's suggestion of providing two feet of landscaping on the side of the wall.

Chair Eastman noted he was not concerned about backing out of the driveway given the existing conditions of the site and similar adjacent properties. He was concerned about recommending approval of a lot coverage deviation based on the economics of building a 13 foot 6 inch garage. He noted he would not support the floor area ratio based on economics alone. Chair Eastman asked if reducing the garage to an 11 foot width would get the project within the required floor area ratio. Associate Planner Hernandez responded affirmatively.

Chair Eastman recommended approval to the Redevelopment Design Review Committee (RDRC) subject to the following conditions:

- The garage shall be moved 6 feet north to allow for a two foot landscape buffer on the north side of the guest parking;
- Proposed garage shall be reduced to an 11 foot width;
- Applicant shall remove the parapet design, if permissible by the Building Division; and
- Plans submitted to the RDRC shall reflect staffs recommended revisions.

MOTION made by Chair Eastman to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the request subject to staff's recommended conditions and revisions as stated, SECONDED by Committee Member Kusch, with Committee Member Voronel voting against the motion, and CARRIED 4-1.

The Committee and applicant discussed landscape plan requirements.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

Adjourned at 11:13 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Secretary