

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

COUNCIL CONFERENCE CHAMBERS

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

November 9, 2006

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:03 PM by Acting Chairman Duncan

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Daybell, Committee Member
PRESENT: Duncan; Committee Members Cha, Hoban
and Larsen

COMMITTEE MEMBERS
ABSENT:

PUBLIC PRESENT: John Killen, Juan Martinez, Evaj and Janet
Peek, Kim Prijatel, Gwynne Pugh, and
Candido Sanchez

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Acting
Senior Planner Allen, Acting Associate
Planner Kusch and Clerical Staff Leopold

MINUTES: MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee
Member Cha to APPROVE the September 28, 2006 minutes AS
WRITTEN. The October 12, 2006 minutes were still being reviewed by
staff.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ04-00919 - ZON04-00098. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: ACCRETIVE
LAGUNA PARTNERS, LLC.

Review of final architecture and landscape details for Phase 2 of construction of the approved Providence Center commercial/office development. (Generally located at the SWC of Bastanchury Road and Laguna Road, encompassing an area between Bastanchury Road., Laguna Road, Laguna Drive, and Sunny Crest Drive) (Previously Certified Mitigated Negative Declaration) (C-2 Zone)

Chairman Daybell said the recommendation of staff is that the item be continued.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided a brief background on the project. He said what was being presented to the Committee were Buildings A, B and D, which include the two-story medical office building, which previously had retail on the ground floor. Staff has reviewed the applicant's submittal and has been in communication with the applicant all day today. He said the developer and architect have agreed with some of the suggestions and design and would like an opportunity to continue the project and address some of the concerns.

Public hearing opened.

John Killen, Accretive Laguna Partners, said he has been working with staff today in response to the staff report. He stated they are supportive with a number of the issues that have been raised by staff and would like an opportunity to work with staff and come back to the Committee to the next meeting in December. He stated some modifications were made to the uses, retail space, ground floor of Building A and shifted over due to the market interest into the ground floor of Building C on the master plan. Mr. Killen said they have been successful in signing a lease with Panera Bread for Building B. Revisions were made to the landscape plan in the courtyard space.

There were no comments from the public.

Public hearing closed.

Chairman Daybell said both staff and the applicant agree to have the item continued to a date in December.

Committee Member Duncan said there is more landscape now than in the previous plans, which is looking good. He stated he agrees with staff's comments, but he has two areas of concern with the landscaping along Bastanchury Road and it being a scenic corridor there can be some modification of re-work with the landscape along that edge. Committee Member Duncan said the applicant has the Sycamore trees spaced along the sidewalk and asked if it was a requirement from the City or part of the proposal? Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the City does have some criteria in terms of distance and spacing, but as far as it being formal or whether it could be bunched, staff would be more than happy to work with the applicant and landscape architect to come up with a solution that works best with the site. Acting Chief Planner Eastman provided a description regarding the landscaping along Bastanchury Rd. east of Harbor Blvd. He said if the Committee would like to see the trees grouped or put in a natural environment versus the systematic spacing, staff would be open to considering that. Committee Member Duncan said the context to the west down, Bastanchury Rd., at the back of the homes is very rural with a lot of Eucalyptus and very informal, that is the kind of context that would be nice to bring up and looked at with informal spacing of the trees. It is not a requirement, but something he sees with a contextual element. He stated the other concern from staff that he supports is the back of the buildings to Laguna Road. It may be the landscape solution that they have a nice architectural element at the corner facing Bastanchury and the landscape falls off, if it is wrapped around that and brought up to Laguna and not the typical landscape that pulls out the building, since there are some nice columns there and nice elements. If the landscape looks pretty intense or organized in that one spot to reflect the building, it creates a nice entry into the project and maybe some modification at least to the units that have three service doors on the back maybe there is something the applicant can do to spice it up and make it not look like the back end. One solution is a green screen, a panel system to plant vines on. The planting of the curved planters at the ground level could be strengthened up to create more of an entry at the sidewalk.

Chairman Daybell asked if the glazing had been changed rather radically on the buildings from what the Committee had previously approved? Acting Chief Planner Eastman said yes, particularly as it relates to Building B. There is a significant amount of glazing that came back from the Bastanchury frontage on Laguna. In addition to that there was a different element on Bastanchury, which included the retaining wall, there was more of sloped roof element and now there is more of a parapet element with a flat stucco wall facing Bastanchury. There was some

glazing along the Laguna frontage that was substantial, and glazing was a big issue previously at other meetings, in terms of discussion. Chairman Daybell said that in the continued process that may have to be re-visited since it was approved at the various levels and is not happy with the idea of approving something, and then a year later trying to cheapen it up. It is something to be considered. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said there is also some glazing on the south side of Building A as it relates to Sunnycrest and Laguna there has been removed, with inclusion of a brick wall in lieu. There have been some revisions and the glazing has decreased. Staff clarified that the applicant has expressed concern with the usability of the internal space for some of his tenants. In addition, or in-lieu of length, it is possible to raise the height of the glazing to create a higher dimension. There are some solutions that can be explored by the applicant and he can come back with something that is less stucco, less flat surface and is more transparent.

MOTION by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Duncan and CARRIED unanimously to CONTINUE the project. Staff asked that the item be continued to the December 14, 2006 meeting. MOTION AMENDED by Chairman Daybell to CONTINUE project to December 14.

Item No. 2

PRJ06-00222 (LRP06-00009, LRP06-00010, ZON06-00040, ZON06-00041, ZON06-00075, ZON06-00076, TTR16813) APPLICANT: THE OLSON COMPANY. PROPERTY OWNER: SUMMA INDUSTRIES.

Review of site, architecture and landscape plans for a proposal to construct a 68-unit residential condominium project which includes requests for a tentative tract map; a change in general plan land use designation of "industrial" to "medium density residential"; a change in zoning from "general industrial" (M-G) to "limited density multiple-family residential" (R-3); a variance to maintain the existing building setback; A variance to reduce the required useable open space; A variance to exceed the allowable lot coverage; and approval of a major site plan on property located at 1600 West Commonwealth Avenue (located on the southwest corner of Commonwealth Avenue and Basque Avenue) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Continued from October 12, 2006 meeting)

The applicant was not in attendance due to traffic issues and the item was heard out of order.

The meeting was moved to the Council Conference Room at 4:25 p.m. There was a 3 minute break.

Meeting re-adjoined at 4:28 p.m.

Item No. 3

PRJO6-00355 – ZON06-00064. APPLICANT: CANDIDO SANCHEZ; PROPERTY OWNER: JUAN MARTINEZ.

Acting Senior Planner Allen presented a request for a Minor Development Project to add a 2-story second unit (including ground-floor parking) on a property located in a Community Improvement District located at 441 E. Truslow Avenue. (Generally located on the north side of Truslow Avenue between 430 and 480 feet east of Lawrence) (R-3) (Categorically Exempt under Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines)

Chairman Daybell asked if the applicant had seen the proposed conditions of approval and if there was any disagreement. Acting Senior Planner Allen said yes and she was not aware of any disagreement.

Public hearing opened.

Juan Martinez, applicant, said the reason he would like to do the addition is because he would like to have more room for his family.

Committee Member Duncan said the plans show a fireplace in the living room and it looks like it is situated under the terrace. The plans do not show a chimney. He asked if it was wood burning or gas? Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified the question for the applicant. Acting Senior Planner Allen said the floor plan identified a gas fireplace. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said, typically for cost effective purposes, these units are gas, which has a hot air vent and can actually vent out through the walls or between ceiling joists, and doesn't require a chimney. If it is going to be a pre-manufactured insert that is wood burning they need to have a flue. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said it will be a gas burning stove fireplace as designed. If the applicant wanted to have a wood stove he would have to relocate it to an appropriate location for a chimney or likely come back to the Committee with a re-design that has a chimney through the terrace.

Committee Member Duncan questioned the need for the wall at the base of the stairs. Candido Sanchez, designer, explained he put the wall was to support the beam and break the space.

Committee Member Larsen said it would be nice to have another window, even clearstory, on each side so they can get some cross ventilation going through on the east and west sides of the bedrooms, since there are hardly any windows on the sides. Mr. Sanchez said it requires more of a setback.

Color of roof materials and composition were discussed. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said staff did not identify a condition that materials or color come back for staff for final review and approval. He said staff can include that condition and review and incorporate any concerns the Committee has at that time.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman said he had not been by the property and asked if the applicant planned to repaint or re-shingle the existing house? Mr. Martinez said it was painted a month ago. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said there was a condition that materials and the stucco match. Acting Senior Planner Allen said it is identified on the plans that the stucco is going to match the existing house.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Cha said the item should be continued in order to get more detail for the fireplace. He asked about the type of roof material on the existing roof.

Committee Member Hoban said he did not go to the property and did not know what type of material is on the existing house, but both buildings should match. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said if the existing roof is not of a high quality it does not justify adding a low quality roof to that property. At some point the front house will be re-surfaced and the intent is that it will actually be brought to a better consistency with a better roof. He explained if the issue is

that the Committee would prefer not to see a three-tab shingle and would like a higher quality roof, staff can require that the applicant provide staff with manufacturer information and clearly identify on the plans prior to pulling a building permit. Chairman Daybell asked Committee Member Cha if this would work for him and he said yes.

Committee Member Larsen said he is fine with the project as it is, with staff's recommended conditions.

Committee Member Hoban said he is fine with all of staff's conditions and thinks it's generic, but for its location it is an improvement.

Committee Member Duncan said he is fine with the project as well.

Chairman Daybell said he would go along with what has been said.

MOTION by Committee Member Hoban, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha, and CARRIED unanimously by all voting members present to APPROVE project pending staff's conditions and add a condition that staff reviews the roof material to ensure its quality, and not a three-tab shingle.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained the 10-day appeal process.

Meeting re-adjourned in the Council Chambers at 4:47 p.m.

Item No. 2

PRJ06-00222 (LRP06-00009, LRP06-00010, ZON06-00040, ZON06-00041, ZON06-00075, ZON06-00076, TTR16813) APPLICANT: THE OLSON COMPANY. PROPERTY OWNER: SUMMA INDUSTRIES.

Acting Associate Planner Kusch presented a staff report on the project.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman indicated that staff does not support the project as designed. He indicated staff's opinion was not based on the proposed architecture or the plan to preserve the building. Preserving the building facades on the street frontages is an aesthetic preference and not based on historical significance. He mentioned that the proposed architecture is unique and the proposed design preserves the building facades. The biggest concern is with the lack of code compliance and the marginal site design. Fundamentally, staff believes there are too many units on the site marginal useable open space, and lots of pavement without landscaping. At this time, staff is not recommending support of the architectural design as presented.

Committee Member Hoban said it was his understanding that this project would not have staff's recommendation until the units are reduced on the site. He inquired if that was a good summary of what would have to happen to have staff's approval. Acting Chief Planner Eastman answered affirmatively. He mentioned that the site plan includes tunnel views of drive aisles adjacent to buildings. The plans have been revised to reflect previous staff concerns, but ultimately staff still has concerns and believes the site plan reflects a marginal design. Acting Chief Planner Eastman mentioned that minimal code compliance for previous projects seeking a zone change or General Plan revision have not been positively received by the City Council. Staff believes the site design can be revised to improve the project's livability.

Committee Member Larsen added if that is the case regarding too many units, what is the “magic number” of units that can be accommodated on the property. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said there are a variety of factors that come into play, including creating more usable open space, meeting code requirements size of units, etc. He stated he could not give an exact number. In terms of creating what staff feels is a quality living environment, and in line with Council direction to go beyond minimal code requirements, staff believes the site design is marginal.

Committee Member Cha stated he was not at the last meeting. He said 50 units sounds reasonable. He asked about the open space requirements. Staff provided more information about parking requirements and open space. Acting Chief Planner said it is necessary to have a secondary entrance into the site for emergency vehicle access.

Kim Prijatel, Olson Company, explained that after the last meeting, they reviewed the proposed density and stated the project would not be viable with a reduction to the proposed 68 units. She stated they looked at how they could address staff's concerns and make it a more livable community. She said adding the pool to the common area creates a more usable active amenity. She stated previous useable open space calculations did not account for the private open spaces, which is allowed by code. As a result, she believed the amount of usable open space was deficient by approximately 68 square feet. She said that amenities have been added to the central open space area creating a more active area. She explained that on the north side of the partially covered drive aisle, planters have been added to lessen the tunnel effect previously identified by staff. Parking for scooters or bicycles has also been added to the north side of this drive aisle. To address staff's concern with softening the appearance of the proposed 16-foot sound wall, Ms. Prijatel said that planters with vines will be added on both sides of the wall. She stated speed bumps were not added to the drive aisles, but could be added if there is a concern with speeding. Ms. Prijatel stated the façade of the office building at the street corner could be preserved while constructing the new building outside the required landscape street setback. She said the plans reflect a proposed building located out of the required setback fronting Basque Avenue. Ms. Prijatel said revisions were also made to address a staff concern with a lack of a sense of entry to the community. A conceptual rendering of the revised project entry was displayed.

Chairman Daybell asked if staff had seen this prior to meeting. Staff indicated that the renderings were presented for the first time at the meeting. Gwynne Pugh, architect, said a lot of the issues have been addressed.

Committee Member Hoban said this development would be 19 units per acre and that is the equivalent of medium density. What if you take an area such as Downtown Fullerton and compare it to Downtown Manhattan? What type of density are we looking at? Mr. Pugh said Downtown Manhattan is probably 120 units per acre and Downtown Fullerton if looking at 2-4 stories about 40 units per acre, Brea 60- 65 units per acre that have 3-4 story quality. It is not unusual to have something in the region. A lot of cities in the more dense areas are running 35 – 45 units per acre. Fullerton would be a low to medium density as generally defined in Southern California. Committee Member Hoban asked what is the residential across Commonwealth? Mr. Pugh said it is single family with about 6 units per acre. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that this project has a similar density to the SocoWalk project, with 6 acres and 120 units. Staff is of the opinion that it is not necessarily the number of units per acre, but there is a variety of other issues that come into play on this project. The changes that have been made to address staff's concerns have been addressed and the Olson Company has tried to meet them. One of staff's fundamental perspectives on this is that in addition to the

setback reductions that are being proposed, eliminating the setback requirements for the most part along Commonwealth, and still not meeting the lot coverage requirements. Normally setbacks count toward non-buildable area, but here they are deviating from the open space too. This project is encroaching into the setbacks and still not meeting the lot coverage. As indicated, the Council, in the past, has expressed a concern that if someone is asking for a zone change, they are asking for a fundamental change as to how City has established its policies, the least they can do is meet code. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated that from a design perspective, it does not meet code and focuses 68 units toward a pool and four park benches in the center of the site. He said that it is too dense of an environment, there is a 300 ft. long building. Staff understands the argument that the applicant has indicated that there is an existing building they are trying to preserve, but it is a lot of units to be facing onto a narrow pool space. Staff is recommending denial at this point. He explained to Committee Member Hoban that density is not necessarily an issue, but context of the environment and create the surrounding areas.

Committee Member Cha asked if the RDRC can recommend not to preserve the wall? He explained he does not see the point in preserving it, since it does not have any historical attribute or nothing for the benefit of the neighborhood or the new development. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said yes and for clarity, the issue of the City Council in preserving the building is per conversations the applicant stated they had with Councilmembers directly. Staff has not received any specific direction that the building should be preserved. He said that at the Council meeting there was an issue of sentimental value of those buildings. He stated if the Committee feels that preserving the buildings is not warranted or does not add to the design, it is their prerogative to make a recommendation. Mr. Pugh said that during the past six months they have been preserving the buildings because of the Council's direction and that is what has motivated this whole movement and the previous application did not do that. This is very specific oriented by their understanding of the Council's feedback.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Hoban added to the re-use of the building question and said there is no official heritage or preservation. He said he has been a long-time Fullerton resident and when he learned this project was leaning toward a re-use, he was more acceptable to this game plan rather than saying no residential and it being knocked down. He had made the comment that this proposal is the direction he wanted to see it go. He does not remember what the Council said, but remembers hearing the Council say they were not happy with the architecture and density but did not say anything about the re-use of the building. At this time, that is one of the directions he is in favor of because although it is not historic it does have heritage. He said he is conflicted because there has been such valiant efforts made in the architecture for this, but is not in favor of what he considers more dense than the area around it, which is residential. He stated he was undecided and would like more dialogue from the Committee. Committee Member Hoban said in his opinion, he likes the architecture and would like to see it less dense. They made a lot of efforts to change the concerns he had at the last meeting, which was the speedway in the back. He said he liked the corridor for the driveway and the way they created the arbor affect and put greenery next to the building. He said he understands they are going to have a 300 ft. building at the cost of perhaps preserving the heritage of the Moorehouse facility and suggested to call it the "Moorehouse Flats" if it became a residential area. He said he would prefer to hear more dialogue. Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the building is larger than 300 ft.

Committee Member Larsen said he liked the idea of the dialogue. He said he really likes the project and what stood out when he saw renderings was the way the architect handled the vehicle corridor with the arbor effect and stated it is really awesome. Basically, he said there is nothing more mundane to him than the parking experience and this actually has taken advantage through a triangular site that is very difficult to work with. He stated that density is not an issue to him and thinks it is close enough. Committee Member Larsen said there is a housing shortage anyway and this is something that we need to start to get used to it. He said even with the density they have, they have pulled off very much a contemporary community of how people would like to exist.

Committee Member Duncan commented on Committee Member Hoban's comment regarding the façade they are keeping along Commonwealth. He said it offers so much to the City to maintain the façade and how it is handled. He said the edge is unique and supports that and thinks the architecture is nice. He is willing to forgive the technicalities because of the uniqueness of this project. He commented on the applicant's comment regarding one less unit and not going to work versus one less unit and not making as much. He wishes there were less units, but does not want to snub the project because he thinks it is an awesome solution. Committee Member Duncan commented on the site plan and said there were minor comments regarding the enhanced paving and putting it out more at the entrance off Basque and make it more of a field where it makes a broader statement and further enhance it. He said the landscape plan is much better. The suggested plant material is awesome and exceeds the City's minimum requirements in terms of water efficiency and is good. The architecture is so unique and planting needs to accentuate it, and it does a fine job along Commonwealth, but maybe in the interior there are other stronger forms in plant material that can be used, not a requirement. He said it is an awesome solution and hopes it can work out.

Committee Member Cha said this is a very unique shape of lot and location. He said this project has a long way to go, but if you want to go the efficient way it should reflect the staff's recommendations and code requirements by reducing the units by 10 - 15 percent (6 units or more). He said he does not think it is helping any aspect of our history. He does not think it is necessary to have it preserved hoping the new Council has a different sentiment it might work. Committee Member Cha said the applicant must work with staff's recommendations and resolve that before they go any further.

Chairman Daybell said a couple of things didn't happen including:

1. The setback on the westerly units along Commonwealth. Less units should be put there to get the setback.
2. Thinks it is too dense and cannot support it. He stated he does not think we should deviate from the existing codes.

Chairman Daybell suggested reducing the number of units on the west. He said one thing that caught his eye is the entry is obstructed by a unit and a carport. If that is done, it will enhance the project as well. Chairman Daybell said he will not support the project with the current density and agrees with staff's recommendations at this point.

Committee Member Hoban asked if it is possible to reduce the number of units and enlarge their size? Acting Chief Planner Eastman clarified that the issue as it relates to this committee's purview is not a land use issue, in terms of density. The issue for staff at this meeting is the design and livability of the space. The issue has to do with how it is designed and the usability

of space, not necessarily the number of units per acre. He encouraged the RDRC to look at density as it relates to design versus solely on land use. Committee Member Hoban said he is trying to separate and not be the Planning Commission and be the architecture review committee. He stated it is very cool architecture and space and thinks that some people will think this kind of space is desirable depending on who they are. He stated that density to him is not so many units, but how many people. He said he would love to see this type of project built with fewer units, but the building size does not bother him.

Public hearing opened.

Chairman Daybell said Committee Member Hoban's question is if we can build fewer but bigger units? Committee Member Duncan asked what the reasoning was for that? Committee Member Hoban said he knows there is a housing shortage, but that is not his concern in this committee and is not his opinion that he wants more people in Fullerton. He stated he wants higher end living and asking if that can help the density of people in the area and does not have a problem on this site with the buildings. Ms. Prijatel said she understands what he is asking and this is what started the re-design and the real estate market took a significant change. She said that in Orange County right now you can make a bigger unit, but not charge more for it. She said they took all 49 three-bedroom units and created 68 two-bedroom units. Ms. Prijatel stated this is an opportunity for a first time home buyer to get into Fullerton and have a cool one-bedroom house and have an awesome experience.

Committee Member Larsen asked if they ever considered roof top decks, community shared as another community space? Mr. Pugh said he found in designing it that those tend to be not the highest value spaces. In this case there will be trains to look at and overlooking neighbors to look at across the street. Ms. Prijatel said the rooftop deck option adds so much cost to the unit that right now people are looking for the most value for their money.

Committee Member Cha recommended not to discuss any further on the economic value or market analysis. Chairman Daybell said yes, if it is the desire of the committee, he would agree. Chairman Daybell said he did not hear the matter of the setbacks discussed. He said in his opinion if we are going to have codes then we need to live by them. He said the excess of coverage of land combined with the reduced setback bothers him and thinks those are solvable and it is a few less units. He said if you want an attractive entry you have a garage staring at you as you drive in and does not meet his eye appeal. Committee Member Hoban said that may be a concern, but he is not concerned with that. He thinks that the applicant can do something and be done very well. He stated he has a concern with the setback and asked if there is a way to redesign building, so the units are in two four-packs and turned 90 degrees with back to back space. So that you can use the back overflow parking by 2 four-packs that are twisted or the units moved to smaller square footage?

Chairman Daybell said it is a challenging lot. He agrees that the re-use of the main building is very well done and you add these outlying things that distract from it and it needs to be revisited. Chairman Daybell said at the present time he is prepared to support the staff's recommendations.

Committee Member Duncan said the Committee has looked at projects that meet open space, and are bland and the Committee approves them. He stated that here is something that has award-winning architecture and looking at this situation he is willing to "give to get" and does not have a problem with those technicalities. He said he wishes there were less units, but to get this would be great for the City.

Committee Member Hoban asked if Committee Member Duncan would be willing to condition the project if they can come up with a way to fix the setback as a condition would that be a reconsideration? Committee Member Duncan said yes it will make it better in a lot of ways. As it stands, he is willing to concede those things and is going on the applicant's comments that it is tough. He stated that every project has constraints and they have dealt great with them. Committee Member Hoban asked if Committee Member Duncan would condition the project that we would recommend approval of the architect condition that they can somehow correct the setback on the west building? Committee Member Duncan said no he would not like to break the project's back.

MOTION by Committee Member Cha to disapprove and recommend staff and developer reflect setbacks and comments. Chairman Daybell stated he would like to SECOND, but could not. MOTION died. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said the Chairman could make a SECOND if he would like to. The motion was to recommend denial to the Planning Commission and City Council based on findings including the discussion today.

Chairman Daybell said he would like to hear another motion and hear what it might be. MOTION by Committee Member Hoban to approve the recommendation to the Planning Commission that the Committee supports the architecture of the project without conditions. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said if the Committee would like to make recommendation of the project to the Planning Commission and City Council staff asks that you consider the conditions recommended by staff as part of the project. Committee Member Hoban said yes.

Chairman Daybell asked if the applicant has seen the conditions. Acting Chief Planner Eastman said yes. Committee Member Hoban asked Committee Member Duncan if he would like to add something about the entryway and its hardscape as part of the conditions. Committee Member Duncan said yes, he would modify one condition. Committee Member Hoban reiterated the condition stating the MOTION is to recommend approval of the architecture pending staff recommendations, SECONDED by Committee Member Duncan. AMENDED by Committee Member Duncan that the decorative paving at the entrance off of Basque be increased to a more substantial level that may go from unit 36 to enhance the entry and AMEND Condition No. 4 that mentions the street trees. In construction and basic aesthetics they should be removed and something gets replaced per the City's landscape superintendent in that area. He said he does not believe they are in separate tree wells and the health of those trees are in decline and don't look good, removal is necessary, instead of being preserved. AMENDMENT SECONDED by Committee Member Hoban. Voted 3-2 with Chairman Daybell and Committee Member Cha voting no.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman reiterated the motion, with a recommendation to approve the project, passing subject to a 3-2 vote and subject to staff's recommended conditions, plus an additional condition that the paving at the entrance be expanded to create more of an entry statement to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development or the RDRC at the Director's discretion, and that the street trees along the frontage of Commonwealth be removed and replaced per the City's landscape superintendent and the City's Street Tree Program. He stated staff is still working out some details in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and will go to the Planning Commission with recommendation to the City Council.

Public Comments

Acting Chief Planner Eastman reviewed the Transportation Master Planning Workshop scheduled for that evening.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman discussed the number of members who have re-applied for the RDRC positions.

STAFF COMMUNICATION

Acting Chief Planner Eastman discussed the Committee's availability for a November 16 meeting.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman reviewed the Palapa Grill's status regarding design.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Committee Member Duncan, SECONDED by Committee Member Cha to ADJOURN meeting at 6:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ruth Leopold
Clerical Support