

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

FULLERTON CITY HALL

Thursday

November 13, 2008

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. by Chairman Hoban

ROLL CALL: COMMITTEE MEMBERS Chairman Hoban, Vice Chairman Cha,
PRESENT: Committee Member Daybell, and
Committee Member Lynch

COMMITTEE MEMBERS Committee Member Silber
ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner St. Paul, Planner Wolff,
Associate Planner Hernandez and
Clerical Assistant Muhaidly

MINUTES: MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Vice Chairman Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present, that the minutes of the regular meeting of
September 11, 2008 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

MOTION made by Committee Member Daybell, SECONDED by
Vice Chairman Cha and CARRIED unanimously by all voting
members present, with Chairman Hoban abstaining, that the
minutes of the regular meeting of October 9, 2008 be APPROVED
AS WRITTEN.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Item No. 1

PRJ07-00354 (ZON07-00077, ZON07-00086, ZON08-00077, LRP-00010, LRP07-00011). APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: EASTSIDE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Review of conceptual landscape plan for the overall site, and final landscape and building plans for Phase 1 of the approved multi-phased master plan for Eastside Christian Church on property located at 2505 Yorba Linda Boulevard. (northwest corner of Yorba Linda Boulevard and Almira Avenue) (R-1-10 zone) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Staff Planner: Joan Wolff).

Planner Wolff stated that the project had come before the RDRC in August, the Planning Commission in September, and the City Council in October, of 2008. The project had been approved subject to conditions, one of which was that final architectural and landscape plans come back to the RDRC for approval through each phase of

construction. She stated that Phase One is about to begin and noted that in August, the RDRC had expressed a want for more architectural treatment on the westerly elevation. To satisfy concerns, a trellis has replaced small awnings in the original plans to strengthen the look of the westerly elevation and match the south and east side of the building. Planner Wolff referred to the architectural and landscape plans for Phase One, which involves the construction of the children's center and themed tower. She indicated that of the four church-owned houses along Almira, two houses will be demolished. During the interim time-frame, two houses will remain, which prevents the entire parking lot from being built. She added that some of the visible landscaping will incorporate turf and ground cover to create nice views and soften up the parking lot until the project is built. Planner Wolff asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Hoban asked how long the time-frame was between phases of construction, and if the landscaping would be on the buffers. Planner Wolff stated that fundraising is involved; therefore the time-frame between phases is indeterminate.

Committee Member Lynch asked if all three phases of construction were presented to the RDRC in the August meeting and Associate Planner Wolff answered affirmatively.

Committee Member Lynch stated that during the August meeting his concerns were that aspects of the future phases resembled a retail center. He asked if those aspects were currently being implemented. Terry Jacobson, project architect, stated that on the subsequent submittals, reforms will be looked at on the buildings that posed concern for the RDRC.

Committee Member Daybell asked if the temporary planting on the uphill church-owned house would grow tall enough to obstruct views for residents above the church. Planner Wolff answered that the planting incorporated Tristanias, and she was unsure about their growth rate. Jim Ridge, landscape architect, noted that the trees would be eight-foot installed, three-foot spread, and would grow three or four feet a year. He stated Tristanias tend to be a vertical form, thirty-five feet high and twenty-foot spread in maturity. However, they may not make it to maturity before the subsequent construction phases. Committee Member Daybell stated that he did not want views obstructed by trees. Bill Thomspson, administrator of the church, stated that there is a wall next to one of the houses, which obstructs any view; therefore, the trees do not really make a difference. The trees will come down when the wall comes down and all will turn into a parking lot.

Committee Member Lynch stated he had a concern with the styrofoam treatment that is shown in keynote seven of the plans. He stated that in the Fullerton Downtown Plaza, styrofoam detailing is used on the tops of columns in the design, which he felt was not a sustainable building practice. He stated the use of styrofoam in the city is something he feels very passionate about. He stated he wrote a letter to one of the city council members regarding removing the styrofoam in the downtown area due to the maintenance nightmare it will become in the future. He stated he noticed the church was using styrofoam in their design and wanted them to use another material in its place—perhaps wood trim wraps or lath and plaster. He noted it is just a matter of time before it comes apart, because there is just a thin layer of stucco over the styrofoam in the church's design. Mr. Jacobson clarified that in addition to some styrofoam elements, which they are open to simulating in another material, there are pre-cast elements in areas that would be subject to abuse or touching. The base of the tower and the top of

all of the guard rails on the balconies are all solid pre-cast to ensure the material is not damaged. He also stated the building is not an efface building, which often has the same problem even further down and along the structure. He stated he would look at the material and consider changing the styrofoam. Committee Member Lynch stated he appreciated the consideration.

Public hearing opened.

Don Nyberg, Almira resident, asked if the parking lot would have a berm because he did not want to have a view of a lot and buildings while coming up his street. He also asked how many phases of construction were going to occur. Chairman Hoban clarified that Mr. Nyberg would like to have feedback on parking and phases. Mr. Nyberg added that he wanted to know how he would drive up his street during construction. Mr. Jacobson stated that the parking along Almira will have a berm, which is over three feet in height, plus additional shrubs. As requested, the berm will be undulated, to create a variety of heights, and will shield the cars behind it. He noted that additional landscape islands and trellis elements were added to the design, bringing the trellis form out into the parking lot--all part of the actions taken to mitigate down views and views along Almira.

In terms of phasing, Mr. Jacobson referred to a diagram indicating a color coded layout of the construction phases. He noted that as each phase develops, those houses along Almira are removed, and then the parking associated with the phase develops.

Mr. Nyberg asked if the City is going to install a street signal to regulate traffic on Yorba Linda Boulevard and Almira. Mrs. Nyberg noted that in addition to construction, the fire department is adjacent to Almira, which makes the noise issue worse as well. Chairman Hoban stated that traffic issues and the implementation of the construction process are not within purview of the RDRC.

Mr. Thompsan added that the elimination of parking along the church side of Almira is being considered by the traffic department. Mr. Nyberg stated he liked that idea.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the project should be approved, subject to staff's recommendations and Committee Member Lynch's idea, that a more sustainable material takes the place of the styrofoam on the design. He also added that, as a citizen speaking, the parking along Almira needs to be eliminated.

Committee Member Lynch added that with the type of detailing on the design, dirt streaking occurs because there is no drip-edge. He stated that he did not know how to eliminate this, other than having a roof-edge metal to make sure the dripping stays away from the building. Mr. Jacobson stated that they are already following through with this idea.

Chairman Hoban noted that he agreed that there are inappropriate locations for styrofoam, but styrofoam is a new technology, and there are good and bad applications of it. He stated he would not rule styrofoam out of any building construction. If the material is forty feet up in the air, it should not be damaged. Committee Member Daybell stated that if the material is forty feet in the air, it is even harder to fix when it starts deteriorating. Chairman Hoban stated that typically this material should not deteriorate

with the weather; it would be because somebody came in contact with it. Committee Member Lynch stated his concern was that with the expansion and contraction of the material from the hot and cold weather, the styrofoam is going to start to break apart. His concern is with the legacy of the material. He noted the original church did not contain styrofoam and it has been there for forty-plus years. He noted he has no faith that the material has any sustainability.

Committee Member Cha stated that as long as the church is aware of the potential problems of styrofoam, the engineer and architect should make the decision about the material. Committee Member Lynch disagreed with Committee Member Cha and stated he believed the RDRC played the role of architectural police and were supposed to monitor these types of things. Committee Member Cha asked the applicant to address the issue.

Public hearing re-opened.

Chairman Hoban asked the applicant how much the change of foam application to a lath and plaster would cost. Mr. Jacobson stated that it was not a cost issue, but a technology issue. He stated that it is a product used almost exclusively in the industry, even on expensive buildings; it is not a cheaping out of material. He stated the condition in the downtown area referred to by Committee Member Lynch is a condition that had impact, and was not protected in terms of detailing for the erosion, dirt, etc. He added he had forty years experience as an architect and would not do something his owner would not be happy with in ten years. He stated that Committee Member Lynch needed to trust the professionals to know what is best for their client. He stated the intent of Committee Member Lynch's comment is heard, and they will be scrupulous if and where foam is used, but does not believe this type of condition is needed. Committee Member Lynch stated he was not trying to undermine Mr. Jacobson's experience, and knows a lot of people are using foam in their designs, but does not know what they are doing to make it better than other material. He stated he questioned the industry-wide use of foam.

MOTION by Chairman Hoban, and SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed 3-1, with Committee Member Lynch opposed.

Item No. 2

PRJ07-00258A – ZON07-00053A. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: CAMERON IRONS. A request to modify the design of the exterior remodel approved as PRJ07-00258 within a Community Improvement District on property located at 133 W Chapman Avenue. (Generally located on the north side of Chapman Avenue between 350 and 450 feet west of Harbor Boulevard) (C-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Heather Allen).

Associate Planner Hernandez gave a brief overview of the project. She stated the project is a requested modification of a previously approved building design, brought to the RDRC on September 27, 2007. The approved design utilized elements of the 1960's "Googie" architectural style, including large, angular, stucco patio covers and decorative structural support accents. The modified design will utilize most of the building's 1963 exterior, with the exception of installing new store-front window systems and a parapet to screen roof-mounted equipment. The exterior shotcrete and smooth stucco, and the

patio covers have been changed to corrugated metal with wood posts. The exception is the circular patio with the palapa cover, which remains from the original design. No change is proposed to the approved trash enclosure, which re-uses the existing pattern block. The approved signage has been modified, and the Googie pole sign to identify the project has been removed. She stated Staff is concerned with the revisions presented in terms of the project presenting a combination of several architectural themes, rather than one cohesive design. Staff recommends the RDRC consider the revised project and provide direction to the applicant. She stated that if RDRC approves the project, Staff recommends the conditions of approval be adopted that are outlined in the staff report.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if the patio cover was corrugated metal and Associate Planner Hernandez answered affirmatively. Vice Chairman Cha asked if the metal would reflect the noise from the outside, as well as the weather. He asked if there was any other material that could be used to match the circular patio, and to prevent the noise. He stated he did not prefer metal to be used for public gathering places due to the noise it reflects and the fact that it does not provide adequate weather protection.

Public hearing opened.

Cameron Irons, Applicant, stated that he agreed the corrugated metal would not absorb noise well. He stated that the idea was to have an open beam system inside, with roof trusses, with the corrugated metal on top, and exposed trusses underneath. He stated he was trying to keep an urban, industrial theme and thought the corrugated metal went with the palapa roof, which is kind of a beach theme. He noted that the corrugated roof is twenty feet out, with a low pitch. He stated he looked at doing a fabric awning, but it was a wear item, and it would have to be replaced every three or four years as it faded. The stucco was also not an effective sound system.

Mr. Irons stated that because the project has been bounced around for so long and the economy is struggling, the project must be constructed more economically. He noted that his tenants actually like the corrugated metal better because it gives them weather protection. The old wing of the cover was eighteen feet high at its outer edge, so even though it was supposed to be a shade cover, it did not provide much shade or weather protection. And considering the shade structure was about thirty five percent of the entire budget, it became a target for using cost-effective materials. He stated he is trying to create something that will hide equipment, provide shade and weather protection, and have an urban feel.

Mr. Irons stated the reason he was going to do the smooth stucco on the parapet was so it could be blended to match the shotcrete on the lower part. He stated this should make the building look concrete and not that of stucco.

The project architect noted that on the parapet wall behind the corrugated metal, openings will be provided so ventilation will come through underneath. Mr. Irons clarified that if the truss is triangle, in the back of the truss will be openings that open to the roof and allow air and light to come through into the open trusses underneath. He noted that the only purpose for the corrugated metal is for shade and rain protection.

Vice Chairman Cha stated that design is the concern for the RDRC, not cost. He asked if it would be a major difference in cost to match the patio roof with the circular one. Mr. Irons answered that it is not really the cost of the palapa design; it was a matter of being too much palapa design. Even though it was a nice accent and drew attention in from

the corner, he didn't want that much of the design, as he believed it to be turning into a sort of Hawaiian theme. He stated he was going for a more urban, industrial design with an accent roof on the end.

Vice Chairman Cha asked Mr. Irons if he was converting from an office to a restaurant public gathering place. Mr. Irons confirmed that the former use was office use. He stated he was trying to design something that fit the downtown area in a quality manner. The money for the patio cover was not the issue; he stated he just wanted the cover to provide shade and weather protection.

Committee Member Lynch stated that he had input on the modified design. He stated that it would be more cost-effective to play on the character of the original design, which is very similar to designs found in Palm Springs. Committee Member Lynch provided a quick drawing of his idea for the modified building. He stated that the equipment screening could be set back away from the equipment, and corrugated elements could be incorporated as well as anodized windows. Desert plants like Yuccas can also be integrated. Mr. Irons asked Committee Member Lynch if he thought the corrugated patio cover should still be included. Committee Member Lynch answered affirmatively. Mr. Irons asked if Committee Member Lynch was implying the tower on the modified design should be eliminated. Committee Member Lynch answered, yes, that he did not really care for the tower. Mr. Irons noted the parapet is raised to get the height of the patio cover out twenty feet. He stated he did not want to have a roof that died into nothing. The project architect stated that a signage band was also needed. Committee Member Lynch stated that possibly a few courses of block could be included to raise it up, and maybe the signage could stand on its own legs. Mr. Irons stated that Code does not allow a roof sign. Committee Member Lynch stated that he was trying to play on the original character of the building and thought something just as nice can be done without spending the money. Mr. Irons stated that height is needed for signage. He stated the initial design was without the parapet, so the roof went up and died. The reason to do the parapet in the modified design was so the roof would die into something and would look finished. Mr. Irons stated the idea was to have the back of the parapet open so ventilation comes through the patio area. Committee Member Lynch proposed that the corrugated roof screen is eliminated and a shorter parapet stays, providing enough room for signage, and still maintains the mid-century look. Mr. Irons stated that he could try to design the tower to be more mid-century. Committee Member Lynch agreed because he felt the tower was "old west" in character.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell stated he was not excited about corrugated metal, and does not want to get back into a shed-roof situation. He stated he was disappointed there was no money to do the original design. He stated that he does not know whether to support the proposed modified design, or continue the meeting so the revised design can be modified further.

Chairman Hoban stated he also loved the original design, but did not like the modified version. Mr. Irons stated that he wanted to go out to bid with two different plans, the original design and a more cost-effective, modified design. He stated that if he could engineer the first design, then he will go with it, but he does not want to bid a plan that the RDRC has not approved. Chairman Hoban stated that he recommends that the RDRC does not vote on the project so it is not denied on record. Mr. Irons stated that he rushed the project because he wants to get to bid. Committee Member Daybell stated that the modified design could be continued. Chairman Hoban asked Staff if the original

design would be voided if the revised design were to be approved. Senior Planner St. Paul answered affirmatively. Chairman Hoban stated that he did not want to approve the modified design because he did not want the original plans voided; he stated the RDRC has given the applicant comments, and thought the RDRC should take no action. If the RDRC continued the project, it would leave the second design floating.

Mr. Irons stated if he could find a way to cost-engineer the first design, he would lighten the structure; instead of stucco on the entire infrastructure of the wing, that wing would become a lighter steel structure with an umbrella fabric. He stated he hadn't cost-engineered this modification yet. He also did not know if he would have to return to the RDRC to change the skin of the original design. Chairman Hoban stated that he would have to return, but he did not think that was not an unreasonable thing to be proposing. It would be a modern interpretation of the original design. Mr. Irons asked if anyone had objections to modernizing the first design. Committee Member Lynch stated that this idea was far superior to the Plan B design. Chairman Hoban stressed the fact that the modification to the original design would have to come back to the RDRC. Vice Chairman Cha stated that the RDRC should not design for the applicant, because if the design returns to the RDRC and the project is rejected, it will cost the applicant a lot of money. He stated if cost is a problem, the corrugated metal patio should be eliminated, and the round design should just remain; otherwise, there needs to be a better material suitable for noise and weather protection.

Committee Member Daybell stated that the RDRC should not vote on the project so the first design is not voided. Senior Planner St. Paul stated that the Committee has to provide direction--either approve, deny, or continue the project. Chairman Hoban stated that if direction is needed, the project should be continued. Chairman asked if there was any further discussion before a vote and the Committee answered no.

MOTION by Committee Member Lynch, and SECONDED by Vice Chairman Cha to CONTINUE TO A DATE CERTAIN of December 11, 2008 to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise plans. Motion passed unanimously.

Item No. 3

PRJ08-00443 – ZON08-00150. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER: SUSAN GOLTSMAN. A request for approval of a Minor Development Project to remodel an existing office building in a Community Improvement District on property located at 109 W. Union Avenue. (Generally located on the north side of Union between approximately 80 and 130 feet west of Harbor Blvd.) (C-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15301 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Heather Allen).

Associate Planner Hernandez stated the applicant is proposing to do an exterior remodel of the existing building. She stated the existing building configuration will be maintained. No additional square footage will be added because the Code does not allow for the expansion of a non-conforming use; however, the outward appearance of the property is allowed to change. The window openings will be changed to aluminum window systems for added natural light and architectural interest. Windows will either have concrete canopy and sill or metal awning that is both decorative and functional. She stated Staff believes the improvements are well executed and appropriate to the scale and design of the building. Staff recommends approval of the project to the RDRC, subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

Vice Chairman Cha asked if there were any changes to the existing floor plan. Associate Planner Hernandez stated there are minor changes to the interior floor plan, but no additional square footage will be added to the building. There will be minor modifications to the restroom area and to the areas next to the doorway openings and one interior wall.

Public hearing opened.

Steve Lang, representing the owner of the property, stated he wanted to create a studio-feel to the property. He stated he wanted to, ultimately, have a campus between the two buildings, but currently, the back building is being used for storage and has been abandoned for a while.

Committee Member Daybell asked about if the mature trees outside the building would stay. Mr. Lang answered affirmatively and clarified the Jacaranda, Palm, and Ash will remain. He noted drought-tolerant landscaping will also be added.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Daybell asked why the issue of wall pack lights was incorporated on condition four of the staff report. Chairman Hoban clarified that it is a general condition.

Committee Member Lynch stated he liked the design and supported the project.

Committee Member Daybell stated he thought the project was a major improvement for the city of Fullerton.

Chairman Hoban stated he liked the gritty, industrial look of the project and was interested in what was going to happen to the landscape.

MOTION by Committee Member Daybell, and SECONDED, by Committee Member Cha to APPROVE the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION:

Senior Planner St. Paul stated that there are RDRC meetings scheduled for Thanksgiving and Christmas day, and a motion is needed in order to cancel them.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Cha, and SECONDED, by Chairman Hoban to CANCEL the scheduled November 27, 2008 and December 25, 2008 RDRC meetings. Motion passed unanimously.

MEETINGS:

Senior Planner St. Paul reviewed the dates of the next City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

Senior Planner St. Paul stated that the next scheduled RDRC meeting will be on December 11th.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 5:18 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadia Muhaidly
Clerical Assistant