CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

August 19, 2009

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair McCormack stated in reviewing the Agenda he would move Agenda Item No. 3 to the front of the Agenda after the consent items.

Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager, stated it was at the pleasure of the Committee to move the Agenda Items. The Agenda was set in an order that Staff thought would work. As Committee Member Wheeler was conflicted out for Agenda Item No. 2 the order of the items to be heard could be changed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not requesting that; however, it would work.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the applicant for Item No. 3 would be available if the order of the Agenda was changed?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she would step out and advise Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, that his item would be heard first and she would also advise Wahoo's, which was Item No. 2, that they would need to wait a bit. She stated there was no policy or procedural information to discuss and the Committee had the minutes to review from the August 5, 2009 Design Review Committee Meeting. The July 15, 2009 Design Review Committee Meeting minutes had been held over for a vote as there had not been enough voting members present at their last meeting. The minutes had already been reviewed and could be approved during the regular session.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting of August 5, 2009. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had something to discuss that he had seen at the new Walgreen's on Chapman and Tustin regarding all the measures that they had taken for water quality. It all looked pretty good, with the exception of railings or guards that had been placed around the seepage pits. He asked if it was necessary that something be placed around those areas to keep people from walking into them?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she had not been to the site; however, Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, had been to the site and the grade difference had been a bit more than they had thought it would be. She was not certain how the need for a barrier had been triggered. It was probably necessary for safety reasons to keep someone from stumbling into those areas.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not a guard rail that would comply and it struck him that they appeared somewhat flimsy and he felt the craftsmanship had not been very good. The rails were not something that he recalled reviewing during a DRC Meeting.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she felt it was a good idea, and something that they had learned, that they should question depending on how deep the swale was. If it was reasonable to leave unprotected or was it something that would need to be added.

Chair McCormack stated the DRC typically had not received that detail.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry asked Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, about the railing and if he had additional information he could offer?

Mr. Garcia stated it was nothing that the City had required. It was an item that Walgreen's had felt they needed to add for liability issues. The swales were pretty deep and they were deeper than he had initially anticipated.

Committee Member Cathcart asked if the reason the rails had been added was because the areas were too deep or too narrow.

Mr. Garcia stated it was due to the fact that the areas were deep and the curb was high. The curb was extended down on the inlet side.

Chair McCormack stated it might have been a better idea to have had a plate that went over the area and to have it extended out to limit the size of the step down.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it would give them something new to review and generally not something that had been brought to the DRC. It could be something that Staff could ask the applicant to supply. Information on a type of rail or barrier they proposed in order for the Committee to review.

Mr. Garcia stated it was due to the grading issue and it had been something that the applicant had installed due to their corporate safety concerns.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All members of the Design Review Committee were present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on matters not listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff, or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action

(1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**:

(a) July 15, 2009 (continued from the August 5, 2009 meeting)

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of July 15, 2009, with the changes and corrections noted during the August 5, 2009 Administrative Session.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(b) August 5, 2009

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of August 5, 2009, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Bill Cathcart ABSENT: Joe Woollett

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for August 19, 2009 Page 5 of 19

Chair McCormack stated he wanted to make a change to the Agenda, in regard to the order in which items would be heard. He would hear Item 3-Uyematsu Office Building first and then Item 2-Wahoo's. The Committee Members concurred with the change to the Agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4340-08 – WAHOO'S FISH TACOS RESTAURANT/BUILDING

- A proposal to demolish a non-contributing one-story stucco storefront, restore and convert the two-story "Vineland Hotel" building to a restaurant. The application includes a proposal to construct a two-story retail and office building.
- 222-228 W. Chapman Avenue, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Preliminary DRC Review on July 2, 2008
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from this Agenda item due to the location of his office within 500 feet of the proposed project.

Committee Member Gladson stated the applicant was gracious enough to allow herself and Chair McCormack to tour the building prior to their meeting.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Susan Secoy Jensen, address on file, stated she was hoping to have an interesting discussion about the negative space. She had latched onto the Paley Park idea and she thought it was an awesome space and what she proposed to do was to use a colored stamped textured ground plane and proposed landscape for the area. There would be dense green ivy. She was open for suggestions. There would be up-lighting on the entire project. She would like to see a plan for street lighting and a larger infrastructure with Old Towne which would keep their site more subdued with up-lighting. She had a rear street elevation, as there had been discussion on how would they treat the back of the building. There was a group of design professionals in the City that had been reviewing trash enclosures and perhaps they could do something with that space. There could be a trellis with some nice landscaping and a nice fence and gate that would mimic the historic building. She had a proposed drawing to review with the Committee for the space. She was working with a buff brick color for the new building, responding to all the buildings on West Chapman which had a bit of a different personality from the rest of the Plaza district. She was working within that vocabulary.

Applicant, Bradley Rodgers, stated he had nothing additional to add.

Ms. Secoy Jensen presented drawings to the Committee and explained the details of each drawing. She also presented color and material samples.

Public Comment

Janet Crenshaw, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated she was excited about the project and she was interested in knowing when the tear down would occur as she wanted to be there to watch.

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he wanted to thank the applicants for including the OTPA in the preliminary process. The project was a win-win situation, which included the restoration of a historic hotel that most people had not ever seen or were not aware it existed. Everyone he spoke with had no idea that the building existed behind there. The project was headed in the right direction and he looked forward to the restoration. It was probably the only existing hotel in Orange and Ms. Secoy Jensen felt it was the only one left in Orange County. Utilizing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards was the only option as far as the OTPA was concerned and it appeared to be the intent of the proposed project. It appeared to comply with the Old Towne Design and Secretary of Interior Standards and they had nothing but support for the project. Sometimes the OTPA was not in favor of additions to old buildings, but it was necessary in the case of the proposed project to create a viable project. A brick commercial-style using in-kind materials was sympathetic with other buildings in the Plaza and the height was in sync with the historic hotel. He believed that the Depot Specific Plan had not addressed the area and had not acknowledged the historic hotel. He supported the idea of the appearance of two separate buildings and it was quite obvious what was old and what was new. He felt the applicant had brought forth an excellent project. He had a few comments regarding the Negative Declaration, most of which was supportive; there was discussion regarding the replacement of deteriorating siding with material of the same profile. He felt wood material that would be rot resistant would be appropriate and red wood was most available and the use of brick from the original foundation on the facade and retaining the historic appearance of the building was a plus. Using the Secretary of Interior's Standards for repair and replacement was appreciated. The OTPA supported re-creation of historic doors and windows wherever possible. Using the Secretary of Interior's Standards Brief No. 9 and it was important to document interior features of rooms 1 through 6 using the Hobbs procedure. There was mention of retaining any sound original plaster of the building and if it was possible the OTPA would be in support of that. He agreed with the recommendations to retain as many character defining features as possible. He understood much of that needed to be removed for the open space required for the restaurant. It was an excellent project and he was in full support of the project. A building most people were unaware of would be unveiled.

Doug Ely, address on file, stated he had taken a look at the proposed project and felt it was a prime example of what historic preservation was supposed to be all about. The addition would be complimentary to the historic structure. Ms. Secoy Jensen had stated that the historic structure would be painted white and that was a perfect color to have the primary, original structure stand alone. Although the addition would be of different materials it was complimentary. The landscape plan he reviewed was great; it was very clean and they would not want it to detract from the building. He was in full support of the project.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated he remembered reviewing the proposed project approximately a year ago and it appeared that it had remained mostly unchanged. There were some areas that had been developed a bit further and he had been in support of the project

initially. He was certainly in favor of the project. He had a few questions regarding the scope of approval. In the Weil Report there was a lot of information regarding the interior of the building and he presumed that a recommendation for the interior would not be part of any approval that would be arrived at by the DRC or by the Planning Commission. The report was attached and there was a lot of information included, much that appeared irrelevant.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated staff understood that the interior space would be remodeled to accommodate the restaurant. The DRC was reviewing, for their purposes, that the aesthetics of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Cultural sections were adequately disclosing any impacts and were answering the questions that were part of the Negative Declaration. The Planning Commission would review the project as a whole and reviewing all the sections based on the recommendations by the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was important to him to separate the documentation. There were drawings that had been prepared and there was the Staff Report and any other substantiating documentation was just information and not part of the documentation for approval.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it was part of the approval process.

Mr. Ryan stated one purpose of the historic searches report was to identify character-defining features of a building; what the condition of those elements were and how they could be used or restored for use in the project. To carry that into the project itself, the same language was carried over into the plans, specifically when there was an opportunity to repair and replace something and to use original materials. The procedure was called out for that using the Preservation Briefs. The clarity of the report was the way Martin Weil approached all of his projects; he had not wanted to leave anything out and it was very clear in the charts. Staff felt very comfortable about the assessment and now they were reviewing the project for some of those repairs and there had been decisions made in the field using those Briefs, such as a certain material had portions that required replacement and they would be looking at the project for those repairs, or that there was one surviving window that had a specific pattern.

Committee Member Woollett stated that information was included and it was part of the assessment. The document was an assessment and it was included for their review and it became part of the approval process. The DRC would be accepting it as an assessment. There were recommendations contained in those documents related to the assessment, such as if there had been a piece of exterior trim it had been commented in one area, however, not reflected in another area. It became a document he would go with rather than the other documentation.

Mr. Ryan stated there was information covered in a general sense that carried that information forward to enable the determination in the field.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was so much in favor of the project and he would not want to see it bogged down later by someone pointing out that certain aspects had not been completed. The documents were what he would base his decision on and there were many things in the assessment that could have been addressed and there were limitations to the scope of what could be reviewed for the proposed project.

Committee Member Gladson stated the way she thought about that particular historical report that was completed by the expert, Appendix D, supported what the DRC would be dealing with in the cultural resources section where they could find that X, Y, and Z had been completed with no disruption to a character defining feature, that the feature would not be lost because they might be doing specific things on the project that would create some significant loss. It was support of why it was less than significant in terms of the box that was checked there. If she had not received that back-up information she could not make that judgment call, as it required some discretion in the cultural resources part and the aesthetic part, she felt it was an adequate document for that too. For both cultural and aesthetic impacts she felt it was more than adequate in helping her to make a decision as it was a disclosure document that provided factual information which the DRC took in as part of the weight in their decision-making process. There were character-defining features in the interior of the building that she would want salvaged. She agreed that the interior component was a bit out of their purvue; however, for the particular historical structure being presented and its significance as a cultural resource to Orange it was nice to have been provided the full assessment. Committee Member Gladson stated her observations on the project were that she was very supportive of where the project was going. There was a lot of detail and things that needed to be done right and she felt they would be done right as that was part of the approach from the beginning. There were many examples in Orange where a restoration was done crummy and that would not happen in the proposed project because things were being done correctly. She had reviewed the plans and she would like to go through some of the details.

Mr. Ryan stated the proposed project would require a lot of interface between the architect, contractors, and City Staff. That interface would lead to good communication and an understanding of what was required. The character-defining features had been identified and also the condition of those features and what the remedy might be to preserve them. There was a commitment by the City to the proposed project; it was not only in the documents involved but also in the work that would take place.

Committee Member Gladson stated in walking through the building it gave her a very concrete picture of what was ahead and the scope of work involved. She was encouraged. In terms of environmental stuff she had not had any questions. There were good recommendations in the documentation provided and many of those recommendations had been pulled into the plans. She wanted to understand the egress part of the project on the 2nd floor and the fact that the 2nd floor of the hotel would have access to the new commercial building.

Committee Member Cathcart stated it appeared that the Committee would review the project again as it progressed and he asked if that was true?

Mr. Ryan stated the landscape and lighting would return.

Committee Member Gladson stated she thought the plans were great; she was just throwing things out there for the purposes of the DRC discussion, and was the applicant ready to go to the Planning Commission?

Committee Member Cathcart stated if the Planning Commission did what they should do, which was stay on point and talk about land use, then yes.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated she wanted to mention something that was brought up by Tita Smith when they were standing up on the roof and she asked how had the two structures connected. Both structures would be on the same plane, and she pointed out the egress on the plans. The wood wall would be kept and exposed; the entire wall would be seen when going up the stairs.

Chair McCormack stated the landscape appeared to go leaps and bounds above what the recommendations required. There were all these issues that were noted.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were all addressed in the drawings.

Chair McCormack stated he had a lot of little things he wanted to speak about.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was the detail that was important. They would not have a second chance and would want to go about it the right way. There were many meaty projects of late and it was exciting to see the restorations of some of the buildings. The community would be excited to understand those projects and they needed to tell the story.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he was a bit scared when Ms. Secoy Jensen had stated the building would be within the context of West Chapman and he thought it would look like Hoffman's Radiator or Paul's Cocktails and after reviewing the plans he was pleased.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated the buildings closer to the railroad tracks were beautiful buildings.

Committee Member Gladson stated there was no question that the proposed project would enhance both sides of the street.

Chair McCormack stated in reviewing some of the other projects and understanding where the population was going he had asked if there was an elevator in the project. It was very expensive, but the reality was, if there would be a change in use how would the need for those services be handled? It could be as simple as making a notation as a placeholder for the future. He always scratched his head in looking at the Depot Walk that the only thing that was lacking was an elevator, and he wanted to bring it up for discussion.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated an elevator was not required, they had the discussion. Once an elevator was installed it would need to accommodate a gurney. As the codes changed in 2007 they had actually become less stringent with the elevator requirements. It was an option. The older constructions could plead hardship, and for the new construction it was not required. It would be up to the owner of the building if they wanted to install one at a future date to adjust the space to accommodate that. It was a good point.

Chair McCormack stated he was in complete support of the project. He felt the proposed project had been done correctly and the details would complete the project. What caught him in the presentation was the fact of lighting and lately it had been a big concern of his. He liked the idea of the up-lighting in the trees. He had heard from the OTPA and other community members that

there was a disconnect in what the City wanted in terms of lighting and what Old Towne lighting should be. The high efficiency lighting was not Old Towne lighting and it was a big deal. They needed to look at the character of lighting and when was the line drawn on efficiency and the need to maintain historic features. He liked the idea of up-lighting. The street lighting was probably more of a high efficiency-type lighting.

Committee Member Gladson stated she thought in the documentation that street lighting was already proposed for the spoke streets of Old Towne.

Mr. Ryan stated there had been a street lighting study completed; however, he was not certain the project for lighting had been completed.

Chair McCormack stated he felt the applicant should focus on lighting on their site and in keeping with the historic appearance. He had mentioned in their previous discussion to possibly use the examples from Paley Park and he felt it worked for the proposed project. The challenge was that in looking at Paley Park it not only provided green but also shade; Paley Park faced south and their project faced north. He wanted to throw that out there as something to think about. It was attempting to find that balance of using trees to screen and to shade. There were areas that were perfectly shaded by the buildings and he pointed out areas that the applicant could focus on for shade issues. On the covered brick that would be exposed after the demo, he asked if that would that be painted?

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated they had not known what they would find and the intent was to match what existed.

Chair McCormack stated they had spoken about the trash enclosure and transformer, in working with SCE they needed access to the transformer and it had not appeared that there was room for both of those activities from the south. They would need to find some manner to provide an opening and the width of what they needed and possibly they could come up with a tandem trash enclosure.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated the design collaborative had been working on trash enclosures and how to incorporate the grease disposal and they were working on pulling the space together to accommodate the uses.

Chair McCormack stated although stamped concrete would not be historic, and he was not a fan of stamped concrete, there had been a lot of discussion about how concrete in its natural state was historic. He suggested in the key to making concrete appear historic was in the jointing and it should also be a very thin tool line and to focus in that direction. In thinking ahead with the old hotel restored and walking around the Plaza, he would want to see the old rolled curbs used. He had discussions with OTPA that they had wanted to save those historic edges and it was something that might find its way back in on the proposed project and give it a connection to the Plaza area.

Committee Member Gladson asked if he was suggesting that element be at the curb in front?

Committee Member Cathcart stated it would be in walkways.

Chair McCormack stated he had a thought about moving the fence back with green in front of it and possibly use a historic edge along the sidewalk to be raised a bit for the planting. It would be added jewelry. New construction and concrete would have such a new appearance. Committee Member Cathcart stated on the Plaza they had added Mica.

Mr. Frankel stated the City had a formula for concrete to have it appear older; it was a combination of coloring and carbide.

Chair McCormack stated it was also in the finishing choices for the concrete. He had initially had a concern with the brick front path; however, they could use historic brick on the walkway. Those were his thoughts; the project was great.

Committee Member Gladson stated regarding the vent, she had reviewed the photo documentation and she wanted to know why that vent choice was made? Her thought was that when they began uncovering the building they might have a better sense of what was there.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated they could remove the vent; there must have been a reference point for the vent and evidence of it.

Committee Member Gladson stated the transoms would be all clear and she asked if that was correct and that there would not be a ribbed pattern?

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated it would be clear glass.

Committee Member Gladson stated there were some existing down spouts on the building and she asked how the water runoff would be handled? She would want to review that detail.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated the down spouts would be replaced, probably with metal.

Committee Member Gladson stated the back of the building was important as the back door would be an access and she wanted to know what was being done with the trash enclosure and the old water heater.

Mr. Ryan stated the redevelopment standards in the Plaza also covered the back of the building and how those issues would be handled.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was covered in those standards and she thought the applicant had wanted their input on those areas.

Mr. Ryan stated basically it would be a matter of getting rid of the water heater and putting a period gate in and changing out the doorways to match the historic building.

Chair McCormack asked if there was parking in an area he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Ryan stated that area was church parking.

Mr. Rodgers stated they had ingress and egress and there was a gate on the east that would be used for deliveries.

Committee Member Gladson stated, and it was probably out of their purvue, employees would probably park on Lemon and walk up to the restaurant, or possibly on Olive. That helped her and the big thing was the connection between the two buildings. She asked about the rear elevation fencing would it be metal or wood? There needed to be fencing in an area she referred to on the drawings.

Ms. Secoy Jensen stated the fencing proposed was wood.

Chair McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4340-08, Wahoo's Fish Tacos Restaurant/Building, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following condition:

1. A landscape plan that also addressed paving and site details, to include lighting and the solution for the trash enclosure and transformer and to include the fencing detail for the enclosure and the plan for the down spouts be brought back for review.

SECOND: Bill Cathcart

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

NEW AGENDA ITEMS:

(3) DRC No. 4430-09 – UYEMATSU OFFICE BUILDING

- A proposal requesting approval for an already-finished exterior façade remodel of an existing office building.
- 321 N. Rampart Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Jesse James, address on file, stated he had nothing further to add.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he completely agreed with the Staff Report and what had been done was compatible with surrounding buildings in the area. He asked what would the light fixtures look like?

Mr. James stated they would be very consistent with the contemporary design of the building. They would be low wattage, to meet the new standards of lower electricity use.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what color would the light fixtures be?

Mr. James stated he was not certain as that had not yet been decided.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he noticed that the proposed plan was to paint the stairs red. Although the DRC had not gotten too involved in color choices, he felt that red would be a mistake and it would be too jarring and not compatible with the other colors they proposed for the building. He suggested they use a cobalt blue or black, and they could possibly use a color for the stairs that matched the light fixtures.

Mr. James stated he would go back to his architect and discuss that with them. They would be returning to the City to obtain a permit for a new roof. The roof would be metal.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in re-doing the stairs he cautioned the applicant to take care as he would need to meet the new code requirements. The vertical pickets would need to be closer and he believed the code would not allow open risers.

Mr. James stated he was not planning on changing the stairway, only to add a new color.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had read on the plans that there was a reference to rebuilding of the stairway.

Mr. James stated there would be some repairs made; however, they would not be rebuilt.

Chair McCormack read from the plans: remove existing staircase and replace with new.

Mr. James stated he was not aware that those changes had been added to the plans. It would not be something he would be doing, as he didn't have the money to replace the stairway. The only changes to the stairway would be some repairs and painting.

Chair McCormack reviewed the plans with the applicant.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had been his understanding that the changes needed to bring things up to code had to do with the total valuation of the changes, and that total valuation would include the changes that had already been made. Although a permit had not been obtained for changes already made, those changes would need to be included in the valuation of any changes the applicant proposed. He stated the applicant might find himself in a situation where changes to the stairway would be necessary. Committee Member Woollett stated he felt very strongly that, although what had been done was fine and he had no issues with the changes, when the plan was re-submitted for the changes to the roof that those plans should include the light fixtures and the colors.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not had any objections to what had been done. She had driven by the building about six weeks ago and had noticed that there had been changes and had not remembered reviewing the project. She saw the benefit in the DRC providing input and insight in proposed projects and the applicant was lucky that he had a nicely designed project which had saved him some heartache.

Mr. James stated he had made calls to the Planning Department and because he was not making any structural changes he thought that permits had not been needed. It was his mistake and the intent was to upgrade the site and to make it look better.

Chair McCormack asked if the property was a stand-alone piece of property?

Mr. James stated it was stand-alone.

Chair McCormack stated obviously the landscape had been modified.

Mr. James stated the space would be landscaped very nicely and there was existing landscape on the site, much more than was generally expected on a piece of property of that size. There was a lot of area that they would be protecting from the trail. There was beautiful landscaping on the site. For safety reasons they had removed some large overgrown trees, as they had security cameras on site. When the project was complete the landscape would be very consistent with the building.

Chair McCormack asked if the DRC would need to review the landscape component or would it be reviewed by Staff?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated generally when an applicant was making an addition to their site the City asked for the whole site to be brought up to code. The applicant was planning on doing additional landscaping and the DRC could give general direction and have the landscape plan reviewed by Staff or the project could be bifurcated with what had been presented and with a condition that the landscape plan return to the DRC. That plan of action would enable the applicant to work on the building while they prepared a landscape plan and hopefully it would all come together in the end.

Chair McCormack asked if the light fixtures and the color choices could return to the DRC?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated if the DRC was comfortable with Staff reviewing those components they could suggest that.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was comfortable with allowing Staff to review the lighting and color. She would want to review the landscaping.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wanted to offer the color comment as a suggestion and not a condition.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not caught the red color choice in the package and she felt it was a good thing to be brought to her attention. If there had been more red woven into the elevations in some other way she could find that color appropriate.

Mr. James asked if the light fixtures were red could they use that for the stairs?

Committee Member Gladson stated that would give the applicant an argument in blending the two elements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt the applicant would find that unfortunate.

Mr. James stated he had an architect working on the project and what concerned him most was to have a project at the end of the day that was beautiful and would attract tenants to the building. He had a very well known architect, the resident architect for the building was an architect for Disneyland, and he had staff at Disneyland and had moved into the area to be close to his client. He was a nationally recognized senior care architect. He had a structural engineer in the building and another one waiting to come into the building. He had design professionals that came to his building because they liked it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the tenants had some interesting ideas for window coverings. They were old blueprints or drawings.

Mr. James stated that was a temporary measure.

Chair McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4430-09, Uyematsu Office Building, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff report and with the following additional condition:

1. To bifurcate the process to have the landscape plan, lighting, and color palette return for review.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was not willing to second the motion.

Chair McCormack stated he had added the landscape plan as it could have an integral design related to light fixtures by not blocking security cameras or affecting the light distribution.

Mr. James asked if the City was concerned with the landscape along the perimeter or the out-of-sight interior landscape?

Chair McCormack stated it was the landscape on the site.

Mr. James stated he had more than enough landscape on the site, more than what had been required by code.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was the internal cohesiveness of the landscape to the architectural features and making it all a nice package with a bow. Generally they saw the integration of both of them and as they had not had the benefit of reviewing that at the front end, where a landscape concept plan would have been submitted, they were wrestling with that currently.

Mr. James stated what had originally been on the site were three trees. They had added landscape to the site.

Chair McCormack stated he would want a landscape plan with the proposed light fixtures to return for review.

Committee Member Gladson stated she could go either way; if they would be reviewing the landscaping, it would not hurt anything to review the other two elements.

Mr. James stated as light was a safety factor, the building currently had no exterior lighting. He asked what if his architect wanted red light fixtures?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would not think that the applicant would want that, it would be too spotty. He suggested they find a color that was more in keeping with the cool tones of the building.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were many shades of red.

Mr. James stated he was concerned with safety and he currently didn't have lights. There were a dozen or so women that were architects in the building that worked until midnight and he needed lighting on the building. He was concerned that he could not return quickly enough to get the approval for the lighting.

Committee Member Gladson stated the DRC meetings were held twice a month and it was a matter of how quickly the applicant could prepare his plans.

Chair McCormack stated there was a motion.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on September 2, 2009, at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

SECOND: Bill Cathcart

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.