



**MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

MONDAY, February 1, 2016
7:00 P.M.

City Council Chambers, Room 213
1685 Main Street, Santa Monica

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Lynn Robb, Chairperson
Margaret Griffin
Craig Hamilton
Therese Kelly
Maegan Pearson
Amy Rothman
Patrick Tighe

Also Present: Steve Traeger, Principal Urban Designer
Grace Page, Associate Planner
Margaret Chapman, Staff Assistant III

3. SECRETARY'S REPORT:

- President's Day is Monday, February 15, 2016 and there will not be a meeting of the Architectural Review Board;
- The Joint Design Review Board for 710 Wilshire, 14-ARB-173, has a tentative meeting date of Monday, February 29, 2016, as materials have not been received from the applicant;
- The design review for 3008 Santa Monica Boulevard will be scheduled for the March 7th meeting.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a. January 20, 2016

ACTION: APPROVED WITH TWO CORRECTIONS, to page 7 paragraph 3 to read, "Board member Kelly stated that the attention to materials and the quality of light is strong. The civic nature of the building and the community engagement component needs to be further developed. Board member Kelly stated that there should be more presence on the corner to announce this as an important civic building. The project should have some element of hierarchy between the overhanging canopy, the canted wall, and the red brick. Something more vertical or transparent could emphasize the project."

Page 8 paragraph, 10 to read, "Chairperson Robb stated that this is a very different way to analyze a project, as directed by the City Council and Settlement Agreement."

Chairperson Robb made the motion to approve the Minutes with two corrections that was seconded by Board member Rothman and unanimously approved by voice vote.

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS AND INPUT:** None.

6. **EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** None.

7. **REVIEWS:** Public input permitted.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice-Chairperson Pearson recommended that Item 7.3, 16-ARB-0016, 2727 Pico Boulevard be moved to the Consent Calendar.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to move Item 7.3, 16-ARB-0016, 2727 Pico Boulevard to the Consent Calendar.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to approve the revised Consent Calendar that was seconded by Board member Rothman and approved by roll call vote 7-0.

a. Resubmissions:

7.1. **15ARB-0406: 1927 18th Street: Multi-Family Residential

Approval of building design, colors, materials, and landscape plans for the construction of a new two-story, three-unit condominium project.

ACTION: APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

b. New Submissions: None

B. REGULAR CALENDAR

a. Resubmissions:

7.2. **15ARB-0314: 1601-1603½ Ocean Front Walk: Retail

Approval of façade design, colors and materials for a new commercial tenant, Starbucks Coffee.

ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT' REQUEST

Elizabeth Valerio was present to discuss the project and distributed additional renderings.

Two chits were submitted, Ellen Brennen and Jerry Rubin.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Many Board members concurred with the Staff report and stated that the proposed project lacks character and individuality and the compositional strategies from the last submittal have not improved. Many Board members expressed concerns regarding the proposed painted vinyl window application that is not permanent.

Board members stated that the Ocean Front Walk location warrants a project with more strength to make it a more active and important place.

The Board directed the applicant to look for other cues on the Pier, carousel, or the adjacent neighborhood to enhance this project.

The Board directed the applicant to continue to work with Staff to define the outdoor dining area and compose a project that is unique and contextual with the surrounding area.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Kelly and continued by the following roll call vote 7-0:

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kelly, Pearson, Rothman, Tighe and Chairperson Robb.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

b. New Submissions:

- 7.3. 16ARB-0016: 2727 Pico Boulevard: Drive-thru/Café**
Approval of sign plans and sign adjustments for Starbucks Coffee Drive-Thru.

ACTION: APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

7.4. **16ARB-0032: 1301 Colorado Avenue: Creative Office

Approval of façade design, colors, and materials for a creative office building renovation.

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH REVISED CONDITIONS

Patty Rehm was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the planting palate/planting plan to verify that they are non-invasive and non-watering.

Board members stated that the proposed project is a significant improvement to the existing building with an appropriate color palate. The proposed project is open with recessed patios, balconies, wood decking, cable railing, and more pedestrian oriented with a revitalization to the corner. The scale and composition of the stucco panels is an architectural element.

Board members also stated that the proposed improvements modernize the existing warehouse where the glazing and white stucco panels work well together; however, the proposed white panels on the Colorado elevation could result in three empty white blank spaces resembling billboards, that at a later date, artwork or advertising is not part of this approval. It was also stated that incorporating a layer of landscaping could soften the wall of aluminum louvers.

The Board conditioned the project for the applicant to work with Staff to be more specific regarding the white stucco panels on the Colorado Avenue elevation. The panels are not to remain white and work with Staff to find an appropriate color and texture for the panels. A friendly suggestion was made to enhance the landscaping on Colorado Avenue with layering of different heights of landscape elements to increase the pedestrian experience.

Board member Tighe made the motion to approve the project with revised conditions that was seconded by Board member Rothman and approved by the following roll call vote 7-0:

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kelly, Pearson, Rothman, Tighe and Chairperson Robb.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

8. DISCUSSION: Public input permitted.

- A.** Courtesy review of the schematic design for a new City Services Building located east of City Hall, 1685 Main Street.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Grace Page, Associate Planner introduced, Mary Mulder, architect, Architectural Services Division, Frederick Fisher and Partners, and the Historic Resources Group to introduce the project.

Ms. Page also informed the Board that the project is a landmarked parcel and will also be reviewed by the Landmark's Commission.

Ms. Mulder stated that per City Council and the City Center Specific Plan adopted in 2005 a City Services Building was to be added adjacent to City Hall to improve services to the public by consolidating staff and services in one location, eliminating multiple current lease spaces, and restoring of some aspects of the historic City Hall. The design goal is to attain Living Building Challenge accreditation, which is the highest recognized standard for sustainability.

Frederick Fisher introduced the schematic design of the project with Hathaway Dinwiddie and Peyton Hall. Three schemes were pursued in the feasibility study to accomplish the goals of the City. With the simple volumes of the existing City Hall building and the complex volumes of the existing Public Safety Building, it was determined that the volume to be placed between the two buildings should be quiet and simple to be efficient.

Mr. Fisher also elaborated on the access to the building, revitalization of the courtyard, planting palate, and the addition of a solar photovoltaic field parking structure cover on the north side of City Hall.

Ms. Peyton stated that the addition to City Hall endeavors to be a sensitive addition respecting the historic significant City Hall Landmark.

One chit was submitted, Jerry Rubin.

Board member Griffin stated that the composure of a quiet design for the City Services Building is appropriate; however additional detailing on the louvers would assist in understanding the project. Board member Griffin also stated that the courtyard should have an accessibility from the outside without going through the building and the lower mass and upper mass should be more differentiated through deeper recesses on the bottom. Board member Griffin made the suggestion that the photovoltaic elements be added to the existing flat roof of the historic City Hall and not be visible from the front elevation.

Board member Pearson stated that the massing scheme is appropriate and works with the existing buildings. Board member Pearson also stated that any future submission could contain detailing on the glass elements showing differentiation. The areas where the ground floor is set in breaks up the long mass and should be elaborated. Board member Pearson also stated that the courtyard area would benefit for an analysis on how the space will be used by the occupants of the buildings and should have access from the outside to make it more of a public space.

Board member Hamilton stated that that the presentation demonstrated the organization behind the massing and concluded in a very successful simple three story building. To compose a mediating building between a historic building and public safety building is a design challenge integrating a ground level courtyard, multiply entries, and photovoltaic canopy with a goal to meet the living building standard.

Board member Kelly stated her support of the project both the functionality and quiet beauty. The materials are the right response as a segway between the historic City Hall and the high tech appearing Public Safety Building. Board member Kelly stated that the courtyard could benefit from additional entrances in different places and smaller outdoor rooms to be a more welcoming plaza and connect more to a secondary outdoor room. The Olympic corner could be further developed as the grade change from the parking structure to the building is challenging. Board member Kelly stated her support of the landscape plan but it could be further developed and terraced down to make it gentler to get to the lower level and use the ramping as a

design element. Board member Kelly also stated that the photovoltaic panels should be further developed.

Board member Rothman stated that the presentation was thorough and provided a variety of materials and details. Board member Rothman stated her appreciation of the quiet building as a bridge between the existing buildings; however, the proposed building feels monolithic and very massive and a little too quiet. Board member Rothman stated her wish was for more pizzazz to the design.

Board member Tighe stated that the massing and scale is appropriate. There is an element of sophistication with the detailing. Board member Tighe also expressed concern regarding the entry access to the courtyard that will allow entry from the exterior and not just limited to access through the building to allow public participation. Board member Tighe stated that the rooftop is an area for further development and could be made into an amazing space as a outdoor room or an area for special events.

Chairperson Robb informed the Board the presentation for the City Services Building is a courtesy review and that the Architectural Review Board does not have any regulatory review role in this process and this project will also go to the Landmark's Commission for review due to its adjacency to the historic City Hall.

Staff also informed the Board that the project may potentially return to the Board for review as a second concept review as part of a Development Review; however that is still being discussed due to the status of the landmark parcel.

Chairperson Robb stated that the schematic presentation demonstrated the needs of the location, the demands of the space, and the challenges of creating a "Living Building." These demands are challenging and the applicant has created a very successful project. The existing character and functionality of the historic structures have been maintained in relation to this new building. The glass fritting patterns and the operable function of the windows will assist to animate and enliven the surface. The differentiation of the lower and upper stories with surface treatments or by recessing the ground floor for greater shadow and visual distinction would be helpful. Chairperson Robb also stated that the courtyard, the design and layout within it, feels trapped and would benefit from an opening or passage way connecting directly to the exterior of the buildings. Chairperson Robb stated that the photovoltaic structure should relate to the architectural features of the park in front of City Hall and to the City Hall itself to create harmony.

- B.** Discuss 3rd Street Promenade design with staff from Downtown Santa Monica Inc., including but not limited to, storefront design, outdoor dining, lighting, and signage.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Staff presented a slide show to recapture the previous concerns of the Board from previous discussions that demonstrate storefronts, materials, finishes, signage, buildings on the Historic Resources Inventory, parapet treatments, outdoor dining, heaters, shade covers, and lighting.

Kathleen Rawson and Steven Welliver from Downtown Santa Monica, Inc., addressed the Board.

Ms. Rawson stated the sensitivity of Downtown Santa Monica Inc. Their goal is to maintain the historic character of the buildings and elaborate on their focus to define downtown Santa Monica, not as a shopping mall, but as individual buildings not to look cookie cutter; as the storefronts should blend with the surrounding areas and be complimentary. Ms. Rawson states that the Downtown Community Plan establishes and maintains the guidelines for facades.

Ms. Rawson commended the Architectural Review Board for their contribution to the process in reviewing projects and guaranteeing a high quality of materials, appropriate signage, adequate windows, creativity, and designed rear facades.

Ms. Rawson stated that the areas of concern that the Architectural Review Board have streamlined are signage size, discouraging animated signs, large signs that block windows not allowing a connection to the street, and maintaining outdoor dining standards.

Ms. Rawson explained to the Board that the outdoor dining standards currently in place were written in 1985 that relate to thoroughfare traffic that no longer exist. Ms. Rawson also explained that the design of outdoor barricades have fire department restrictions. Mr. Rawson expressed concern with the standards that influence what covers the outdoor dining. There are no regulations at this time that regulate umbrellas, height, and head clearance. Awnings also are of concern at this time as awnings are limited to two-thirds of outdoor dining area and would benefit from review.

Ms. Rawson reviewed lighting; brightness, possible distraction from store lighting onto the street, tree lighting, and pole lighting.

Ms. Rawson explained that the ambient lighting on the Promenade is very light. Currently the rope lighting on the trees is not healthy for the trees and will be removed and will need to be replaced. The bistro lights are also very light originating from 1989, so there is a dependency on the storefront light. Ms. Rawson also stated that the safety, security, and the vibrancy of the Promenade are a prominent concern as the rear facades are too dark and inhibit the comfort of pedestrian circulation.

One chit was submitted, Jerry Rubin.

Chairperson Robb thanked Ms. Rawson for her explanation of the current condition of the Promenade. The explanation of the existing lighting conditions, with particular attention to the explanation of the glazing from the stores was helpful.

Chairperson Robb stated that the Board carefully reviews proposed pronounced upper level lighting that is beyond signage.

Chairperson Robb expressed concern with Mr. Rawson regarding the maintenance of the historical references of the elements of the Promenade in regards to the light poles and kiosks.

Mrs. Rawson informed the Board that this is no change-out plan for the center kiosks at this time due to budget restrictions. The base of the lights poles will need to remain with the possibility to replace the fixtures to a more streamlined appearance. All future repair work is being restricted by budget.

Ms. Rawson also stated that other equipment that has been attached to the light poles ideally would be removed. There are currently new banners in place on the Promenade and an effort to light the banners is underway. The dinosaur topiary is only lit during the holiday and an effort to light the topiary permanently is ideal.

Board member Griffin expressed concern regarding the visibility of design of materials underneath some canopies that should be an area of focus. Board member Griffin stated that a concern to enhance the porosity of alleys to the Promenade has always been a positive concern of the Board. The connection from the alley makes the alley a better pedestrian place. Board member Griffin also concurred with Ms. Rawson regarding the height and placement of umbrellas.

Chairperson Robb stated that movable furniture has a large impact on the quality of outdoor dining spaces and the overall aesthetic quality of the Promenade. This condition may need to be part of future packets.

Staff informed the Board that umbrellas do not require building permits, so an Architectural Review Board permit is not triggered. A review is triggered if signage is proposed on umbrellas.

Board member Kelly requested clarification regarding the application process for new businesses and the awing size limitations.

Staff informed the Board that the application process is parallel as applicants file with both entities.

Mr. Rawson informed the Board that not every applicant comes to the Downtown Santa Monica, Inc. Board. The only applicants that come before the Downtown Santa Monica Board are those seeking a variance. Their focus is on the use of the building and passageways. Ms. Rawson also elaborated on the 1997 Bayside Plan in reference to the Outdoor Dining Standards that limits the size of an awning to two-thirds of the space, the purpose was to eliminate the creation of outdoor rooms. Ms. Rawson also stated that she would like to see standards placed on outdoor umbrellas.

Board member Tighe proposed that Promenade retail residents could contribute to an infrastructure for improvements and maintenance, such as lighting on the Promenade.

Board member Hamilton stated that with the review of the Downtown Plan, what needs to be incorporated into the plan is detail to ensure that the Promenade and Downtown remain viable.

Ms. Rawson stated that in the past the Promenade was marketed as a premier shopping destination. The restrooms in the parking structures are clean and well lit but are not modern. There is a maintenance of an authentic urban environment. The Promenade is not a shopping mall with individual buildings and real alleys. There is a street population with citizens of the community. All of the elements are in balance. The Downtown Santa Monica Inc. Board has talked about design guidelines and the evolution of what should be in the Downtown Specific Plan and are hopeful that the Design Guidelines are not part of that document, but act as a complimentary document.

Chairperson Robb that Ms. Rawson for her contribution to the downtown area and taking the time to come and present to the Board and provide a better understanding of the process and a context of the whole Promenade intertwined in an urban fabric.

Ms. Rawson informed the Board that Downtown Santa Monica Inc. is in the process of developing a capital upgrade program. There may

not be many dramatic changes as the context of the street is important. Ms. Rawson would like to keep the Board involved in this process and would appreciate the Board's input.

9. FUTURE BOARD AGENDA ITEMS: None.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Chairperson Robb made the motion to adjourn at 9:18 p.m. that was seconded by Board member Kelly and adjourned by voice vote.

mc
02-22-16

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Margaret Chapman
Staff Assistant III

Lynn Robb
Chairperson