



**DRAFT MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

MONDAY, April 4, 2016
7:00 P.M.

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 7:10 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:** Present: Lynn Robb, Chairperson
Craig Hamilton
Therese Kelly
Amy Rothman
Patrick Tighe

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

Absent: Margaret Griffin
Maegan Pearson

3. **SECRETARY'S REPORT:**
 - Correspondence was received for Item 7.1, 16-ARB-0042, 1636 Bryn Mawr Avenue in support of the project. Staff also received numerous E-mails inquiring about the procedural aspects of the review and general questions about the proposal;
 - Three letters of correspondence were received regarding Item 7.2, 16-ARB-0063, 945 Berkeley in opposition of the project proposal;
 - There was a press release last week stating that the Santa Monica Downtown Community plan schedule will be adjusted to allow for additional outreach and community input. This item is agendaized for discussion later in the Agenda.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None.

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

6. **EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** Board members Hamilton, Kelly, Rothman, Tighe, and Chairperson Robb were individually contacted by the architect for Discussion Item 8A. "Preliminary design review of Development Agreement (12DEV-005) proposal involving a 6-story, 65 residential unit,

mixed-use building at 1325 6th Street.” No Board members corresponded with the applicant.

7. REVIEWS: Public input permitted.

Chairperson Robb stated that Item 7.4, 16-ARB-0090, 1927 19th Street did not have plans included in the packets to the Board members. Chairperson Robb recommended that this item be continued to the next meeting April 18, 2016.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to continue Item 7.4, 16-ARB-0090, 1927 19th Street, that was seconded by Board member Kelly and continued by a roll call vote 5.-0.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. **Resubmissions:** None
- b. **New Submissions:** None

B. REGULAR CALENDAR

- a. **Resubmissions:** None
- b. **New Submissions:**

7.1. **16ARB-0042, 1636 Bryn Mawr Ave: Single Family Unit

Approval of a 499 square foot, third story addition (within the allowable height limit of 28-feet) to an existing single family residence on a parcel with a grade differential greater than 12.5-feet between the front and rear parcel line.

ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Staff outlined for the Board that this application is a request for a single family residence to have the Board review the compatibility and overall massing in relationship to the neighborhood context, insure the addition does not enlarge the first floor of the existing residence, that non-conforming features are not expanded, examine properties in the immediate neighborhood, and to guarantee that this addition is not an impact for technically a third story addition less than

500 square feet, and within the maximum height limitations of the zone.

Steven Cho was present to discuss the project.

Four chits were submitted, Grady Hall, Todd Sherman, Brian Roger, and Perry Anderson.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Many Board members stated their support of the Staff Report stating that the applicant has attempted to mask the modest addition in setting back on the front yard and side yard in a tasteful manner. The articulation of the addition and the roof presentation minimizes the addition.

Many Board members stated that the plan at the second floor could be revisited because of the articulation that appears as a symmetrical second floor and accentuates the two story volume. A more lineal approach would help the massing of the façade to reduce the impact. The addition is a change to the character of the neighborhood, although within the Zoning Ordinance.

One Board member stated that the street was narrow and would like to visit the site and abstained from voting on the project.

Many Board members stated that the proposed project is a thoughtful modest design and the features of the house are very well done; however, any future submittal should contain a cross section to understand the sectional qualities of the project. Many Board members stated that a design directed to the back would provide better spaces and satisfy the quality of context concerns.

The applicant was directed to continue to work with Staff to minimize the massing, consider reducing scale and possibly building out at the back.

Board member Tighe made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Rothman and continued by the following roll call vote 5-0.

Mr. Cho asked for a continuance.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: Rothman.

Absent: Griffin, Pearson.

7.2. **16ARB-0063, 945 Berkeley St: Single Family Unit

Approval of the size, mass, and placement of a new single family residence on a parcel with a grade differential greater than 12.5-feet between the front and rear parcel line.

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

Staff outlined for the Board that this application is a request for a single family residence and explained the methods of determining theoretical grade. Theoretical grade is accomplished by taking the building pad, using segments of the pad with three different elevation points, and divide into thirds. The building and number of stories was demonstrated for the Board to indicate the segments and showing the back portion of the property that was built into the hillside for a first story calculation.

Mike Patterson was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Many Board members stated that the project is appropriate for the site and the massing and form are appropriate and successful. The project does suit the context in its massing and form and is restrained in many aspects. The height appears accentuated due to the narrow building. Board members also stated that the landscaping enhances the sloping nature of the site and the existing garage volume at the street front is compatible with other garages in the neighborhood.

One Board member stated that the design was beautiful and thoughtful; however, expressed concern regarding compatibility of the style within the neighborhood.

One Board member expressed concern regarding the garage and retaining wall at the street that are rendered in the same tone as the elevated volume at the top and made the friendly suggestion to use a natural material for the front site wall and garage, perhaps board formed reinforced concrete to simplify the palate and enhance the landscape at the front.

One Board members stated that the aerial view was very useful with the context and demonstrated the front façade in relationship to the other homes.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to approve the project, that was seconded by Board member Kelly and unanimously approved by the following roll call vote 5-0.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Griffin, Pearson.

7.3. **16ARB-0149, 949 Centinela Ave: Single Family Unit

Approval of the size, mass, and placement of an addition to an existing single-family residence on a parcel with a grade differential greater than 12.5-feet between the front and rear parcel line.

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

Chiedu Chijindu was present to discuss the project.

One chit was submitted, Robin Ossenbeck.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Board members expressed their support of the project stating that the design was thoughtful and tasteful and in context to the neighboring buildings and is smaller than the Zoning Ordinance allows. The preservation of the rear landscaping is appropriate.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to approve the project that was seconded by Board member Kelly

unanimously approved by the following roll call vote 5-0.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Griffin, Pearson.

7.4. **16ARB-0090, 1927 19th St: Multi-Family Residential

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

ACTION: CONTINUED BY STAFF AT THE MEETING

7.5. 15ARB-0425, 1733 Ocean Avenue: Restaurant

Approval of the façade design, colors, materials, and landscape plans for a new restaurant tenant, Jimmy's Famous American Tavern.

ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Ron Lewis 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 glass wall with landscaping making it appear as an enclosed space and not open to the public, the glass wall seams and connections, the wall height, the roof awning materials and projections, the ceiling plane and lightings, and the underside materials of the canopy.

Board members stated that the proposed project is composed of high quality materials and the site will benefit from a redesign however; the proposed project is over designed, and does not compliment the existing building. The overall features are not pedestrian oriented and the permanent feeling of the roof and the uninterrupted street wall makes it look like an interior space and does not engage the street. The repositioning of the entry doors to open on Ocean Avenue is inviting; however the design is different than the existing building.

Board members referred the applicant to continue to work with Staff regarding the wall, posts, and landscape treatments, and space heater placement that may affect the overall design and need to be architecturally integrated.

Mr. Lewis asked for a continuance.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Tighe and continued by the following roll call vote 5-0.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Griffin, Pearson.

**7.6. **16ARB-0068, 2520 Santa Monica Boulevard:
Retail**

Approval of the façade design, colors, materials, and sign plans for a new commercial tenant, Pacific Patio.

ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Aaron Brumer was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Robb closed the public hearing.

Many Board members stated their support of the project design and many Board members stated that the building is “funky” in its existing condition and its “pier-like” approach.

Many Board members stated that the proposed large scale printed vinyl signs are poor quality and the letters may not be legible over the graphic. Outdoor signage should be composed of architectural materials for durability and aesthetic appropriateness.

Chairperson Robb made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Rothman and continued by the following roll call vote 5-0.

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

Noes: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: Griffin, Pearson.

8. CONCEPT REVIEWS:

- 9.** Preliminary design review of Development Agreement (12DEV-005) proposal involving a 6-story, 65 residential unit, mixed-use building at 1325 6th Street.

ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Michael Folonis and Dave Rand were available to discuss the project. Mr. Rand stated that it is undetermined at this time if the affordable units are on location or off site. Mr. Rand also stated that the affordable units are very low.

Board member Hamilton stated that as demonstrated in the early stages of design, the circulation spaces to the left appears to be tight and tunnel-like. Board member Hamilton also stated that the outdoor space could be more closely associated with entry and access, the south façade could be more developed, the transparency of the ground floor retail spaces could also be more developed along with the material at the ground by the bike racks.

Board member Kelly stated that the location, commercial spaces and open spaces have a lot of potential. The facades with different geometries and the variation of opacity and the different rhythm is strong. Board member Kelly stated her support of animating the stairs with the screens. Board member Kelly also stated that there is a competition with the very strong angular motif that feels like a different language than the rectilinear, and the angular motif is not as strong. The edges should be more rationalized, especially the balconies on Sixth Street as they come in near the elevator stair tower. The sharpness is also coming out in the way that some of fins are detailed, especially the grill at the top of the ground floor spaces. This building is higher than the one next to it and the former Google building will be visible, so attention to that stair tower will be beneficial. The yellow panel treatment color could be more explored.

Board member Kelly invited the applicant to ask any questions.

Board member Rothman stated that the design is very interesting; however feels a little disjointed. Board member Rothman stated that the current design is lacking sophistication and elegance. The concept of the angled panels are a good design; however, the yellow color, as shown, is taking away from the design and not an enhancement.

Board member Tighe stated that the proposed design is clean and modern, with a touch of playfulness. The building is dense and the applicant has

taken that challenge and broken it up. It is a take on a courtyard building with pseudo courtyards that is done very well with a nice feel. The experience in the corridors has a wonderful air flow and invited the applicant to expand on those angles that work with the experience of the building and perhaps carry that to the outside. The building at the ground level needs more work, it is a high space with a lot of hardscape and the transition from the sidewalk to the hard space could be explored to increase pedestrian experience. Board member Tighe requested a better explanation of the placement of the affordable units from the applicant.

Mr. Rand clarified for the Board that there will be five extremely low units. That number is fifty percent more than the Code requirement. The units will be composed of three one-bedroom units and two two-bedroom units. If an off-site location is chosen within a 100% affordable housing building there will be more affordable units provided. Mr. Rand stated that the final details are pending.

Chairperson Robb stated her appreciation of the opportunity to have this conversation with the applicant and get ideas and give input at this stage of the process. Chairperson Robb stated that this design review is strong on many levels, maximizes the location, animates the building and street level in a unique way and accesses the open space and ties it in to the Library. The architecture is strong with the asymmetry and the volume at the corner. There is permeability of light through the stairway and the adjacent wall could be permeated as well where it is located above the other building because it feels like a piece of the parking garage on that edge. There is strength at the outer corner where the glass is pushed back but it is defeated by the elevator and the stair tower. There is articulation of the front panels that is an indicator of what is happening in the interior of the building with the angles. This project has not just been aesthetically considered, but attention was given to the livability of spaces by providing the flow of air that works within the vocabulary of the building. The asymmetry and the design elements are in service of the building and how the spaces perform. The architecture of this corner is strong, and Chairperson Robb suggested a permanent architectural feature at the corner and remove the umbrellas, as the double height is broken by the umbrellas and should stand alone with the natural occurring light.

Michael Folonis stated his appreciation of the early preliminary design review process for Development Agreements and will consider the comments to help improve the design of the building.

- 10.** Preliminary design review of Development Agreement (15ENT-0266) proposal involving a 5-story, 100 residential unit, mixed use building at 1430 Lincoln Boulevard.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

John Reed, John Reed Architectural Group was available to present the project.

Board member Tighe clarified with the applicant that the retail is two stories in the front and then changes to five stories of residential behind it.

Board member Kelly clarified with the applicant the residential use of the ground floor patio along Lincoln Boulevard with windows and no doors.

Board member Kelly stated that by maintaining the relative height of the adjacent retail, this project moderates the significant change to this block of Lincoln Boulevard and makes a strong urban design gesture for the street. The massing is appropriately broken up with the two volumes detailed differently; however, they don't go together. There should be more compatibility between those two volumes. The section of the courtyard to the residential entry feels compressed and a pinched point at the stepdown, and would benefit from a revisit.

Board member Hamilton stated that the Lincoln façade has been developed very well with the commercial space and a bridging element. Future development in the relationship of two buildings to the base would benefit from a revisit. The planting materials at the roof deck were confirmed to be a vine effect. Any future submittal should contain the unit plans that would be beneficial to understand the relationship of how the outdoor space is approached

Board member Rothman stated that the three design elements on the front façade are not complimenting each other as designed, but competing with each other and would benefit from a revisit.

Board member Tighe stated that integrating the retail at the street with the rear housing is a smart choice. The outdoor spaces at the front work very well; however, some of the courtyard spaces for the rear units appear tight.

Chairperson Robb stated that this Lincoln site is very well composed with good proportions by breaking it up to make it appear as multiple facades and not one very large building. The project has a great relationship of scale; however, in trying to give these different components their unique identity, they could benefit from a revisit to tie them together. There is asymmetry and character on the front elevation and the remaining elevations are formal and repetitive. Detailing how all these elements work together will make this a successful project.

Chairperson Robb advised the applicant to consider how the project will be accessible during the night hours with lighting components, for safety and

privacy of the units and businesses. These choices may affect the design of the building.

11. DISCUSSION: Public input permitted.

**A. Discuss/update on Downtown Community Plan.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD**

Staff provided an update on the Downtown Community Plan and the timeline. The City made an announcement last week, indicating that there is a need for further community involvement and an opportunity for workshops and speakers to be conducted. The project was tracked for adoption with the City Council in July 2016, but due to the additional outreach and community input that date has been changed to 2017. It will go to Planning Commission in the early months of 2017 and then to City Council. This new timeline gives the opportunity for the Architectural Review Board subcommittee to further access the document. The April 18, 2016 or the May 16, 2016 Architectural Review Board meeting will include a presentation from the Downtown Community Plan Staff.

Chairperson Robb requested an update on the Zoning Ordinance and Design Standards.

Staff informed the Board that the Zoning Ordinance and Design Standards are still in working progress with Staff.

Staff directed Board members to E-mail Staff their choice of dates for the Staff presentation of the Downtown Community Plan so that the agenda can be coordinated.

The subcommittee provided a summary report of their review of the Downtown Community Plan. Board member Kelly informed the Board that three sections of the Downtown Community Plan were reviewed by the subcommittee; Pathways and Public Spaces, Standards and Regulations, and Design Guidelines. One area of concern was outlined to be prescriptive wording that does not provide flexibility in design. Other concerns outlined were the uses of privately owned public spaces and incentives, and the installation of small structures on small privately owned public spaces. The subcommittee agreed on the need for more animated public spaces. Regarding Chapter Four that focuses on Standards and Regulations; the committee discussed a maximum unbroken façade length and concluded that it may be too prescriptive and may not be of benefit to individual designs. Board member Kelly stated that a desire to maintain the "Our Town"

atmosphere is demonstrated in the language of the principals at the beginning of each chapter.

Chairperson Robb stated that allowing more flexibility provides a forum for more creativity.

Chairperson Robb thanked the subcommittee for their analysis and shared information.

- B.** Discuss the upcoming City of Santa Monica Boards & Commission Dinner and video/script preparation.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Chairperson Robb informed the Board and Staff that she will not be attending the Boards and Commission Dinner as well as the meeting on May 16, 2016 meeting due to a conflict in schedule.

Chairperson Robb informed the Board that she and Vice-Chairperson Pearson will be working with City TV tomorrow. The protocol is to interview a member of a Board and Commission and then City TV will edit the video to give it a more interactive approach and not the appearance of just reading a script. They have expressed interest in focusing on the Mission Statement.

Chairperson Robb requested that each Board member send a headshot to Chairperson Robb for her to incorporate into the Architectural Review Board video.

Board member Tighe expressed concern regarding the wording of the current Mission Statement and stated that it should be updated.

The Board reviewed with Staff the most recent iteration of the Mission Statement and the limitations due to the Zoning Ordinance, and would like to reagendaize this subject for a discussion at a later date to compose it to be more reflective of how the Architectural Review Board performs.

Chairperson Robb stated that she would like to emphasize during the oral interview that the Architectural Review Board does more than what is encapsulated in the existing Mission Statement.

- C.** Reports from Board members regarding community and/or public meetings they have attended.
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

The subcommittee informed that Board that 14-ARB-173, 710 Wilshire Boulevard was approved unanimously at the March 30, 2016 meeting. It was a unique process and a different experience to work with the applicant. The applicant was responsive and creative to the suggestions and guidance of the Board. Areas of concern were the glass elements, color application to the building, lighting, landscaping, canopy entry, rear alley elevation, the architectural corner treatment, and the handling of the blue color. Signage will return to the subcommittee at a later date.

12. **FUTURE BOARD AGENDA ITEMS:** Chairperson Robb agendized a discussion to review the Mission Statement and directed Staff to update the Board on the previous revisions.
13. **ADJOURNMENT:** Chairperson Robb made the motion to adjourn at 10:36 p.m. that was seconded by Board member Kelly and adjourned by voice vote.

mc
04-12-16

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Margaret Chapman
Staff Assistant III

Lynn Robb
Chairperson