



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

MONDAY, August 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: Meagan Pearson, Acting Chairperson  
Margaret Griffin (arrival 7:09 p.m.)  
Craig Hamilton  
Therese Kelly  
Amy Rothman

Also Present: Grace Page, Senior Planner  
Margaret Chapman, Staff Assistant III

Absent: Patrick Tighe

**3. SECRETARY'S REPORT:**

- Staff reminded the Board that the Downtown Community Plan will be hosting their second speaker series and workshop, Saturday, August 13, 2016 at the Santa Monica Women's Club. More details are available on the Downtown Plan website. RSVP is requested as refreshments will be provided and ample seating arranged.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**A.** May 16, 2016

ACTION: APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the Minutes of May 16, 2016 as submitted that was seconded by Board member Rothman and approved by voice vote 4-0.

Minutes from June 20, 2016 and July 18, 2016 will be continued to the August 15, 2016 meeting when a quorum is present from attendees of those meeting.

**B.** June 20, 2016

ACTION: APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

- C. July 18, 2016  
ACTION: APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the Minutes of June 20, 2016 and July 18, 2016 as submitted that was seconded by Board member Rothman and approved by voice vote 5-0.

- 5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS AND INPUT:** One chit was submitted, Jerry Rubin, who spoke about City trees.

Board member Griffin arrived at the Dias at 7:09 p.m.

- 6. **EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** Board member Hamilton was contacted by the applicant for Item 7.3 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street, several weeks ago and visited the site at that time.

Board member Kelly received an E-mail mail from the applicant for Item 7.3 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street, and met with the applicant for Item 7.1, 16-ARB-0324, 2600 Colorado Avenue, last week.

Board member Rothman received an E-mail from the applicant for Item 7.3, 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street, about a month ago and met the applicant at the job site.

Acting Chairperson Pearson received an E-mail from the applicant for Item 7.3, 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street.

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

- A. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Board member Rothman suggested that Item 7.3, 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street, be moved to the Consent Calendar.

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to move item 7.3, 16-ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street, to the Consent Calendar that was seconded by Board member Griffin.

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to accept the revised Consent Calendar that was seconded by Board member Griffin and approved by roll call vote. 5-0

**a. Resubmissions:**

**7.1. 16ARB-0324, 2600 Colorado Avenue: Office**

*Approval of façade design, colors, materials, and landscape/hardscape plan for an office building entrance renovation and sign program modification.*

ACTION: APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

**b. New Submissions: None**

**B. REGULAR CALENDAR**

**a. Resubmissions:**

**7.2. \*\*16ARB-0156, 2455 Santa Monica Boulevard: Restaurant**

*Approval of façade design, colors, materials and projecting sign for a new restaurant tenant.*

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

Glen Bell was present to discuss the project.

Acting Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the function of the benches and casement windows. Of concern, was the ability for the casement windows to remain completely open.

Board members stated that the applicant has responded to the previous concerns of the Board with significant improvement and stated that the revised design is elegant, strong, with handmade brick the full width of the façade, charred wood; all working with the intended use.

The Board expressed concern with the bench width that may be too narrow to be comfortable. The Board also stated that the benches are sculptural, fixed and quirky, and serves as a perch for an active storefront.

The Board members made the friendly suggestion to deepen the benches and outdoor dining.

Board member Griffin made the motion to approve the project with staff conditions that was seconded by Board member Kelly and approved by the following roll call vote 5-0.

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kelly, Rothman, and Acting Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Tighe.

**b. New Submissions:**

**7.3. \*\*16ARB-0127, 2807 Main Street: Restaurant**

*Approval of modifications to the building design, colors, materials, and sign plans for an existing restaurant, Ashland Hill.*

ACTION: APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

**7.4. \*\*16ARB-0305, 1612-16 Ocean Park Blvd: Retail**

*Approval of building façade design, colors, materials and sign plans for an existing single story commercial building.*

ACTION: CONTINUED, APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Griffin, as the applicant was not present.

**7.5. \*16ARB-0336, 1681 26<sup>th</sup> Street: Creative Office**

*Approval of sign program and sign adjustments for a multi-tenant creative office site, Pen Factory.*

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS

Dan Herman 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 seamlessness of the pen sculpture as it appears in the renderings.

The Board directed the applicant to continue to work with Staff to submit more details to ensure the

monolithic quality of the pen sculpture that is represented in the graphic images is how it will actually be tectonically.

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the project with Staff conditions that was seconded by Board member Hamilton and approved by the following roll call vote 5-0.

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kelly, Rothman, and Acting Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Tighe.

8. **CONCEPT REVIEWS:** None

9. **DISCUSSION:** Public input permitted.

A. Discuss application of murals as building design components and board purview.

**ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD**

Staff introduced the discussion to speak on public art versus proposed murals as part of the design component of a building. The City has a cultural requirement for public art pieces that is triggered when a private development is more than 7,500 square feet or changing the building and doing a TI that is greater than 25,000 square feet or doing a residential project of five units or more. There are several options for a developer to satisfy requirements. Proposing to provide for a public art piece on a project site must be reviewed by the Arts Commission. The alternative, based on the size of the project, is to offer a cultural facility integrated as part of the development or an in-lieu fee that is a contribution to the cultural arts fees that is one percent of the average square foot cost of construction is how public art is being integrated into projects. Public art is also art installation on public properties or Civic buildings. Sometimes, murals will come before the Board if those murals are part of the public art piece, included in the Staff Report, not as a requirement, but as a proposed mural on a vacant or blank wall.

Properties that predate the ARB purview, prior to the late 1970's, that do not have a set color or design established per City records, painting does not require a permit and therefore; no ARB review is necessary. That process is limited to painting and not a sign.

Buildings that do have ARB approval are required to adhere to an approval unless they return to the Board to change the façade and add a mural.

One chit was submitted, Jerry Rubin.

Board member Griffin stated that murals on existing structures and new structures are very discretionary and depend on the applicant providing true colors and paint chips that are very helpful to allow staff to have a clear understanding of the project. Board member Griffin also stated that projects should demonstrate a clear understanding of the maintenance plan, the paint should be of high quality, and graphics on plastic are not acceptable.

Board member Hamilton stated that a mural is part of the language of a building and should be separated from signage. Board member Hamilton also stated that the age of a building should not influence the decision of whether a project should come before the ARB for mural or art review and the objective measurement of a mural versus signage.

Board member Kelly stated an inventory of existing murals may be of a benefit. Board member Kelly also stated that murals become part of the visual landscape of a project. Board member Kelly stated her appreciation of the murals on Lincoln Boulevard that improves the experience of the boulevard. This improvement by small business owners should not be procedurally complicated to assist owners to improve their properties. However, on newer construction, the review process by the ARB is beneficial.

Board member Rothman stated that the beautification of the City is important, however, there should not be a limit on murals on older buildings and not on new construction. Some murals are executed better than others and more attractive with quality materials, colors, placement and appropriateness on the façade. Quality standards should apply to all applicants.

Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to return to Item 4 on the Agenda for Approval of Minutes, now that a quorum of present members has been attained. The motion was seconded by Board member Hamilton and approved by voice vote 5-0.

**10. FUTURE BOARD AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** Acting Chairperson Pearson made the motion to adjourn at 8:02 p.m. that was seconded by Board member Kelly and adjourned by voice vote.

mc  
08-03-16

---

Margaret Chapman  
Staff Assistant III

---

Maegan Pearson  
Acting Chairperson