



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

MONDAY, October 17, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

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

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:02 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:** Present: Meagan Pearson, Acting Chairperson  
Margaret Griffin (arrival 7:04 p.m.)  
Craig Hamilton  
Barbara Kaplan  
Therese Kelly  
Joshua Rosen  
Patrick Tighe

Also Present: Jing Yeo, Planning Manager  
Rathar Duong, Associate Planner  
Margaret Chapman, Staff Assistant III

**3. ELECTION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD CHAIRPERSON  
AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON**

ACTION: ELECTION COMPLETED

Board member Kaplan nominated Board member Pearson as Chairperson that was seconded by Board member Rosen and approved by a roll call vote 7-0.

Board member Kelly nominated Board member Hamilton as Vice-Chairperson that was seconded by Board member Kaplan and approved by a roll call vote 7-0.

**4. SECRETARY'S REPORT:**

- Jing Yeo, Planning Manager updated the Board on Staff changes and stated that Roxanne Tanemori will also be attending meetings in conjunction with Rathar Duong, additional Staff is planned in the future with interviews scheduled next week for the Preservation and Design Liaison who will return to the Architectural Review Board;
- The Downtown Community Plan, Future of Mobility workshop is Saturday October 29, 2016 at Saint Monica's campus at 10:00 a.m.;
- The next meeting of the Architectural Review Board will be Monday, November 7, 2016.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**A.** September 19, 2016

ACTION: APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the Minutes of September 19, 2016 as submitted that was seconded by Board member Tighe and approved by voice vote 7-0. Board member Griffin abstained from voting as she was not in attendance at that meeting.

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

**7. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** Board member Kaplan stated that she received photographs from Landmark Commissioner, John Berley regarding Item 8.2, 16-ARB-0455, 1670 Lincoln Boulevard and copies were given to each Board member.

**8. REVIEWS:** Public input permitted.

**A. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**a. Resubmissions:** None

**b. New Submissions:** None.

**B. REGULAR CALENDAR**

**8.1 16ARB-0305, 1612-1616 Ocean Park Boulevard:  
Retail**

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

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH REVISED CONDITIONS

Justin Block and John Staff were present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the rendered bronze anodized aluminum, the cast in place concrete façade, and the depth of the front façade recesses.

The Board stated that the applicant has integrated the comments from the previous hearing and returned with

a design that is transparent and compatible with the neighborhood context with increased rear parking visibility. The Board also commended the applicant for their outreach to the local community.

Board members stated that the project is elegant, simple and sophisticated; however there are details missing to allow the Board to review the project in its entirety. Concerns were expressed regarding the cast in place concrete façade, the pattern and spacing of the snap ties, and the butting seams of the plywood, as that imprint is part of the elevation.

The Board confirmed with Staff that signage is not part of this submittal but future signage submittal should contain details of signage placement as to not conflict with the approved front façade. The rear parking lot has been revised with removal of the fence, increased visibility, and the addition of trees. The project is simplified and the treatment works with the overall scale of the project and the rhythm of the block and a simple expression on the street. Daylight has been increased with the addition of skylights, the HVAC units are hidden, and the rear alley is now elegant.

The Board directed the applicant to work with Staff to develop details for the cast in place concrete façade, the return into the recess area, pattern of the snap ties, seams of the concrete form work, and future signage. It was noted that the location strategy for future signage should work with the fenestration of the building and continue the relationship of the architecture to the façade.

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

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kaplan, Kelly, Rosen, Tighe, and Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

**8.2 16ARB-0322, 212 Bay Street: Multi-Family Residential**

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

ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH REVISED CONDITIONS

Ralph Mechur was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to placement of the trash staging area.

Board members expressed their support of the project stating that the applicant has responded to the previous comments of the Board and the changes have improved the project and the pedestrian experience in the front. However; some Board members expressed concern with some removal of the windows on the stair enclosure element as they break down the scale of the wall. The clarification of the landscape materials would have provided more information. The railing materials have been changed; however, more detail should have been provided as the railings are an integral part of the front elevation.

Board members also stated that there is a better relationship to the street and the project is improved with the railing and material changes. The reduction in the height of the stair enclosure as it approaches the roof, the detailing of the windows and their relationship to the wood are all positive changes.

The Board encouraged the applicant to revisit the trash staging area and directed the applicant to relocate that area to the east side of the driveway or explore other alternatives that would provide a more generous, softer approach to the front elevation with more landscaping.

The Board directed the applicant to work with Staff to return the windows on the stair enclosures, to provide a railing detail, and revisit with waste management that the trash staging location can be moved to the other

side of the driveway and if not; screened with vertical landscaping.

Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the project with revised conditions that was seconded by Board member Kelly and approved by the following roll call vote 7-0.

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kaplan, Kelly, Rosen, Tighe, and Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

**8.3 16ARB-0395, 1501 Ocean Avenue: Restaurant**

*Approval of building façade design, colors, and materials for a new restaurant tenant, Meat on Ocean.*

ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST

John Hatch was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the lack of a cut sheet for the lantern light fixtures and their placement in the landscape planters at the sidewalk level. The Board also questioned the choice of the decorative tile in relation to industrial stockyard-inspired aesthetic of the project.

Board members referred the applicant to continue to work with Staff on the design of the project and to simplify the material palate. The Board stated that the applicant was directed to return to the Board with a refinement of the architectural expression through more and better detail of the materials, use of, and the transition between different materials that is not displayed in this presentation. There are still unresolved issues in the overly complicated materials, and color palate. The thematic elements are wildly referential. The evening renderings appear very dark; however, the fenestration pattern around the entrance ties the project to the building behind it and makes it familiar to the environment. The inclusion of landscape

plans assists in the evaluation of the project since the project location is an important pedestrian corridor.

One Board member stated that the previous design was more open to the sidewalk and the new addition of a raised patio wall limits the pedestrian experience and the ability of the outdoor space to engage the street.

The Board directed the applicant to continue to work with Staff incorporating the elements of fire, steel, wood, and brick and directed the applicant to review the landscape materials as some of the planting materials are invasive species.

Mr. Hatch asked for a continuance.

Chairperson Pearson 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, Kaplan, Kelly, Rosen, Tighe, and Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

**c. New Submissions:**

**8.4 \* \*\*\* 16ARB-0455, 1670 Lincoln Boulevard:  
Restaurant**

*Approval of building facade design, colors, materials, and sign plans and sign adjustment for a new restaurant, Mel's Drive-In.*

**ACTION: CONTINUED AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

Steven Weiss and Jack Goldfinger were present to discuss the project.

Four chits were submitted Carol Lemelein, Adriene Biondo, Chris Nichols, and Ruben Cielak.

Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the painted

color blue window mullions. The Board also questioned the applicant if any of the original interior materials were retained by the current user. The question of bringing back the original landscape was also discussed, as was the proposed addition of a planter at the base of the pylon sign. The importance of the original architecture was also discussed as the new submittal shows three new windows on the southern elevation. It was also discussed that there is a visual transparency into the original building.

Staff clarified for the Board that the sign modification requested by the applicant is for a larger sign to make the necessary changes without impacting or endangering the status of the sign as meritorious; and therefore, trigger its nonconforming rights and causing it to be removed from the site.

Board member stated their support of the applicant's desire to restore the Googie style building; however, the submitted packet is incomplete and difficult to evaluate the level of detail necessary to understand the proposal and ensure that the project will be executed as described. Elevations and renderings should be included in future submittal.

Board members also stated that the proposed transparency of the original is demonstrated and the interior becomes part of the architecture and becomes the elevation of the building. The addition of hedges or landscaping defeats the purpose, so landscaping plan should also be part of any future submittal. The detailing of the patio railing enclosure, patio furniture, tree retention or removal, should all be presented in any future proposal.

Board member Kaplan stated that she consulted with Landmark Liaison John Berley prior to the meeting. Board member Kaplan stated that the addition of the transoms to the windows detract from the openness of the six glass panels, and the inclusion of new doors or transoms and any new features should be slightly differentiated from the original but consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation. Board member Kaplan expressed concern with the planter at the base of the pole sign. The materials,

should be differentiated as to not try to replicate the historic building but reference what was there.

Chairperson Pearson made the motion to continue the project that was seconded by Board member Rosen and continued by the following roll call vote 7-0.

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kaplan, Kelly, Rosen, Tighe, and Chairperson Pearson.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Chairperson Pearson made the motion for a short break at 9:26 p.m.

Chairperson Pearson called the meeting to order at 9:31 p.m.

**8.5 \* 16ARB-0462, 411 Santa Monica Boulevard:  
Restaurant**

*Approval of a modification to an existing sign program and a sign adjustment for a new restaurant, Mainland Poke.*

**ACTION: APPROVED ON REGULAR CALENDAR WITH STAFF CONDITIONS**

John Iadipaolo was present to discuss the project.

Chairperson Pearson closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued on various aspects of the presentation including but not limited to the finishes and color of the materials.

Board members stated their support of the project and Staff Report to reduce the width of the sign to fit within the opening between the two steel posts. The blade sign is a pedestrian-friendly element and is consistent with the adjacent uses.

Chairperson Pearson made the motion to approve the project that was seconded by Board member Tighe and approved by the following roll call vote 7-0.

Ayes: Griffin, Hamilton, Kaplan, Kelly, Rosen, Tighe,  
and Chairperson Pearson.  
Noes: None.  
Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

**9. CONCEPT REVIEWS:** None

**10. DISCUSSION:** Public input permitted.

1. Presentation from the City's Urban Forester and discussion on proposed updates to the Urban Forest Master Plan.  
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Matthew Wells, Urban Forester, gave a presentation on the Urban Forest Master Plan that was approved by the City Council in 2011. Mr. Wells informed the Board that the presentation given tonight will be available on the Santa Monica Trees website.

The Urban Forest Task Force will return in November to City Council to review the species selection by category and update the document.

With the current climate changes five years into the drought, the strengths and weaknesses of the 2011 Forest Plan were presented. Other issues that were discussed were future trees species, reducing future management costs, and the management of species diversity.

A five-year plan was presented, street planning priority, environmental elements, pollution, population, age of population were all addressed and prioritized.

Questions were addressed regarding tree species, structure failures, drought-stressed trees, and losses. The different neighborhoods were addressed in conjunction with species selection and survival rate.

2. Discussion regarding correspondence received by the Board from community members dated September 15, 2016 regarding the previously-approved project at 120 Hart Avenue (15ARB-0103).  
ACTION: DISCUSSION HELD

Jing Yeo, Planning Manager, reminded the Board that the neighborhood concerns as outlined in printed material was distributed at the previous meeting of September 17, 2016, but was not discussed as it was not agendaized for discussion.

Six chit were submitted from Les Kaplan, Miriam Kaplan, Alison Stirland, Tom Strickland, Lisa Plotkin, and Mike Russ.

Board members verified with Staff the process for approval, inspection and final approval.

Ms. Yeo stated that that the application at 120 Hart Avenue, 15-ARB-0103 has been approved by the Board, the sign posting of the site was made available for viewing on the projector. The building permit has been issued and the project is currently under construction. Ms. Yeo stated that the ability to stop the project is not within the authority of the Architectural Review Board. The applicant submitted an application and has an approved project that complies with current City Code and the project is under construction at this point.

Chairperson Pearson verified with Staff that what is currently being constructed is in conformance with the approved plans and that any deviation would result in an action of a final non-approval. A complaint can be filed with City Code Enforcement if the project is not compliant with the approved project. The approved plans shows a roof deck with a stairwell enclosure.

Ms. Yeo stated that the file with the approved plans are available for viewing for any public member by making a file request with the City Clerk. The project was posted with a picture of a particular angle, was approved and not appealed and has moved forward.

3. Reports from Board members regarding community and/or public meetings they have attended.  
ACTION: NO ACTION TAKEN

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

12. **ADJOURNMENT:** Chairperson Pearson made the motion to adjourn at 10:36 p.m., that was seconded by Board member Griffin and approved by voice vote.

mc  
11-02-16

---

Margaret Chapman  
Staff Assistant III

---

Craig Hamilton  
Vice-Chairperson