

CORONADO DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

February 24, 2010

The regular meeting of the Coronado Design Review Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, February 24, 2010, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Reed.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Hammett, Jones, Reed, Shallan, and Turpit
(arrived at 3:06 p.m.)

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Peter Fait, Associate Planner
Martha L Alvarez, Recording Secretary, Minutes Preparer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of February 10, 2010, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chairperson Reed reported that the Public Art Subcommittee is working very diligently on a re-organization effort of the subcommittee. A concept plan for a Cultural Commission will be presented to City Council for their consideration, at which point it may be discussed in a roundtable type of discussion at a workshop. If this concept plan is met with approval, it would be presented to Design Review for their consideration and City Council, again, for final approval.

Chairperson Reed also reported that the Subcommittee is speaking with the artist who designed a sculptural piece called the Kaleidoscope, in hopes that the City may be loaned the public art for display. If so, the item would also be presented before Design Review.

Commissioner Jones reported that the Historic Resource Commission met last Wednesday, and approved an amendment to an existing Historic Alteration Permit for the property at 108 D Avenue. The Commission also heard a presentation by Ed Walton of the Engineering Department regarding the terrazzo paving in front of the Village Theatre. Ms. Jones said that the City Engineer communicated that the cost factors would be relatively the same if the terrazzo was restored vs. replaced. This issue will be agendized and discussed at the Historic Resource Commission meeting of March 3.

Vice Chair Shallen asked staff if it would be possible to communicate Design Review's views on this issue to the Historic Resource Commission via Commissioner Jones, as she is the Design Review representative on the Historic Resource Commission.

Mr. Fait asked if clear direction was not given at the previous Design Review meeting.

Vice Chair Shallen said that the Commission was asked to evaluate the private property portion of this project. The terrazzo was to be discussed at the Council level as part of the Capital Improvements Plan, and was not under Design Review's purview.

Mr. Fait clarified that Design Review discussed at their previous meeting the section of terrazzo located behind the ticket booth. The Commission agreed that if the terrazzo could be easily restored and saved, restoration would be good. If not, the Commission preferred replacement.

Vice Chair Shallen said this information was correct.

Chairperson Reed stated that the Commission selected a two-member subcommittee consisting of Chairperson Reed and Commissioner Turpit. Ms. Reed said they met on site with City Engineer Ed Walton. Mr. Walton showed the subcommittee the terrazzo section that would have to be repaired extensively or replaced. He said the issue is that the substructure is not supporting the terrazzo. If the terrazzo is repaired without fixing the underlying problem, the terrazzo will crack again. Ms. Reed said she has visited the area during inclement weather and it is very slippery. She has visited the Lambs' Theatre and understands that they place a rug over the terrazzo when it is wet. It is not possible to do this in front of the Village Theatre. At the time of their visit and with the exception of Mr. Turpit (he wanted to first meet with a terrazzo repair expert), it was agreed that replacement was the best option as it does not appear that the terrazzo lends itself well to repairs. Subsequently, Mr. Turpit spoke before the City Council and said it was his opinion that the terrazzo should be replaced. Ms. Reed suggested that a representative from Design Review speak before the Historic Resource Commission on March 3.

Commissioner Turpit agreed to speak before the Historic Resource Commission.

Commissioner Reed said it was important to have another representative, other than Ms. Jones, present at the Historic Resource Commission meeting in order to confirm the Design Review's unanimous decision to have the terrazzo replaced.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Rita Sarich, Coronado MainStreet, 1013 Park Place, said the State Historic Preservation Officer from Sacramento, Wayne Donaldson, spoke at their meeting. Mr. Sarich reported that Mr. Donaldson had an opportunity to look at the terrazzo in front of the Village Theatre and concluded that the terrazzo can be repaired. Ms. Sarich stated that it is MainStreet's position that they would like the opinion of a terrazzo specialist.

APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

DR 16-09 EMERALD CITY – Request for a revised design approval for an exterior remodel to the existing commercial building located at 1118 Orange Avenue within the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan/C (Commercial) Zone.

Mr. Fait presented the staff report as outlined in the agenda.

The applicant, Jules Wilson, 677 7th Avenue, San Diego, said it is relevant to look at the existing photographs because the awnings are attractive. When viewed from the street, the arches are more impressive than what is depicted in the elevations. She added that from the beginning, the concept of the design was to temper back the original construction of the building and have it exposed. Bringing out the arches is their attempt to keep true to the original design concept.

Vice Chair Shalan asked if anyone was aware of what was underneath the existing awning after the original plans were submitted.

Ms. Wilson said they knew there were arches but because of the layers of existing construction, they understood there would be a concrete beam at the spring line with an infill of bricks. When the facade was exposed, it was discovered that there was no beam at the spring line, which meant that the entire area could be open. Ms. Wilson said it was challenging to completely research the original construction.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the thickness of the wall, and asked if the glass would be set back in order to emphasize the arch.

Ms. Wilson replied that she does not have an exact measurement but believes the wall's thickness measures about ten inches. The storefront system is planned to be set back about two to three inches so that the expression of the arch can be fully realized, and the outline of the storefront will also reinforce that.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the size of the mullion.

Ms. Wilson said it is two inches on the face, and four inches in depth.

Commissioner Turpit stated that if the back of the mullion can be aligned to the inside face of the wall, the depth measurement may be closer to 12 inches.

Ms. Wilson said it is possible.

Commissioner Turpit suggested that the mullion be molded to the inside face of the wall so that it does not look like painted glass on the flat.

Ms. Wilson said she understood and asked to compromise by setting it back midway because the store front spacing is very limited. The further the glass is set back, the further it encroaches onto

the floor space for the storefront. She is pleased to express the arches.

Commissioner Turpit said he is not attempting to design the area—he is just excited about the arches.

Commissioner Hammett asked if a sharp corner will result at the area where the arch and the smooth stucco meet.

Ms. Wilson said there will be a slight ease but it will be square.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members wishing to speak at this time.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Shalan said he was incredibly underwhelmed by the design. He respects wanting to pay homage to the history but he feels there are places where it makes sense to do so and places where it does not. He said the building has a large storefront and said he was excited about the placement of the awnings as he felt the building “pop.” He does not understand what the arches do for the building because he sees glass arches and a plain building with some roof tiles. He would like to see a different type of awning or something other than a flat face.

Chairperson Reed concurred. She said the arches are nice but the building next door has exposed arches; therefore, there is nothing unique about this design. She said the previously submitted design was sharp and had an edge to it that made the building look unique. She commented that she has walked by the building and viewed it from a scale point of view several times.

Vice Chair Shalan said he has visited the site and met with the contractor during the demolition process. Mr. Shalan said the interior of the building is more exciting with its exposed brick.

Ms. Wilson said that from a retail point of view, having the interior be more visible by having a larger window area on the face is very important. The awnings would restrict the visibility. In addition, the awning height is plus eight feet. At an exterior scale, it is fairly low, where the arches are more open and the interior is viewed easily.

Chairperson Reed said that if the awnings are at the eight foot level, the store’s interior is visible from across the street, not from directly in front of the building. She feels the present design lacks excitement.

Vice Chair Shalan said that after having designed nine retail shops, he would comment that the business will not sell any more merchandise by having a display from the 10 to 14 foot level. He is very concerned that the building will return to having a very bland façade.

Ms. Wilson said that the pedestrian view is important; she was considering it more from the point

of view of persons driving by. The difference between 8 and 12 feet does open it up more.

Vice Chair Shallan said that persons driving through are more focused on their destination.

Chairperson Reed said that pedestrians spend more time looking at the store's façade vs. persons driving by.

Commissioner Hammett said he supports saving the arches. He said that the arches should be displayed, and supports the applicant's revised plan.

Commissioner Jones concurred. She likes the arches and feels that the glass windows should be set in to where the interior brick begins.

Vice Chair Shallan asked if something could be done to make the façade "pop" more.

Ms. Wilson said the huge blade signs help the front façade.

Chairperson Reed said the blade signs are located at the far ends, the front façade is large, and the awnings make a statement. She asked the applicant if there is something that can be added to the arches, i.e., tile work or darker paint on the inside edge.

Ms. Wilson said they have an anti-décor approach but if it means further expressing the arches architecturally, they would consider it.

Vice Chair Shallan said the previous design also contained anti-décor but it had definition to it. He is looking at "one great big wall" and said there needs to be some differentiation or color to it.

Commissioner Turpit said he likes the arches because it is architecture. He said the arches fall to the ground and it becomes a column. When the structure was built, the column had a base, and the base became a wainscot because the eye connects the base. There is usually some type of articulation, i.e. plaster, casting, at the base. Kippy's articulated by using tile.

Ms. Wiles asked if the suggestion is to separate the column portion of the arch to the actual radius arch as it would be more true to structure.

Commissioner Turpit replied yes, a column base.

Chairperson Reed said she would prefer to see something more unique.

Commissioner Jones said she really likes the arches, the concept of emphasizing the columns, and setting in the windows. She feels that the tile roof really works with the arches. She supports keeping the arches.

Commissioner Turpit said that the arches are a great beginning; however, he said articulation and detail need to be added to the palette. Mr. Turpit said there is not sufficient information being

presented today for approval, although he feels the applicant is taking a step in the right direction.

Ms. Wilson said she loves classical architecture and has studied it extensively so understands the formatting. However, she feels that the present design is intended to be understated.

Commissioner Turpit said that it is too understated.

Chairperson Reed suggested that it may be to the applicant's advantage to have the item continued until more information is made available to the Commission for review and approval.

Ms. Wilson asked for clarification.

Vice Chair Shallan said the applicant may want to continue the item, and if requested, a subcommittee of the Commission could be made available to provide input on some of the Commission's direction.

Chairperson Reed said input has been provided to the applicant; however, a subcommittee is optional.

Ms. Wilson said she would like to continue the item to the next meeting.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON REED MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO THE NEXT MEETING.

VICE CHAIR SHALLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Jones, Reed, Shallan, and Turpit
NAYS: Commissioner Hammett.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 4-1.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

Ms. Wilson added that a local architect and numerous persons have provided their support in keeping the arches.

Chairperson Reed clarified that it is not the Commission's direction to not keep the arches—just simply to embellish the arches and present additional information.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

Rachel A. Hurst
Director of Community Development, Redevelopment
& Housing Services