

CORONADO DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 26, 2011

The regular meeting of the Coronado Design Review Commission was called to order at 3:02 p.m., Wednesday, January 26, 2011, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Shallan.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hammett, Jones, Rice, Shallan, Turpit

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of January 12, 2011, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate report.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Historic Resource Commission**

Commissioner Jones reported that at the meeting of January 19, the Commission granted historic designation to the property at 1212 Sixth Street, and recommended approval of a Mills Act agreement for the property at 1306 Sixth Street.

**Public Art Subcommittee**

Commissioner Rice reported that at the meeting of January 25, the Subcommittee announced that the Imagine Tent City informational sign and the Golf Course mural have both been installed. He also reported that the Subcommittee is still working with the City to determine an appropriate location at the Community Center for placement of the Faust sandcasting. He then reported that the My Bike sculpture at Tidelands Park that is currently undergoing repairs.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Commissioner Jones stated that she had received a complaint from a resident regarding the signage located at Park Liquor on Orange Avenue. Concern was expressed as to whether the two new large signs meet the City's signage requirements.

Mr. Fait suggested that the complainant file a formal complaint with the City so that the matter can be investigated.

APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

**DR 2010-10 ANASTOPULOS, MAXWELL** – Request for approval of a revision to the exterior remodel for the six-unit apartment complex at 920 tenth Street in the R-3 (Multi-Family Residential) Zone.

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

Commissioner Turpit asked about the material used for the rails.

Greg Hudek, Project Manager, confirmed the material is a painted aluminum.

Commissioner Jones asked about the location of the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Hudek said the equipment is located on the roof.

Mr. Fait said that the applicant is planning to place new air conditioning equipment on the roof; however, the screening of the equipment is presenting a challenge and the proposed parapet walls will hide the equipment.

Commissioner Jones asked about the overall difference in height for the proposed structure compared to the previously-approved height.

Mr. Hudek responded that the new structure is proposed to be four feet higher.

Vice Chair Hammett asked about the color of the painted aluminum.

Mr. Hudek said the color will be black.

Vice Chair Hammett asked if the soffits that support the wood corbels will also be made of wood material.

Mr. Hudek responded yes.

Vice Chair Hammett asked about the color of the soffits.

Mr. Hudek responded it will be a brown color.

Commissioner Jones asked about the material for the window surrounds.

Mr. Hudek said it will be a stucco material.

Commissioner Jones asked about the material for the doors.

Mr. Hudek said the doors will be wood and painted the same color as the stucco.

Chairperson Shalan asked if Mr. Hudeck is the developer, architect, or builder.

Mr. Hudeck said he is the project manager.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the project manager needed additional time in order to revise the drawings so that they more clearly represent the actual materials and colors proposed to be used.

Mr. Hudek said he would like to return with more specific information.

Commissioner Turpit said he liked the proposed concept presented today over the previously-approved design. However, he said the proposed design must represent the applicant's intentions. Mr. Turpit said he likes the level of detail that has been added to the building, i.e., the outriggers under the eaves, the surrounds around the window, and the trim underneath the first floor windows.

Commissioner Hammett asked if the arched eaves/vents are false.

Mr. Hudek said the eaves/vents are false.

Commissioner Rice said he understands that the mansard roof was designed to hide equipment; however, he said he has had success locating equipment in side yards. He said many companies make air conditioning compressors that are shallow and satisfy code requirements. He said he would be more concerned about vibrations emanating from compressors located on a second floor. Mr. Rice said he believes there are ways to position equipment without locating it on the roof. He said he likes the attention that has been given to the eave; however, he feels this can be done in an artful way on the existing structure as well. Mr. Rice said he likes the color palette of the previously-submitted drawings as the door and railing colors had more of a variation. He said he also liked the previously-approved tropical landscaping scheme as it blends in much better with the older scheme rather than the Victorian style of the newly-proposed landscaping scheme.

Mr. Hudek said they hired an acoustical engineer who provided sound ratings of the air conditioners.

Mr. Fait noted that it is difficult to have air conditioning equipment in side yards comply with noise limitations, especially when there are six units. Mr. Fait also noted that there are no changes to the previously-approved, tropical-themed landscaping.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak at this time.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Shalan stated that the testimony given by the applicant's representative is different from the drawings which have been submitted. Mr. Shalan asked that the entire color scheme package and detailing of the building return before the Commission with proper renderings and

samples, but that the issue of the roof be taken up at this time.

Commissioner Jones said the proposed color scheme is brighter and more colorful. She likes the roofing material but does not like the mansard roof as it appears out of context. Ms. Jones said she was concerned that the height on an already tall and narrow structure would be increased.

Commissioner Rice agreed that the slope of the mansard roof appears very severe. He said it would create a slightly flatter roof in order to accommodate six air conditioning compressors. Mr. Rice suggested that the roof could be sloped in a shallower manner.

Commissioner Turpit said the mansard roof is better than many other mansard roofs he has seen, and commented that he would prefer not to see a mansard roof screening six mechanical units.

Vice Chair Hammett said he is pleased with the previously-approved landscaping plan. He is surprised that the applicant is going forward with the corbels as it is an expensive project.

Chairperson Shalan said he is not entirely comfortable with the design. Although he does not mind the mansard roof, he feels that a long uninterrupted roof is an issue.

Commissioner Jones agreed that the proposed landscaping plan is out of context with the structure.

Chairperson Shalan asked the applicant's representative if he was agreeable to continuing the item.

Mr. Hudek said yes.

Mr. Fait asked if the Commission prefers a different type of mansard roof with perhaps a different slope and/or additional features added on the side as opposed to what was originally approved, or if the Commission would rather keep the originally-approved roof.

Chairperson Shalan asked if there is a way to tone down the proposed roof but still accommodate the equipment on the roof.

Commissioner Rice said the roof needs a revision because if it is not done absolutely perfectly, it will show. He said the building clearly never had a roof of this type and said he prefers something a bit more understated.

Chairperson Shalan proposed that this item be continued.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON SHALAN MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION'S DESIGN CONCERNS INCLUDING: SLOPE/HEIGHT OF ROOF, ROOF DETAIL ALONG BOTH SIDES, CHANGE OF MATERIALS AND COLORS WITHIN THE ROOF DORMERS, COLOR AND MATERIALS OF ROOF SUPPORTS/CORBELS, SIZE AND

PROPORTIONALITY OF WINDOWS AND DOORS ON FRONT, DETAILS OF WINDOW TRIM, EXTENDING THE WINDOW DETAIL AND MATERIALS BELOW WINDOWS TO THE SIDE FACADES, AND CHANGES TO THE LANDSCAPE PLAN.

COMMISSIONER TURPIT SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Hammett, Jones, Rice, Shallan, Turpit.  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

**DR 2011-01** **SANCTUARY SALON & SPA** – Request for design approval of a new exterior awning and sign at 874 Orange Avenue within the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan/C (commercial) Zone.

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

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak at this time.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Hammett said the awning is too large for the front space; it is startling.

Mr. Fait asked if Commissioner Hammett's comment concerned the height of the awning.

Vice Chair Hammett said yes.

Chairperson Shallan noted that the awning is the same height as both the existing sign and awning of the business next door.

Commissioner Jones said she visited the site yesterday and commented that the storefront is very beautiful. However, she is having difficulty with the overall context of the structure, the blue awning of the business next door, and the proposed black awning for the subject business. Ms. Jones agreed that the awning is handsome but somewhat startling given its overall appearance with its surrounding environment.

Mr. Fait reminded the Commission the awning will project three feet and that the sides of the awning will have solid fabric on the sides.

Commissioner Jones suggested that the color of the awning may look better in a dark blue.

Vice Chair Hammett suggested that that the awning size could be smaller.

Mr. Nicolls communicated that the client wanted their business to be set apart from the neighboring liquor store. He clarified that he did not design the awning but is present at today's meeting on behalf of the awning company. He suggested that the awning could be less tall; however, the logo would be tilted inward and would not be visible. He noted that the width of the awning, as depicted in the photograph, is to scale; however, the height may not be to scale. Mr. Nicolls opined that although the awning looks ominous in the photograph; once it is placed, it can be better appreciated.

Commissioner Turpit said the awning appears to be enormous, as depicted in the photograph.

Chairperson Shalan respectfully disagreed. He said the awning is not enormous in the least, and the business owner has every right to use the storefront to differentiate. He said that the Commission has approved on this street many different types of awnings of every size and color.

Mr. Nicolls agreed and reiterated that the awning is not as ominous as it appears in the photograph.

Commissioner Turpit said he had no issues with the color of the awning—only the size.

Chairperson Shalan said that if the awning size is made smaller, the awning will be inside the window frames.

Mr. Nicolls agreed.

Chairperson Shalan said the intent of the original design was to have the awning come down over the top of the window and leave about 24 inches of column space between the two businesses.

Mr. Nicolls said that when he designs awnings, it goes to the window frame which gives a wide space on either side of the building. He suggested that if the awning is made smaller width-wise, it could be justified with the windows; the height would be left as-is.

Commissioner Turpit said he liked this idea.

Chairperson Shalan commented that he would rather look at the awning than the building front.

Mr. Nicolls said the black awning would look spectacular on the building and would be a nice contrast with the blue awning.

Commissioner Turpit asked about specifics with regard to bringing the awning to the window.

Mr. Nicolls said the outside of the awning would justify with the corner of the tile.

Chairperson Shalan asked if the measurement is about 13 ½ feet.

Mr. Nicolls said yes, it would be 10 to 15 inches less width than what is currently being proposed.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the projection of the blue awning.

Mr. Nicolls said the projection is 3 feet, 3 inches.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the Sign Ordinance would allow the business' name, in the requested font size, also be placed on the end of the awning.

Mr. Fait responded that there is no prohibition for this; it is subject to the total signage and approval of the Commission.

### COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON SHALLAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST AS SUBMITTED, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE WIDTH OF THE AWNING NOT EXCEED THE OUTER WIDTH OF THE FRONT WINDOW AND THAT THE APPLICANT MAY INSTALL SIGNAGE (OPTIONAL) ON THE NORTH END PANEL OF THE AWNING ADJACENT TO VONS OF A SIMILAR STYLE AND COLOR AS THAT APPROVED FOR THE FRONT, WITH THE TOTAL CUMULATIVE SIGN SQUARE FOOTAGE NOT TO EXCEED 16 SQ. FT.

COMMISSIONER HAMMETT SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Hammett, Jones, Rice, Shallan, Turpit.  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

---

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