

CORONADO DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

February 23, 2011

The regular meeting of the Coronado Design Review Commission was called to order at 3:05 p.m., Wednesday, February 23, 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
Martha L Alvarez, Recording Secretary/Minutes Preparer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of January 26, 2011, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Public Art Subcommittee

Mr. Fait reported that Vice Chair Margo Roberts resigned on February 18, 2011. The subcommittee is considering whether to recruit and fill the vacancy immediately, or to put together an alternative interim plan while discussion proceeds on the potential restructuring of the subcommittee.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

None.

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. *(continued from the meeting of January 26, 2011)*

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

Commissioner Jones asked about the additional overall height of the mansard roof.

Mr. Fait said there was a 3-foot height increase.

Vice Chair Hammett asked about the color of the trim.

Mr. Fait said it is a white-white color.

Commissioner Rice asked if there were proposed changes to the previously-approved landscaping plan.

Mr. Fait said there were no changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Rice said he noticed more detail in the drawings which delineate the proposed design. He said the mansard roof evolved centuries ago in an attempt to create another level but have it look more like a roof. There was a purpose for this—the space was occupied but it did not make the building look taller and it was a way to work around zoning code requirements. In this instance, the same roof style is being used; however, the reason for it is to screen six air conditioning compressors that basically take up 10 percent of the roof. Mr. Rice said it appeared there was much effort to create a screen just for the sake of decoration. He said he believes in the design ideology of form follows function and feels this design does not work because there is a tremendous mansard roof whose function is to solely screen a few air conditioning compressors. He said the proposed design is lacking and prefers the building as it exists—simple yet elegant. He commented that there is a way to artfully add detail and interest if the equipment is to be located on the roof and suggested the addition of stucco with a copper shroud, or maybe a copper screen that would look more like a chimney, as either option would be minimally visible.

Commissioner Jones agreed and said if the six air conditioners are centered on the roof, perhaps screening would not be an issue. Ms. Jones said the design is out of context and character with the surrounding structures. She likened the design to a Disneyland-Victorian façade, and said that the design could be more artful and less startling.

Vice Chair Hammett said he understands that the project's very detailed landscaping plan has already been approved and was surprised that the applicant returned with a design that is in stark contrast to the originally submitted plan because of the proposed placement of the air conditioning units.

Commissioner Turpit said it appears that the applicant has a desire to have the building look as presented and stated that this is a costly way to screen air conditioning equipment. He said that

although he does not like the mansard roof design, he is unsure whether it is in the Commission's purview to disapprove the applicant's choice of roof design. Mr. Turpit added that although the windows look like wood trim windows, they are in fact stucco, which is nice on track homes but not necessarily on this type of structure. He also commented that the black steel railing is not appropriate for this type of architecture.

Chairperson Shallan said the roof structure appears incomplete as there are two pop-outs and a vent in the front façade, one vent on another side, and no vents on the remaining two sides. When reviewing historic photographs, the facades run evenly which makes it interesting. He said the railing in the original submission was more interesting. Mr. Shallan said he believes the Commission has the purview of approving or disapprove property designs.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RICE MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE REQUEST ON THE BASIS THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT OF CORONADO, THE DESIGN IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED LANDSCAPING PLAN, AND THE DESIGN OF THE ROOF IS NOT WELL THOUGHT OUT.

CHAIRPERSON SHALLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 4-1.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

DR 2011-02 PAUL, BRUNO AND ANA – Request for design approval to change the exterior paint color, awning, lighting, and landscaping at the Barcelona Apartments at 427 Orange Avenue within the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan/R-4 (Multi-Family Residential) Zone.

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

The applicant's representative, Lisa West, said she was unaware that design approval was needed. She said that they reviewed many paint colors and felt the light pink color suited the building.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the applicants were seeking design approval after the fact.

Mr. Fait said yes; however, the awning placement and landscaping has not been done yet.

Commissioner Rice asked if the Southwestern wood detail at the bottom and top of the windows were removed as a component of the recent painting.

Ms. West said the wood detail was removed as it was very heavy and presented a dangerous condition.

Commissioner Rice asked if the Barcelona sign is in good condition.

Ms. West said the sign is in good condition. She said the sign, including the ironwork, has been painted.

Chairperson Shallan asked about the color of the previous awning.

Ms. West said it was brown.

Commissioner Jones asked when the structure was built.

Mr. Fait said it was built in 1965.

Commissioner Jones said that architecturally speaking, the structure is a product of its time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Jones said the color is acceptable as it is not a blatant bright pink, the structure has been cleaned up, and the color of the awning is fine. Ms. Jones said she likes the thought that the fixtures will be replaced and the landscaping improved.

Vice Chair Hammett said the color is a light, pleasant pink and not a hostile pink. He said that the wood detail on the windows is missing but is unsure what could be added to complement the windows. The windows are recessed with the concrete vertical detail and appear clean and fresh. He added that the burgundy color of the awning appears to complement the structure's pink color.

Chairperson Shallan said the proposed landscaping plan was confusing. He asked if the plants will be removed.

Mr. Fait said the plants have already been removed.

Commissioner Rice asked if the Fan Palm will be retained.

Ms. West said yes.

Commissioner Turpit said he has no objection to the color; however, he feels that there has been no study of the structure's architecture and suggested that the property owner hire someone who is trained to study the architecture and provide "tack-on" aesthetics and paint schemes. Mr. Turpit said the Commission has a responsibility to the community to demand that property owners carefully study their efforts before submitting their application for review by the Commission. He said it appears that no effort has been made on behalf of the applicant and stated that he said he will not support the request. Commissioner Turpit reiterated that he had no issues with the color.

Chairperson Shallan said that it did not appear the Commission had an issue with the color. He said that the building is large and is located in Coronado's main thoroughfare. He said that a disservice was being made to the community if this project were to be rubber-stamped. He felt that the building was very plain and suggested that the landscaping plan, as submitted, was lacking direction.

Commissioner Rice said he agreed with the comments made by the Commissioners. He said that old photographs of the building depict the wood trim which is a texture that provided a nice contrast to the stucco and whose deeper brown color also provided a contrast to the lighter color of the building. Even though the material was not in good condition, architecturally it provided some interest and depths as well as variation to the façade. He suggested that some type of decoration, such as an awning over the windows at the front façade, could give added depth. He also suggested possibly adding an additional color that complements the pink color and accentuates some of the recessed areas or projections on the façade. Mr. Rice said he does have an objection to the pink color or burgundy awning but feels that more thought could be put into adding some more interest to the building. He likes that the applicant will retain the Fan Palm but is unsure of the direction for the proposed landscape. He noted that the proposed plantings are in bits and pieces and require a high amount of maintenance. He said the landscaping plan appears to lack a homogenous train of thought or direction.

Commissioner Jones agreed that awnings over the windows in the front façade would work as the structure faces west and it would provide relief from the sunlight. With regard to the landscaping plan, she does not feel that it is ideal to have various small, high maintenance plantings against such a large structure, but agreed that the Fan Palm should be retained.

Chairperson Shallan suggested that the item be continued to a future date to allow the applicant an opportunity to return with a revised design plan. He suggested assigning a subcommittee comprised of two members to provide guidance to the applicant, if needed. He reiterated that the Commission is not requesting that the applicant repaint the building.

Commissioner Turpit commented that it is important for applicants to better prepare when submitting their requests and making their presentations. He suggested that applicants seek proper and professional advice, especially when the project involves façade renovation for properties located on prime real estate.

Chairperson Shallan said that Commissioner's Turpit's comments are valid; however, there is no requirement in the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan or any code which requires an applicant to present design plans completed by a professional.

Mr. Fait said that when reviewing applications, staff attempts to provide the Commission with as complete design plans as possible. Many of the design plans reviewed by the Commission have been re-designed several times by the applicant before it is accepted by staff for presentation to the Commission.

Commissioner Turpit said his comments were directed to applicants and commended staff for a job well done.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON SHALLAN MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO A FUTURE MEETING TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO RETURN WITH DESIGN MODIFICATIONS. THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDED A REVISED LANDSCAPING PLAN, ADDITIONAL DETAIL TO THE STRUCTURE, E.G. DECORATION OR AWNINGS AT THE FRONT FAÇADE AND/OR THE USE OF AN ADDITIONAL PAINT COLOR TO CREATE A CONTRAST TO THE LIGHTER PAINT COLOR.

COMMISSIONER JONES 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 2011-03 SPATAFORE, DAVID – Request for design approval to remodel the exterior of the former Beach N Diner at 1015 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, David Spatafore, provided a brief overview of the request and answered questions of the Commission.

Commissioner Turpit asked how many bays are contained in the project.

Chairperson Shalan said it is four bays.

Commissioner Jones asked about the parapet in the area of Forget-Me-Not.

Mr. Spatafore said the existing parapet has been there for a long time. At one point, the parapet height was cut down to a safe height in response to previous safety concerns. If approved by the Planning Commission, Mr. Spatafore said he is proposing to raise the height of the parapet so it is continuous and becomes part of the single building.

Commissioner Rice asked if tables and chairs are allowed to be located beyond the property line in the Caltrans right-of-way.

Mr. Fait said that any use of the sidewalk within the Caltrans right-of-way requires a permit from Caltrans. He said that Caltrans has previously denied these types of requests because of liability issues.

Chairperson Shalan confirmed that a request for outdoor dining is not part of this application request.

Commissioner Rice asked if there was previously a railing by the outdoor dining tables.

Mr. Spatafore said there was a railing on the property line between the columns.

Commissioner Jones asked if Caltrans has ever challenged the encroaching of the public right-of-way by retail establishments.

Mr. Fait said he is not aware of any challenges. He said there are a number of businesses who have created alcoves that were on private property in order to accommodate outdoor dining. There are other properties, not within the Caltrans right-of-way, that have applied with the City for an encroachment permit and the City has allowed it with certain design restrictions.

Chairperson Shalan stated for the record that he has met several times with the applicant to discuss the project design; however, no direction was given to the applicant.

Mr. Spatafore said he made a conscious business choice to move away from a restaurant that offered breakfast, lunch and dinner, seven days a week, as this is the most difficult model to run in the restaurant industry. He has been exposed to many urban, eclectic restaurants in the South Park, Mission Hills, Hillcrest areas that are tremendously successful and offer a lot of diversity to the type of selection available in Coronado. He was able to purchase a full liquor license and began the planning process to change the concept from a 50's diners to an urban eclectic dining experience which is more adult-oriented but certainly not a bar. The restaurants he has used as models have a long wine/cocktail list but are not in the style of McP's or Island Sports and Spirits. He stated that Leroy's is not a sports bar or lounge bar. Mr. Spatafore said the style of the restaurant will be a new trend of sustainability and local sourcing, using reclaimed materials including concrete floors and exposed rafters. He has attempted to take the soft casual

environment and apply it to the exterior of the structure which is a “pie” floor plan that is difficult to work with. He agreed that the storefront is tremendously long and meets at one point at the rear of the building. Because of the loss of the outdoor dining component which was within his property line, he added a glass garage door element in order to open it up in the summertime when persons are looking for the outdoor, fresh air experience. There are two planters that were formed into the sidewalk when the original remodel was done in 2001. Each business was allowed to leave their brick floor inlay in the sidewalk pattern; it is easy to see where the new sidewalk was formed in 2005. The reason he selected 24-inch in-ground planters was to match the existing planters. He chose not to install planters at a higher level because the maintenance is more difficult and they become trash bins for passers-by, as well as it blocks some of the design elements of the vintage timber. Mr. Spatafore said that he is aware that businesses encroach on the Caltrans right-of-way; however, he understands that he must be very careful with this issue. He said he is happy with the project.

Commissioner Rice asked about the plans for locating tables and chairs on the exterior enclosed patio.

Mr. Spatafore said the service area for the kitchen, due to the change in use, is actually reverting back to the front. It is more of an open kitchen type of environment as a part of the restaurant’s style. Because of the design angle, it becomes a very tough use with regard to egress. With the exception of one small table and chairs, this area does not allow room for tables and chairs.

Chairperson Shalan asked if this is an interior element.

Mr. Spatafore said yes.

Commissioner Rice asked if it is the applicant’s intent to have tables and chairs located in the exterior of the business.

Chairperson Shalan said this specific request is not part of the application submittal.

Vice Chair Hammett asked if the gray stucco stone will cap the columns.

Mr. Spatafore said yes, the caps are an existing feature on the building.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the windows lack mullions.

Mr. Spatafore said yes.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the non-vision glass material.

Mr. Spatafore said the glass is half-inch tempered clear glass. It is a frameless butt joint with a bronzed perimeter frame only.

Commissioner Rice asked what passers-by will see when they walk past the glass in the front

façade, and asked if this was a dining area.

Mr. Spatafore said the kitchen is located in this area. There will be a 5-foot tall wall so passers-by will only see part of the kitchen. The servers need this area in order to facilitate service to the restaurant.

Chairperson Shalan said that the dining and bar area would be visible in the adjacent area.

Commissioner Rice asked if there would be shades that could potentially be drawn.

Mr. Spatafore said that although there is an issue with sunlight during the summer, he does not plan on installing shades. The idea is to keep the area open and expansive.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the applicant's motivation for the specific design.

Mr. Spatafore said the interior finish is considered urban eclectic and contains raw, stained concrete, exposed rafters, finishes on the wall that are distressed wood, tables containing cork material, and so on. There is much reclaimed type of material in the interior which is contrary to the bright, vinyl, shiny neon that was formerly there.

Commissioner Turpit said the vertical column stone is not a good representation of the type of stone that will be installed. The proposed stone is a much more sand-colored finish.

Mr. Spatafore said the pieces that were actually put on the plan were downloaded from the El Dorado website; he was unable to obtain a more accurate photograph which is why he is providing a material sample. The stone is very irregular.

Commissioner Turpit asked if wood would be located below the window sills.

Mr. Spatafore said yes.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the applicant had considered the landscaping being in close proximity to the wood and causing material damage.

Mr. Spatafore said the plantings are not high maintenance and can be hand-watered. The stones will assist in retaining moisture in the soil.

Commissioner Jones said the plant, Horse Tail, is a very good-looking plant for this type of structure. It is a long, thin, low maintenance plant. She suggested that a low-type of irrigation drip line could be installed.

Commissioner Turpit said he had an issue with the idea of looking into a service bar. He said he understands the necessity of having this area but was concerned about having a visible "cluttered" area. He asked if there is a way to expand on what is occurring in the interior of the restaurant as it will have an impact on the views from the exterior area. He asked staff if it was

in the Commission's purview to inquire on interior design plans.

Mr. Fait said there is a balance in that the exterior design is affected by how the floor plan is laid out and what is located behind the glass at the front façade.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the applicant had given thought to the garage door windows and the ability to open up the interior/exterior relationship.

Mr. Spatafore said he obtained a bid to have garage doors located across the entire façade in order to provide an expanded open area. However, there are health department issues related to the garage doors and its proximity to the kitchen--the health department will not accept this design. Mr. Spatafore said he also looked into having non-operable garage doors so that the mullion look would be continued; however, he decided that he liked the non-uniformity created by using a garage door grid and having pane glass without the mullions. This is the reason they decided to have a butt joint—to keep a very clean, clear look.

Commissioner Rice asked about the health issue with the kitchen, and if having an enclosed kitchen would resolve the issue.

Mr. Spatafore said the health department does not like any type of openings in the kitchen. They require the doors to be closed and have accepted the garage doors in dining room establishments only when they are positioned away from the food preparation area.

Mr. Fait clarified the question to be whether an interior wall that encloses the kitchen would resolve the issue.

Chairperson Shalan said the health department requires that if there is an open window, which is a pass-through to deliver food, a garage door is not allowed. The health department will not allow any opening within a certain amount of feet from the kitchen.

Commissioner Jones asked about the Forget-Me-Not space.

Mr. Spatafore said they have submitted a design plan to the Planning Commission. It appears that they will be able to accommodate the required parking; however, it is a lengthy process. He prefers not to delay finishing the remodel and, therefore, has divided the project into two phases.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rita Sarich, Executive Director, Coronado MainStreet, said she laments the loss of outdoor dining as she considers it a mainstay of main street; however, she understands the reason for it. She expressed concern about the building's massing, especially since it will include an adjacent property, and suggested that the outdoor dining area would break up the volume. She said she supports staff's recommendation to not allow planters on the Caltran's right-of-way. Ms. Sarich commended the applicant on their menu and wished them the best of luck.

Mr. Spatafore said he assessed Orange Avenue and noticed that businesses have in-ground planters that encroach into the public right-of-way. He said that these types of planters add to the bulk of a structure to a point that consideration should be given to using a different type of plant.

The Commission recessed at 4:39 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 4:45 p.m. All members were present.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Shallen noted that Emerald City located across the street has about the same size of massing as the subject project. He does not feel that the existing structure is too large and added that the design is a significant improvement. Mr. Shallen said he likes the fact that the awnings project only two feet and feels that the in-ground planters are fine. He added that placing planter boxes in the front façade would do a disservice to the design as it would block the wood accents on the structure. He said he considers the design a home run.

Commissioner Jones asked about the significant of the business' name.

Mr. Spatafore said that he named his business after his cousin, Leroy. His cousin is Dutch-Indonesian, speaks four languages, and has been very much a part of his business during the last 13 years. Mr. Spatafore said he considers his cousin a very eclectic and worldly person.

Commissioner Jones said that planters have a tendency to become neglected, thereby becoming a nuisance and discontinue being an attractive aspect of a business or structure. Ms. Jones said she received a few telephone calls about this project. There was concern that the front façade may appear too sterile; however, after reviewing the materials she feels the structure is attractive. She said that there is also added activity with the views through the front glass which displays the open kitchen. She said she likes the organic nature of the interior and feels that the exterior design will complement it.

Commissioner Rice commented that the boundary between the exterior and interior is very critical, especially with this type of restaurant. He noted that other restaurants have explored this type of boundary in many ways. He mentioned Bankers Hill restaurant, which has an incredible and unique detail consisting of huge pivoting steel glass front doors, and The Station restaurant in South Park, which has won many AIA awards, and feels that these restaurants hit the mark well. He suggested there may be a unique element design for the project's front door. With regard to reclaimed materials, Mr. Rice said he has always had an issue with synthetic stone, which is concrete made to look like stone. He said that using a natural stone product in a relatively small area should not present a significant cost increase, and consideration should be given to the front façade which is located in such a prominent location in town. He said he would also like to see wood material used more extensively, e.g., the gray stucco replaced by wood in the window areas. Mr. Rice suggested plantings that cap out around three feet in height and noted that he does not have an issue with the use of planters. However, he considers this type of plant a voracious spreader which needs barriers created around it in order that it does not

grow to about four or five feet in height. He suggested opening up some of the window walls and said this would satisfy his indoor/outdoor boundary issues.

Commissioner Turpit commended the applicant for their delectable ice cream and for creating jobs for youths in the community. He said he also received telephone calls regarding this project. He agrees with comments made by Commissioner Rice and stated that the building has a contemporary look which must be “on the money” and cannot have errors with the detailing or finishes—it must be perfect. Mr. Turpit commented that Emerald City is a contemporary look and has carefully incorporated many details, i.e. depth of the glass off the face of the columns in the front façade. He expressed concern that there is an insufficient amount of detail at the front façade, which is lengthy and has the potential of looking monotonous, therefore, careful consideration should be given to the indoor/outdoor relationship. He does not agree with “walling off” the front façade area from the street and having a single door into the restaurant. He suggested the applicant consider opening up the front so that it feels more like an outdoor dining experience. Mr. Turpit commended the applicant for his restaurateur abilities and asked that the applicant consider his comments in a kind and gentle fashion. He said that he has no issues with the proposed in-ground planters.

Chairperson Shalan said he understands the Commissioner’s comments regarding the glass at the front façade; however, he stated that, short of the applicant re-doing the layout of the kitchen which would require additional kitchen equipment, there is a very a minimal possibility that the health department will approve open windows in this area. Mr. Shalan performed a walk-through of the restaurant, and reviewed the layout and, therefore, understands the applicant’s design. He asked the applicant if he would consider using real stone on the columns and installing wood cladding instead of the wood stucco for the windows.

Mr. Spatafore said he would agree to use real stone; however, he would need additional time to select a wood clad material that matches the design. He said that he had originally considered using the wood detail on the window; however, he did not want it to look too similar to the look of the neighboring Starbuck’s design. He prefers to keep sufficient diversity in the selection of the material used so that the rusted metal-look of the design washes out into the wood. He mentioned that in the area of the Forget-Me-Not sign, he did have the potential opportunity to place openings, but because of the 172 sq. ft. pie shaped area, it became a third element on the storefront which did not work. He said that the 172 sq. ft. area is in a very tight angle so an additional garage door element was not feasible. An industrial roll-up style door would also not work because of the glass material. He also considered using mullion glass with pistons to lift the door up; however, it lifts out toward the sidewalk which would encroach lower than eight feet, which is outside the code. Mr. Spatafore made the point that he really did try to find a solution.

Chairperson Shalan asked about the option of having the doors fold sideways.

Mr. Spatafore responded that by using a cantina-type door, it would create a third element, which he considers overused and not unique. The idea of using the garage door with the high wall was taken from a business in Sacramento. He liked the idea that typical garage door elements come

all the way down to the ground and become walkways—this idea uses it as a window element.

Commissioner Rice asked if the applicant considered other options for the main entry door.

Mr. Spatafore said he asked for a few quotations on the Brixten hinge. On a 42-inch door, he may not be able to get the egress that is needed. He said he may need to use a 48-inch door so that as it pivots at the 2/3 or 1/3 point yet still has the appropriate clearance for entry/exit. This would also need to be approved by the Fire Division.

Commissioner Jones said she would love to see the opening in the Forget-Me-Not bay have some mullions or open directly into the restaurant; however, she said the applicant's remarks made sense with regard to the floor plan design and not having sufficient room for an entry door.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER HAMMETT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST, AS SUBMITTED, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT USE NATURAL STONE, AND CONTINUE TO PURSUE A QUALIFYING EGRESS FOR THE DOOR OR SUBSTITUTE THE DOOR. IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT A SUBCOMMITTEE BE APPOINTED TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT IN THE FINAL SELECTION OF THE STONE AND DOOR IN ORDER TO KEEP THE PROCESS MOVING FORWARD.

CHAIRPERSON SHALLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Turpit stressed the importance of the structure having an indoor/outdoor relationship, thereby breaking up the long façade. He understands that the applicant would like to be unique and not use a roll-up door at the sill height of the window; however, this may be one of the reasons that the façade appears so lengthy. Mr. Turpit said the façade needs some type of interruption. He suggested that the roll-up needs to be extended to the ground. He asked if the mini triangle area, the Forget-Me-Not bay, had the potential of being opened up to the street in some fashion.

Chairperson Shallan responded that, assuming this bay area can be closed off from the rest of the kitchen, the applicant would be allowed to open this area to the outdoor.

Commissioner Turpit said that having a dining area that architecturally expresses an indoor/outdoor experience during the different seasons promotes community interaction. He said he would not vote in favor of the request.

Vice Chair Hammett said that if he were to walk past the Forget-Me-Not section, he would see private dining. If he continued walking past the next section, he would see servers and serving stations and possibly catch a glimpse of the kitchen. In addition, the entranceway is looking into the restaurant. He feels that this activity is sufficient for an indoor/outdoor experience. He also said that interior lighting provides more visibility into the restaurant.

Commissioner Turpit commented that the café experience adds a tremendous amount of vitality, warmth and scale to a storefront.

Commissioner Rice said he agreed with Commissioner Turpit's comments. He said that the café environment is key and a huge point with customers. He added that the ideas about the doors are great and would like to see it incorporated into the design.

Chairperson Shallen said he had previously suggested having a subcommittee approve the door selection.

Commissioner Hammett agreed that two members could meet with the applicant and approve the door selection.

Commissioner Jones said she did not want to hold up the process, but asked if the Forget-Me-Not space could return before the Commission with design options on making this area more of an indoor/outdoor aspect.

Chairperson Shallen said he was hearing comments from the Commission related to a café environment, indoor/outdoor dining, and indoor/outdoor element. He said that as a businessperson, he does not feel that the Commission has the right to tell an applicant how to run their business. He suggested that if the applicant chooses to not provide outdoor dining, he should not be required to do this. Mr. Shallen pointed out that the applicant is abiding by the law. Mr. Shallen said the applicant has described his business as more of an upscale fine dining establishment, and pointed out that these types of businesses do not necessarily have outdoor dining located on the street. Commissioner Shallen suggested the motion be changed to have the door selection return before the Commission for approval.

COMMISSIONER HAMMETT AMENDED HIS MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST, AS SUBMITTED, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT USE NATURAL STONE, AND THE DOOR SELECTION RETURN BEFORE THE COMMISSION FOR FINAL APPROVAL. IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT A SUBCOMMITTEE BE APPOINTED TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT IN THE FINAL SELECTION OF THE STONE.

Commissioner Turpit said that he mentioned the idea of outdoor dining because it is an element that breaks up the façade—in this case it is an 80-foot long façade. He said the applicant should consider the long length of the façade and create some way to make it more interesting.

Mr. Spatafore said that the design of the door would not change, only that it would be hinged differently so he was unsure why this specific change to the door would need to return before the Commission for approval. He added that the structure is on the convex side of the street so the long façade should not be overwhelming.

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

The motion failed with a vote of 2-3.

Chairperson Shallan said the applicant may want to consider adding articulation to the structure as this seemed to be the general concern amongst the Commissioners.

Mr. Fait suggested that the Commission may consider making an alternative motion.

Commissioner Turpit recommended that a subcommittee be selected to provide assistance to the applicant and that the item return before the Commission in two weeks.

Chairperson Shallan agreed.

Mr. Spatafore said he originally planned to submit for approval by the Commission a request for outdoor chairs and tables to replace the chairs and tables that were previously located outside of the railings. In his meeting with staff, it was determined that it was not in the purview of the Commission to approve such a request because the proposed area is located in the Caltrans right-of-way. He said that if the Commission's articulation issues include outdoor dining and a café style environment, his original plan was to continue in the same manner that he has always done business, as have other business owners on Orange Avenue, which is to have a lunch time café type seating in the right of way. Mr. Spatafore reiterated that if he attempts to locate the outdoor dining further into his property, it becomes an unworkable situation because of lack of interior space. He said he would be willing to consider this option; however, he stated that this issue is difficult to address because it cannot be addressed.

Commissioner Jones suggested using the same garage door design in the Forget-Me-Not bay at the east end of the structure. She noted that the middle sections are three large areas of plate glass. She said she is not as concerned with the indoor/outdoor dining area as she is with the amount of glass which provides no relief in depth or interest features. She said that she does not like the "matchy-match" look but feels that the east end of the structure needs to be relieved somehow. Ms. Jones said she appreciates the fact that the structure is located on a curve which in itself would provide the opportunity to make the front façade more interesting to the passer-by.

Mr. Spatafore said that if the Commission is looking for a balance in the form of an inoperable garage door within the 170 sq. ft. area, he would consider this option as it would be very cost effective.

Mr. Fait suggested that the applicant submit an alternative design plan for consideration and approval by the Commission at its next meeting.

COMMISSIONER JONES MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS AND SUBMIT AN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN PLAN WHICH WOULD MODIFY THE FAÇADE TO REDUCE THE VISUAL MONOTONY. A SUBCOMMITTEE COMPRISED OF COMMISSIONERS JONES AND RICE WAS SELECTED TO ASSIST THE APPLICANT IN THIS PROCESS.

COMMISSIONER HAMMETT SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Hammett, Jones, Rice, Shallen, Turpit.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

The motion failed with a vote of 5-0.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

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