

CORONADO DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

March 9, 2011

The regular meeting of the Coronado Design Review Commission was called to order at 3:05 p.m., Wednesday, March 9, 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 February 23, 2011, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Fait provided the Commission with the new Walking Tour brochure map which includes information about the mosaic murals located at the Coronado Golf Course Clubhouse.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Historic Resource Commission

Commissioner Jones reported that at the meeting of March 2, 2011, the Commission approved Notice of Intent to Demolish applications for the properties at 836 I Avenue and 467 D Avenue. The Commission continued the request for a Mills Act Agreement for the property at 723 A Avenue to their next meeting of March 16, 2011.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

None.

APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

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. (Continued from the regular meeting of February 23, 2011)

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

The applicant, David Spatafore, gave a brief overview of the changes that were made in response to the Commission's recommendations and with the assistance of a two-member subcommittee appointed by the Commission.

Commissioner Turpit noted that the double entry doors are not depicted on the floor plan.

Mr. Spatafore said the floor plan did not reflect the change; however, double entry doors will be installed.

Commissioner Rice stated that he met with Mr. Spatafore after the subcommittee meeting. He asked the applicant if the parapet wall was lowered.

Mr. Spatafore confirmed that the parapet wall was lowered about 12 inches. He said the building originally contained a 48-inch parapet wall with a 12-inch left overhang; it now measures 36 inches.

Commissioner Jones asked if the Forget-Me-Not bay's parapet wall will also measure 36 inches.

Mr. Spatafore said the height measurement is fairly close.

Chairperson Shalan asked if the height measurement will be the same for all four bays.

Mr. Spatafore said yes.

Commissioner Rice asked how the ipe wood is detailed as it passes over the column.

Mr. Spatafore said he considered two options: notching out the wall to match the columns, or adding vertical pieces to break up the vertical lines on the wall.

Commissioner Rice asked if the face of the stone projects five inches in front of the bulk of the ipe wood and if the stone directly over the column is flush.

Mr. Spatafore said the ipe wood will be flush and he will add a vertical element to make up the difference between the stone and the ledge located at the top of the column. It would measure less than five inches—possibly 2 ½ inches—because there is a spacer behind the wood horizontal fashion which can be brought out by using a 2x2. Because of the irregularity of the stone, he prefers not to place a cap feature to box out the wood.

Commissioner Turpit said he understands that the stone will project outside the face of the wood.

Mr. Fait said the outside face of the stone should not project past the property line unless there is approval by Caltrans.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the wood will extend beyond the face of the stone if the face of the

stone is on the property line.

Mr. Fait said this has not been an issue previously because it is not on the walkway or ground.

Commissioner Rice asked if the applicant intends to ask for an encroachment permit from Caltrans on some of the finish materials.

Mr. Fait said this is a general requirement for structures or concrete cutouts located on Caltrans property.

Commissioner Jones asked if the wood above the column will be set in two inches so that the lip of the column projects two inches from where the wood is located.

Mr. Spatafore said yes.

Commissioner Turpit said the new drawing shows a reduced stucco element located between the column return and the mullion. He said he does not understand the need for this element as it is a difficult detail to build.

Mr. Spatafore said the element has been retained because he needs a support post in between the non-structural columns. He noted that each of the columns follows the structure backbone of the building and are located at the end of the structural support; however, the column itself is not a part of the structural support as it is a non-reinforced masonry column. In order to support the parapet wall and windows, a beam will be installed under each awning which will continue across the top of the mullion of the glass to hold up and protect the glass below it. He said the element was reduced from 12 to six inches per Commissioner Rice's guidance as it was felt that it was too thick and there was too much mass on the 32-inch column. He noted that this change gives depth to the windows.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the distance from the face of the glass to the outside face of the stone column.

Mr. Spatafore said the glass is $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches deep with a column depth of five inches.

Commissioner Turpit asked if the double entry doors can remain open.

Mr. Spatafore said the double entry doors will open out but cannot remain open because of its proximity to the kitchen.

Commissioner Rice said that although the stone looks natural, it is a manufactured veneer product. He understands there will be a return on the column of about four or five inches and asked if there is a corner piece.

Mr. Spatafore said that the product is sold as an interlocking system with no separate corner pieces.

Commissioner Jones asked if there is gradation in the color of the stone.

Mr. Spatafore said the stone has a natural gradation to it and contains grays and blacks in it.

Commissioner Turpit asked about the outcome of the applicant's meeting with subcommittee members Jones and Rice.

Commissioner Rice said the subcommittee discussed having wood material at the top and stucco at the bottom of the columns so that it anchors the building more and cuts the post off at the parapet wall. He stated that subcommittee discussions did not include the relocation of the entry doors.

Commissioner Jones said she is pleased with the new location of the entry doors.

Commissioner Turpit asked if there is a way to solve the structural issue of the posts that are wrapped in stucco on either side of the column.

Commissioner Rice clarified that the decision to add stucco adjacent to the stone occurred after the subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Fait suggested that the stone columns could be built six inches wider so that it measures 42 inches in width. He also suggested the stone be placed to extend to where the glass is located.

Mr. Spatafore disagreed and said that a flat surface is needed for the adherence of the mullion.

Mr. Fait suggested that the mullion could be located on the 6x6.

Chairperson Shalan advised that the Commission should not redesign the project and instead should allow the applicant the opportunity to present his design element.

Commissioner Jones said that by reducing the amount of stucco from 12 to six inches, it would create a framework for the windows.

Commissioner Turpit asked the applicant how he avoids the stucco at the jam on the roll-up window as it is required to be installed on the fixed glass.

Mr. Spatafore explained that the roll-up window has an existing jam similar to other windows, and he plans to use the gray stucco features on the garage door.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Jones commented that horsetails are an aggressive plant and suggested the applicant may want to consider using grasses that have a similar look but are containable maintenance-wise.

Mr. Fait noted that the Commission, at their previous meeting, did not express concern with the planters located at the front façade. He said horsetails do not need much depth and suggested a 12- or 18-inch planter.

Commissioner Turpit said a 24-inch planter would make the front façade look unique and would break up the monotony of the flat sidewalk; however, he was agreeable to allowing a smaller planter.

Commissioner Rice said that overall he likes that the lowered columns, the division in the windows, the recessed area at the entry way as it helps to define the front door, and the addition of a light over the entry way. He agreed with Commissioner Turpit that reducing the encroachment from 24 to 12 inches is a good idea as it provides more sidewalk area. He also agreed to the use of a smaller planter. Mr. Rice said he does not like manufactured veneers because the corner pieces, although stepped, are visibly thin and appear cheap. He said he favors a natural stone veneer with corner pieces in lieu of the proposed stone. Mr. Rice said that due to the manner in which the wood is articulated at the top of the column, he would suggest the wood be faceted out two or three inches. He added that the ipe wood will give the columns a nice definition, and although minor, he feels that this detail will help to define the transition at the top of the post.

Commissioner Jones agreed, and suggested an 18-inch planter at the front façade.

Commissioner Turpit said the project is much improved and commended the applicant's reputation as an entrepreneur. He noted that one of the most important aspects of a project is the details. In order to obtain this type of elevation, which is a contemporary, sleek, clean, high-end look, the structure must be properly detailed and built to those details. He stated that the applicant has not submitted the proposed changes in writing. He said he would approve the general concept but would not approve the request as presented because it could be a failure if not properly detailed. Mr. Turpit said the applicant began by selling ice cream and now intends to bring a first-class restaurant into the community—it will most likely be one of his favorite spots—it may be time for the applicant to step up the details and possibly consider hiring someone who is educated, licensed and trained to assist with detailing storefronts.

Chairperson Shalan said he liked the previously-submitted design and likes the proposed design even better. He likes the ipe wood at the top of the columns and the fact that the columns do not extend to the top of the wall. He considers the 2 ½ inch differentiation acceptable, likes the fact that the stucco was reduced from 12 to six inches, and suggested using a planter box which measures between 12 and 18 inches. He commented that the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan or guidelines do not require that an applicant hire an architect or designer to submit plans.

He said the applicant has clearly communicated what his intentions are in building and designing this project. He said he likes the stone material but is unsure how the issue of the corner pieces should be resolved.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON SHALLAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. AT GRADE LANDSCAPE PLANTERS PROPOSED BELOW EACH WINDOW NOT EXCEED A PROJECTION OF 18-INCH INTO THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY;
2. APPLICANT HAS OPTION TO PROJECT WOOD PARAPET AT COLUMNS FLUSH WITH FACE OF COLUMNS;
3. THE COMMISSION WILL APPOINT A SUBCOMMITTEE (COMMISSIONERS HAMMETT AND RICE) TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF THE CORNER PIECES OF THE STACKED STONE;
4. THAT NO EXPOSED RACEWAY OR EXPOSED CONDUIT BE PERMITTED FOR THE WALL SIGN;
5. THAT A PERMIT BE OBTAINED FROM CALTRANS FOR ANY PROJECTION OVER THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE INTO THE ORANGE AVENUE PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY, OR WORK WITHIN THE RIGHTS OF WAY, OR USE OF THE ADJOINING PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

COMMISSIONER JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Turpit asked Commissioner Rice to clarify his comment regarding the wood in relation to the fascia column.

Commissioner Rice reiterated that he felt it would be a nice detail if the wood faceted out so that the face of the wood was in alignment with the face of the stone, which is about 2 ½ inches in front of where the bulk of the wood would be located.

Chairperson Shallan asked if there would be a 2 ½ inch return on the wood every 20 feet or so.

Commissioner Turpit said it would change the elevation significantly because it would effectively create a square.

Chairperson Shallan said it would create a column that would go up to the top of the wall.

Commissioner Turpit said the shadow line would come out on either side.

Mr. Fait suggested leaving this decision to the discretion of the applicant.

Mr. Spatafore noted that the street is curved but the building is not. He expressed concern that because the wood is not 88 feet long, it may require a hidden miter which may not look right. He

said that until he sees it in real function form, he does not know if it will work because the material he is using does not flex. He said that stucco can be molded to curve but the wood cannot. He said he likes staff's idea about leaving this type of decision to his discretion as it provides him the opportunity to mask the miter and clean up the column.

Commissioner Turpit said it is a better solution to bring the wood flush with the column at the column capital so that it defines the column.

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 2011-04 BONEY, DEBBIE – Review of design of a proposed parking lot at 170-172 C Avenue to support Boney's Bayside Market in the Orange Avenue Corridor Specific Plan/C (Commercial) Zone.

Commissioner Hammett was disqualified from participating because his business is located within 500 feet of the subject property.

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

Commissioner Rice asked if the appropriate City department had been contacted regarding traffic signs in the alley as persons must cross the alley to reach the market.

Mr. Fait said that for projects requiring Special Use Permits, information is circulated to the Fire, Police, Public Services and Engineering departments. He said the Engineering Department requires review by the Traffic Operations Committee of the existing and proposed parking lot layouts and alley traffic. He said the outcome may result in the installation of stop signs in the alley or a pedestrian crosswalk.

Chairperson Shallan said although not in the Commission's purview, crosswalks would certainly be advised.

The applicant, Deborah Boney, introduced her business partner and son, Nick Boney, as well as Luis Delgado, the project's architect.

Commissioner Rice asked if the applicant had made accommodations for storage of grocery carts in the proposed parking lot.

Ms. Boney said there is a storage area for carts on the existing lot; however, she said she would

accommodate an area for this purpose on the proposed parking lot. Additionally, she said she is proposing a 6-foot fence on the south side property line and asked if she could also install a similar fence on the north side property line. The only difference is that part of the fence would measure 6 feet, then drop down to 42 inches. The wall would discourage patrons from walking through the lot.

Chairperson Shallan asked if the request for a fence on the north side property line is part of the submission.

Mr. Fait said that the plan depicts is a 6-foot wood fence along the northerly property line from the alley to the center of the lot. He said that Ms. Boney would like to extend the fence, measuring up to 42 inches in height, from the middle of the lot to C Avenue.

Chairperson Shallan asked about the side fence height requirement in residential areas.

Mr. Fait said that in residential areas, a portion of the front yard fence can be a maximum of 6 feet in height, while a portion is limited to 48 inches in height. (However, this residential zone is not subject to these limitations.)

Commissioner Rice asked if the lot will be used exclusively by patrons of the market.

Ms. Boney said yes.

Luis Delgado said he worked for John Zebarth, Zebarth & Associates Architecture & Planning. He said that the parking lot contains a zero curb for storm water drainage purposes.

Commissioner Jones asked about the planting of the Carrotwood tree and potential maintenance issues.

Mr. Delgado said he specifically choose this type of tree because it is an evergreen.

Commissioner Turpit said he had spoken with a landscape architect and they both agreed that the selection of trees for this project was appropriate. Mr. Turpit recommended that root barriers be used for the trees.

Mr. Delgado noted that root barriers are always used in their projects.

Mr. Fait said staff makes root barriers a requirement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Rice said that the overall project looks great and he appreciates the applicant's time and attention to details. He thanked the applicant for the submittal of clear and easy-to-read plans.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RICE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THAT A LOCATION FOR SHOPPING CARTS STORAGE BE PROVIDED;
2. THAT THE APPLICANT HAS THE FLEXIBILITY TO INSTALL A WOOD FENCE (UP TO 42" IN HEIGHT) ALONG THE EASTERLY ½ OF THE NORTHERLY PROPERTY LINE.

COMMISSIONER SHALLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

There is a 15-day appeal period.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

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