

City of Palm Springs
ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, California 92262
(Via Zoom)

Minutes of February 1, 2021

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Jakway called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members Present: Doczi, McCoy, Poehlein, Thompson, Rotman, Jakway

Committee Members Absent: Lockyer, Walsh

Planning Commissioner Present: None

Staff Present: Assistant Director of Planning Newell, Associate Planner Mlaker, Assistant Planner Perez

REPORT OF THE POSTING OF AGENDA: The Agenda was available for public access at the City Hall bulletin board (west side of Council Chamber) by January 28, 2021, and posted on the City's website as required by established policies and procedures.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA:

The agenda was accepted, as presented.

Doczi, seconded by Poehlein to accept the agenda, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, MCCOY, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, ROTMAN, JAKWAY

ABSENT: LOCKYER, WALSH

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: NOVEMBER 2, 2020 & DECEMBER 7, 2020

November 2, 2020:

Rotman, seconded by Thompson to approve minutes, as presented.

AYES: POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: LOCKYER, WALSH
ABSTAIN: DOCZI, MCCOY

December 7, 2020:

Thompson, seconded by Dozci to approve minutes, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, ROTMAN
ABSENT: WALSH, LOCKYER
ABSTAIN: MCCOY, JAKWAY

NEW BUSINESS:

- 2. GLOBAL GO, LLC, ON BEHALF OF CALIBLISS, FOR A MINOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION AND SIGN PERMIT FOR EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS TO AN EXISTING BUILDING FOR A NEW CANNABIS DISPENSARY/LOUNGE FACILITY LOCATED AT 562 SOUTH INDIAN CANYON DRIVE (CASE NOS. 3.3416 MAA AND SI 20-056) (AP).**

Assistant Planner Perez presented the proposed project as outlined the staff memorandum.

IVY BADER, applicant, (responded to questions from the Committee) explained that a trash receptacle will be provided for both the residential and cannabis uses. She said the City Council granted the distance waiver for this business, subject to substantial renovations on the property. She also provided additional background on the regulatory permit and odor mitigation measures for the cannabis use.

Vice Chair Rotman stated that an existing meter is located in front of the building and asked how it will be relocated. He asked about details on the planter face material. He questioned how customers will access the business –from the front or back? Mr. Rotman asked about details on the existing transom window and the signage design details. (Ms. Bader responded that the meter will be relocated, and the stone will be neutral color. She said customers will walk around to the front of the building to access the tenant.)

Vice Chair Jakway asked about window treatment, whether transparent or opaque. He questioned if the southerly window will be transparent, since it may show cannabis products from the exterior. (Ms. Bader clarified that the windows will be transparent and visible from the sidewalk, and indicated the local code will be changing to be consistent with the state requirements relative to visibility of products.)

Member Doczi asked about enhancing the paving and parking areas. (Ms. Bader responded that applicant is amenable to improving these areas.)

Member Thompson noted that the upper floor awning seems to be deteriorating and questioned if it will be repaired for replaced. (Ms. Bader said any ripped or torn materials would be replaced.)

Chair Jakway noted that the City Council requested significant upgrades and questioned what other opportunities have been considered to meet this request. (Ms. Bader said the applicant would be amenable to enhancing the treatments on the side of the building and upgrading the second floor railing.)

Member Poehlein asked if the textured block would remain. Ms. Bader said they intend on adding smooth stucco to these surfaces.

Member Doczi thinks the existing textured block should remain, as it is part of design of the building. He thinks the asphalt pavement in front should be replaced with concrete or other enhanced paving to match the sidewalk material in front of the building.

Member Poehlein agreed with retaining the existing textured block.

Vice Chair Rotman agreed and requested the applicant replace the temporary dividing curtain on the second floor with a more permanent solution. He expressed concern that the drawings do not match the current profile of the storefront; and he is not in favor of a “can” sign, as proposed.

Chair Jakway said clarification is needed on the signage relative to the angled glass. He also said the balcony rail needs to be upgraded and recommended creating a solid linear design, perhaps wrapping the front of the railing.

Rotman, seconded by Thompson to recommend to denial, as presented, and resubmit with AAC comments for further study.

1. Address improvements to railing and second floor awning.
2. Signage band detail needed.
3. Planter stone material.
4. Provide paving material and design.
5. Retain existing texture/diamond block on elevation.

AYES: DOCZI, MCCOY, POEHLIN, THOMPSON, ROTMAN, JAKWAY

ABSENT: LOCKYER, WALSH

3. THE BANK DISPENSARY AND LOUNGE FOR A SIGN PROGRAM TO ESTABLISH SIGN CRITERIA FOR THE MULTI-TENANTED COMMERCIAL

**BUILDING LOCATED AT 296 SOUTH PALM CANYON DRIVE, C-B-D ZONE
(CASE SP 20-006) (GM).**

Associate Planner Mlaker presented the proposed sign program as outlined in the staff report.

Chair Jakway opened the public meeting via Zoom:

JULIE MONTANTE, owner, was present and described the renovations within the building and stated that landscaping will be placed within the existing planter beds (Blue Palms at 5 feet tall) and the fountain will be repaired and functional. She stated that the main logo is meant to look like a coin to reflect the history of the building. The signs are placed on the Baristo side so that traffic on the two-way street can read the signs. The main use of the building will be a cannabis dispensary and lounge on the first floor with tenants on the second.

JACK RIVERS, Canyon Signs, described the proposed sign program and answered questions.

Member Rotman, asked for a description of the tenants within the building. He supports the main sign on South Palm Canyon Drive but thinks the Baristo tenant signs look very heavy.

Chair Jakway stated that he is in favor of adding new plants in the planters. He said the tenant signs should be lined-up or justified uniformly with a common font and color.

Member Thompson stated that the size of the tenant letters are too large and should be reduced.

Member Doczi stated that the circular sign backer looks as though it is applied to the building façade with no depth. The backer should be two (2") inches thick.

Member McCoy stated that the tenant signs are too large, and the letter height should be reduced.

Jakway, seconded by Thompson to recommend approval to the Planning Commission subject to the following conditions:

1. Tenant signs to be 96" long and 17" tall.
2. Tenant signs to be placed lower on the building spaced and left justified uniformly.
3. Letters to be black and halo lit with font to be consistent for all tenants.
4. Circular sign to have a 2" off-set for backer.

AYES: DOCZI, MCCOY, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: LOCKYER, WALSH

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

STAFF MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Advisory Committee of the City of Palm Springs adjourned at 6:56 pm to the next regular meeting at 5:30 pm on Tuesday, February 16, 2021, Council Chamber, City Hall, 3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs.

David Newell, AICP
Assistant Director of Planning

DRAFT

City of Palm Springs
ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, California 92262
(Via Zoom)

Minutes of February 16, 2021

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Jakway called the meeting to order at 5:34 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members Present: Doczi, Lockyer, McCoy, Thompson, Walsh, Vice Chair Rotman, Chair Jakway

Committee Members Excused: Poehlein

Planning Commission Present: None

Staff Present: Development Services Director Fagg, Assistant Planning Director Newell, Associate Planner Kikuchi, Associate Planner Mlaker, Assistant Planner Perez

ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA:

Doczi, seconded by Rotman to accept the agenda, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: POEHLEIN

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. MASSFLORA, LLC ON BEHALF OF EUFLORA, REQUEST A MINOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION AND SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION TO MODIFY THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING AND INSTALL NEW SIGNAGE**

**FOR A NEW CANNABIS DISPENSARY LOCATED AT 577 EAST SUNNY
DUNES ROAD, ZONE CM. (CASE NOS 3.2967 MAA & 20-063 SI). (AP)**

Planner Perez presented the proposed project as outlined the staff memorandum.

Member Doczi asked about the existing and proposed parking lot lighting.

Chair Jakway asked if the number of parking spaces complies with the parking standards.

JAMES CIOFFI, architect, (responded to questions from the Committee) said the building was previously designed by Howard Lapham and is pleased to assist with the remodel. He clarified that the trash cans are stored within the building and described the proposed changes. Mr. Cioffi explained that there is no parking lot lighting and said they are happy to work with staff on screening the rooftop equipment.

Vice Chair Rotman asked about the plan for exterior lighting, including the existing exterior “can” lights under the front overhang. (Mr. Cioffi responded that the existing “can” lighting would be retained. There will also be landscape lights.)

Chair Jakway asked if an ADA ramp would be necessary. (Mr. Cioffi said they would most likely file a hardship to avoid installing a new ramp along the front.)

Member Lockyer thinks landscape lighting or spot lights can be done on the trees to adequately light outdoor spaces. He said the down and up-lighting on the existing palms seem adequate; however, he thinks some low voltage lighting could be used on the steps.

Member Doczi asked about trash handling and the other tenant spaces in the back. (Marie Fonseca responded that their business is required to implement standard operating procedures and they are uncertain about the adjacent businesses.)

Member Thompson said the wall address letters should be reduced to be a similar scale to the other elements of the building.

The Committee discussed the address sign letter height and its scale relative to the main sign, prior finalizing the motion.

Doczi, seconded by Lockyer to approve, as recommended by staff and as follows:

1. Add low voltage lighting to the front steps.
2. The address sign to be 30” width by 69” height, and any future modifications to signage shall require the applicant to submit a sign program.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: POEHLEIN

2. COASTAL BUSINESS GROUP REPRESENTING (AT&T WIRELESS) FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY ON THE CITY PARKING GARAGE TO MIMIC AN EXTENSION OF ELEVATOR TOWERS AT A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF FIFTY-ONE (51') FEET LOCATED AT 235 SOUTH INDIAN CANYON DRIVE, ZONE CU. (CASE NO. 5.1500 CUP). (GM)

Planner Mlaker presented the project as outlined in the staff memorandum.

FRANK ORTEGA, applicant, described the necessity for the proposed facility.

Member Thompson questioned why the enclosure needs to be 11' high and what other options they've considered for siting a facility in nearby properties. (Mr. Ortega said to achieve the height their engineers have deemed the coverage necessary; otherwise they would be pointing antennas right towards a structure to reflect a signal.)

Vice Chair Rotman asked about details of the structure, including the brackets that hold the enclosure and antennas. He asked about the clear spaces within the enclosure.

Member Lockyer questioned the possibility of installing the antennas near the center of the project. (Mr. Ortega said they tried to avoid the loss of parking and wanted to stay within the design theme that already existed with the extension of the elevator tower already on-site. He said also said there may be engineering challenges to locating near the center cables.)

Member Doczi questioned if the applicant considered using a faux palm. (Mr. Ortega responded about the challenges with a faux palm design.)

Chair Jakway said the proposed location is inappropriate and suggested locating elsewhere, not adjacent to streets. The towers appear out of proportion to the surroundings.

Member Walsh suggested concern with the faux design and there could be another design solution. He agreed that the design was inappropriate for the location and is not in support of the proposal.

Member Lockyer felt the height is out of scale and recommended moving it towards the interior of the structure.

Member Doczi suggested there could be better integration with the garage structure.

Vice Chair Rotman said the project was out of proportion with the rest of the garage.

Member McCoy agreed with other committee members.

Thompson, seconded McCoy recommend denial project, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY

ABSENT: POEHLEIN

3. STUDIO AR&D ARCHITECTS, ON BEHALF OF EDWARD F. FREEMAN OF PINNACLE VIEW, LLC, FOR A MAJOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A 4,276-SQUARE-FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A 20,705-SQUARE-FOOT HILLSIDE PARCEL LOCATED AT 2610 WINTER SUN DRIVE, ZONE ESA-SP PLANNING AREA 4 (DESERT PALISADES SPECIFIC PLAN), SECTION 4. (CASE 3.4206 MAJ). (NK)

Members Lockyer recused himself, due to business conflict.

Associate Planner Kikuchi presented the project as outlined in the staff report.

Member Thompson requested clarification on the building height exceptions. (Associate Planner Kikuchi responded that the applicant had submitted an Administrative Minor Modification application to request height exceptions.)

Chair Jakway asked about the pool cabana and verified if it can be permitted.

Vice Chair Rotman questioned how the area of the pool cabana is calculated and confirmed that the area is the roof area, not the floor area. He also confirmed the area for which a yard setback reduction was requested is adjacent to an open space trail and not another single-family residence. (Assistant Planner Kikuchi confirmed that Vice Chair Rotman's statements were correct.)

Member Doczi questioned about site and landscape lighting requirements in the Desert Palisades Specific Plan. (Assistant Planner Kikuchi responded that the Specific Plan provides general requirements such as avoiding light pollution and the requirement of shielding.)

JORDAN MOSSLAR, architect, described the design intent of the proposed residence, materials, cabana design, roof projection, and setback encroachment.

Member Doczi questioned the materials of the trash enclosure. (Mr. Mossler stated that the exterior of the trash enclosure will be smooth stucco which will match the residence.)

Chair Jakway requested further details on the stepped design of the home relative to the topography. (Mr. Mossler responded that the dining room, kitchen and garage will be located at a higher elevation than the bedrooms.)

The Committee clarified that the applicant has responded to items 1 and 5 of the staff recommendations.

Member Doczi expressed concern with regards the amount of the proposed landscape lighting fixtures, as it appears there are a total of 79 lights. Member Doczi stated that the amount may be excessive, particularly for a hillside property.

Chair Jakway stated that the project was nicely done and that minor deviations for a hillside property are appropriate. Chair Jakway stated that he hopes the minor deviations could be approved as the design elements are strong at those locations.

Rotman, seconded by Walsh to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, as recommended by staff- and allow chimney/wall element, partial projection of the residence into the required side yard setback area, pool cabana, and a reduction of the total number of landscape lighting fixtures.

AYES: DOCZI, MCCOY, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: POEHLEIN
ABSTAIN: LOCKYER

Member Lockyer returned to the meeting.

4. MIKE FLANNERY, FOR A SIGN PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR FLANNERY EXCHANGE, A MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL BUILDING, LOCATED AT 750 NORTH PALM CANYON DRIVE, ZONE C-1, SECTION 10. (CASE 20-005 SP). (NK)

Associate Planner Kikuchi provided an overview of the sign program as outlined in the staff report.

Member Walsh asked about compliance with the sign ordinance, in the event the applicant reduced all signage.

Vice Chair Rotman questioned the location of the freestanding signs relative to the right-of-way. (Associate Planner Kikuchi clarified the location of the property line

relative to the low-standing wall on Palm Canyon and the Indian Canyon Drive frontage.)

JOHN CROSS, applicant, Best Signs, provided a description of the proposed signage.

Member Thompson confirmed that Sign 2.2 would be wrap the curve and not be a square panel. (Mr. Cross indicated that was correct.)

Chair Jakway suggested allowing Option a freestanding sign for both frontages, with an encroachment permit fronting Palm Canyon and pushing sign on Indian Canyon back on-site. He also suggested eliminating signs 2.1 2.3 2.4 and 2.5 and 3.1 and 3.2, but allowing blade signs.

Vice Chair Rotman suggested returning with a better way to organize the signage on the building or freestanding, but he said there were currently too many signs strewn across the facades.

Walsh, seconded by McCoy to continue for further study, based on Committee comments.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY
ABSENT: POEHLEIN

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS:

STAFF MEMBER COMMENTS:

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Advisory Committee of the City of Palm Springs adjourned at 8:15 pm to the next regular meeting at 5:30 pm on March 1, 2021, City Hall, 3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs.

David A. Newell, AICP
Assistant Planning Director

City of Palm Springs
ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, California 92262
(Meeting held via Zoom)

Minutes of March 1, 2021

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice Chair Rotman called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members Present: Doczi, Lockyer, Poehlein, Walsh, Vice Chair Rotman

Committee Members Absent: McCoy, Chair Jakway

Planning Commissioner Present: None

Staff Present: Assistant Director of Planning Newell, Engineering Associate Minjares, Associate Planner Lyon, Associate Planner Mlaker

REPORT OF THE POSTING OF AGENDA: The Agenda was available for public access at the City Hall bulletin board (west side of Council Chamber) by February 25, 2021, and posted on the City's website as required by established policies and procedures.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA:

Vice Chair Rotman requested clarification on the location and lighting for the proposed monument signs.

Poehlein, seconded by Doczi to accept agenda presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN

ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. A SIGN PROGRAM APPLICATION BY RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY HEALTH

CARE FOR A MULTI-TENANT CENTER LOCATED AT 191 NORTH SUNRISE WAY, ZONE RA (CASE SP20-004). (KL)

Approved, as presented.

Walsh, seconded by Lockyer to approve as part of Consent Calendar.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN
ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- 2. CBM TWO HOTELS, LP, FOR A MINOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION PROPOSING FAÇADE MODERNIZATION AND ADDITION OF AN 864 SQUARE FOOT FITNESS CENTER AT THE COURTYARD BY MARRIOTT HOTEL LOCATED 1300 EAST TAHQUITZ CANYON WAY, ZONE: RESORT ATTRACTION (RA) (CASE 3.0779 MAA) (KL).**

Planner Lyon presented the proposed project as outlined in the staff memorandum.

MICHAEL HARPER, applicant, described the project and said they are open to modifications to the landscape plan. He said that the proposed lighting under the porte-cochere is brighter due to the area being higher pedestrian activity.

Member Doczi asked about the use of wood and potential concern with the long-term maintenance. (Mr. Harper responded that they are not concerned and their goal is match the wood elements on the front and side entrances.)

Member Walsh questioned the proposed location of the rooftop mechanical and whether or not it could be placed on the ground. (Mr. Harper said the reason was due to the unit being located closer to the vent and if on the ground it would require additional screening. He thought they could study making the equipment well deeper. However, the ideal situation is to allow a steeper slope, allowing the elimination of the parapet.)

Vice Chair Rotman clarified details of the storefront windows related to the entry door height. He confirmed that the dark grey and cedar colors were part of the proposed rebranding. He thinks that the fitness center building overhangs may not be necessary for the east and west sides of the building, due to the size of the existing adjacent buildings, and said the overhang proportions seemed odd and top heavy. He's concerned with the overall design of the entry façade.

Member Walsh thinks the design is inappropriate from an aesthetic standpoint.

Member Lockyer discussed the user experience with the proposed changes, stating the lack of landscape around the proposed fitness center. (Planner Lyon provided an overview on the proposed landscape changes.) Mr. Lockyer suggested adding landscape to the fitness area to improve the user experience of the landscape/hardscape spaces.

Member Lockyer asked about the proposed lighting temperature under the canopy. (Planner Lyon responded that the applicant has agreed to lower the temperature to 3000K.)

Member Doczi recommended moving the fitness center building closer to the parking lot to allow for additional landscape in the interior space. He also expressed concern with the proposed design integration with the building.

Vice Chair Rotman said the rebranding of the building needs to relate better to the existing architecture. The lighting temperature needs to be consistent with existing (building and landscape). The fitness center building overhang needs to be evaluated based on a shade study. The proposed colors are incompatible with the current Spanish architecture.

Rotman, seconded by Thompson to table for further study based on Committee comments.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN
ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY

NEW BUSINESS:

- 3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LLC (DBA: CO-DVLP DISPENSARY) REQUESTING A MINOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION FOR THE RENOVATION OF AN EXISTING 2,637-SQUARE FOOT VACANT BUILDING INCLUDING NEW LANDSCAPING AND PARKING LOT UPGRADE AND EXTERIOR SIGN REVIEW FOR A NEW CANNABIS DISPENSARY AT 315 NORTH INDIAN CANYON DRIVE, ZONE CBD (CASE 3.289 MAA) (GM).**

Associate Planner Mlaker presented the proposed site and exterior renovations for the 2,637-square foot cannabis dispensary.

GARY MILLER, project architect, provided details about the building exterior, landscape and lighting. He discussed heat gain from the large glass windows, mechanical screen on roof and the need for a solid wall on the south elevation.

NICK WOLIN, owner, discussed the location of the front slider door placed further back from the street for security. He discussed the driveway widths, textured walls, and

landscaping. He said the building design needs to be sensitive to the odor control methods used within the building in relation with front door width and location.

Member Doczi would like to see a better site plan that defines the walkways versus loading area/walking area. He supports the design of south building wall; however, he's concerned with the dirty area in the back and suggested adding landscaping.

Member Poehlein asked about the up-lighting on the south elevation wall. He would like to see a planter bed in front of the store-front window. He said he can support the south wall design.

Member Lockyer asked about the location of the front property line and the right-of-way. He would like to see a planter bed below front windows. He also suggested adding planter beds on the north wall and places where hard surfaces meet the ground to soften the building.

Vice Chair Rotman noted that the front entry door is 7'-6" tall and needs more of a presence. He suggested using a simple screen around the mechanical equipment and adding a transom over the front door. He likes the sign and south building elevation; and suggested simplifying the roof screen and adding a trash enclosure on the plan.

Member Thompson asked if the front door could be moved forward toward the street. He would like to see a planter along the front façade.

Member Walsh stated that he supports the project and would like to see the planter in the front. He thinks the signage is acceptable and the site/landscape plan needs to be more developed.

Member Doczi, second by Member Lockyer for approval with revisions:

1. Submit revised landscape plan to include:
 - a.) Planter along north side of building.
 - b.) Return with a detailed sign and landscape plan, including trash enclosure and planter in front of window and add trash enclosure;
 - c.) Simplify the A/C roof screen.
 - d.) Delineate spaces behind the building.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN
ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY

The Committee took a recess at 7:43 pm and reconvened at 7:50 pm.

4. GREG HICKEY, OWNER, PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A 3,946-SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A HILLSIDE LOT

LOCATED AT 2274 WINTER SUN DRIVE, ZONE: ESA-SP, PLANNING AREA 4, DESERT PALISADES SPECIFIC PLAN (CASE 3.4203 MAJ) (KL).

Member Lockyer said he will recuse himself on the next two items, due to a business conflict of interest. He left the virtual meeting by turning his camera and microphone off.

Planner Lyon presented the proposed project as outlined the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Rotman questioned the location of the pool relative to city's standards.

NICK LAFARO, applicant, introduced the project and proposed design. He indicated the views are to the south and east with the intent the proposed layout will take advantage of these views. He described the challenges with terrain, resulting in the proposed orientation with the garage.

Member Poehlein asked about the contrast in the four elevations as presented in the renderings.

Vice Chair Rotman asked about the privacy wall and pool barrier design, the proposed colors/materials, and the cantilever at the master bedroom.

Member Doczi discussed the front façade and its simplicity, however, he thinks that there should be some transition between the equipment walls (to the east) that integrates the two into the landscape. He suggested this should occur on the west side as well, to allow some movement of the stone wall and tie the architecture into the site.

Member Thompson referenced a similar design he's seen in Rancho Mirage and thinks the design is well done.

Member Poehlein said the front façade is imposing and agreed that the design wall could be better integrated into the site.

Vice Chair Rotman agreed with other comments and staff's recommendations.

Member Doczi questioned the amount of lighting proposed.

Walsh, seconded by Thompson to recommend approval subject to further review of the landscape lighting.

AYES: DOCZI, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN
ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY
ABSTAIN: LOCKYER

5. DAVID AND PATRICIA MARINO, OWNERS, FOR A MAJOR ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION PROPOSING A 7,125-SQUARE FOOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES ON A 39,940-SQUARE FOOT HILLSIDE LOT LOCATED AT 1405 ROSE AVENUE, ZONE: R-1-C (CASE 3.4208 MAJ / 7.1621 AMM / 5.1525 CUP) (KL).

Member Lockyer abstained on this project.

Planner Lyon presented the proposed project as outlined the staff memorandum.

Member Doczi asked if there are any restrictions on the number of driveways a project can have.

Vice Chair Rotman requested staff describe the Administrative Minor Modification and building height request.

NICK LAFARO, applicant, said the project was designed based on the client's active lifestyle. He noted there is a 35-foot terrain variation and described the proposed design of the project. Mr. Lafaro explained the design intent with the façade wall.

Member Thompson requested clarification on the façade wall height. (Mr. Lafaro said the wall is approximately 18 feet, 2 inches above finished floor.)

Member Doczi confirmed that the highest portion of the façade wall would be approximately 27 feet above the existing curb.

Vice Chair Rotman asked for clarification on the landscape walls. (Mr. Lafaro described the southerly walls, including the existing property line wall and a second wall that will be 4 feet, 6 inches in height above the pickle ball court wall.)

Vice Chair Rotman asked the applicant if they considered having the pickle ball court on the interior of the site near the bocce ball court. (Mr. Lafaro responded that the bocce ball court and pool are integral activities and said the pickle ball court was a separate activity and the reason for separating from the other activities.)

Vice Chair Rotman confirmed the color and materials for the house.

Member Thompson asked for the reason why lighting on the pickle ball court is necessary, if the owner is a casual player as indicated by the Applicant.

DAVID MARINO, applicant, responded that pickle ball can be difficult to see the ball and play during dusk. He expects that during summer months his family would play during the evening when it's cooler, thus the reason for having lighting on the court.

Member Doczi said he was concerned with the overall height of the poured in place concrete wall on the east elevation, particularly on the south side of this element, and thinks the amount of driveway space along the street seems excessive.

Member Poehlein agreed that the overall size of the street façade wall seems imposing. He thinks the integration of the wall with the building is “awkward” and appended to the house and questioned if there’s a better way to intersect the roof plane with the wall elements.

Vice Chair Rotman said the height of the façade wall is a concern, noting 27 feet above the curb at the highest point is significant and may block views. Mr. Rotman expressed concern with the location of the pickle ball court due to the noise and lighting associated with such use, and felt the size of the site could accommodate the court elsewhere. He also expressed concern with the driveways.

Doczi, seconded by Poehlein to continue to date uncertain to provide additional information, as follows:

1. Site sections showing impact of design on surrounding properties, and the view of the garage driveways.

AYES: DOCZI, POEHLEIN, THOMPSON, WALSH, ROTMAN
ABSENT: MCCOY, JAKWAY
ABSTAIN: LOCKYER

Member Lockyer returned to the meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

STAFF MEMBER COMMENTS:

- Next AAC meeting will be on March 8th (instead of March 15th). The agenda will include a discussion on changes to the architectural review process, as well as regular business items.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Advisory Committee of the City of Palm Springs adjourned at 9:15 pm to the next regular meeting at 5:30 pm on March 8, 2021.

David Newell, AICP
Assistant Director of Planning

City of Palm Springs
ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, California 92262
(Meeting held via Zoom)

Minutes of March 8, 2021

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Jakway called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members Present: Doczi, Lockyer, McCoy, Poehlein, Walsh, Vice Rotman, Chair Jakway

Alternate Member Present: Thompson

Committee Members Absent: None

Planning Commissioner Present: Kathy Weremiuk

Staff Present: Development Services Director Fagg, Assistant Director of Planning Newell, Associate Planner Kikuchi

REPORT OF THE POSTING OF AGENDA: The Agenda was available for public access at the City Hall bulletin board (west side of Council Chamber) by 10:00 am on Thursday, March 4, 2021 and posted on the City's website as required by established policies and procedures.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA:

Rotman, seconded by McCoy to accept the agenda, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, POEHLEIN, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JANUARY 4, 2021

Poehlein, seconded by McCoy to approve minutes, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, POEHLEIN, JAKWAY
ABSTAIN: WALSH, ROTMAN

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- 2. MIKE FLANNERY, FOR A SIGN PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR FLANNERY EXCHANGE, A MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL BUILDING, LOCATED AT 750 NORTH PALM CANYON DRIVE, ZONE C-1, SECTION 10 (CASE 20-005 SP). (NK)**

Planner Kikuchi presented the proposed project as outlined the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Rotman confirmed the freestanding signs were the same design. (Planner Kikuchi confirmed that was correct.)

JOHN CROSS, Best Signs Inc., applicant, said the revised sign program was reviewed with the owner and the overall package was reduced.

Chair Jakway asked if the aluminum on the freestanding sign would match the finish on the building. (Mr. Cross responded that it would be a faux finish paint and there will be no issues with maintenance or rust.)

Member Doczi said the project was a big improvement from the previous proposal.

McCoy, seconded by Walsh to recommend approval, as presented.

AYES: DOCZI, LOCKYER, MCCOY, POEHLEIN, WALSH, ROTMAN, JAKWAY

NEW BUSINESS:

- 3. DISCUSSION ON CHANGES TO THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW PROCESS (CASE 5.1526 ZTA). (FF)**

Director Fagg provided background and an overview of the proposed process changes. He said City Council provided direction to staff to streamline the City's entitlement process, and a Subcommittee consisting of two Planning Commissioners (Chair Kathy Weremiuk and Maria Song) and Chair Jakway was formed to provide recommendations. The Subcommittee reviewed other architectural review processes of other cities and materials from the American Planning Association on best practices.

Mr. Fagg described the current process and changes recommended by the Subcommittee, including a pre-submittal conference with staff, followed by a formal submittal that is reviewed by the Planning Commission under a Site Development

Permit and the criteria that the Commission would use to evaluate applications. Upon completion of the Site Development Permit application decision, the AAC would then review the application, and Director Fagg described the proposed criteria for review at this stage of the revised process. He provided examples of projects in the proposed process, including a new commercial building and hillside single-family residence, and described other changes to the current processes related to signage and single-family homes.

Chair Jakway noted the proposed changes would rename the AAC to the Architectural Review Committee, and the AAC would become the deciding body on architecture. Mr. Jakway said currently the AAC is limited to two reviews and asked what would occur if the AAC couldn't approve an application in two reviews in the new process. Mr. Fagg responded the applicant would need to submit a revised application.

Vice Chair Rotman referenced the matrix on the different review processes and questioned how tract reviews would be processed, and referenced the Miralon development. Mr. Fagg responded that reviews of tract houses would still require approval by the AAC.

Mr. Rotman asked about the disparity in AAC review and Planning Commission where the AAC rejects a basic massing plan, such as the Block B-1 residential development, and the Planning Commission or Council approve that design. Mr. Fagg responded that there are currently four specific plans that have design guidelines and requirements that may need to be re-evaluated, and/or there may be a joint meeting with the AAC and Planning Commission.

Chair Jakway said mobile home park reviews should be reversed in the matrix.

Member Lockyer said the proposed changes appear to require two separate applications, and questioned if that would be too cumbersome. Mr. Fagg responded that while there are two applications, the intent would be to keep the application materials the same, and not require additional fees.

Member Doczi asked what level of detail would the Planning Commission review site plans, specifically the location of trash enclosures, etc. Mr. Fagg indicated the Commission would review these details as they are part of the development standards. He also described the appeal process in the event that the AAC denied the application in the new process.

Member Poehlein questioned if there could be a rotating member of the AAC to serve in the pre-submittal conference role. Mr. Fagg noted the large time commitment necessary for the proposed pre-submittal conference and the reasons for not requiring volunteer board members to fulfill this need.

Member Thompson said the proposed process change for cell tower review involving rooftop design might be something the AAC would want to review, as it is an architectural review matter.

Member Walsh asked how the proposed changes would be rolled out. Director Fagg indicated a roll-out date of possibly July 1, as it starts the new fiscal year, but did say that it would require several months to have the staffing and revised administrative procedures in place prior to beginning the new process.

Member McCoy asked if there would be changes to when the public is engaged with the new process. Director Fagg described that the public would still be able to provide comment to both the Planning Commission and AAC, and that notification would continue to be provided for hillside applications.

Chair Jakway questioned page 3, Item I, of the proposed ordinance and the review of Class 1 and Class 2 historic resources. Director Fagg responded that the proposed changes are consistent with the new Historic Preservation Ordinance, so a review does occur by the Historic Site Preservation Board.

Chair Jakway said the work that went into the proposed changes was well done.

No action taken; discussion only.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

STAFF MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Advisory Committee of the City of Palm Springs adjourned at 6:40 pm to the next regular meeting at 5:30 pm on Monday, April 5, 2021, City Hall, 3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs.

David Newell, AICP
Assistant Director of Planning