

**4.d MATT MORGAN, IB FORUM (APPLICANT): CONSIDERATION OF DESIGN REVIEW CASE (DRC-22-0028) PROPOSING A 527 SQUARE FOOT PATIO EXPANSION TO THE EXISTING IB FORUM RESTAURANT AT 1079 SEACOAST DRIVE (APN 625-392-23-00). (USE-22-0092).**

Member Grace returned to the Council Chambers at 6:49 p.m.

Senior Planner Openshaw gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed patio expansion to the existing IB Forum Restaurant located at 1079 Seacoast Drive.

Public Comments:

William Long, Sea Village HOA Board member, noted there has never been a complaint about noise from the IB Forum in the 15 years he has been on the board. He spoke in support for moving forward with the project.

Speaking for Dante Pamintuan, Mr. Long stated that Mr. Pamintuan had to leave the meeting, told him that he supports the project and to speed it up.

Martin Mattes spoke about the need for additional seating in order to accommodate more customers and reduce wait times for a table. He also mentioned that people usually use rideshare or golf carts to visit the restaurant.

Member Rogers spoke about the need to preserve every parking spot in the City, not just on 9th Street but also on Seacoast Drive. He wished that the applicant could build up and have the patio on the roof because that is needed due to density and there is a big problem with parking.

Member Grace noted that in the past, the Board had approved a lot of projects that had zero parking. She stated that although there is a loss of a few parking spaces, she supported the project because there will still be eight or nine parking spaces and there is a lot of parking along the estuary. She commented that the landscaping is nice.

Member Voronchihin stated that he used to live across the street from IB Forum and said that the loss of the few parking spaces will not impact the neighbors because people will park anywhere else but in that lot. He said it is a great project and it is aesthetically pleasing. His only observation is that where the stone veneer meets CMU block in the same space looks

awkward. To resolve it, he suggested using stone veneer in the whole enclosure.

Member Beltran agreed with comments made by Member Voronchihin with regard to parking. This is a short-term commercial private use versus the public having a long-term parking situation. He liked the continuation of the landscaping buffer from the parking, so the wall is not up to the edge of the parking. In terms of the actual materials, Member Beltran said that there is a break between the stone veneer wall and in the proposed patio wall, so the wall would continue the line from the existing split face wall with a little bit of a hardscape break and then again back to this split face versus existing conditions where you have some landscaping in between to soften that transition out. He further stated that he is not a huge fan of string lighting for commercial uses because it gives a low budget/vacation bar type look versus something that is more established. He commented that rodents like to nest in Birds of Paradise so if there is a rodent issue to consider another type of plant. He supported the project.

In response to Chair Bradley's question about having a precedent for relaxing the parking requirements along Seacoast, Senior Planner Openshaw stated that in our Commercial Mixed-use Zone, parking requirements are relaxed along Seacoast. Parking may occur off-site instead of having the parking on the site of the project with incorporation of TDM (Transportation Demand Management) measures.

Chair Bradley concurred with his colleagues stating that there is a difference between providing the parking spaces for residents and providing parking spaces for a business. He spoke in support for recommending approval to City Council.

Member Rogers clarified for the record that he will not vote to approve the project because in the Design Review Guidelines (where it discusses circulation and parking) and in the Design Review Compliance Checklist there is no allowance for a reduction in parking.

Chair Bradley stated for the record that he agreed with Member Rogers, however, in the interest of fairness when there has been precedent to reduce parking requirements along Seacoast, given his familiarity with that location, and the fact that the Imperial Beach Blvd. improvements enhance the availability of parking in the region, he will vote in favor of approving this project. For the record he generally opposes reductions, but this is an instance where he would hate to give the perception that they would single

out an individual business along Seacoast Drive to be treated different when others have been in areas where they had the inability to provide the level of parking that's indicated in the ordinance and created a greater impact than this particular business. He spoke in support for recommending moving forward with the project.

Member Rogers responded that Member Grace made a good point which was that the DRB approved other projects on Seacoast with zero parking. He stressed that there is a limited amount of parking on Seacoast and overtime the circumstances will change so this is not singling out a particular project. He further stated that it seems like overtime that circumstances will continue to change with regard to the general parking for all properties on Seacoast. Therefore, his concern for sticking to precedence will lead to no parking.

Deputy City Manager Foltz stated the City hired STC Traffic to look at a coastal parking analysis. The whole coastal area was analyzed and a few months ago City Council was presented with near-term and long-term strategies on how to make parking better now, and how we can do long-term strategies, while also facilitating projects that the City wants. It is a fine balance. The study is step one and the City will continue to work with the traffic engineer to make parking better. He stated there is no solution right now, but it is something that the City is working on.

In response to Chair Bradley's question, Manager Foltz stated that if staff had significant issues with the project, they would have noted them during the presentation and that staff does not hold up a project from being reviewed by the Board. Concerns would be noted within the staff report and in the presentation. He further stated that the data that's been provided by the traffic engineer does not show that there are significant issues right now. However, like Member Rogers said, we have to look at it as time progresses to make sure we are planning effectively. He spoke about the unique situation when a project requires a Conditional Use Permit requiring a review by the DRB, yet CUP's can only be approved by the City Council.

In response to Member Voronchihin's question about how many parking spaces are required, Planner Openshaw responded 18 parking spaces are required.

**Motion by** Chelsea Grace

**Seconded by** Miguel Beltran

The Design Review Board considered the design of the proposed attached 527 square foot exterior covered patio addition to the existing IB Forum restaurant at 1079 Seacoast Drive (APN 625-392-23-00) and recommended approval of the project's design to City Council.

AYES (4): Karl Bradley, Miguel Beltran, Chelsea Grace, and Iliia Voronchihin

NOES (1): Lance Rogers

**Motion Carried (4 to 1)**

DRAFT