

Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 01/24/2024)

This report is created by the Neighborhood Planner and included with staff reports to City Boards and/or Commissions.

Logistics	Stakeholders
Project Name/Address: 2650 California Ave	Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident): Marshall Shadeland Civic Group [MSCG] Board Marshall Shadeland residents Applicants [Owner, and Architect] Public Safety Councilman [District 6] DCP
Parcel Number(s): 44-M-105	
ZDR Application Number: DCP-ZDR-2024-02349	
Meeting Location: Virtual on Google Meet	
Date: April 1, 2025	
Meeting Start Time: 6:00 pm	Approx. Number of Attendees: 19
Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): ZBA [Zoning Board of Adjustment]; To be reviewed for a use variance due to the proposed expansion.	

How did the meeting inform the community about the development project?

Ex: Community engagement to-date, location and history of the site, demolition needs, building footprint and overall square footage, uses and activities (particularly on the ground floor), transportation needs and parking proposed, building materials, design, and other aesthetic elements of the project, community uses, amenities and programs.

During the community meeting, the applicants gave us an overview of the background, the function(s) of the business, and the proposed expansion and design, and the timeline for it.

The applicants introduced themselves and gave an overview of the project proposal. They started with a current photo of the building and mentioned that the restaurant had expanded the roof and added posts on the street and received some citations. After that, the owner came to the architects for a resolution. The architects recommended another way to try to expand the seating area without using the sidewalk or the public property. Then they presented the map to give people a sense of where the property was located: Woodland and California Ave. The historic map and photo showed the one-story historic building from around 1923. It had an expansion sometime before 1983. A 1983 Certificate of Occupancy [CoA] showed a second story as a dwelling unit. The first floor was a restaurant or a tavern.

Now they are looking to restore the building back to the previous roofline from a few years back, instead of using the sidewalk for seating. The architects recommend building a deck in their parcel at the back. The restaurant owns part of the lot behind this property. The proposal is to construct a screened deck in that piece of land and use the space for outdoor seating. In the process, the owners also wanted to change the CoA to add the second floor for commercial use as well for the restaurant. By the code, currently they are allowed to expand by 15% max. But adding the area of the deck and the second floor, the expansion becomes a 128%. This is what triggered a public hearing with ZBA for a use variance. They showed the back area again to give people a sense of where the proposed deck will be. Then they presented drawings and renderings for the proposed screened deck. A 6' high railing for screening and some 7'-6" high posts for lighting are proposed.

The MSCG board asked a few questions during and after the presentation and later opened up the floor for questions/comments. [All of them are as follows.]

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
. Is it a business or a residential place?	. This is a business. Right now, there is a residence on the second floor. That's what the occupancy certificate is for. But this [today's meeting and presentation] is for a proposed expansion.
. What's the name of the business? Just so that we can get a visual as in where the place is at.	. It's called Hysyde Lounge, it's at 2650 California.
. Just a comment: it's a shame that you can take away a whole parking lane along with the sidewalks Downtown for restaurants, but you can't even have outdoor seating on the sidewalks in our neighborhood.	. For the record, we could have had dine-in, but we could not have a roof overhead. So, that's where the challenge came in. The Department of Mobility & Infrastructure [DOMI] was willing to work with us regarding the roof. But the roof could not have posts that touch the ground on City property. They did offer a variance to look at to do a roof. But the associated cost was overwhelming due to a steel structure for that roof. Also, there have been some complaints about this anyway. So, the owners' intent is to move the outdoor seating from the sidewalk to try to be a better community member.
. With the expansion of the business, what is the parking situation? We do have a lot of complaints re: parking in the area. Any proposal addressing that?	<p>. [Architect] I don't think this will increase the parking demand more than it already has been. They are not looking to add a thousand people into the space. They are just trying to make up for the lack of sidewalk seating that they had over last summer. Because of the topography, it's difficult to add any parking on site. So, if it's something that would benefit (you all), we can look into it.</p> <p>. [DCP] If the project required additional parking based on our code, we would flag it. In this case, because it is going before the ZBA, it's all tied together. One of the requirements you have to meet to go to this board is proving that this request is not going to be harmful to the neighborhood based on traffic generation for parking spaces. This is something that will come up during the ZBA hearing.</p>
. Can you share the presentation with MSCG?	. Will do.
. What's the ZBA hearing date?	. It's scheduled for the May hearing.

Other Notes

During and after the presentation, Q&A and other discussions around the Development Activity, MSCG board members and residents showed their general support for this project, contingent upon a discussion during the board meeting.

Planner completing report: NT