

**CULTURAL ARTS COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

Tuesday, April 11, 2006  
Manhattan Beach City Hall  
**6:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Cultural Arts Commission  
Sharon Greco, Chair  
Shelby Phillips, Vice-Chair  
Candy Duncan  
Susannah Rosenthal

PAAC Members:  
Donna Grossman  
Dean Nota  
Don Spencer  
Jill Will  
Alison Wright

Absent: Commissioner Francey Seckinger

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved with the following corrections:  
On page 2 in the second paragraph, insert “In addition to *Fantastic*” at the beginning of the fifth bullet. In the first sub-listing under the same bullet, replace “Manhattan Beach residents” with “South Bay residents” for the recommended community musical casting. At the last sentence of the section, replace “converting” with “adopting.”

Minutes of the March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved with the following corrections:  
On page 2 in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, insert “the final designs were modified by the commission.” On page 3 at the end of the section of “Public Art Advisory Committee,” insert the meeting date of April 11.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

V. GENERAL BUSINESS

06/02/22.1. Strand Alcove/Bench Proposal Review

Ms. Purner explained the selection process and briefly reviewed the ballot sheets. The purpose of this meeting was 1) to review the images for the 31 proposals submitted for the project (with no identification and background information of the artists); 2) select the

top 15 artists/designers both for the first bench commission and for a future artist pool. Comments by the Commission and Public Art Advisory Committee are as follows:

Entry #1:

- The durability and appropriateness of stainless steel as material in the beach environment was questioned.

Entry #2:

- This proposal was lacking an alcove design element.
- The importance of considering the impact on both long-term and incoming community members was emphasized and the panel's responsibility for selecting the first alcove bench.
- The ADA requirement for the project needed to be clarified; whether the wheelchair access was required on one or both sides of the bench.

Entry #3:

- This proposal lacked an alcove design element.
- It was suggested the design was not compatible to the beach environment.

Entry #4:

- This design evoked a fun atmosphere and a wide seating area.
- The unique treatment in the design was appreciated.
- The designed was thought to mirror some personalities in the community.
- There were too many different elements here, creating a cluttered design and thought to present an inappropriate theme for the site.

Entry #5:

- The subject matter (Catalina, Italian, or Mediterranean) was appropriate.
- This design was not inspiring.
- Perhaps the alcove might be too narrow for the bench.

Entry #6:

- The subtle way of dealing with natural landscape was appreciated, while the safety of the project was questioned.
- This proposal's configuration of three chairs conveyed an intriguing atmosphere that would invite conversation.
- There were concerns and questions about the design's fabrication and implementation.
- It was noted the lighting fixtures in the proposal would not be available at alcoves.
- Generally, people do not have a tendency to sit on sculptural furniture.

Entry #7:

- This design was thought to be heavy-handed on the alcove.
- The straight back would not be comfortable for sitting.

Entry # 8:

- The subject of lost species had no specific relationship to Manhattan Beach.

Entry #9

- This design raised the question of providing sufficient seating area.

Entry #11:

- The compass theme was appropriate but rendering insufficient.

Entry #12:

- This design looked too commercial.

Entry #13:

- The design looked cold and uncomfortable
- It brought an impression of a tombstone marker.

Entry #14:

- While appreciating its unique subject matter (sandcastle) for a bench design, it was uncertain how much detail could be actually transferred to the final product.
- The seating looked uncomfortable and hard to sit on.
- The design was neither practical nor functional.
- The panel wanted to see background information to evaluate the artist's skill level for implementation.

Entry #16:

- It was thought this whimsical design might work in some other spot.
- The issue of whether strand residents would like that piece in front of his/her house was raised.
- This design led the panel to question the possible risk of vandalism.
- The durability of the material in the beach environment was questioned.

Entries # 17, 18, 18a, 19, 20 and 21

- These designs were not appropriate, were not a fit thematically, or the design included a covering above the alcove/bench space.

Entry #22:

- The panel overall favored the design, colors, and playfulness.
- There was concern about possible discoloration.
- It was questionable whether the extension to the left of the bench provided for wheel chair access.

Entry #23:

- This design was a good and appropriate design delivering a Catalina feeling.
- It was remarked that this design was too safe and too common.

Entry #24:

- It was unclear if the boat (which was a main element in this design) might go beyond the alcove space.
- The design and subject were suitable for the beach location.

Entry #25:

- This proposal raised concern about the vulnerability to graffiti.

Entry #27:

- It was thought the bench would be too big for the site.
- There was concern the adjacent property owners might object.
- It would be more suitable for a temporary installation project.

Entry #29:

- There was concern that the sculptural piece might be interpreted as a religious image.

Entry #30:

- This bench with a beach volley ball theme is similar to a bench in the community.

Entry #31:

- This design is not appropriate for the site.

The panel voted, and the top 15 candidates were selected for the second tier review. The entry numbers are: #16, 22, 24, 6, 5, 23, 4, 9, 29, 14, 7, 27, 20, 3, and 28. (Descending order based on the voting points.)

The panel wanted to see the background information of the artists/designers including previous public art works before making recommendations for the top alternatives.

## VI. REPORTS AND OTHER BUSINESS

Next meeting is Tuesday, May 2 at the Creative Art Center.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.