

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017

AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1424 MISSION STREET

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 6:45 pm
Commissioners Present: Mark Gallatin (Vice Chair), John Lesak, Rebecca Thompson, Victor Holz
Commissioners Absent: Steve Friedman
Council Liaison Present: Robert S. Joe, Councilmember
Staff Present: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

*Please Note: These Minutes are a summary of the meetings and are not a fully transcribed record.
An audio recording of the meeting can be made available upon request with the City Clerk's Office.*

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

1. No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. **1740 Virginia Place**
Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect
Project No: 1985-COA
Historic Status Code: 5D3

Project Description:

A request for a façade change to a previously approved CHC project. The front porch will be altered by adding decorative balusters with decorative columns. The proposed materials will be wood.

Commission Comment:

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that this is the first Consent Calendar item before the CHC made possible with the recently revised CHC Ordinance. He explained the project is for a minor façade change to the front porch balusters.

Presentation:

Mr. Nott: Noted that he was trying to restore a historic house that has been stuccoed over and given vinyl windows. He mentioned that upon chipping away at the stucco siding, they revealed wood siding that was in relatively good shape. The property owners have been agreeable to the historic restoration including the installation of period appropriate wood windows. He realized the front parapet and the porch details had been revised around 1988. No original remnants of the original porch details remained under the porch parapet, nor did any historic photographs reveal any previous designs of the porch railing. He also mentioned that he developed a simple classical detail that was approved by the client and he felt was appropriate to the house.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Lesak: Asked the Commission and the applicant what was approved by the CHC previously.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that it was assumed that there was siding under the parapet wall of the porch, but when the applicant stripped away at the stucco, there was no other material found. He also noted that it was not determinable in the record permit files if the porch was altered, but in the drawings it was noted the porch was altered in the 1980s.

Mr. Nott: Noted that a permit record does exist for the previous porch alteration.

Commissioner Gallatin: Inquired if the applicant will be willing to convert the existing iron railing on the steps to wood as a condition of approval to match the new proposed porch railing.

Mr. Nott: Noted that he will accept that condition.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that Criteria 3 is applicable to the project as this is contributor to a District, and will remain a contributor, and that the proposed porch railing will be fine.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that his original concern with the proposal was due to their being no record of the porch alteration. However, he noted that his concern has changed since new evidence was presented by Mr. Nott to prove otherwise regarding the permit records.

Decision:

Commissioner Gallatin: Made a motion to approve the project with the condition of changing the iron railing at the stairs to wood to match the new porch railing balustrade.

Commissioner Lesak: Seconded the Motion

APPROVED WITH CONDITION TO REPLACE IRON RAILING AT STAIRS TO MATCH WOOD RAILING DETAIL AT PORCH BALUSTRADE

(Ayes: 4; No: 0), Freidman Absent.

Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.

CONTINUED ITEMS

3. 2024 La France Avenue

Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect

Project No.: 2008-COA

Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project was presented conceptually

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 607 square foot contemporary style, second story addition to an existing 2,018 square foot one story, English Revival house on a 7,217 square foot lot. The second story addition will consist of adding a master bedroom, a master bathroom, a

closet, a sitting area, and a study. The proposed exterior materials for the addition will be smooth stucco siding with aluminum windows and doors. The project includes two-second story decks. One deck would be located on the rear elevation at 126 square feet; the other would be on the south elevation at 70 square feet. Both decks would feature guard rails made of steel cable.

Presentation:

Mr. Fenske: Presented a 3d digital model to the Commission. He noted that he has chosen to work on studying the massing through 3d digital modeling rather than the drawings to obtain feedback from the Commission. He also mentioned the Commission's concern from last month's meeting with the project having too many roof slopes, which he has since simplified to have only three different roof pitches. He also added that the new roof dormers are not readily visible from the front.

Commission Questions & Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted the skylights in the model and inquired if they were there before.

Mr. Fenske: Noted that the skylights are new additions.

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired if the vent at the top of the ridge is glass or an actual vent, and what its actual size is.

Mr. Fenske: Mentioned that the vent as is shown in the model is not accurate, but its actual size is about 10x18 inches. The same vent proportion will be added to the gable end at the addition.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the east elevation does not show windows and inquired if the applicant will remove any windows.

Mr. Fenske: Noted that no windows are proposed for removal, rather the windows are hidden so that he can focus on the massing of the project at this stage.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that she would prefer to see all the windows in the model with the existing windows greyed out for differentiation and to make more clear what is new and what is existing.

Commissioner Lesak: Inquired about the rake of the addition.

Mr. Fenske: Noted that he is trying to match the addition with the roofing and differentiate with eaves by adding eaves to the addition areas.

Commissioner Lesak: Suggested that the rear balcony seems out of proportion, scale, and character with the house, and suggested it be made smaller. He suggested that perhaps a pony wall will be better for the balconies as they would align with lower floor features. Current code requires larger rails than what was required back then, but the applicant should find a way to cheat it through design.

Commissioner Gallatin: Mentioned that the Commission did not receive any set of drawings to review against the model and that it does a disservice to the project and its review.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that at the previous meeting the Commission directed Mr. Fenske to come back to the Commission more conceptually as he has done today, but drawings would also have been helpful.

Decision:

Commissioner Gallatin: Made a motion to CONTINUE the project to the next meeting.

Commissioner Lesak: Seconded the Motion

CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING

(Ayes: 4; No: 0), Friedman absent.

4. 1029 Park Avenue

Applicant: Sam Pitnick, Designer

Project No.: 2022-COA

Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remodel an existing 1,285 sq. ft. single family home and convert the attic space into a habitable second level. The second story addition consists of 679 sq. ft. with: three bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a walk-in closet. The addition will have new wood windows and wood siding to match the existing. A small dormer will be added upstairs on the street side. The majority of the addition will be behind the existing gabled roof and not seen from the street. The height of the existing ridge will be increased in order to achieve code-require ceiling heights upstairs. There is also a 350 sq. ft. proposed car port in the rear yard. All wood members would be painted to match the existing house.

Applicant Presentation:

Ms. Salazar (Owner): Noted that she appreciates the opportunity to discuss the project and the feedback from the Commission. She also added that at the previous CHC meeting, there were three areas that needed refinement including the addition, the exterior windows, and the carport. She noted that it is her objective to maintain the character of the historic house and still accommodate her family.

Mr. Pitnick: Noted that changes were made to the windows in response to the Commission's concerns. The front dormer was lowered from the roof ridge as requested by the Commission. The roof dormer of the rear addition was lowered as well, and brought in about 3 feet for an overall square footage reduction of 70 square feet. The carport was moved to the side yard and separated into two separate detached structures. He also noted that the survey of the property and its boundaries was correct, but they were improperly shown in the previous submittal.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired why the carports are not symmetrical in their separation distance from the projecting bay at the side of the house. She also noted that the carport elevation drawings are not shown in relation to the elevation drawings of the house and it is difficult to see the relationship of the carport structures with the structure of the historic house.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that there is a context issue here because the carports are not drawn in relationship to the house and the relationships are important to see and that relationship is not indicated in the drawings. He added that the details are not the only important matter; important matters also pertain to spaces and spatial relationships. The proposed carports now change the approach to the house, and it is hard to see that spatial relationship when it is not drawn in context. There are important details of how the posts relate, how the corners relate, etc.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the vinyl front door is historically inaccurate and suggested the clients/owners consider a new door.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Pitnick: In response to Commissioner Thompson's question regarding the spacing of the carports, he noted that the design guidelines suggest that parking be subordinate to the house requiring certain offsets from the front façade.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that at the previous meeting, the Commission asked the applicant to look closely at the neighborhood pattern and the massing volumes of the dormers.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he still has some concern with the roof of the rear addition as it is big and bulky. He also noted that these types of additions stand out from the street, and they are not recommended in the guidelines. However, he also noted that it is set back and at the rear, and the roof of the addition has been lowered.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that the 12:1 pitch is the same as the rear lower floor addition, and that they followed the commission's last suggestions to reduce its height and recess it back some more. He expressed concern with setting a precedent for the approval of the rear addition as it is designed. He added that on sheet A3.1, the cardinal directional views are mislabeled.

Commissioner Holz: noted that he was okay with the rear addition, although he was a little bothered by it and would like to see them do something more.

Commissioner Thompson: Added that the rear addition may not be readily visible and that it should be okay.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITION for a Chair Review to correctly position the carport and show them in relationship to the house in elevation drawings. The project meets the mandatory Findings and specific Findings of: 5, 6, and 7.

Commissioner Holz: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION TO UNDERGO A CHAIR REVIEW FOR THE CORRECT POSITIONING OF THE CARPORTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE HOUSE IN ELEVATION DRAWINGS.

(Ayes: 4; No: 0), Friedman Absent.

Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.

5. 612 Meridian Avenue

Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect

Project No.: 2041-COA

Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 749 sq. ft. single story addition to a 864 sq. ft. Craftsman house on 5,264 sq. ft. lot. The addition will consist of; a new kitchen, a new bedroom, a new bathroom, a new master bedroom suite along with a walk-in closet and bathroom. The new exterior siding for the addition will consist of wood lapped siding to match the existing, wood windows to match the existing with wood trim, and fiberglass roof shingles. The patio attached to the garage will be removed. The applicant is also proposing to demolish an unpermitted 140 sq. ft. storage addition to the existing single vehicle garage.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Fenske: Noted that at the previous CHC meeting, the Commission pointed to several drafting errors and that those errors have since been corrected. He also noted that the storage room off the garage was not permitted, but will be rehabilitated win the Commission's approval.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that a pecan tree will be removed and asked if the applicant had considered flipping the location of the addition to save the tree. He also inquired what steps were taken by the applicant to address differentiation.

Commissioner Lesak: Asked if there was a rake detail in the drawings.

Commissioner Thompson: Suggested that the windows at the master bedroom along the south elevation be separated to be on either side of the bed instead of being above the bed out of concern with safety and the expanse of horizontality of the windows.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Fenske: In addressing the concerns over the Pecan tree, he mentioned that the location of the addition was chosen to address heat gain issues with a north addition location. He also added that the tree in question was not in good health as determined by the property owner’s arborist and that they have already been issued a permit to remove the tree. To answer the question regarding the rake, Mr. Fenske noted that the intention of the new rake detail is to match the existing. Regarding issues of differentiation, Mr. Fenske noted that at the south elevation, the addition steps back about a foot and a half and on the north elevation, the kitchen steps out towards the property line. He also added that another method of differentiation will be with the new framing which will be 1x5 instead of the 1x4 of the existing. Mr. Fenske also expressed that he was open to separating the windows at the master bedroom.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the garage door type is mislabeled along with the bedroom doors in the door schedule. He also noted that the south elevation should be labeled as existing and proposed. Additionally, a window on the north garage wall is shown in elevation but not in plan, and the zoning designation should be RM rather than RS. Overall, he praised Mr. Fenske for the progress he has made on the project.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITION for a Chair Review for the separation of the windows at the master bedroom along the south elevation. The project meets the mandatory Findings and specific Findings of: 5, 6, and 7.

Commissioner Thompson: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION TO UNDERGO A CHAIR REVIEW FOR THE SEPARATION OF THE WINDOWS AT THE MASTER BEDROOM ALONG THE SOUTHERN ELEVATION.

(Ayes: 4; No: 0). Friedman Absent.

Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31

NEW ITEMS

6. 1810 Foothill Street

Applicant: Julie Phanstiel

Project No.: 2067-COA

Historic Status Code: 5B1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 1,388 sf. single story addition to an existing 1,900 sf. single story Adobe Revival style house, built in 1926. The existing 360 sq. ft. garage will be demolished. It will be replaced by a 459 sq. ft. single car garage and a 240 sq. ft. carport trellis. The addition also consists of a 639 sq. ft. master bedroom and bathroom. There is also a proposed exterior

deck that will be built behind the new master suite. The completed house will be 2,539 sq. ft. New exterior will be stucco to match existing materials. All new roof shingles, doors, and windows will match existing style and materials.

Applicant Presentation:

Ms. Phanstiel noted that she brought a sample of the cedar light roofing to replace the existing wood shake on the house. The architect has redrawn the elevations to clearly show the separation of old and new. The materials have been called out as smooth stucco on the additions with continuity through color. She also noted that she has received more direction on the windows and doors, and noted that the house has had different window treatments over time, but a more traditional casement style is currently desired. She also added that the garage door will be compatible with the front door.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Lesak: Asked the applicant if they had a roof sample. He also asked if all the skylights are new because they are shown as existing on the plans. He noted that the plans indicate the roof ridge and chimney butting against the skylight, but it does not show that way on the west elevation. Though he noted that he generally approves of the design intention of the skylights, he would like to see them drafted correctly in the plans. He also inquired how the window projections are constructed, and he wanted clarity on what the window projection volumes were made of and that the elevation drawings indicate a wrap-around frame.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the new proposed roofing material is beefier and heavier than the original wood shake and if the roofing structure will need to be strengthened to support the extra load. She also noted that the verticality of the glazing of the French doors is inconsistent with the more rectangular glazing typical of adobe architecture.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he has concerns about the proposed composite roofing material and that it does not seem consistent with the house style and addition. He suggested the applicant look at the house 233 Hillside which is being installed with a real wood roof.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Phanstiel: Provided a roofing tile sample for the Commission to review. She also noted that the roof structure has been checked to ensure it can support the added weight of the new proposed roofing material. She also added that all the skylights are new, and none are existing.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Thompson: Wanted to see more clarity on the windows and that the shadows on the elevations are somewhat confusing. She noted that there were numerous errors in the drawings, but that the overall design is good. She strongly suggested they look at wood shingles for the roof, but she is fine with the composite material being proposed.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he is not opposed to the proposed composite roofing material; he is actually quite accepting of the overall proposed project, which is why he strongly encourages the applicants to look at real wood shake roofing over composite due to the naturalness and softness of real wood shake.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITIONS for a Chair Review to ensure the plans are revised to correct the windows and French doors and that they are shown consistently throughout the drawings, and that actual window details be provided, that the skylights be

shown properly with details of how high they sit above the roof plane, the chimney skylight is corrected along with the window and door schedule to reflect the plans. The project meets all the Mandatory Findings along with Specific Findings of: 2, 5, & 6.

Commissioner Gallatin: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION OF CHAIR REVIEW FOR DRAWING ACCURACY AND CLARIFICATION ON THE FOLLOWING:

- **WINDOWS AND FRENCH DOORS ARE SHOWN CONSISTENTLY IN THE DRAWINGS;**
- **THE SKYLIGHTS BE SHOWN PROPERLY WITH DETAILS OF HOW HIGH THEY SIT ABOVE THE ROOF PLANE;**
- **THE WINDOW AND DOOR SCHEDULE SHALL ACCURATELY REFLECT THE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS; AND**
- **WINDOW DETAILS BE PROVIDED.**
- **CHIMNEY SKYLIGHT SHALL BE CORRECTED.**

(Ayes: 4; No: 0), Friedman Absent.

Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31

NEW BUSINESS

7. 636 Alta Vista Circle

Karen Hallock (Owner)/Anthony Brady (Legal Representative)

Description:

The owner is requesting a discussion about her property and its proposed inclusion on the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Presentation:

Mr. Brady: Noted that he is requesting the removal of the property from the City's proposed updated Inventory as the property is listed under contradictory descriptions. The house was built outside of the Mid-Century Modern period and that the house fails to meet substantial criteria of Mid-Century Modern architecture. He understands the Commission has a desire to preserve the integrity of the Inventory list, and properties that are not representative of historic preservation should not be included.

Public Comment:

No comments.

Commission Questions/Discussion & Applicant Response:

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked Staff if this project should be reviewed with the rest of the Inventory, and what the Commission will do tonight with the item.

Staff: Noted that the Commission can make a decision tonight on the property, and the recommendations will go to Council in January with the rest of the Inventory recommendations, or the Commission can fold the item into the list of other contested properties that are to be reevaluated by HRG, the historic consultant on the Inventory update.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that it is possible there is wood siding under the stucco, and how does the owner know that the stucco is not original.

Mr. Brady and Ms. Hallock: Noted that the stucco is a coarse thick stucco that is typical of the 70's onward and not typical of the house construction period or Mid-Century Modern architecture.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the Commission previously found strong reasons to support the removal of the property from the Inventory update.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that Mr. Brady is misunderstanding the concept of Integrity of Setting. This criteria is how the setting has changed over time. He also noted that if the stucco is not original, it needs to be verified as it greatly helps in analyzing the house, however the applicant is not clear on the originality of the stucco, and they are being too literal when they shouldn't be, and not literal enough when they should be in their justifications for removal.

Ms. Hallock: Noted that the stucco has a popcorn ceiling-like finish and it is not representative of the Mid-Century Modern period.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that textured stucco was available during the Mid-Century era. He also noted that there are State guidelines on how historic surveys are conducted and that he is leaning towards the removal of the property from the Inventory, but the argument the applicant is making is not strong enough.

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked the Commission if they should really weight the fact that the house was constructed in 1966/1967 when the period of significance for Mid-Century Modern ends in 1965.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the house screams Mid-Century even for a difficult site. The fenestration and the horizontal banding all allude to modernism, and that is what Mid-Century Modernism is really all about.

Commissioner Holz: Asked why the applicant wants to be off the proposed Inventory update.

Ms. Hallock: Answered that the reason to request removal from the Inventory is to preserve the ability in the future for possible alterations, though she added, no plans for alteration are in the future.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that even if it was not on the Inventory, any exterior alterations would still require discretionary review by the Design Review Board.

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired if the applicant has plans to demolish the house.

Commissioner Gallatin: Added that the applicant would have to come back to the CHC for a proposed demolition as the structure is over 45 years old, even if it is excluded from the new Inventory.

Ms. Hallock: Noted that there are no future plans to demolish the house.

Decision:

Commissioner Gallatin: Made a motion to include the property to the list of properties that are requesting removal and for further study by the City's historic consultant HRG.

Commissioner Lesak: Seconded the motion

APPROVED FOR INCLUSION IN THE LIST OF CONTESTED PROPERTIES BEING ADDED TO THE INVENTORY UPDATE AND FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS BY THE CITY'S HISTORIC CONSULTANT PRIOR TO DETERMINATION OF INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION FROM THE INVENTORY WHEN IT IS ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CHC.

(Ayes: 4; No: 0) Freidman absent.

8. 1920 Edgewood Drive

Applicant: Mr. James Fenske, Architect

Conceptual Review

Historic Status Code: 5D1

(Conceptual Review)

Description:

A request for a conceptual review in regards to a proposed single story addition of 883 sq. ft. and a new second floor addition of 1,427 sq. ft. to an existing 2,524 sq. ft. to a Colonial Revival Influence house on a 13,241 sq. ft. lot. The existing garage is proposed to be demolished and a new 600 sq. ft. three vehicle garage with an attached 200 sq. ft. pool house. The exterior materials will match the existing. **This item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made at this time.**

Presentation:

Mr. Fenske: Presented a 3D digital model of the project and noted that he was trying to design the second story addition within the context and relationship of the rest of the neighborhood that consists of multiple two-story homes.

Public Comment:

No comments.

Commission Questions/Discussion & Applicant Response:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that this is not the only single-story house on the street.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that only 20-25% of the existing walls are proposed to remain.

Property Owner: Noted that most of the existing square footage beyond the existing front volume is non-original and was added on over time.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the applicant needs to show how the changes over time have happened. He would like to see how the additions occurred over time and how the historic integrity has already been lost, because without that information, he could not approve of this project as currently proposed. He noted that this house is a contributor to a District, and that this addition is not compatible or acceptable. He would like to see permit records as evidence to the owner's claim. He added that the house has strong Ranch stylings of simple volumes, and the current proposal is too complicated as a box-like form plopped down with an overly busy roof.

Property Owner: Noted that the house is identified as colonial and they were trying to reference that in the proposed addition. She noted that there are four houses on her side of the block that are large, two-story homes.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the house has French Eclectic vernacular.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the front facing gables of the proposed addition make the house look bigger. He added that this house is a contributor, and the changes that are proposed will no longer make it a contributor and it is the Commission's job to ensure that the property remains a contributor.

Mr. Fenske: Noted that the house was outlier to the District as most of the other contributing homes are larger.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that this is a mixed neighborhood of varying styles, and to try to make it match other houses is not how preservation of its status as a contributor works. He noted that he does not quite understand the property because it is not clear what is original and what is not original. There is a French influence on the existing house that is not indicated in the proposed addition. He suggested to the applicant to let the house's original features shine.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that he shares the concerns of Commissioner Lesak and that there are more fundamental issues of massing and integrity which need to be looked at more closely.

Property Owner: Asked the Commission if it was still feasible to propose a second story addition.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that a second floor can be added, but it should be humble in its appearance and subordinate to the existing original building.

9. Historic Resources Survey and Inventory of Addresses Survey Update

Description:

The Commission will review the historic resources survey and inventory of addresses update that was prepared by the City's consultant, Historic Resources Group (HRG), review any changes based on the October 12, 2017 Special Meeting and make a recommendation to City Council.

Public Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked Staff if they had any comments to provide to the public and the Commission.

Staff: Noted that it was recently decided by the City to contract with HRG, the historic consultant, to conduct a higher level analysis of the properties that are being contested with regards to the proposed Inventory update including the properties that wish to be removed and wish to be added. A timeframe for their analysis is not available, but we are anticipating for the CHC to be able to conduct their recommendation to Council at the January 2018 meeting rather than the December meeting as earlier anticipated, with the recommendation expected to now go to Council in February 2018.

Commissioner Gallatin: Opened up the item for public comment.

Thomas Thompson (1523 Indiana Ave.):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Mr. Thompson provided photographs of his property to the Commission and Councilman Joe. He noted that his house was evaluated at 7R which means the surveyor could not see the house and the condition it is in. He also added that the neighborhood is surrounded by mostly 70s or 80s construction. He and his wife have no plans to alter or demolish the house in the near future, but they are concerned with the possibility in the remote future if they want to sell the house and its historic status may be a red flag to potential buyers.

Gwen Taylerson (1210 Pine Street):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Ms. Taylerson noted that he owns a 4-unit apartment building on Pine Street. He noted that this property is a business and to have an additional layer of review is difficult for income properties. He noted that his apartment building is a twin to an adjoining apartment building (1214 Pine Street) that is not owned by him, and that property was not included in the Inventory update while his property was. He noted that he owns two historic homes and that he supports historic preservation, but that this particular building is a business, not his personal residence.

Myles Mattenson (628 Orange Grove Avenue):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Mr. Mattenson provided additional information to the Commission along with the already submitted evidence that supports removal. He noted that the building is not a great example of Minimal Traditional. He noted that the property is 628-642 Orange Grove Avenue, not just 628 Orange Grove, which to him suggests that the surveyor did not closely observe the property.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked Staff if the three properties that wanted removal from the Inventory back in August 2017 were added to the list of potential removal.

Staff: Mentioned that a matrix has been compiled of properties wanting to be added, wanting removal, and expressing a general concern of being added, and if Commissioner Gallatin would email those three properties in question so they may be added to the list of properties wanting removal.

Commissioner Gallatin: Made a motion to CONTINUE the item to the December meeting for additional comments.

Commissioner Lesak: Seconded the motion.

CONTINUED TO THE DECEMBER MEETING

(Ayes: 4; No: 0). Friedman absent.

10. Commemorative Centennial Historic Building Program

Note: This item was switch in order with Item No. 11 by a motion approved by the Commission.

Description:

The Commission will discuss the possible revival of a commemorative plaque program for buildings in South Pasadena that have reached their centennial age. The program was a collaborative effort between the CHC and the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation (SPPF) with all costs borne by SPPF.

Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that he sits on the Board of the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation and recently learned of a once active program of commemorating buildings that reached their centennial year. He wished to gauge the Commission for their input on possibly reviving the program. He noted that the process worked by having Staff review their records to identify buildings reaching their centennial, and then a joint sub-committee would be formed between the Commission and SPPF to work with the owners of the building on commemorating the property. A plaque, would be placed at the building site, and the plaque's cost would be borne entirely by SPPF. There was perhaps a ceremony involving the Mayor and members of SPPF to honor the centennial of the historic building. He added that he was excited about the program because it is a great way to engage participation and support of historic preservation.

Commissioner Thompson: Referenced a homeowner that received a plaque at some time and how excited they were about it.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he does not like these type of programs, because just because a property is old does not mean it is historic. Historic preservation does not necessarily mean it is old, and this program reinforces that notion that only old buildings are historic and that is not true.

Commissioner Gallatin: Suggested that perhaps the CHC was involved in the joint sub-committee capacity to determine the validity of the old building as a building worthy of historic recognition. He also added that if the program were to be restarted, the CHC can establish clear guidelines to address the age versus historic issue.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he is not opposed to the program, but is cautious about its implementation. He added that the SPPF was founded to be a partner and work in tangent with the CHC and act together in the preservation of the City's historic properties.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that this program would not be forced upon property owners, and would only apply to property owners that are willing to participate. He also added that he sits on the Board of Directors of SPPF and that he can happily report back to the SPPF Board that there is some interest from the Commission to restart the program.

11. 929 Buena Vista Street

Applicant: Babak Zahabizadeh

Project Number: 2080-MIL (Mills Act Request)

Historic Status Code: 2D

Landmark No: 41 (Torrance-Childs Residence)

Description:

The Commission will consider a proposal for a Mills Act contract for Landmark No. 41 (the Torrance-Childs House), a Craftsman/Tudor Revival style house. The Commission will discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the City Council about whether to approve it.

Applicant Presentation:

The owner noted that they have lived in the house for 20 years and would like to restore the property as a great deal of work needs to be done and the Mills Act will greatly help with that. He noted that restoration is a huge undertaking and that most of it relates to structural stability and some aesthetic programs.

Debbie Howell-Ardilla: Presented the proposed scope of work and noted the requested additions by the Commission from their Special Meeting that convened on the subject site on October 25th. These changes included photographs of the existing conditions, although she noted that the interior photographs were not printed in time for today's meeting. The installation of the fire alarm system has been moved to the number one item. She noted that the Commission requested a site plan, but that timing was short and if the Commission would be receptive to receiving a site plan with the presentation of the geotechnical study when the owner comes back to the CHC for their COA.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired about painting the shingles as noted in the work plan.

Ms. Howell -Ardilla: Noted that that a consultant will assess the conditions of the shingles and present those findings to the Commission before any restoration work is done. She also noted that the shingles are painted in their existing state.

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired where the sump pump will be located.

Ms. Howell-Ardilla: Noted that the sump pump location will be determined based upon the findings of the forth-coming geotechnical study as the site conditions are challenging given the heavy clay content in the soil and possible soil creep.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that at the field visit during the Special Meeting, he expressed concern with the electrical system and that it was not added to the revised work plan presented today as part of the list of improvements. He was concerned with the age and complexity of the current and antiquated electrical system and any potential fire risks it poses. He would like to see an electrical engineering analysis be added to the proposed work plan.

Ms. Howell-Ardilla: She noted that the electrical engineering analysis can be added and that the owners have been in discussion with Edison for upgrades.

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired about the projected timeline for the Contract.

Ms. Howell-Ardilla: Noted that this meeting was to make the recommendation to Council for their December meeting and recordation with the County before the end of the year.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that under normal circumstances, the applicant will present a Letter of Intent before the Commission, and the Commission will appoint a sub-committee to review the proposed work plan and needed improvements. However, at the last meeting in October, Commissioner Lesak suggested a Special Meeting of all available Commissioners to convene at the subject property to expedite the process.

Ms. Howell-Ardilla: Noted that the owners actually filed a Letter of Intent last year in 2016.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the new CHC Ordinance has a more rigid timeline for submittals, but given the original date the owners submitted their Letter of Intent, the Commission can be fluid towards the submittal deadlines.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Expressed that he believes this is one of the more historic properties in the City and the on-site Special Meeting was very enlightening in regards to the special challenges the homeowners have in the restoration of the property. This is the type of project and program that the Mills Act was very much intended to incentivize, and this is the perfect case for the CHC to make a recommendation for.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to recommend to City Council the Mills Act for the property with the following conditions:

1. The applicant add an electrical engineering analysis.
2. The applicant add interior photographic documentation.
3. A site plan be provided with the geotechnical report.

Commissioner Holz: Seconded

APPROVED FOR RECOMMENDATION WITH THE ABOVE CONDITIONS

(Ayes: 4; No: 0), Friedman Absent.

COMMUNICATIONS

12. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL LIASON:

Councilman Bob Joe noted that at the recent joint Planning Commission and City Council Meeting held earlier this month, the Council directed Staff to proceed with the EIR phase of the General Plan update using the growth projections and locations contained in the report which allotted for 500 units of housing, 135,000 square feet of retail, and 300,000 square feet of commercial office space.

Commissioner Gallatin: Inquired if these projections were at maximum build-out.

Councilman Joe: Noted that this is not the maximum build-out, but the recommended growth limits due to demand and market studies.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that an EIR always requires alternatives, and one alternative is always a no build option, while the other option will be the maximum growth projection and another alternative may be 80% of maximum growth. If the City wants to go back and add more density beyond the projected maximum, they have to go back and amend the EIR.

Councilman Joe: Noted that the new Downtown Specific Plan now extends along Mission Street to Fair Oaks and includes Fair Oaks down to the Pavillions shopping center site. He also noted that the City Council adopted a resolution for new sewer and water rates. The City is also negotiating a new lease with the stables, and approved an RFP for two new pocket parks on Berkshire and Grevilea.

13. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he just had a Mills Act approved in Pasadena and the process is so much more simpler in that city and he suggested that South Pasadena provide better informative methods to promote and educate the public on the Mills Act.

14. COMMENTS FROM STAFF:

No additional comments from Staff

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

15. Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he had substantial edits and requested a continuance along with a digital copy of the minutes to make edits to the October 12 Special Meeting draft minutes.

Commissioner Gallatin: Provided Staff with hand-written edits to the October 12 and October 19 draft minutes.



Commissioner Gallatin: Made a motion to continue the minutes to the next meeting.

Commissioner Lesak: Seconded the motion.

CONTINUED (Ayes: 4; No: 0), Friedman Absent.

ADJOURNMENT

16. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 21, 2017.

APPROVED,	
	
Mark Gallatin	Date
Vice-Chair, Cultural Heritage Commission	