

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION**

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

**CONVENED THIS 15<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2018**

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

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting convened at: 6:45 pm

Commissioners Present: Mark Gallatin (Chair), John Lesak (Vice-Chair), Steve Friedman, Rebecca Thompson, Victor Holz

Commissioners Absent: None

Council Liaison: Michael A. Cacciotti, Councilmember (absent)

Staff Liaison Present: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner; Knarik Vizcarra, Interim Senior 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. No Items

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

3. **2017 Berkshire Avenue**  
***Applicant: Celine Juan, Designer***  
***Project No: 2084-COA***  
***Year Built: 1914***  
***Architectural Style: Craftsman***  
***Historic Status Code: 5D1***

**Project Description:**

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a proposal to build a 300 sq. ft. single story addition to an existing 1,466 sq. ft. Prairie Influence style house on a 7,238 sq. ft. lot. The addition will consist of a new family room that connects to the existing kitchen. A new 42 sq. ft. laundry room, and an additional 24 sq. ft. to the master bedroom. The exterior materials, windows, and roof materials will all match the existing. The addition will extend to the rear of the property.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Property Owner: presented the project and noted that the applicant/designer could not make it for tonight's meeting. She noted the previous concerns of the Commission with regards to the rear bay window. She noted that the existing house has a flat roof, and the new addition will continue with the

flat roof design as an extension of the roof plane. The applicant presented a handout of her presentation to the Commission.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comments.

**Commission Questions:**

Commissioner Thompson: asked if the clearstory windows on the 3D view provided are original and if the side yard setbacks indicated are correct.

Commissioner Gallatin: asked if all the windows and door will be wood, and if so, that information will need to be notated on the drawings. He also inquired if the roof height has been corrected as was requested at the Items' first hearing in January.

Commissioner Gallatin: addressed the Commission and noted that the owner and applicant came to him at a Chair Review about two weeks and presented the project to him including the design options developed to address the concerns of the Commission at the January 2018 meeting.

**Applicant Response:**

Property Owner: In response to Commissioner Thompson's questions, the owner noted that the ceiling height is about 10-11 feet high, and the clearstory windows are about 1 foot below the ceiling height. The side yard setbacks are existing and they are correct. In addressing Commissioner Gallatin's questions, the owner stated that the proposed windows will be wood, and the roof height has been corrected.

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioner Lesak: noted that at the last meeting he felt strongly about the height of the roof line for the new addition and feels that the addition should have a lower roof line than the existing, and he continues to feel that height offset is necessary. He also stressed that there should be an offset at the south side elevation for differentiation purposes.

Commissioner Thompson: inquired with Commissioner Lesak what the lower roof plane should have as a finish.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that a continuance of the existing roofing material will be fine, but the top of the roof addition should be a minimum of 1'-8" below the bottom of the existing fascia. He also added that a differentiation of roof height and ceiling height in a building adds visual interest and helps the interior spaces be used differently.

Commissioner Holz: agreed with Commissioner Lesak and noted that a lower roof plane for the addition would look better.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that the south wall is a little expansive, but he could live with it as proposed, and would prefer to see the roofing planes differentiated.

Commissioner Thompson: noted the unusual history of the house and that the house is actually half of a house, with the original second floor being removed and relocated for a new home elsewhere. She also noted that the windows on sheet A-200 look as if they are two mullied windows that will operate as a casement. She added that it looks like a transom and a casement have been mullied together to get a casement window.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that the window issue Commissioner Thompson brought up might simply be a drafting error upon reviewing the specification sheets for the windows.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that the existing windows on the south side do not provide any notation on the operation type, even though they look like the proposed mulled windows on the north.

Property Owner: clarified the confusion and noted that the windows are fixed and do not move.

Commissioner Lesak: expressed concern with the existing bay window because not enough is known about its originality and he would prefer to keep it as shown in floor plan option-2 which preserves the rear bay window. If it is proven that the bay is not character-defining, than he would prefer floor plan option-1 which eliminates the rear bay window.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that floor plan option-1 does not present an idea situation to resolve the functionality of the existing bay window, and prefers floor plan option-2 that overall preserves the functionality of the bay window.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that a dropped roof as requested on the addition can still provide the interior space with a 9 foot ceiling.

Commissioner Thompson: agreed with Commissioner Lesak on the roof and ceiling height matter.

Commissioner Lesak: also wanted to have the south wall plane offset a minimum of 8 inches to the exterior as a method of additional differentiation between existing and new.

**Decision:**

Commissioner Gallatin: Made a Motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITIONS listed below, subject to a Chair Review. The project meets the mandatory Findings and specific Findings of: 2, 3, & 5.

Commissioner Friedman: Seconded the Motion.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS:**

- The roof line of the addition shall be a dropped a minimum of 1'-8"
- The elimination of the fixed transom windows on both the south and west elevations
- The floor plan approved shall be floor plan option-2 as presented tonight
- The south wall of the new addition shall be outset a minimum of 8 inches from the existing wall plane
- The labeling of the setbacks shall be corrected
- The window and door schedules shall include the materials
- The window and door types illustrative on Sheet A-200 shall show the French door type

(Ayes: 5; No: 0)

*Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.*

**NEW ITEMS**

**4. 921 Monterey Road Milan Avenue**

***Applicant: Ken Rideout, Architect***

***Project No: 2004-COA***

***Year Built: 1912***

***Architectural Style: Craftsman***

***Historic Status Code: 2S***

**Project Description:**

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 480 sq. ft. garage addition to an existing 253 sq. ft. detached garage. The existing garage will be relocated. The proposed exterior materials of the garage will match the existing. The exterior materials will consist of cedar wood shingles, asphalt roof shingles, wood French doors, and a wood roll-up garage door.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Mr. Rideout: made a brief presentation of the proposed project.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comments.

**Commission Questions:**

No Commissioner questions.

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that the project developed through a subcommittee.

Commissioner Lesak: thanked the applicant for working with the CHC and the subcommittee to develop the project further.

**Decision:**

Commissioner Lesak: Made a Motion to APPROVE the project as submitted. The project meets the mandatory Findings and specific Findings of: 2, 6, and 8.

Commissioner Thompson: Seconded the Motion.

**APPROVED.**

(Ayes: 5; No: 0)

*Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.*

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**5. 1014 Milan Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)**

***Applicant:*** Danna Olsen, Designer

***Project No:*** 2096-COA

***Year Built:*** 1896

***Architectural Style:***

***Historic Status Code:*** 5D1

**Project Description:**

A request for a conceptual review in regards for a new 373 sq. ft. second story addition to an existing 1,472 sq. ft. single story Craftsman house on a 8,500 sq. ft. lot.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Ms. Olsen: presented the project and presented the Commission with additional imagery of the existing structure.

**Commission Questions and Discussion:**

Commissioner Lesak: inquired what the setback was on the alley side. He also noted that he had a difficult time figuring out what the property lines were in the drawings.

Ms. Olsen: responded that the setbacks are five feet.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that there are elegant options available to make the addition proposal much better than what it currently is. There is an ideal way to differentiate between the new and the old through shifts and massing. Extruding straight up as currently proposed, is not a shift and is not ideal. He also added that on sheet A-5, the cantilever of the proposed second story is awkward and the wall of the roof should touch the ground. The cantilever as drawn is inconsistent with the style of the house. The roof form and the roof planes needs to be looked at differently as well that could provide a more interesting dynamic of spatial and massing layout. He further described the proposal as kind of like a Snoopy dog house hanging off the cliff and he emphasized there is a much better solution available.

Ms. Olsen: noted that the structural engineer strongly recommended against adding the addition over the existing foundation. She also noted that the owner wanted high ceiling heights.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that Commissioner Lesak's recommendation was to extend the addition at the rear, and have the addition volume actually touch the ground plane, and not to extend over the existing foundation. She added that the windows should also relate to each other rather than just being punctures in the walls.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that there were numerous inconsistencies with the project data numbers.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that the interior floor plan is awkward and it should be looked at as part of the proposed addition.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that for a conceptual review, he would prefer not to see all the data information, rather the overall picture of design to provide feedback.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that she printed the section of the design guidelines for the applicant to go through.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that one of the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior Standards calls for differentiation between new and old. He added that the Commission is not only looking for consistency and compatibility, but differentiation as well.

Commissioner Lesak: noted that when you start a project, you need to make a conscientious decision to be different, or an all-out effort at replicating of the existing design. If you choose to be different, you need to determine how you want to be different.

Ms. Olsen: requested if it would be possible to develop a subcommittee to help in the development of the design of the project.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that any project addition is an opportunity to correct or remedy inappropriate additions to the building that were done previously.

Ms. Olsen: noted that the project is not a part of a district, but is just an old home and if that has any bearing on the review of the project.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that the house has a 5D1 rating and that means it is contributor to a district, in this case the Mission South West Craftsman District.

Ms. Olsen: noted that the cantilever was a solution to allow room for a planned pool in the future.

Commissioner Thompson: added that no matter if it is a first floor or second floor, there is a required distance needed between pools and building so people do not try to jump into the pool from the building window.

Commissioner Lesak: suggested the applicant look at the site holistically whether a pool is built or not. He noted that the big problems lie with a cluttered interior layout and massing problems on the outside, and that the materials will work themselves out with the design of the addition.

---

**6. 904 Monterey Road**

**Applicant:** Anne and Eric Schermerhorn, Owners

**Project No:**

**Year Built:**

**Architectural Style:** Queen Anne Cottage

**Historic Status Code:** 5S3

**Project Description:**

A request for a conceptual review in regards to the proposed demolition of the existing single vehicle garage with attached carport on a 6,953 sq. ft. lot. The existing house is a 1,367 sq. ft. Queen Anne Cottage built in 1885.

**\*\*Project not presented or discussed as the applicants were not in attendance.**

---

**7. Commission Reorganization**

**\*\*Note:** The Commission voted to reorder this Item to Item No. 12.

**Description:**

The Commission will elect a new Chair and Vice-Chair for 2018.

**Action:**

Commissioner Lesak: opened the roll call to allow for the Commission to vote on the Chair position.

Commissioner Friedman: nominated Commissioner Gallatin to be the Chair.

Commissioner Lesak: seconded the nomination. All approved.

Commissioner Gallatin: opened up the election for the Vice-Chair position.

Commissioner Thompson: nominated Commissioner Lesak to be the Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Gallatin: seconded the nomination. All approved.

**Results:**

Chair: Mark Gallatin (Ayes: 5, No: 0)

Vice-Chair: John Lesak (Ayes: 5, No, 0)

---

**8. Policy Direction Regarding Demolition of Non-Inventory Accessory Structures**

**Description:**

At the request of the Planning Department, the Commission will discuss policy matters related to the recently adopted CHC Ordinance specifically regarding the administering of requests for demolition of

accessory/appurtenant structures on properties that are not on the Inventory. If necessary, the Commission will create a subcommittee to further review the matter.

**Presentation:**

Mr. Sissi: Noted that Staff has received several development requests to demolish detached garage structures that are not on the Inventory, and not in a District, yet they are over 45 years old and subject to the Historian's analysis per the new Ordinance. Some of the proposals for the Historic Resource Evaluations are coming in quite expensive, for example Staff received one proposal that bid a fee of \$10,000. Staff would like to implement policy, per CHC approval, to allow for a reduced Assessment level for accessory structures such as detached garages.

**Commission Discussion/Comments & Applicant Response:**

Commissioner Gallatin: Inquired with Staff if by reduced Assessment, they mean a memorandum-type assessment.

Mr. Sissi: Noted that a memorandum-type Assessment is being suggested.

Commissioner Holz: Inquired if the lower-level tier policy will still allow the discretionary body to require a full HRE report.

Mr. Sissi: Noted that if the Commission were to determine the memorandum-type assessment is not sufficient enough, the Commission has at its discretion to request a full HRE report.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted a few issues with this proposed policy. Even though the structure is not in a District, and is not on the Inventory, when an Historian is asked to review the structure, they are asked to review them in that fashion to determine if the property itself is historic, if the property is in an eligible District, and if the accessory structure relates to any of that. This is a complicated analysis. A quick analysis would be to determine if the primary structure is Historic, and if the accessory structure is contributory to that. He added that if there is evidence that the accessory structure is newer than the primary structure and is also inconsistent with the primary structure, it is easy to determine its eligibility as an Historic Resource.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that a good example of that was the garage located at 904 Monterey Road which was built in the 1950s, while the primary structure is a Queen Anne and a Contributor to a potential District.

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired if it was easy to determine the construction date of these accessory structures through permit records.

Mr. Sissi: Noted that it is not always easy as many earlier permits do not indicate the construction of the garage or accessory structures, and in some instances the City does not have building permit records of the primary or secondary structures.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that there are other resources available to determine the era of construction for accessory structures in relation to the primary structure, such as through the Sanborn Maps and Assessor records.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the property owner can and should perform the first steps of collecting building permit records, Assessor records, and Sanborn Map information, to assess the relationship of the accessory structure to the primary structure. He also mentioned other resources such as aerial imagery, like Historic Aerials online.

Commissioner Holz: Inquired why property owners need to go through the evaluation process if the property is not on the Inventory.

Commissioner Gallatin: Replied that an evaluation is required due to its age as outlined in the Ordinance.

Commissioner Gallatin: Proceeded to open up the recruitment process for the election of Subcommittee members to address these demolition and Assessment policy concerns.

Commissioner Holz: Volunteered to be on the Subcommittee.

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that he would like to provide remote assistance on establishing a flowchart/step-by-step guidelines for property owners on what they can do to facilitate the review process for any proposed demolition subject to the provisions of the Ordinance.

Results:

Commissioner Holz and Commissioner Lesak to serve on the Subcommittee.

## COMMUNICATIONS

### 9. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL LIASON:

No comments.

---

### 10. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION:

Commissioner Lesak: inquired with Staff on the status of the Inventory Update.

Mr. Sissi: noted that staff has not received any update from the consultant, HRG, but they are anticipating a report this month. Whether or not it will be on the March Agenda remains to be seen as the City still needs to review the report findings, so it may go forward in March or April for the CHC Agenda.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that he and Commissioner Lesak have been asked to be on a subcommittee to draft a response to the FOAE (Finding of Adverse Effect) of the 710 freeway extension. The original EIR noted that there would be no impact to Historic Resources, which was not an accurate analysis. The project has to go through both CEQA and NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act). He noted the four alternatives to a surface route extension of the 710 freeway: 1 – the freeway tunnel option; 2 – a light rail tunnel option; 3 – a surface-level bus rapid transit system; 4 – the TSM/TDM which is surface street and traffic light coordination improvements. He noted that the tunnel path for the light rail would be routed under Fair Oaks, and have some vibration or noise impacts with the Rialto Theatre. The Area of Potential Impact (API) includes South Pasadena, portions of San Marino, Pasadena south of the 210 freeway, El Sereno, East LA, and Alhambra. He added that the City has to draft a response to the document and that he and Commission Lesak have been asked to help draft the response.

---

### 11. COMMENTS FROM SOUTH PASADENA PRESERVATION FOUNDATION:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the SPPF website has been relaunched, and to coincide with the new year the Foundation is looking at ideas for fundraising. A fundraiser that is being planned is to restart the South Pasadena Home Tour event, to occur within the next few months.

---



**12. COMMENTS FROM STAFF:**

Mr. Sissi: noted that a request for an Historic District nomination may come before the CHC soon, the request is for the Rollin Street Craftsman Cluster.

Ms. Vizcarra: handed the Commission a copy of the HSR for the Rialto that will be on the CHC Agenda for next month's meeting.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that there has been a retail shop owner going around to raise objections to the Rialto and Mosaic Church in regards to the parking.

Ms. Vizcarra: responded stating that Mosaic has entered into agreements with other property owners for shared parking agreements, and that there is also public parking available for everyone.

Commissioner Gallatin: noted that he was in attendance during the December 2017 Planning Commission meeting and that the parking study noted that Mosaic has secured an overage of their parking requirement.

Commissioner Thompson: noted that Mosaic leaves their diesel trucks in operation all weekend, which causes noise and pollution. They also leave the rear doors open during rehearsals and services and it generates a lot of noise.

Ms. Vizcarra: noted that she will bring up Commissioner Thompson's concerns with the Pastor of Mosaic so that he can address them.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

13. No minutes to review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

14. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 15, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Gallatin  
Chair, Cultural Heritage Commission

9-13-18

Date