

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

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

**Thursday, June 17, 2021 at 6:30 P.M.**

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

### ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 6:30 pm

Commissioners Present: Rebecca Thompson (Chair), Mark Gallatin (Vice-Chair), William Cross and Conrado Lopez

Commissioners Absent: Kristin Morrish

Staff Present: Joanna Hankamer (Planning & Community Development Director), Marina Khrustaleva (Interim Associate Planner) and Lisa Krause (Contract Planner)

City Council Liaison: Evelyn G. Zneimer

City Attorney: Andrew Jared

*Please Note: These Minutes are a summary of the meetings and are not a fully transcribed record.*

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approved 4-0

### DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

None.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

None.

### PRESENTATION

The new City Manager, Arminé Chaparyan, will introduce herself to the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) at the first in-person meeting.

### PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Mills Action Application for a Mills Act Contract for 807 Bank Street:**

**Presentation:**

Interim Associate Planner Marina Khrustaleva presented a PowerPoint presentation of the project.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Cultural Heritage Commission recommend to the City Council to enter into a Mills Act Contract for 807 Bank Street.

**Questions for Staff:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin asked staff about the fiscal impact and the discrepancy between the tax reductions presented in the financial analysis report and shown in the presentation, requesting clarification of which number was correct.

Interim Associate Planner Khrustaleva explained that upon review of the figures provided by the applicant, she derived a different number from that shown in the financial report and, after consultation with the analysts who prepared the financial report, discovered there was an error on the spreadsheet used to make the calculation. The consultant concurred that the number provided in the presentation was the accurate number.

Vice-Chair Gallatin asked staff about the fence which will be replaced and whether the plans for the fence will come for review before the Commission as a whole or by the Chair.

Interim Associate Planner Khrustaleva explained that although listed in the overall scope of the project, it will not be part of the contract.

Vice-Chair Gallatin clarified that the fence will not be subject to any special review other than any other fence in the City.

Interim Associate Planner Khrustaleva responded that that was correct and invited the applicant's representative to respond.

Debi Howell-Ardila, the applicant's representative, stated that it is her understanding that any fence replacement work would just be subject to the typical COA requirements in the Code irrespective of whether it is capitalized or not.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

None.

**Decision:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin motioned, seconded by Commissioner Lopez and approved by roll call vote to recommend approval to the City Council to enter into a Mills Act contract for 807 Bank Street.

**Motion carried, 4-0.**

This project is recommended for approval by the City Council.

2. **2002 Oak Street/2388-COA (Continued) – Certificate of Appropriateness** for a twenty-eight square-foot porch enclosure to an existing single-story, 1,309 square-foot single family residence located at 2002 Oak Street.

**Presentation:**

Contract Planner Lisa Krause presented a PowerPoint presentation of the project.

**Recommendation:**

The staff recommends the Cultural Heritage Commission approve the project subject to the standards listed in the Conditions of Approval.

**Questions for Staff:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin pointed out several grammatical and editing changes to the staff report. He also asked about the absence of existing elevations on the staff report.

Contract Planner Krause responded that the information arrived too late to be included.

Vice-Chair Gallatin confirmed that this meeting's review is for the twenty-eight square-foot addition and not for comments on the proposed ADU.

Contract Planner Krause confirmed that ADUs are not subject to COAs, even if there is a project requiring a COA.

**Public Comments:**

None.

**Questions for Applicant:**

Applicant did not provide a presentation.

Chair Thompson asked if this project is more of an aesthetic to create some type of foyer, and whether or not the door will be set back or have a four-foot covering over it, is recessed or some other way covered as required by the California Green Building Standards Code.

The applicant's representative responded that there is a little bit of a roof overhang where the existing door will be relocated. Both the door and the window can be easily taken out to go back to the original function.

Chair Thompson asked how the applicant would get around the four-foot cover requirement by Cal Green.

The applicant's representative stated that they haven't gone through the Cal Green requests just yet. But, if it comes up, they will definitely follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommendations. They do not want to alter the exterior of the home and the Cal Green requirements and similar Title 24 requirements would take a back seat to keeping the historic nature of the home under the Mills Act.

Chair Thompson closed this part of the Public Hearing.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin expressed concern about reorienting the direction of the front door, from facing the street to turning it sideways to face the driveway.

Chair Thompson inquired about "fang shui".

Vice-Chair Gallatin stated he has seen doors reoriented for that purpose. Not ascribing those beliefs to these homeowners, the owner gave a very logical reason why they're proposing to do this alteration.

Commissioner Lopez stated that he does not feel strongly one way or the other. He would not have a problem with it.

Chair Thompson asked the applicant's representative how would the little stub wall that would support the latch side of the door be differentiated from the rest of the house.

The applicant's representative explained how this would be handled and reminded the Commissioners that this can also be very easily removed should the door need to be put back in its original place. If the desire was to make it significantly different, a different texture of plaster than the original plaster can be used.

The applicant's representative addressed the door facing the front concern stating that the new location will make the door more visible from the street and show it off. Further, the applicant's representative stated that the house next door is very similar in style and design, and also relocated the door to the same location that is being proposed.

Chair Thompson next expressed a concern about the specifications for the wall to be added for support of the door and discussion ensued with the applicant's representative.

Commissioner Cross stated he had nothing to add to the discussion. He has no problem with it.

Chair Thompson called for a motion.

**Decision:**

Commissioner Lopez made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Gallatin and approved by roll call vote to approve the project as presented, with the condition that the plaster on this little stub wall is somehow differentiated from the original.

**Motion carried, 4-0.**

This project is approved subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in the agenda or as amended today. This decision is final unless an appeal is filed within 15 days from today. No construction or activity may commence during this period. Appeal forms may be obtained from the City Clerk's office.

**3. 1020 Milan Avenue/2371-COA/AUP/NID – Certificate of Appropriateness:**

**Staff Presentation:**

Preservation Planner Madsen presented a PowerPoint presentation of the project.

This item is for Project 2371- Certificate of Appropriateness, Administrative Use Permit and Notice of Intent to Demolish for 1020 Milan Avenue. It was continued from the March 2021 Hearing for the applicant to work with the Chair to revise the plans.

Chair Thompson inquired as to whether there was a conflict of interest on this project. Commissioner Lopez indicated that there was and he left the meeting.

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer instructed Commissioner Lopez on how to leave the meeting and how she would invite him back into the meeting via email or text. Chair Thompson asked if someone would be sitting in for him like the previous meeting when his wife, who is also an architect, sat in for him, but will not today. Chair Thompson indicated that she had some questions that would need to be addressed. Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer said that Commissioner Lopez could rejoin the meeting representing himself as the applicant as long as his role is clear.

City Attorney Andrew Jared joined the meeting and explained to the Commissioners the rules and regulations regarding a Board member with a conflict of interest.

Commissioner Lopez rejoined the meeting.

Preservation Planner Madsen restarted the presentation.

**Questions for Staff:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin asked for clarification regarding the proposed walkway.

Preservation Planner Madsen shared her screen once again and showed the Commissioners where the proposed walkway was located.

Vice-Chair Gallatin asked if the demolition of the back-roof gable and replacement are part of the previous addition done at the back of the house.

Preservation Planner Madsen stated that part of it is. However, part of it still would be the walkway and pointed out the distinction.

Vice-Chair Gallatin wanted to know what extent of new construction would trigger a condition to have the applicant reconstruct or repave the alley across their frontage. Vice-Chair Gallatin said he realized it would be a Public Works condition, but didn't know whether there was a threshold of additions over a certain size that triggered this.

City Attorney Jared stated that the law on that is that the project, in both its nexus and proportionality, would apply along the lines of the portion of the alley that they bought, but not the entire alley.

Vice-Chair Gallatin stated that he was only referring to the portion of the alley that abuts opposite their property.

City Attorney Jared stated that it is a policy decision.

Vice-Chair Gallatin next asked about the one-hour fire rating requirement of the proposed new garage and how it is going to be achieved.

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer responded that if it's required by the Building Code, it would go through that process before it was permitted and approved.

Vice-Chair Gallatin clarified his reason for the question - whether they were going to deal with it on the inside or the outside.

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer gave permission to Commissioner Lopez to speak as the designer.

Commissioner Lopez explained how the fire rating requirement would be achieved.

Commissioner Cross had no questions.

Chair Thompson discussed the roofline and commented on the severity of its proposed change and the size of the addition itself.

Chair Thompson asked staff if any public comments were received.

**Public Comments:**

None.

**Applicant's Presentation:**

Michael Haralambos, the Applicant, presented a prerecorded presentation.

Interim Associate Planner Khrustaleva added that ESA provided a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) Report for the garage and concluded that there is no adverse impact with rebuilding the garage. They did not evaluate the project as a whole.

**Questions for Applicant:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin and Commissioner Lopez discussed the garage design and compliance with the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Cross had no questions.

Commissioner Lopez said that he would go ahead and leave the meeting.

City Attorney Jared interjected that for purposes of this meeting, the way it is being conducted with Commissioner Lopez not showing the video and just listening in, it would be appropriate for him to just continue to be available during deliberations to answer any additional questions. Therefore, he recommended Commissioner Lopez continue to stay as part of the Zoom meeting – keeping his camera and microphone off to not influence the deliberations.

Commissioner Lopez consented.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Gallatin and Chair Thompson served as the subcommittee appointed to work with the applicant. They discussed their review and recommendations.

Discussion ensued among Vice-Chair Gallatin, Chair Thompson and Commissioner Lopez regarding the roofline, the floor plan and various elevations and the height of the addition, including use of the attic.

Vice-Chair Gallatin directed the Commissioners back to the Staff Report and Conditions of Approval, P13 a, b and c, specifically, because of its recommendation or mandate that the height of the second story addition be no more than 20 feet high. The Commissioners discussed the issue.

Preservation Planner Krause clarified that the reduction of the height to no more than 20 feet high is based off the City of South Pasadena Design Guidelines as well as the Secretary of the Interior Standards. It was rather more a reference to the scale and subordination rather than a feasibility of a two-story addition at 20 feet.

City Attorney Jared asked to clarify the language as to Condition P13a and stated that in order to achieve the goal that the planner just talked about and keep it consistent with what was intended to be achieved in the future, he recommended that a qualifier be inserted — to the minimal amount to achieve the additional goals. This addition would allow the Commission to achieve those goals in the future without throwing out the issue all together on future approvals.

Vice-Chair Gallatin suggested to add a clause in the qualifier that would say - not to exceed the height proposed.

City Attorney Jared agreed.

The Commissioners and City Attorney Jared discussed the exact language change to the Condition.

**Decision:**

Chair Thompson called for a motion and a second.

Vice-Chair Gallatin made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cross and approved by roll call vote to approve the project subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval with the following amendment to Condition P13: first that subsection a be revised to say – further reduce the height of the second story addition to the minimal amount necessary to achieve the objectives of the Design Guidelines for subordination and not to exceed a height of twenty-three feet, seven inches; secondly, to delete subsection b referencing the connecting walkway; and third, to maintain subsection c as proposed in Condition P13. Further, as part of this motion the project can meet all of the mandatory findings for approval, as well as the project’s specific findings recommended in the Staff Report. The applicant will submit revised plans for review and approval by the original subcommittee.

**Motion carried, 3-0, with Commissioner Lopez recusing himself due to a conflict of interest.**

Chair Thompson continued – this project is approved subject to the Conditions of Approval as described by Vice-Chair Gallatin with revisions to P13. No construction or activity may commence during this period. Appeal forms may be obtained from the City Clerk’s office.

## ADMINISTRATION

### 4. Comments from Council Liaison:

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer said that Ms. Zneimer needed to leave earlier and provided her comments to her so that they can be read into the record. Ms. Zneimer’s wanted to make sure that CHC Chair Thompson and the CHC Vice-Chair Gallatin are involved in the project regarding removable bollards that are proposed for the area on Meridian and Mission and the selection of those bollards. Second, she wanted to make sure that the Chair and the Vice-Chair are involved in the design and details of the rectangular rapid flashing beacons project to make sure that they are compatible with the character of the businesses of the historic district.

Chair Thompson confirmed that she and Vice-Chair are actively involved with the bollards project. And regarding the blinking lights, or the flashing warning signs on the pedestrian crossing, she has been in discussions with Public Works.

### 5. Comments from Commission:

Vice-Chair Gallatin spoke about attending the California Preservation Foundation’s Virtual Conference. He was in a number of sessions that Marina also attended, commending her for taking advantage of that opportunity for training and education. The sessions were great – interesting and educational.

Commissioner Lopez said that he is looking forward to seeing everyone in person at next month’s in-person meeting.

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer said mark your calendars for July 15 and we can’t wait to see your faces in person.

Commissioner Lopez said inquired about the attire requirements for the in-person meeting.

To Chair Thompson’s question to Vice-Chair Gallatin about the Preservation Foundation - Vice-Chair Gallatin made two comments. Odom Stamps and his wife, Kate, had a table set up at the Farmer’s Market in front of the museum and were signing and selling copies of their new book, *Style and Sensibility*. At today’s book signing, the Stamps agreed to donate \$12 from every sale to the Foundation’s museum. We’re really grateful for that.

Second, a reminder to everybody to mark their calendars for Saturday, July 24<sup>th</sup>, which will be the Preservation Foundation’s Annual Meeting, and it will be in-person this year, at the home of Odom and Kate Stamps at 318 Fairview – time to be determined. Two added draws: It’s going to be the world premiere of our virtual tour of the Miltimore House designed by Irving Gill and our new City Manager, Arminé Chaparyan will be a special guest in attendance.



Interim Associate Planner Khrustaleva said that she had the opportunity to join Kate Stamps on each photograph taken for this book. It was her summer project in 2019. She was holding curtains, watering flowers and moving furniture. It was a fun project and the book is gorgeous.

**6. Comments from Sub-Committees:**

None.

**7. Comments from Staff:**

Planning & Community Development Director Hankamer mentioned that a special meeting was schedule for 5:00 pm that day for an item and that they were initially notified through a Staff Report that the item was going to be continued to July 8<sup>th</sup>. However, they have revised that date to July 15<sup>th</sup>. The ADU Ordinance update for historic properties is going to be a special meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> of July at 5:00 pm and it will occur right before the regular meeting is scheduled to occur on the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Thompson said when we meet on the 15<sup>th</sup>, Arminé Chaparyan, our new City Manager, will be participating in that in-person meeting, instead of the virtual meeting tonight.

**ADJOURNMENT**

8. The meeting adjourned at 9:03 pm to the next Special Cultural Heritage Commission meeting scheduled for July 15, 2021 at 5:00 pm.

APPROVED,	
<i>Mark Gallatin</i>	September 19, 2022
_____ Mark Gallatin Chair, Cultural Heritage Commission	_____ Date