

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

Thursday, August 18, 2022 at 6:30 P.M.

AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1424 MISSION STREET
AND
VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE

ROLL CALL-

The meeting convened at: 6:30 pm

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

Staff Present: Angelica Frausto-Lupo (Community Development Director), Ted Gerber (Public Works Director), Matt Chang (Planning Manager), Susana Martinez (Associate Planner), Sandra Robles (Associate Planner)

City Council Liaison: Evelyn G. Zneimer

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approved 5-0.

DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

N/A

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Thompson remarked in some of the meeting minute answers to questions are not specific enough.

Chair Gallatin agreed this item needs to be addressed.

Chair Gallatin motioned to approve the September, 2, 2021 meeting minutes.

Motion passed 5-0

PRESENTATION

None.

CONTINUED ITEM

1. 2022 Camden Parkway, Project No. 2473-COA— A Certificate of Appropriateness for a 38 square-foot first-floor addition, a 1,360-square-foot second-story addition, and a 325-square foot rear trellis to an existing 1,650 square-foot one-story single-family dwelling:

Recommendation:

Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner Robles presented the staff report

Questions for Staff:

None

Applicant's Presentation:

Architect for the project Tim Clark thanked the subcommittee for working with him to revise the plans. Showed the addition was pushed back to comply with standards. Back bedroom was moved over the back patio to give more articulation to the front elevation. Briefly described features of the project.

Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Thompson thanked the applicant for the revision. Notes scale is good and preserves style of original home. Commissioner Thompson asked about the plate heights in the bathroom. Applicant answered it was 10 feet.

Commissioner Cross thanked the applicant for meeting with the subcommittee and said the project looks much better.

Chair Gallatin thanked the applicant for taking the suggestions of the subcommittee. Asked about the modernity of the sconces, which breaks with the older style of the home. Architect Clark says the choice was made to be refreshing and simple. Chair Gallatin also asked if an attic vent on the west elevation could be made to be the same as the original attic vents. Architect Clark replied it could be changed.

Public Comments:

Michelle Trafficante informed the commission that the people on zoom could not see the screens during the presentations.

D. Barbera echoed the previous public comment.

Commissioner Discussion:

Chair Gallatin noted the improvements on the project reflected the value of the subcommittee system.

Decision:

Commissioner Morrish motioned to approve the project with a condition the applicant redesign the attic vents on the first floor. Commissioner Thompson seconded.

Motion carried, 5-0. This project is approved, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

2. **525 Floral Park Terrace, Project No. 2463-COA – A Certificate of Appropriateness to add an 867 square-foot two-story addition and interior remodel of an exist 1,434 square-foot single family dwelling.**

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Cultural Heritage Commission Approve 2463-COA

Presentation:

Planning Manager Chang presented the staff report.

Questions for Staff:

Planning Manager Chang noted an amendment to the conditions of approval.

Applicant's Presentation:

None

Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Morrish asked about the design of the skylight, as it was missing in the rendering. Architect for the project Nott replied that it was not curved. Chair Gallatin reminded the applicant that skylights visible from the street are not allowed. Chair Gallatin then asked the applicant if they would be willing to continue the roof to a pyramid point and replace the skylight.

Commissioner Morrish asked if the window in the living room of the house was original. Architect replied he thought it was original.

Commissioner Morrish asked about the large variety and busyness of the windows. Architect Nott said the applicant was open to revision. Commissioner Morrish asked about a false front. Architect Nott replied it was a compromise between him and the planner in order to stay within the floor area ratio.

Commissioners discussed among themselves various remedies to the 35% floor area ratio. Commissioner Thompson asked about arches in the front elevation. Architect Nott replied it was a design choice. Commissioner Thompson also asked about the sudden roof incline in the rear elevation. Architect Nott replied it was the planner's recommendation.

Chair Gallatin asked if the east and north elevation stairwell area windows were able to be combined to avoid having an asymmetrical feel. Architect Nott replied he himself didn't enjoy the slim windows, and would consider combining it.

Chair Gallatin pointed out a correction to sheet A 4.3. The proposed south elevation was labeled as the existing south elevation.

Public Comments:

None

Commissioner Discussion:

Vice-Chair Lopez liked the scale and location of the proposed addition. Mentioned if some of the small details could be ironed out the project would be very good. He liked the idea of the skylight and pyramid shaped roof. Vice-Chair Lopez told the applicant he would much rather prefer there be real windows for an actual purpose than fake smaller windows.

Commissioners discussed among themselves if the project needed to be sent to chair review.

Decision:

Commissioner Morrish motioned to approve the project with a condition that there be a CHC chair review to approve the changes discussed at this meeting. Seconded by Vice-Chair Lopez.

Motion carried, 5-0

- 3. 420 Prospect Circle, Project No. 2472-COA – A Certificate of Appropriateness to add a 45 square-foot addition to the first floor and an 883-square-foot addition to the second floor of an existing 2,243 square-foot single-family dwelling.**

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Cultural Heritage Commission approve of the project, subject to an additional review by the Cultural Heritage Commission Chair and Conditions of Approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner Robles presented the staff report.

Questions for Staff:

Commissioner Morrish asked which time period the project should be restored to. Associate Planner Robles clarified it would be restored to 1951.

Chair Gallatin asked if the 6ft height increase in the report was the same as the 4.5 foot height increase referenced by page 4 of the presentation. Commissioner Thompson replied it was not relevant as the roof height changes across the roof.

Chair Gallatin was concerned with the spacing of the shutters and window casing. Associate Planner Robles replied window casings would be a lot less bulky. Commissioner Thompson asked about the basis for the shutter recommendation. Associate Planner Robles replied for a Cape Cod style home, shutters are traditional. Commissioner Thompson inquired about the extent of the Cape Cod style, including a lack of symmetry. Associate Planner Robles replied the designation was based on a survey.

Chair Gallatin noted contemporary shutters for show often are not functional.

Vice-Chair Lopez wished for further discussion on the topic of shutters.

Applicant's Presentation:

None

Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Cross asked the applicant what the purpose of all the concrete in the front yard. Architect for the project Melissa Tsai clarified the concrete was already there and is not part of the proposed project.

Public Comments:

None

Commissioner Discussion:

Chair Gallatin noted the house is in a historic district without being designated as such. He appreciates the staff being so specific in their recommendations.

Vice-Chair Lopez does not wish for the house to try and look like the rest of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Thompson expressed disapproval for the east elevation roof. Vice-Chair Lopez replied that such a small part of the roof should cause cancellation of the project. Commissioner Thompson then brought up the windows in front. Vice-Chair Lopez said he prefers the proposed windows to the old windows. The applicant is following what it is there.

Decision:

Vice-Chair Lopez motioned to approve the project as submitted. Commissioner Cross seconded.

Motion carried, 3-2

AYES: Vice-Chair Lopez, Commissioner Cross, and Commissioner Morrish

NOES: Chair Gallatin and Commissioner Thompson

- 4. 1020 El Centro Street, Project No. 2441 COA/DRX/DBR/AHR/CUP/TTM/SIGN/TRP – A Certificate of Appropriateness, Design Review, Density Bonus Review, Affordable Housing Review, Conditional Use Permit, Tentative Tract Map, Sign Program, and Tree Removal for a proposed mixed-use development consisting of 108 residential condominiums, of which 19 will be affordable units; approximately 22,032 feet of food service and retail uses; two incentive/concessions for an increase in the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and an increase in the permitted number of stories from two stories to four stories; removal of 25 trees.**

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Cultural Heritage Commission recommend approval of the project to the Planning Commission, subject to the conditions of approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner Martinez presented the staff report.

Questions for Staff:

Commissioner Cross asked if there was any community outreach to the local residents and businesses.

Commissioner Morrish asked if the planning commission wanted the CHC to comment on the project. Associate Planner Martinez clarified that the commission should focus on the cultural resources. Specifically, the auditorium and former school district office building.

Chair Gallatin asked if he can ask questions not pertaining to historical resources.

Commissioner Morrish asked about a city ordinance that preventing applicants from having to go through more than one design review.

Planning Manager Chang further clarified that the CHC's main purpose was to review the certificate of appropriateness, but the commission could comment on other aspects of the project. The Planning Commission would be the final reviewing body, assuming no appeal is filed.

Chair Gallatin asked if the project would have to go through a state architectural review, since it was under the Department of Education. Associate Planner Martinez clarified that this project does not pertain to education and this would not be the case.

Chair Gallatin noted that there is a large residential complex on the west side of the project. He asked how many buildings there would be in the project. Associate Planner Martinez answered many buildings are interconnected through hallways.

Chair Gallatin asked if the city could deny a density bonus request. Planning Manager Chang clarified if the project meets state code, the city cannot deny a density bonus request.

Chair Gallatin asked if the city could deny concessions requests, incentive requests and waiver requests. Planning Manager Chang confirmed that the city could not deny those requests if the project followed state code 65915.

Chair Gallatin asked if any one-way couplets were considered for Diamond Avenue southbound only and Fairview northbound only. Planning Manager Chang introduced Public Works Director Ted Gerber. Director Gerber told the commission that question could be best answered by the applicant and their traffic consultants. Casey Le introduced herself as the traffic consultant who work on the traffic study for the project.

Chair Gallatin asked why water demand calculations were being requested post entitlement, instead of before the project was entitled. Director Gerber replied the city does water calculations with its existing hydraulic models and consider all the other capital improvements to the water system in that area. While the applicant pays for the analysis, it is important that the city does its own analysis as well.

Chair Gallatin asked why the sewer study was asking for after the entitlement. Director Gerber replied that while the city does not have a very complicated sewer system, it is important that the City looks at how the layout will look in the near future, not just the present.

Chair Gallatin asked why a traffic study would be done after construction, and how long after construction should the study be done. Director Gerber replied that the applicant had to make some assumptions already, and the applicant should complete the study about a year after construction to confirm the assumptions were correct.

Applicant's Presentation:

Mark Gangi introduced himself and the Fairview Court and School Hall project.

Mr. Gangi then introduced Dawn Dyer with Studio-MLA to go over the landscaping.

Joe Catalano introduced himself as a qualified historic architect and the author of the historic resource evaluation to go over the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Cross asked if Mr. Catalano had every talked to the architect of this building. Mr. Catalano replied he did, but could not remember the architect's name. Some discussion on the school building style of the era.

Chair Gallatin asked where the section on adaptive re-use was. Mr. Catalano replied it was in the secretary of the interior standards.

Chair Gallatin asked if the applicants would be pursuing state historic tax credit. Mr. Gangi said that legislation had not taken effect yet.

Chair Gallatin asked if there were guidelines for infill districts in the national guidelines. Mr. Catalano did not know.

Chair Gallatin asked if there had been review of the records of the state architect. Mr. Catalano replied there was difficulty in obtaining any information from the state.

Chair Gallatin asked if health-related uses meant fitness related or medically related. Mr. Catalano clarified it was fitness related.

Vice-Chair Lopez asked if he could get more details on the brick screens regarding earthquake resistance. Mr. Gangi replied they would be clipped into balconies at each level. They would be traditionally stacked.

Chair Gallatin asked about the actual number of parking spaces. Mr. Gangi said it depends on how you calculate the site due to different state and local codes. Mr. Gangi says the underground parking was designed to be bright and safe. The project is definitely over the minimum required parking, as requested by the community.

Chair Gallatin asked for clarification in the permitted floor area ratio. Associate Planner Martinez replied it was 0.8 FAR but, incentives would allow them to go higher.

Chair Gallatin asked if the traffic study thought about moving the driveway to Diamond Avenue. Mr. Gangi replied that both Diamond and Fairview Avenue were considered, but Fairview was more attractive as it had a longer and less dark ramp. Additionally, the community felt Diamond was already too crowded, so a traffic consultant was brought in to assess the traffic change.

Chair Gallatin made a correction the project regarding building dates.

Chair Gallatin brought up a public comment, concerning a CEQA Class 32 categorical exemption. Saying the site had not demonstrated it could be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. Chair

Gallatin asked if the lack of focus on schooling would be based on the demographics of the intended tenants. Associate Planner Martinez replied that SPUSD is in favor of the project since it would add more students to the district. Chair Gallatin further explained the public comment, which brought up the cumulative impact of similar projects, asking why the applicant did not believe there would be a cumulative impact. Planning Manager said the Mission Street Specific Plan already envisioned the area to be mixed use. Jessie Fan, City's CEQA consultant for the project, replied that all plans would have to demonstrate conformity with the state or city code. Additionally, in the categorical exemption, the applicant concluded there would be a negligible environmental impact, leading to no cumulative impact.

Chair Gallatin asked why the applicant did not do a supplement to the project that was proposed in 2016. Planning Manager Chang replied the project in 2016 was prepared by the School District and the city was not part of the process. Chair Gallatin asked if there was anything that blocked the city from using another agency's environmental report. Planning Manager Chang replied that the city was unable to discern why the EIR was required. Jessie Fan replied the applicant was unable to find the EIR, and were unable to add to that documents.

Chair Gallatin brought up concerns about the number of large projects going on at the same time. He recommended that a group be formed to deal with the increased amount of traffic due to the numerous large projects under construction.

Chair Gallatin asked why the presentation did not bring up residential units on the second floor of two buildings on the Mission Street side between Meridian and Diamond in the air quality report. Ms. Fan replied that the residential units were 40 feet away from the site. Chair Gallatin disagreed and asked if Staff could check the distance.

Chair Gallatin asked if the Downtown Revitalization project was still active. Ms. Le replied that it was considered in the traffic report as part of a natural growth in traffic.

Chair Gallatin asked for a brief explanation of the transportation table. Ms. Le quickly went over the table.

Chair Gallatin asked about the level of service metric being used, as it was outdated. Planning Manager Chang replied that there are many components to the traffic study, and other jurisdictions are using level of service (LOS). Ms. Le replied that the city required the LOS metric to be included.

Chair Gallatin brought up public concerns over traffic issues and depth of traffic analysis. Chair Gallatin asked if it was within the MTIC (Mobility and Transportation Infrastructure Commission) scope to review the project's traffic report to gain a local review. Director Gerber replied that the MTIC does not have a detailed charter to review, so it is possible for them to review it, but it is not part of its responsibility.

Commissioner Morrish asked about the tenant signage. Mr. Gangi explained there will be signage identifying it as a building.

Chair Gallatin asked if a 90% storefront allowance for signage would put signs too close together on adjacent buildings. Mr. Gangi confirmed. But didn't think that everyone would max out their signage.

Chair Gallatin asked for a definition of rope lighting. Mr. Gangi replied it was LED lights put into plastic tubes to create a halo effect. Chair Gallatin also asked about Day-Glo iridescent black lights. Mr. Gangi replied that he didn't want to constrict any innovative sign designs that could enhance a store's brand.

Chair Gallatin asked about retractable doors in an area that currently has panel doors. Mr. Catalano replied that the doors would never be placed on character defining details. Additionally, metal classroom doors should be removed for aesthetic and safety reasons.

Chair Gallatin asked about the reasoning behind a variety of door styles. Mr. Catalano replied he didn't know the exact details.

Chair Gallatin asked Staff about lot frontage requirements. Associate Planner Martinez replied that 95% of the linear feet must be openings.

Chair Gallatin commented a potential place for public art.

Chair Gallatin asked why two parcels are created into of just one. Mr. Gangi replied that since it is a for sale product, they can be sold separately. Additionally, construction would be done at different speeds.

Public Comments:

Lisa Henderson introduced herself as a local architect. Ms. Henderson asked what the process of approving the COA would be with respect to the tenants moving in.

Josh Albrektson brought up declining enrollment in SPUSD and is very excited that the new tenants will bring more life to the South Pasadena. He also brought up that the locals who walk everywhere do not care about traffic. Additionally, the Gold Line parking has a high capacity and believes that the parking issues are overblown.

Karen brought up how she knows many families in Pasadena who would love to bring their kids into SPUSD. She feels as someone who has to drive over the freeway overpass due to safety concerns, parking is very difficult already. She also asked why 4 stories are being allowed, when two is the maximum.

Aaron Giesel introduced himself a former South Pasadena resident who was priced out of the area. He hopes with this project he can move back into South Pasadena.

D. Barbara asked if there was any concern of the parking garage harming the trees. He also asked who approves the designs. His biggest concern is the scale of the building will change the community.

Jimmy voiced his support to the project, citing density as a positive.

Chair Gallatin addressed the 4-story concern. Under density bonus, they are allowed to request extra height.

Mr. Gangi clarified that the trees should have ample root room.

Associate Planner Martinez answered some of Ms. Henderson's questions. The applicant was suggesting phasing, to get more tenants situated. Mr. Gangi told the tenants there would be barricade during constructions, and all tenants were previously notified.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Morrish suggested the commission support the COA.

Vice-Chair Lopez commends the applicant and their team for their thoroughness, and community outreach.

Commissioner Cross also commended the applicant for their thoroughness.

Chair Gallatin felt the HRE was very well done and thanks Mr. Catalano. Chair Gallatin recognized he asked many questions not regarding historic resources, but feels the community was interested in non-historic issues.

Decision:

Vice-Chair Lopez motioned to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission to accept the project as submitted, subject to the conditions of approval. Commissioner Morrish seconded.

4-0 motion carried.

ADMINISTRATION

5. Comments from Council Liaison:

Councilmember Zneimer provided comments to the proposed mixed-use project.

6. Comments from Commissioners:

Chair Gallatin lets Staff know that a set of guidelines detailing ADUs on historic properties has won an award from the state.

7. Comments from Subcommittees:

None.

8. Comments from SPPF Liaison:

Chair Gallatin reminded the public that garden gala tickets are now on sale.

9. Comments from Staff:

Director Frausto-Lupo reminded everyone there is a community meeting this Saturday on the Housing Element at 10 am in the Council Chambers. Director Frausto-Lupo also lets the commission know that the planning staff has been working efficiently on the Housing Element project to provide a second draft by September 15th.

ADJOURNMENT

10. The meeting adjourned at 11:36 pm to the next regular Cultural Heritage Commission meeting scheduled for September 15, 2022 at 6:30 pm.

APPROVED,



Mark Gallatin
Chair, Cultural Heritage Commission

2-16-23

Date