


**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
 CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
 CONVENED THIS 5TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2017
 AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 124 MISSION STREET**

ROLL CALL		<p>The meeting convened at: 7:00 PM</p> <p>Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez (Chair), Jim Fenske (Vice - Chair), Susan Masterman, Mark Smeaton</p> <p>Board Members Absent: None</p> <p>Staff Liaison: Edwar Sissi, Planning Intern</p>
NON-AGENDA ITEMS	1.	Masterman: Mentioned the January 11 public forum for the proposed mixed-use project on Mission and Fairview and would like the public to be informed.
CONTINUED ITEMS	2.	None
<p>NEW ITEMS</p> <p><i>Note: 817 Orange Grove Place was placed as a new item due to modification in design, expiration of continuation on previous Agenda, and re-mailing of public notifications.</i></p>	3.	<p>817 Orange Grove Place Project Number: 1750-DRX Applicant: Peter DeMaria, Architect</p> <p>Project Information: A request for Design Review Board approval to demolish the existing duplex and a proposal to build a new triplex on a 10,091 square foot lot. Unit A will consist of a single story 1,031 square foot unit. Unit B will consist of a 437 square foot single story unit, located below unit C. Unit C will consist of a 2,249 square foot unit and it s located on the second floor. Unit A will consist of: a living room, a dining room, a master bedroom, a bedroom and two bathrooms. Unit B will consist of: one bedroom, one bathroom, and kitchen/living area. Unit C will consist of: three bedrooms, three bathrooms, a laundry room, a family/living room, a dining room and a kitchen. An 835 square foot carport is proposed and will be attaching Unit A to Unit B and C. An 835 square foot deck is proposed above the carport. 609 square feet will be allocated to the common open space area and 226 square feet will be allocated to the private area for unit C. The exterior materials for structures will consist of: smooth stucco siding, wood siding, metal standing seam roofing, frameless glass railing, aluminum windows and sliding doors.</p> <p>Presentation: Peter DeMaria: Mentioned he went back to the Design Guidelines to ensure compliance. DeMaria presented the Board with an itemized list of design points in which 1 – the project was the result of outreach between DeMaria and the neighborhood in which he met with members of the neighborhood at least two times and that they seemed relatively pleased with the design proposal, only to be surprised that they did not see the project favorably during the public hearings. 2 – the project design had evolved with input from the neighbors and the opinions of the Board to create a more "cottage-like" front unit, and breaking up the elongated roof lines with cross gables. The design has evolved to push most of the square footage of the development towards the rear of the property, thus fulfilling the desires of the Design Guidelines. The square footage has been</p>

reduced to be about 72% of the square footage allowed. 4 – The front unit has been maintained as a single story unit in keeping with the streetscape of existing single story homes. 5 – The selection of materials are to include ipe wood siding, smooth stucco finish, and standing seam metal roofing. These materials are a limited palette, but not a modernist palette. 6 – The double gable roofing breaks down the massing and the cross gable proposal breaks down the monotony. DeMaria mentioned how he met certain Design Guideline criteria as described on page two of the handout that was presented to the Board Members including: Building Massing and Plan Development; Roofs, Materials, Form, and Shape. The style has not been reinvented, but is not striving to recreate a false sense of history. The style has been abstracted and in comparison to the house south of the property, the proposed design looks very conservative. DeMaria then showed a sketch to soften the look of the finished building, including what the front façade would look like with mature vegetation. DeMaria reiterated that the eastern modern house is at least six feet taller than the proposed design. The rear two story building will hardly be seen from the front behind the front single floor unit. DeMaria also showed images of each building along Orange Grove Place and pointed out the varied roofing design of the varied architecture throughout the street. He did note however, that of the varied styles, the gable roof stands out as a prominent style explaining the reason behind his proposed roofing design.

Board Questions:

Masterman asked Sissi: What the landscape requirements are for new development. Sissi responded that a landscaping plan is required for new development and that the landscaping must comply with the City's water efficiency ordinance. Masterman then asked what the requirements are for trees and if trees are required for new development. Sissi responded that Planning does not require tree plantings for new development, but there are provisions in the Code for the protection of existing trees.

Masterman then asked DeMaria what the relationship for the front setback for the existing building and the proposed building. DeMaria responded that the new proposal will be the average between both parcels to the east and west. The existing setback is 20 feet. Masterman also asked the applicant what the top plate height is; the front door is an 8 foot double door, and the top plate height is 10 feet.

Masterman: Inquired what the required setback was from the rear alleyway, and if the applicant feels they have pushed the building back as far as possible. DeMaria responded the location of the building at the rear is located due to an open space requirement located at the edge of the alleyway.

Masterman: Asked if the square footage changed from the previous presentation. DeMaria responded no.

Masterman to Sissi: does a covered deck meet the definition of a "courtyard" if it is on a second story. Sissi responded that the definition would need to be verified.

Lopez: Inquired if the intention of differentiating the cross gables at the front unit from the cross gables of the rear unit is intentional. DeMaria responded yes for scale reasons. Asked why the east elevation does not have ipe wood siding on the front unit. DeMaria stated that ipe wood is to

be on both east and west elevations.

Smeaton: Asked if there were any tree specimens that were proposed for the project. DeMaria mentioned that trees would be a great addition and that not putting them would be detrimental to the project. Smeaton was concerned that trees were not included in the plans.

Lopez: Wanted to confirm that a landscape plan was not submitted with the application; no landscape plan was included with the project.

Public Comments:

Elizabeth Hollingsworth (815 Orange Grove Place): Urged the Board to deny the project before them. Expressed her frustrations with the owner for not understanding the needs of the neighborhood and the Design Guidelines for compatibility in spite of the numerous changes to the design and presentations before the Board. The project has been on the DRB Agenda 15 times, 3 for Conceptual Review, and 12 for Action. Reiterated the concerns of the Board and neighbors from previous meetings and how tonight's proposal presents insignificant changes and continues to not meet the concerns of the neighbors. The project is still too massive. Urges denial of the project.

Michael Hollingsworth (815 Orange Grove Place): Urges the Board to deny the project as it has changed little since the last hearing.

Jane Schurmeister (814 & 816 Orange Grove Place): Passed around a signed petition by the neighborhood urging the Board to deny the project. There are a total of 16 signatures, and many of them are tired of raising their concerns with the project. The project is being proposed by a developer, not a neighborhood resident and remains out of scale with the neighborhood.

Resident (804 Orange Grove Place): This is a quality of life issue, and it is like putting a size 11 foot in a size five shoe. The scale of the project will cause more people and more cars on a dead in street and will overwhelm the street. This overdevelopment is what she escaped from in North Hollywood and does not want to see that happen here.

Terra Kawakami (825 Orange Grove Place): Little has been done to reduce the visual impact. Though the project has been densified towards the rear, it still remains too massive. The rear units are going to be visible from any standpoint on the small street. The cupolas on the front unit give it the look of a church or a caboose. The carport parking gives the project the feeling of an apartment. She also alleged the property owner pulled out trees and does not practice good landlord services.

Eric Chu (809 Orange Grove Place): Recently purchased the property and is new to the area, but is overwhelmed by the scale and scope of the project. He remains concerned about the parking and has yet to find street parking in front of his own home.

Annette Marshain (918 Magnolia): A realtor that represented Mr. Chu in his recent purchase. Mentioned what when she had open houses, people would mention that the street was really nice, but were inquiring why there was an apartment on the street, when in actuality they were referring to the modern house at 821 Orange Grove Place. She mentioned that the

street does not need another large complex on the street.

Gary and Mellissa Tsai (821 Orange Grove Place), Presented in an email to Planner Jose Villegas and read aloud by Board Member Masterman: Would like to note the differences between the 821 and the proposed project at 817: 1- We live on the property, where as the owner of 817 does not live there. 2 - 817 will be a triplex rental property, and we at 821 are a single family residence of a family of five and plan to stay there a very long time. 3 - We are not making money off our home, unlike the developer at 817 whom is trying to maximize their bottom line. 4 - While we understand the right of the developer, we remain concerned with the density, the turnover of tenants, and the traffic flow. 5 - In terms of materiality, just to say they are using the same materials, does not mean it is compatible with the neighborhood or the street.

Applicant Response:

DeMaria mentioned that they did not use the house as a precedent and believes that the proposed project looks nothing like it. DeMaria inquired how many people on the signed petition actually looked at the drawings. He also mentioned that the parcel is zoned multi-family and that they did not try to fit a size 11 foot in a size 5 shoe. The square footage does not come close to the maximum allowable on the property. The applicant expressed the reality that it must be expected that properties in a multi-family zone will most likely see multi-family projects within that zone be developed. He also brought up the issues of why someone would be able to purchase a property in a multi-family zone, but not be allowed to develop it as a multi-family zone. He explained that he and his client are trying to work within the parameters of what is allowed. They have worked in good faith, and believes they have been quite sensitive to all the issues. The key to the massing issue is the single floor front building and becoming a part of the streetscape.

Board Discussion/Decision:

Masterman: Explained the parti of the project as a single floor volume at the front, and a two story volume at the rear. The front building seems to be keeping with the scale and general neighborhood fabric. The back building, which is really big, and it is partly related to the parking requirements. The parking requirements are based on the number of units, so it is self-imposed issue. Determines that the building cannot meet the findings on the issue of scale.

Lopez: Expressed his understanding of the complexity and permitted allowances of development for the property, but at the same time, realizes that the majority of the houses on that street are so small. So it is the Board's responsibility to weigh all the issues and look at it from everyone. He appreciates all the design changes the applicant has made, but the issues pertain to the size of the units, and maybe the number of units. He believes the zoning and the numbers are incompatible with the neighborhood. Though the applicant has done his best to articulate the architecture, but still sees the second floor unit as too massive including the required parking. Believes another reduction is required whether it be in bedrooms, or number of units. The target is not necessarily the number of the units, but the size of the units and their required parking. The parti of the volumes with single story at front and two story at the rear is encouraged, but for this property, the issue remains with the scale attributed to the rear units that is even larger because of the

	<p>parking.</p> <p>Masterman: The scale is not right for this neighborhood, and the parking requirements are self-imposed. Asked Sissi what the parking requirements were for multi-family projects. Sissi explained the requirements pertain to the number of units, the number of bedrooms and then the required guest parking spaces. Masterman believes that the 10 foot plate height is too tall along with the 8 foot entry doors on the front unit as being out of scale with the neighborhood. Believes that the vertically of the front unit can still be reduced, but the back massing and scale is just too large.</p> <p>Lopez: Does not have an issue with the architectural styling, but the back building needs to be reduced in size.</p> <p>Smeaton: Agrees with the comments made by Lopez and Masterman. Believes this project would be easily approved in other locations where the houses are larger. The Board is struggling with addressing how this project is compatible with this neighborhood.</p> <p>Fenske: Struggles with this because this will set a precedent for other development to take place with similar scale and massing on what is a predominately small-scaled street. The issues are the numbers of the cars and the character of the small neighborhood. The Board needs to follow through on the General Plan which is to preserve the overall character of the neighborhood. Fenske is personally ok with the project and design, but has to take into consideration the concerns of the neighbors and the dilapidated alleyway at the rear. Believes everything works, especially the front unit, but the density is too much at the rear.</p> <p>Lopez made a motion to CONTINUE the project with Smeaton seconding the motion. The project was CONTINUED 4-0.</p>
<p>Discussion Items</p>	<p>4. 2032 Stratford Ave. Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)</p> <p>Project Information: A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal to add 115 square feet at the rear of the first floor. A second floor addition of 797 square feet is also proposed of which 585 square feet is an existing unpermitted converted attic space. The unpermitted second floor work occurred within the existing attic space of the high-framed roof. All work, including the existing unpermitted work, will be required to comply with current building codes and permitting procedures including a field inspection. The existing 1,398 square foot house is located on a 6,622.5 square foot parcel and is located in the Residential Single Family (RS) zoning district. The house was built in 1924, but is not identified in City records as a historic property.</p> <p><i>NOTE: APPLICANT AND DRB BOARD MEMBER JIM FENSKE IS THE ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR THIS PROJECT. HE RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE REVIEW AND EXITED THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS WHILE HIS WIFE PRESENTED THE PROJECT ON HIS BEHALF.</i></p> <p>Presentation: Laurie Dieckman was late to the review, so the Board members reviewed the project amongst themselves (absent of Jim Fenske). When Laurie</p>

		Dieckman arrived, she mentioned that all the windows are going to be replaced with wood. Board Discussion: Masterman: Believes the design is compatible with the architecture of the house. The material is good. Lopez: Everything looks good, including the scale and windows. Smeaton: Appreciates the replacement of a slider window with a wood window, along with a landscape plan.
Board Comments	5.	None.
Staff Comments	6.	None.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7.	Minutes The Minutes were not reviewed.
ADJOURNMENT	8.	The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on February 2, 2017 at 7 p.m.
	9.	
	10.	
	11.	

Approved,



Corrado Lopez, Chair

2.6.17

Date