

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 7TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2017**

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 7:00 pm

Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez (Chair), Jim Fenske (Vice Chair), Susan Masterman, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune

Board Member Absent: None

Staff Liason: 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 ITEMS

1. No items.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. **Project Address:** 1609 Camden Parkway
Project Number: 2029-DRX
Applicant: Yan Wang, Designer/Jason Quan, Contractor
Potential Historic District: Camden Court District

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will consider a request for the approval of a façade change. The change will consist of a 192 sq. ft. new patio with a pitch roof on the entry area and columns.

Presentation:

Jason Quan: Presented the project on behalf of the designer and noted that he presented the project before the DRB a few months ago and that it was continued to address design issues with the roof which the designer has since worked on along with simplifying the new porch columns.

Questions from the Board:

Masterman: Noted that part of the concern with the Board from the project's first hearing was the concern over the accuracy of the drawings and she mentioned that those issues were not addressed with the latest set of drawings submitted for today's hearing. She also asked the applicant to confirm all the changes that were made from the previous submittal. She noted that the section sheet indicates a 9'-4" ceiling height and if this was accurate.

Sissi: Provided Ms. Masterman with a copy of the previous submittal for her review.

Smeaton: Inquired what the stone material was on the columns and asked if the columns were slightly tapered and what the stone cap was on the columns.

Lopez: Inquired if there were any photographs in the latest submittal. He also inquired if the windows are being changed.

Sissi: Provided Mr. Lopez with a copy of the photographs from the case file.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Quan: Noted that the stone cap at the columns will be of a concrete-like material. He also mentioned that the windows will be changed, however the window sizes will remain the same, and the correct height of the ceiling is 8 feet + as the ceiling height varies.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment.

Board Discussion:

Fenske: Noted that he thinks the number of columns is right, but the scale is not correct and the material is not preferable.

Lopez: Noted that the scale of the base of the column is not correct.

Masterman: Expressed that though the Board is not opposed to the overall design concept of the shed roof extension with a column-supported porch, the Board is concerned with the scale and the details of the design. Adding a base material to the columns is not sufficient enough to call it a "neo-traditional" style. The use of the materials, and the way they connect as proposed do not work.

Smeaton: Noted that there should be a beam that connects the columns across at the top.

Lejeune: Noted that the project could perhaps use four columns to evenly balance the vertical members.

Masterman: Noted that the front roof gables are not symmetrical so the amount of columns do not need to be symmetrical.

Lopez: Asked the Board if a member would be willing to meet with the designer to finesse the design further so that applicant does not have to come back and be continued again.

Fenske: Noted that the applicant has been before the Board three times, and that a Chair review should suffice.

Lopez: Also noted that there are enough inconsistencies in the drawings that he feels it should come back before the Board with revisions.

Masterman: Volunteered to meet with the applicant in order to assist in the detailing of the design revisions before the next DRB hearing in January 2018.

DECISION:

Lopez: Made a motion to continue the project to January 2018 and for Staff to arrange a meeting time between Susan Masterman and the applicant to review the detailing of the design.

Lejeune: Seconded the Motion

PROJECT CONTINUED (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

****Note: Applicant was late, and this Item was reshuffled to Item 4's position at the Hearing****

-
3. **Project Address:** 1325 Mountain View
Project Number: 2028-DRX
Applicant: Imran Chaudhry (Owner), Guillermo Lujan (Designer)
Potential Historic District: Not Applicable

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a total; 827.50 single story addition to an existing 959 sq. ft. single story house on a 5,327 sq. ft. lot. The single story addition will consist of; 365 sq. ft. family room and kitchen, a 345 sq. ft. master bedroom with bathroom, a 30 sq. ft. addition expanding an existing bathroom and laundry room, a 41 sq. ft. addition on the front elevation expanding a bedroom and a 48 sq. ft. entry addition. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco, asphalt roof shingles, and vinyl windows. The property owner is also seeking the approval for a new 194 sq. ft. garage addition. The proposal with create a three vehicle garage.

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

****Project not presented at this meeting****

4. **Project Address:** 2015 Hill Drive
Project Number: 2061-DRX
Applicant: Anna Baycher
Potential Historic District: None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 480 single story addition to an existing 975 sq. ft. single story house on a 7,500 sq. ft. lot. The new single story addition will consist of: a bedroom with bathroom and walk-in closet, linen closet, laundry room, and guest bathroom. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco and asphalt roof shingles to match existing materials. New windows and door materials on the proposed addition will match the existing construction

Presentation:

Luka (Contractor): Presented the project noting that the addition is single-story and is located at the rear of the house and is approximately 480 square feet in size. A restroom will be relocated to the back to provide more bedroom space internally. The addition will accommodate a new bedroom, walk-in closet, and laundry. Materials will match existing for the roofing and the stucco. There will be no changes to the front, and the garage will remain the same. The rear yard landscape planters will be relocated to accommodate the addition.

Questions from the Board:

Fenske: Inquired with Staff why the project was before the DRB as less than a 500 square foot addition.

Sissi: Noted that if a project exceeds 25% of the existing square footage, it requires a public hearing.

Smeaton: Inquired about the window in the restroom and if it is existing.

Applicant Response:

Luka: Noted that the restroom window is existing.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Fenske: Noted that the project fits in; that it is humble and straight forward.

Lopez: Agreed with Mr. Fenske and liked that it fit with the scale of the neighborhood.

Decision:

Masterman: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED and that it meets the Findings.

Lopez: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

NEW ITEMS

- 5. **Project Address:** 604 Arroyo Drive
- Project Number:** 2023-DRX
- Applicant:** Allen & Vivian Yip, Owners
- Potential Historic District:** Mid Grand Avenue Revival District

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 1,114 sq. ft. single story addition to an existing 1,694 sq. ft. single story house on a 8,400 sq. ft. lot. The existing garage will be converted to a master bedroom with a bathroom and walk-in closet. The new single story addition will also consist of; three bedrooms, two bathrooms and walk -in closet. There is also a proposed 440 sq. ft. garage that will replace the existing garage. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco and asphalt roof shingles to match existing materials. New window and door materials on the proposed addition will match the existing materials.

Presentation:

Mr. Lowe (Contractor): Noted that the existing house is a two bedroom and one bath is too small for the enlarging family. The addition is about 1,100 square feet of the conversion of the existing carport to accommodate the addition and provide space for his newly married son. A new two-car garage is being proposed.

Questions from the Board:

Masterman: Asked if the board and batten on the front of the existing elevations and if it being proposed to be replaced with stucco.

Lopez: Inquired if all the windows are being replaced.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Lowe: Responded that the board and batten siding will be removed and replaced with stucco and capped with a stucco molding. He also added that not all the windows will be replaced.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Masterman: Noted that the project is good massing and the applicant can still maintain the six foot side yard setback, but she did mention concern with the stone cladding.

Lopez: Agreed that the scale and the massing are compatible, although he noted the house appears to be larger than the 50% max footprint. He also had an issue with the simplification of the face from the wood siding being removed to plain stucco and nail-on windows.

Lejeune: Noted that missing information on the neighborhood context is making the review challenging.

Lowe: Noted that predominate finish on houses in the neighborhood is stucco.

Smeaton: Inquired if the brick veneer on the front façade is in bad shape and if the proposed stone cladding will have a cap.

Lowe: Noted that the existing brick cladding is old and aesthetically obsolete, and that the new cladding will have a concrete cap trim.

Masterman: Noted that there are issues with the proposed removal of windows and patching of the wall within walls with wood siding.

Smeaton: Noted that he does not have a problem with the removal of the wood siding in place of smooth stucco if the windows receive a trim piece as added detailing.

Masterman: Noted that if the wood siding is removed, and new windows are installed, the windows should not be flush with the new stucco wall finish, but there should be some relief in plane.

DECISION:

Lopez: Made a motion to CONTINUE the project

Smeaton: Seconded the motion

CONTINUED (5-0)

**6. Project Address: 143 Pasadena Ave.
Project Number: 2054-DRX
Applicant: David Judson
Potential Historic District: None**

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 42 sq. ft. illuminated wall sign on the front elevation that reads "Judson Studios" and below that will read "Art & Architectural Glass." The proposed color and materials of the sign will be opal and transparent glass. The dimensions of the sign are 31.5" x 16'.

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15311, Accessory Structures. Class 11 (a) on-premise signs.

****Applicant did not appear, and the project was not presented at this meeting****

**7. Project Address: 264 Saint Albans
Project Number: 2054-DRX
Applicant: Christian Taylor, Owner
Potential Historic District: None**

Project Information:

Design Review Board will review an expired DRB project from 2000. The approved project consisted of a 330 sq. ft. addition to the first floor, an 865 sq. ft. addition to the second floor, and a new 1,333 sq. ft. to third floor. The project was revised and a 209 sq. ft. addition to the second floor was constructed without Planning and Building Dept. approvals. The property's building permits expired in 2008, however, construction continued without valid approvals. The total square footage for the three story house consists of 5,076 sq. ft. The first floor is 1,971 sq. ft., the second floor is 1,745 sq. ft., and the third floor is 1,151 sq. ft. The exterior design and materials will remain the same as the previous approval. All work, including the existing unpermitted work, will be required to comply with current building codes and permitting procedures including a field inspection.

Presentation:

Mr. Taylor (owner): Presented the project and noted that began in 2000, and was continued under approved plans. The project stopped during the Recession, and then continued with a slight modification of 209 square feet.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: noted that he had some difficulty understanding what was originally approved and what has changed.

Taylor: Noted the entire house was approved back in 2000, but was stopped due to funding. The change in the additional floor area occurs on sheet a-4 because the 2nd floor juts out above the first floor by about 1'-8".

Smeaton: noted that the windows on sheet A-4 are different than what is shown in the photographs.

Lejeune: asked if the intent was to build the house in accordance to the plans presented, to which the applicant replied yes

Lopez: noted that the windows in the photographs do not match the windows in the drawings.

Lopez: noted that the drawings need to be clearly accurate as to what has been constructed and what is being proposed as the drawings were confusing. He also noted that the door and the windows are not accurate to what is existing as shown in the photographs.

Smeaton: noted that the window operation types are different in the drawings than what is shown in the photographs and asked if they are proposing the windows in the drawings.

Taylor: noted that he is not proposing the windows in the drawings. The drawings are incorrect.

Lejeune: wanted clarity on why the windows and doors were different as installed than what was approved, and procedurally if that means the applicant will be seeking approval for the change in window and door design.

Taylor: Noted that, yes, he is seeking approval for the change in window and door design.

Applicant Response:

No further response.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Masterman: noted that the intent of the project is clear. In the spirit of the original approved set, not a whole lot has changed, it is just a matter of how the project is presented to us for accuracy. She believes that though there are minor changes to the square footage and the window design, the project is not incredibly out of character to be approved.

Lopez: noted that what worries him is that there are changes between details and finishes to what was approved and what has been built.

Lejeune: noted that there is still more to be built, and that the details need to be finalized for review.

Masterman: asked if it is the Board's job to analyze the design of a previously approved design review.

Smeaton: noted that it is if the new proposal deviates from the original approval.

Lopez: noted that it is difficult for the Board to approve work that has been constructed that does not match the original approval or what can be approved.

DECISION:

Masterman: made a motion to continue the project. She noted that the scope of the work looks fine, but the drawings need to be clear. The drawings need to be cleaned up to remove any excessive notes, and made clear what has changed such as the window and door design, and the addition. Photos of all elevations, no cropping. Photographs of the surrounding neighborhood. And all drawings to be clear for the changes.

Lopez: made a motion to CONTINUE the project with clear drawings.

Masterman: seconded motion.

CONTINUED (5-0)

8. Project Address:	709 Fremont Avenue
Project Number:	2074-DRX
Applicant:	Steven Chan
Potential Historic District:	North of Mission Addition

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 15 sq. ft. non-illuminated wall sign on the front elevation that reads "Milestones, Retina Eye Care" and "Express Employment Professionals". The proposed colors are: gray for the background with blue and black for the letters and white for the background with blue for the letters. The sign will be made of polymetal material

Presentation:

Mr. Chan: Presented the project for a 15 s.f. wall sign that will be non-illuminated and noted the sign will be made of poly metal material.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: asked if it is one piece of metal with two separate graphics and attached with the little button pins.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Chan: replied yes to Conrado Lopez's question regarding the attachment pins.

Board Discussion:

Smeaton: noted that he does not have a problem with it as it is property located and covered.

Lopez: noted the he approves of the proposed size of the sign.

DECISION:

Smeaton: made a motion to approve as submitted
Lopez: seconded the motion

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15311, Accessory Structures. Class 11 (a) on-premise signs.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 9. **Project Address:** 5 Pasadena Avenue
- Project Number:** CONCEPTUAL REVIEW
- Applicant:** Steven Dahl, Architect
- Potential Historic District:** N/A

Project Information:

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal to construct a 5,839 sq. ft. two story, 5-unit office building on a 15,299 sq. ft. lot. The designated zoning for this proposal is Commercial General. The proposal also includes a 14 spaces of parking with a total area of 7,079 sq. ft. Parking is located on the west side of the building. The materials for this proposed office building include brick veneer and smooth stucco. **This item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made at this time.**

Presentation:

Steve Dahl: presented the project with a 3D model and material samples. Noted that the building is a triangle and that the roof slopes higher to the north and lower at the south. The parking lot except for the ADA spot is steam-rolled gravel. The materials will be brick, with metal mesh. It is a blend of Google and Mid-Century. Each unit will have their own exterior entrance. The plain brick walls and the rear column that extends above the roof plane by about 4 feet are intended as rotating exhibit space for public art.

Board Questions and Discussion:

Lejeune: asked what the material is for the column at the low end of the roof.

Dahl: it will be pre-cast concrete unpainted.

Lopez: noted that the scale seems appropriate and the siting of the building is responsive to the street. He thought the garbage housing looks too separate, and that it should be more reflective of the overall design of the building. If the garbage housing is to be separate and its own structure, then it should have a design personality of its own given its proposed prominent location.

Masterman: liked the additions of the awnings at the single-height because it adds a pedestrian scale to the building.

Lopez noted that the low garden wall at the corner of the street seems out of place with the design.

Lejeune: asked why the brick wall parapets don't all have circle pop outs in them.

Dahl: the ones with circle pop outs have an 8 foot extension above the roof plane and they became too heavy and require less resistance. The brick walls are actually all the same height, they just extend above the roof at different heights because of the sloping roof.

Lejeune: asked if the glass roll up doors will roll when opened.

Dahl: they will fold into the office space like a garage door, or they can roll up.

Lejeune: noted that the entry alcove for the mechanical access seems a little weak and should be designed better as it faces the street.

Fenske: asked if his intention was to bookend the city with Google-like structures with shakers restaurant at one end, and this structure at the other.

BOARD COMMENTS

10. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

11. No Staff comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

12. Minutes for the previous DRB meeting were not reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT

13. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm to the next scheduled Special Meeting on January 11, 2018.

APPROVED



Mark Smeaton
Vice Chair, Design Review Board

Date

