

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 2ND DAY OF AUGUST, 2018
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, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune, Yael Lir, Jim Fenske
Board Member Absent: None
Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

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.

1. No items.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. No Continued Items

NEW ITEMS

3. **Project Address:** 1225 Chelten Way
Project Number: 2115-NID-DRX
Applicant: Jay Baliwag, Architect
Potential Historic District: Ashbourne/Chelten District

Project Information:

A request for a Design Review Board approval for the demolition of the existing single-story single family house, garage, breezeway and carport totaling 3,720 square feet in addition to a proposal for a new 7,397 sq. ft. two story house on 24,441 sq. ft. lot. The first floor will consist of a library/guest suite, living room, dining room, play room, family room, kitchen, bathroom, mud room, and attached garage. The second floor will consist of four bedrooms, four bathrooms, a master bedroom, a master bathroom, and a family room. The exterior materials will consist of lap siding, presidential shake roof shingles, clad wood windows, clad wood French doors, and carriage style garage door.

Presentation:

Adele Chang, architect presented the project through a PowerPoint and noted that the project sits on a private street. She notes that the front of the project is narrow at the street front to reduce its street visual impact, with the bulk of the project occurring at the rear. The two story portion is also stepped back from the front of the first floor. The design massing is to be respectful of the neighborhood and to reduce any encroachment into the mature oak trees on the site. One oak tree will be moved from the back yard to the front yard, and with the existing front yard oak, the oak trees will frame and soften the front of the house. She mentioned that the house is craftsman inspired with gable roofing, front and rear porch, timber work, lap siding, and volumetric forms. A front yard picket fence is also proposed to add further dimension and softening of the project.

Rob Grossman, Landscape Architect: explained the scope of his proposed landscaping plan, and noted that he designed a cottage-style garden that is not intended to be highly manicured and will be more naturalized and soften the building. Most of the trees will be preserved, and new additional trees will be planted to provide a pedestrian-scaled landscape and reduce the scale of the project. The rear yard accommodates recreational and active play with a lawn area, and it will include a vegetable garden. The plantings will be predominantly drought-tolerant.

Public comments:

Soon Ju: Noted that he lives north of the property on Monterey and that the existing oak tree proposed for relocation is beautiful and provides him some privacy and he would like to see it preserved. He expressed his concerns with privacy, but would like to see the applicant's build a better property fence, and some confusion regarding the development immediately adjacent to his house.

Chang: noted that a new property fence will be constructed along the sides and rear at 6' feet high block wall.

Ms. Hoffman, 1220 Chelton: Expressed some concern with the development and its impacts to her and other neighbors and privacy. She also expressed some concern with the relocation of the oak tree. She was concerned about the large size of the house and its impacts on privacy, construction impacts, and property values. She was concerned about the ADU, its design, size, and who was going to live there.

Mr. Nakasone, 1228 Milan: Noted that he is directly to the west of the property and that he shares in the concerns of Ms. Hoffman.

Board Questions & Applicant Response:

Lopez: Inquired with the applicant if the tree relocation has been approved by the NREC.

Chang: The applicant mentioned that the tree relocation was brought before Public Works, and they mentioned that it was up to the DRB on the tree's fate for the project design.

Sissi: Mentioned that if the DRB can approve the project subject to the tree removal/replacement through Public Works and NREC and if they do not approve of it, the project will have to come back to the DRB.

Lopez: Inquired if the shutters proposed on the elevations will be operable.

Chang: Noted that it is preferred that the shutters be real and operable, and not be simply stuck on.

Lejeune: Inquired if the windows will be wood

Chang: The windows will be wood, but clad in fiberglass on the exterior for maintenance purposes.

Fenske: Inquired what the existing house was made of and who lived there prior to the new owners.

Chang: The house is made of Adobe block, and it was reviewed by the CHC for any historic significance and it was determined that the existing house is not significant and the previous owners were the Jangs.

Lir: Inquired about the driveway encroachment on the existing front yard oak tree.

Chang: Noted that the driveway on the proposed site plan is actually within the existing footprint of the existing driveway.

Lejeune: Inquired with Staff if they are allowed to have a rental unit with the site's zoning.

Conrado: Inquired with Staff what the City's regulations are about ADUs.

Sissi: Noted that the City requires lot sizes to be a minimum of 12,500 square feet for new ADU construction which this project complies with. Staff cannot notice the construction of a new ADU, per State law.

Board Discussion:

Smeaton: Noted that the project was presented with a nice set of drawings. He also thanked the applicant for providing a full landscape design plan.

Smeaton: Noted that from an architectural perspective, he is okay with the size and scale of the project given the large lots of the private street neighborhood.

Lir: Noted that the project was nice, and it was beautifully designed. She expressed hope that the oak tree will survive its relocation, and that she appreciated the drought-tolerant landscaping.

Fenske: Expressed some concern with the massing on the front elevation, and noted that he prefers the rear elevation more due to its simplicity, however, the project overall was nice.

Lejeune: Expressed concern with the solid glass panel French doors that open onto the front and rear porches, and noted that he would prefer the doors to have more lights. He expressed some concern with the house's impacts on the historic neighborhood. He noted that the spirit of South Pasadena is to be neighborly and it would behoove the applicants to really speak to the neighbors and communicate with them the project and listen to their concerns about the project. He also expressed concern with the 15 foot difference in the front yard setback (new house is closer to the street) than the low-slung adobe house currently there, and then to put a large two-story house in its place.

Lopez: In regards to the proposed ADU, he noted that this is a good example of an ADU in terms of its size and scale, its setbacks, and its architectural detailing and articulation.

Lopez: Noted that he shared in Lejeune's concern about the front yard setback difference of the new house in comparison to the setback of the existing. He believes that a middle point between the house on the north and the house on the south is a better placement of the front setback for this project. He also expressed some concern with the shutters, and that the proposals are not done in a realistic way. He noted on the front elevation, double windows, share three shutters, but if the shutters are going to be real, each window needs to have two operable shutters each.

Chang: Noted that there is a special kind of hinge that allows a shutter to overlap for those types of conditions, and that is what will be used.

Lopez: Expressed satisfaction with that design element.

Lopez: Noted that he was concerned with the proposed pavers of the new driveway and that it will require some depth for the digging and placement of the paver stones.

Chang: Noted that the driveway is in the same location as the existing driveway and it should not be an issue for the oak tree. She also apologized to the public for not showing the ADU in the PowerPoint presentation, but that it complies with all state laws and city laws, and that it was included in the drawing packet.

Lir: Expressed some concern with the planting's proposed for under the oak trees and noted that only a few plants will survive under oak trees. She also expressed concern with the planting proposed on the front and that those plants require full sun, but with the proposed trees, and only morning sun on the east, some plants may not survive.

Chang: Noted that the landscaping plans are schematic.

Decision:

Smeaton: Finds the project meets the required Findings, and made motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS, subject to a Chair Review for the for following:

- NREC, or Public Works Department approval of the oak tree relocation as proposed, if it does not affect the design placement of the main house.
- Push the front, primary structure, back a few more feet than the currently proposed front setback.
- Flush out the details of and operability of the window shutters.
- Provide additional divided lights to the front French doors.
- A review of a revised landscape plan for the front yard subject to review by Yael Lir.

Lejeune: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities, Class 1 (L) (1) Demolition of existing small structures, one single-family residence; and Section 15303, Class 3 (a), the new construction of a single-family residence, or second dwelling unit in a residential zone.

4. **Project Address:** 1829 Hill Drive
Project Number: 2149-DRX
Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect
Potential Historic District: None

Project Information:

A request for a Design Review Board approval for an expired plan check project. On August 4, 2016 the DRB approved the construction of a 290 sq. ft. single story addition and a new 1,301 sq. ft. second story addition to an existing 2,041 single story house on an 11,380 sq. ft. lot. The exterior materials consisted of sand troweled stucco, brick, Hardi board siding, asphalt roof shingles, aluminum windows and sliding doors by Milgard. The aluminum windows and doors are changing to vinyl materials. On October 6, 2016 the DRB approved the change to the façade of the house, which consisted of the entry canopy and the windows on the entry area.

Presentation:

Tom Nott: presented the project, and noted that the project was previously approved by the DRB and the Building and Safety, but due to financing issues, it was never realized. The project could not be extended by the Building and Safety Division due to new energy code requirements explaining why the application is back before the DRB. The original approved plans called for aluminum windows, but the new energy codes do not accept aluminum windows, so they are now proposing vinyl windows. The windows will be the same profile as the original approved, and all fenestration sizes will be the same. The vinyl windows will be bronze in color.

Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Repsonse:

Lopez: Inquired with Staff why the project was back before the Board for a simple window change.

Sissi: Noted that the DRB approval expires after one year, and the Building and Safety expired and could not be extended because of new energy code requirements, so the project needs to go back before the Board to renew the entitlements and bring it back to building and safety.

Fenske: Inquired if they provided window brochures or spec sheets.

Applicant: Noted that the windows information is included in the packet.

Lopez: Noted that the new windows may have a different sectional profile.

Nott: Noted that the new Title 24 energy codes require R5 insulation, which means the house walls had to grow an additional inch in width, which provides the windows virtually the same sectional profile as originally proposed with the aluminum windows.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Decision:

Fenske: made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, and that it meets the findings.

Smeaton: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities, Class 1, (e)(1) additions to existing structures

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 5. Project Address: | 1131 Marengo Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW) |
| Project Number: | 2144-DRX |
| Applicant: | Li Sy, Owner |
| Potential Historic District: | None |

Project Information:

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for a 750 sq. ft. single story addition to an existing 1,337 sq. ft. single story house on a 5,998 sq. ft. lot. The existing garage will have an addition toward the rear of the garage. It will increase the total garage square footage to 500 sq. ft. **The demolition of the existing detached garage received Historic clearance by the Cultural Heritage Commission. This Agenda Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made.**

Presentation:

Li Sy: presented the project and noted she worked closely with Staff and they recommended she get a survey of the property which she did with noted that the existing detached garage sits on the property line, and the north side yard fence sits inward from her property line.

Questions / Discussion from the Board:

Lopez: Noted that she was removing the fireplace and expressed some concern with that.

Sy: Noted that the garage will not be accessible if the chimney were to remain, so it is necessary to remove it.

Lopez: Noted that the roofing design is a concern and the proposal to dramatically change it is not in keeping with the style of the house, and the proposal is very expensive. Lopez noted that he would prefer the roof style remain and the new addition attach onto the existing roofing style. He also expressed concern with the south elevation and its flatness and length. He wanted to see some more articulation along that facade.

Lopez: Noted that he would not approve of any false mansard roofing as proposed in the drawings.

Sy: Noted that she requested the designer/architect to reuse the existing windows on the rear, and to have all new windows match the style of the existing.

Smeaton: Noted that he does not like the flat arch window as proposed on the front as it contrasts too greatly with the arched doorway. he suggested a large rectangular window.

Lopez & Lejeune: Expressed concern with the removal of the chimney and that it is a character feature that should be preserved.

Lopez: Suggested the chimney be relocated or rebuilt.

Lopez: Noted that he will need to see window details, window specifications, light fixtures, new roofing specifications, new landscaping plan

Lopez: Noted that the drawings indicate clay tile roofing.

Sy: Noted that the roofing should be composite shingle roofing.

Applicant Response:

No additional response.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment

-
6. **Project Address:** 296 Saint Albans Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)
Project Number: 2146-DRX
Applicant: Cristian Poloni, Architect
Potential Historic District: None

Project Information:

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for a 937 sq. ft. addition, a 139 sq. ft deck extension, a new 439 sq. ft deck, and a garage extension of 39 sq. ft. **This Agenda Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made.**

Presentation:

Christian Poloni: presented the project and noted that it is a downhill addition, but the slope of the property does not meet the 20% threshold for classification of a hillside. The new addition will be vertical Hardie board siding and composition shingle roof.

Questions / Discussion from the Board:

Lopez: Noted that for the final presentation, he would prefer to have existing and proposed on the same page for both plans and elevations. Full elevation photographs of the house will be needed, along with photographs of the neighboring context. Lopez noted that the proposed shows only the new, but the new needs to be shown in context with the existing. Full plans are required, not partial elevations as proposed. he also noted that the existing elevation drawings should be 1/4" scale, and have existing and proposed on the same page.

Smeaton: Wanted to see the existing and proposed on the same page for the site plans too.

Smeaton: Inquired if a 3D was available, and if more views can be provided.

Poloni: Noted that he can provide more 3D views.

Lopez: Noted that he would like to see an existing 3D view of the same view provided on the title sheet.

Lejeune: Noted that on sheet T-1, Pasadena should be corrected to South Pasadena.

Smeaton: Suggested the applicant provide a materials board.

Lopez: Noted that conceptually, the addition of the house downhill seems reasonable. However, he noted that since the house is growing on the rear, he would like to see the relationship of neighboring property building footprints on the site plans.

Applicant Response:

No additional response.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment

BOARD COMMENTS

7. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

8. No Staff Comments

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ADJOURNMENT

10. The meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm to the next scheduled September 6, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton
Chair, Design Review Board

Date

4/30/2019