

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 1ST DAY OF JUNE, 2017
AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1424 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, Assistant Planner</p>
NON-AGENDA ITEMS	1.	No Discussion
CONTINUED ITEMS	2.	No Continued Items
	3.	<p>711 Fair Oaks Avenue Project Number: 1998-DRX Applicant: Justin Ko, Business Owner</p> <p>Project Information: A request for a Design Review Board approval for a new wall sign. The wall sign will read: "NORI SUSHI WRAPS." It will be a total of 18 square feet and the dimensions will be 36"x72". The sign will be aluminum channel letters with plexiglass. The colors will be black and white.</p> <p>Presentation: The applicant mentioned that they just opened up a new restaurant and noted that the public notice spelled sushi incorrectly, and in fact, sushi will be spelled correctly in the sign. The signage letters are all individual and they will be black and white.</p> <p>Questions from the Board: Masterman: Asked if the applicant will have to patch and paint the wall after the pre-existing former tenant's sign is taken down.</p> <p>Applicant Response: The applicant mentioned that it will not be necessary as the new sign will cover the entirety of the old sign space.</p> <p>Public Comments: There were no public comments.</p> <p>Board Discussion: Masterman: Believed that the sign was nice and that it could meet the findings.</p> <p>Board Decision: Masterman: Made a motion to approve the project as submitted and that it meets the Findings.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p>

	<p>Approved as submitted 4-0 and that the project meets all the required Findings.</p>
<p>NEW ITEMS</p> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Jim Fenske, DRB member, and project applicant, recused himself from the review of this project, and exited the Council Chambers during the project discussion. His wife, Lorie, presented the project before the DRB.</i> 	<p>4. 629 Alta Vista Circle Project Number: 1997-DRX Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect</p> <p>Project Information: A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal to add a 480 sq.ft. single story addition and a 296 sq. ft. second story addition to an existing 1,618 single story house on a 6,840 sq. ft. lot. A new 500 sq. ft. garage/carport is proposed. The proposed addition is located on the front side elevation of the house. A new modern design is proposed for the entire structure. The single story addition consists of an attached garage being converted to a family room. The second story addition will consist of a master bedroom, a master bath room and a deck. The exterior materials will consist of smooth stucco siding, bonderized iron sheet metal roof, and aluminum windows.</p> <p>Applicant Presentation: Lorie noted that the narrative needed a few corrections, regarding the perplex siding and lpe wood siding, which are now no longer proposed for the project. Lorie presented a 3d computer model with two options indicating a light well and the other without a light well. The roof, the guardrails and the lightwell will be clad in bonderized iron. There is an existing deck in the back which will remain as noted in the plans. There is now a parapet all around the roof planes to harmonize the existing volumes with the new modern additions. The railing on the rear decks is stainless steel cable, while in the front deck it is bonderized iron. The design has been modified to make the project more holistic between existing and new since last month's conceptual review.</p> <p>Questions from the Board: Masterman: Inquired if the changes from last month's conceptual review include the elimination of lpe and perplex siding, the addition of the new parapet, the lightwell, and the bonderized metal finishes. Also noted that the FAR will be maxed out at the 35% limit with the proposed addition. She asked Staff what the limits for garage space and FAR are.</p> <p>Sissi: Noted that any square footage above 500 square feet for covered parking will be added to the property's FAR. A covered parking space of 480 square feet as proposed will not be counted towards the FAR.</p> <p>Smeaton: Wanted clarity on why the applicant is willing to spend money on the expensive bonderized metal roofing for the existing volumes when it is going to be obscured anyway by the proposed parapet. He also noted his appreciation for the simplified material palette. Smeaton expressed some skepticism towards the covered parking design but was interested in seeing if it will actually be successful.</p> <p>Lopez: Appreciated the refined material palette and more cohesive design proposal as an improvement over last month's conceptual review. He likes the idea of the roof material being used as siding element too. The volumes seem to be compatible and the right size.</p> <p>Masterman: Noted that the Design Guidelines do not mention the opacity of the garage or project parking, and that the proposed transparent</p>

	<p>garage actually ties into the proposed design of the house.</p> <p>Applicant Response: There were no additional responses from the applicant.</p> <p>Public Comments: There were no public comments.</p> <p>Board Discussion: Masterman: Noted that the FAR will be maxed out at the 35% limit with the proposed addition. She asked Staff what the limits for garage space and FAR are.</p> <p>Sissi: Noted that any square footage above 500 square feet for covered parking will be added to the property's FAR. A covered parking space of 480 square feet as proposed will not be counted towards the FAR.</p> <p>Smeaton: Noted his appreciation for the simplified material palette. Smeaton expressed some skepticism towards the covered parking design but was interested in seeing if it will actually be successful.</p> <p>Lopez: Appreciated the refined material palette and more cohesive design proposal as an improvement over last month's conceptual review. He likes the idea of the roof material being used as siding element too. The volumes seem to be compatible and the right size.</p> <p>Masterman: Noted that the Design Guidelines do not mention the opacity of the garage or project parking, and that the proposed transparent garage actually ties into the proposed design of the house.</p> <p>Board Decision: Smeaton: Made a motion to approve the project as submitted with the Conditions that the existing rear deck is to remain subject to a new railing design as presented, that the additional construction details as submitted are approved, and that the Monitor (lightwell) is approved.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p> <p>Approved 3-0 with Conditions and that the project meets all the required Findings. (Jim Fenske recused himself from the vote and review of this project).</p>
<p>Discussion Items</p>	<p>5. 412 Grand Ave (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW) Applicant: Srinivas Rao, Architect</p> <p>Project Information: A request for the approval of a 526 square foot second story addition to an existing 1,586 square foot single story house one a 6,494 square foot lot, including the demolition of the 441 square foot detached garage, which will be replaced with a 230 square foot single vehicle garage with an attached carport trellis at the rear of the property. The design of the existing house will change to a modern/contemporary design. The second story addition will consist of a new master suite, a new master bathroom, and a walk in closet. The proposed exterior materials will consist of stucco siding, ribbed fiber cement panel in a gun-smoke color, fiber cement panel in a concrete color, slate tile for the roof, fibrex windows, and wood for the rear trellis patio cover and carport trellis.</p>

	<p>Applicant Presentation: Srinivas: Noted that they have presented the project before the Board before with request by the Board to change the design. Noted that the client had bought the house with unknown unpermitted square footage. The clients have since demolished the unpermitted square footage, but in doing so, they substantially reduced the square footage explaining why they would like to make the addition.</p> <p>The new garage has been reduced to one enclosed space and one attached carport trellis and moved to the rear to satisfy the Board. The new front entry has been designed to provide a tall entry foyer that leads to the public spaces of the home. There is a large lightwell to allow for interior light due to the darkness that the new second floor will cause.</p> <p>The new master suite will also be located in a new second floor addition to appease the Board, provide more outdoor space, and reduce the footprint of the house.</p> <p>The materials of the house will be a cement fiber board which is manufactured for a quick and easy install including smooth stucco on the rest of the house.</p> <p>Questions/Discussion from the Board Masterman: Appreciated the design of the house and the work the applicants put into addressing her concerns for meeting neighborhood context.</p> <p>Smeaton: Appreciated the new design and the work the applicants put into it. Noted that the new second level addition along the front would benefit from a window along the front façade which would benefit the master bath.</p> <p>Lopez: Asked the applicant to bring in material samples and noted that the Board will be looking for longevity in the materials of choice, and material detailing. Asked the applicant if the siding will be treated as rainscreen installation. The applicant said yes.</p> <p>Fenske: Would like to see the neighboring properties in the drawings for context.</p>
6.	<p>2060 Meridian Avenue (Conceptual Review) Applicant: Lilian</p> <p>Project Information: A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal to add 2,054 square foot two-story second dwelling unit with an existing 1,413 square foot single story structure onto an 8,638 square foot lot in the RM – Residential Multifamily Zoning District.</p> <p>Applicant Presentation: The presenter mentioned that they represent the contractor. They would like to add about 110 square feet to existing front unit, relocate the existing garage, and construct a new unit at the rear.</p> <p>Questions/Discussion from the Board Masterman: Inquired if the applicant is proposing to construct a three or</p>

		<p>two units. The applicant said they only intend to have two units.</p> <p>Smeaton: Inquired with Staff what the FAR is for RM zoning. Sissi noted that the FAR is 50%.</p> <p>Masterman: Appreciated that the front unit is retained, and that the larger unit is at the rear of the property. However, the noted that the new rear addition needs to match the ceiling heights, roof pitches, massing, and scale of the original front structure. The chimney of the new unit including the windows and door detailing does not match the front unit. Inquired if the applicant was proposing to replace all the existing doors and windows in the front unit. The applicants said no.</p> <p>Lopez: Noted that the existing garage that is proposed to be retained, is small and asked Staff if parking will need to be brought into compliance. Sissi noted that the parking will need to be brought into compliance with current zoning size regulations since they are proposing to expand and intensify the use. Encouraged the applicants to lower the height of the rear unit to be more in scale with the existing front unit. Wanted to see the details of the front unit replicated on the new rear unit. The applicant will also need to provide a landscape plan.</p> <p>Smeaton: Noted that the new addition is a little too tall, even though the neighboring properties are not small.</p> <p>Fenske: Suggested that the applicants research English/Tudor Revival style for inspiration on details, scale and form that would be compatible with the styling of the front unit.</p> <p>Masterman: Would like to see a 3d model of the proposal including a front elevation drawing with adjacent properties shown. Suggested that the applicant move and expand the garage or just build a new one. The applicant will also need to provide door and window details and other details of architectural features. In general, the concept is good, but the detailing and articulation needs to be improved.</p>
Board Comments	7.	None
Staff Comments	8.	None
Approval of Minutes	9.	The Minutes from the May 2017 DRB meeting were not reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT	10.	The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 6, 2017 at 7 p.m.
--------------------	-----	--

Approved,



Conrado Lopez, Chair

Date 10.12.17