

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA  
CONVENED THIS 6<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2017  
AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
1424 MISSION STREET**

<b>ROLL CALL</b>		<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>
<b>NON-AGENDA ITEMS</b>	1.	No Discussion
<b>CONTINUED ITEMS</b>	2.	<b>No Continued Items</b>
<p><b>Note:</b> <i>This property has been identified as an historic architectural resource noted as a significant example of Mid-Century Modern residential architecture especially for its aspects of preserved architectural integrity including its: low-pitched shed roofs and wide overhanging eaves, wraparound balcony, decorative wood balustrade, prominent exterior brick chimney, concrete block exterior, and wood battens. The house was designed by architect Charles W. Wong and was constructed in 1971.</i></p>	3.	<p><b>1401 Via Del Rey</b> <b>Project Number: 1999-DRX</b> <b>Applicant: Melissa Tsai, Designer, &amp; Dillon Chang, Owner</b></p> <p><b>Project Information:</b> A request for a Design Review Board approval for a façade change by removing and replacing the wood balustrade on the wraparound balcony with a proposed 42 inch high steel bar guardrail capped by a wood handrail. The applicant would also like to clad the prominent exposed concrete block on the lower level with horizontal redwood siding. No additions are proposed for the approximately 5,000 square foot home located on a 12,641 square foot lot in the Altos De Monterey Overlay Zone.</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Melissa Tsai presented the project by stating that the new owners did not realize that design review was required for South Pasadena, and the owner began to make changes to the façade of the house. The façade change was reported as a code violation for not obtaining building permits and not obtaining design review approval first. Ms. Tsai also pointed to photographs of the design change including unpermitted wood siding as cladding over the existing brickwork. The wood work is proposed as a design proposal to encapsulate the existing brick work along the façade. The second part of the design proposal is to replace the existing wood balcony for several reasons including making it compliant with current safety code, replacing the balustrade railing due to deterioration reasons, replacing the balustrade railing out of a safety concern for the owner's young children, and for aesthetic purposes. The applicant's would like to replace the wood balustrade railing that encircle the home's upper level with a stainless steel cable railing system with a redwood top rail.</p> <p>Daniel Freedman (Owner's legal counsel): introduced himself to the Board to address any historic issues the Board may have.</p> <p>Eleanor Chang (Owner, came in late to present): presented photographs of the couple's young children and noted that her kids can fall through the railings as they are now. She noted that the second floor is locked and secure to prevent their children from playing or walking alone one the</p>

wrap around balcony. She noted that there was significant termite damage and that the overall existing conditions of the balcony is unsafe.

Dillon Change: Noted that the existing railing has seven inch wide gaps, and the height is under 3.5 feet both of which present a significant safety issue. He noted they went to the CHC and they mentioned they were willing to work with the owners. The went back to the CHC and presented a simple solution, but the CHC would not approve of the design change. He also noted that the owners received signatures of approval from several neighbors, including the original architect and a sketched proposal as a possible solution (not the design proposal presented to the Board).

**Questions from the Board:**

Masterman: inquired when the renovations began and when they ended.

Tsai: responded that the owner's closed on the purchase in January, and began their unpermitted renovations in February and stopped in March when they were cited for unpermitted construction work.

Masterman: asked Staff that since the project is now before the DRB, does this mean the house is no longer considered historic?

Sissi: Explained that the house has been identified by a Survey, and that it is not yet on the City's Inventory. Though the property has not yet been adopted on the City's Inventory, it has still been identified and is registered with the State Office of Historic Preservation under a DPR Form, and as such it is a Cultural Resource subject to CEQA review. Due to the fact that the applicant's submitted design changes to an identified historic property, but the property has not been officially adopted into the City's updated inventory, this case presents an unprecedented gray area of which Commission should review the project.

Masterman: Asked what the process is to update and adopt the new Inventory.

Sissi: Noted that the Inventory is updated by a Survey, and the City has been undergoing a Survey for several years. The Survey is reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission, whom in turns makes a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the new Inventory based on the Survey. The Cultural Heritage Commission is a month or two away from recommending the Inventory for adoption by Council.

Smeaton: The project was conceptually reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) correct?

Sissi: Noted that the project was routed to the CHC for a conceptual review upon realizing that the project had been identified as a Cultural Resource and possible inclusion into the City's updated Inventory.

Lopez: Inquired what the state of deterioration is, if it was 25% or 50%, etc. He also asked what the material of the balustrade was, if they were wood vertical or metal vertical elements.

Tsai: Noted that the existing balustrade has 3 or 4 metal horizontal bars, and wood vertical balusters and they are surface mounted to the balcony fascia. And due to the amount of wood, a lot of it has termite damage.

Masterman: Asked what the materials were on the balcony deck.

Tsai: Noted that the balcony deck has a terrazzo finish, while the underside was stucco along with the fascia.

Lopez: Inquired what the reason was behind the wood siding, and what the finish will be on the redwood.

Tsai: Noted that the wood siding was for aesthetic reasons, and that the redwood would have a clear finish.

Smeaton: Asked how the siding was attached and if there was any damage to the block.

Tsai: Noted that there is a block spacer that is shot into the block and the wood siding is mounted onto the spacers.

Masterman: Counted that there are 20 neighbors that have signed a petition of support as presented by the owners along with a letter of support from the house's original architect, Mr. Wong whom designed it in 1971.

**Applicant Response:**  
Freedman: Mentioned that the legal standards set by the City and State Statutes are confusing and challenging to understand.

Lopez: interjected Freedman's response by stating that the DRB does not review historic properties as historic properties are not under their purview.

**Public Comments:**  
Anonymous Neighbor (Via Del Rey Resident): Mentioned that he has no objections to the proposed design as presented.

**Board Discussion:**  
Lopez: Congratulated the owners for recently buying the home, and the he himself considered the idea of purchasing it himself. Noted that it is obvious the railing needs to be redone due to age and safety reasons. He believes that something needs to be done to the railing. He believes that the proposed cable railing has gone too far to changing the character of the house and that a new design should be proposed. The railing of this house is very prominent and it should be looked at carefully, and it is also a feature that he himself like a lot. Historic connotations aside, the railing proposed for this house is inappropriate and this house needs a more elaborate design or a design compatible with the design of the house. The railing that is there provides an inspiration of the design that he would use for a design proposal. Lopez also noted that he does not approve of the wood siding, and that the concrete block was important to the house.

Masterman: Noted that a guardrail is 42 inches high, and that a gap cannot exceed four inches under current Building Code. She also noted that to make a decision, the required Finding #4 would not be met. She agreed with Mr. Lopez in that because of the house design and the inspiration it evokes, the existing and very unique guardrail is compelling. She also noted that the proposal is lacking in details of how everything connects together.

Smeaton: Agreed with both Lopez and Masterman that the existing balustrade is part of the design of the house and that it has some interesting merit to it, even though he agrees it is not safe.

Tsai: Noted that she has an alternative solution that was presented and rejected by the CHC, but was not proposed before the DRB as part of the Agenda Packet. The alternate design uses the current baluster design as inspiration, narrowing the wide gaps, incorporating more horizontal metal bars in the back, and elongating the wood balusters to meet current code height. The materials are the same, with metal horizontals and wood balusters.

Masterman: Asked the designer if she could talk the Board through the details.

Smeaton: Asked what condition the wood was in, and predicted that most of it was in bad shape and will need to be replaced.

Tsai: Noted that most of the wood is indeed in bad shape and needs to be replaced.

Masterman: Asked Staff why the CHC did not approve of the alternate design as just presented before the DRB.

Eleanor Chang: Interjected and stated that her husband, Dillon, attended the CHC meetings, and that they were inflexible in accommodating a new balustrade design, even the proposed alternative that mimics the existing features. When Mr. Dillon mentioned the safety of his children, the CHC's response was that all children grow up, implying that the owner's children would eventually outgrow the safety issue.

Smeaton and Masterman: inquired about the detailing of the wood siding if the corners were mitered, and how the siding meet openings at windows and doors.

Tsai: Could not recall how the owner installed the wood siding, but that it might just end.

Lopez: Noted that the Board will need more details on the wood siding.

Fenske: Mentioned to Staff that it really bothers him that the owners bought the house and that they thought they could do whatever they want. He wanted to know when the owners were notified that their new house was to be included in the updated Inventory and that it not okay for the City to say "you may be historic" without saying they will be definitively. It is their house, they should be able to do what they want.

Sissi: Noted that regardless of any historic designation, or non-historic designation, all properties in South Pasadena are subject to Design Review whether before the CHC or the DRB. Sissi also began to read off the time line of events noting that the DPR form was recorded in February 2016 10 - 11 months before the owners purchased the property.

Freedman: Noted that the property should never have gone before the CHC and that this home is not historic, because it does not meet three criteria under age, approved inventory status, or landmark status.

Lopez: Noted that the DRB does not review historic properties and that a discussion on the historic nature of the home is not under discussion tonight.

Fenske: Believes the house is not historic, and that the owners can do what they want. Believes that the existing design is pretty good and that they should work with that.

Smeaton: Noted that there are a few notable mid-century designs in the City and that the City is rightfully trying to protect them.

Lopez: Noted that there are different ways to make the railing safe, including attaching a piece of glass behind the existing railing, even though that may not be a favorable or the right approach. On the other hand, this is a house that is about to be on the Inventory, and he would feel more comfortable with a design that was inspired what it there. Also noted that the skinning of the block with redwood siding is not appropriate.

Freedman: Tried to persuade the Board to approve the project with Conditions per the Board's recommendations.

Eleanor: Mentioned that the CMU block was not aesthetically appealing and that it dated the building and looked like an apartment building with too much concrete. The wood siding helps to soften the house and makes it look more like a home.

Masterman: Asked the Board if they were comfortable with approving the project with a Condition of a Chair Review.

Smeaton: Noted that he prefers a balustrade with a design inspired from the existing style, and that the Board should discuss the siding to complete the decision.

Masterman: Noted the proposed siding as wrapping around three sides of the house.

Smeaton: The wood siding is an all or none thing, and that it cannot just be applied on a part of the house.

Lopez: Reiterated that the siding was too strong a change to the architecture of the house. The safety issue of the railing needs to be considered, and that the design of the balustrade should be taken as inspiration. Also noted that the damage to the block wall is damaged at the fault of the owners for installing siding without approval or permits.

Fenske: He approved of the siding, but would prefer to see it painted a neutral color.

Smeaton: Really liked the burnished concrete block and would prefer to see it preserved.

Masterman: Noted that preserving the concrete block is in keeping with the architectural style, and that it is unfortunate of the holes in it for the unpermitted siding work. Also noted the details that were missing, the

		<p>floor, the fascia, the connections, etc.</p> <p><b>Board Decision:</b>                  Masterman: Made a motion to disapprove of the wood siding that was installed without approval, AND approve the new railing system based upon the presented alternate sketched design drawn by the original architect with the Condition that comprehensive connection details, specifically a section of the railing system through the balcony showing the fascia, materials, and spacing, be reviewed and approved under a Chair Review.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p> <p><b><i>Approved with the alternate design solution submitted. 4-0 and that the project as noted meets all the required Findings without the proposed wood siding.</i></b></p>
<p><b>NEW ITEMS</b></p>	<p>4.</p>	<p><b>1719 Via Del Rey</b>  <b>Project Number: 2013-DRX</b>  <b>Applicant: Giovanni Quintero, Architect</b></p> <p><b>Project Information:</b>                  A request for Design Review Board approval for a 28 sq. ft. proposed addition to an existing 2,760 single story house on a 19,083 sq. ft. lot. And a new roof that will be raised. The roof materials will be Class "A" certaineed asphalt. The single story addition will consist of expanding an existing hallway located in the center of the house near the courtyard. The proposed materials will match the exisiting.</p> <p><b>Applicant Presentation:</b>                  Giovanni Quintero presented the project and noted that they are proposing to change the roof line by changing the pitch and raise the roof two feet in height to accommodate an HVAC system in enlarged attic space. All materials will remain the same. They are also adding a small addition to square off the interior courtyard and maintain a consistent roof line. The windows have already been changed out from a previous approval.</p> <p><b>Questions from the Board:</b>                  Masterman: Inquired if the applicant had any details through the roof or eve details.</p> <p>Quintero: The details are going to match the existing. No new design details are being proposed.</p> <p>Masterman: Inquired if the applicant noted the like for like details on the drawings.</p> <p>Quintero: The like for like notes were added on the applications.</p> <p>Lopez: To raise the roof, you will need new ridge beams, and those are going to extend out like the existing?</p> <p>Quintero: Yes, the ridgelines will extend out like the existing and they will be supported by posts.</p>

	<p><b>Applicant Response:</b> There were no additional responses from the applicant.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Board Discussion:</b> Masterman: Mentioned that the details need to be specifically noted for like to like matching as existing.</p> <p>Lopez: Mentioned that the he visited the project site earlier in the day, and liked the existing home. He mentioned that he might have an issue with the roof raise but noted that the ridges of the roof will run in a direction that will not make the roof raise readily visible. He also inquired if the applicants would consider a new stucco surface.</p> <p><b>Board Decision:</b> Masterman: Made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted with the condition that the following clarifications be made to the drawings that all roof details will match the existing.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p> <p><b><i>APPROVED as submitted 4-0 with the Conditions that clear notes be made to indicate that all roof details will specify to match existing and be reviewed as a Chair Review and that the project meets all the Findings.</i></b></p>
Discussion Items	<p>5. <b>412 Grand Ave</b> <b>Project Number: 1990-DRX</b> <b>Applicant: Srinivas Rao, Architect</b></p> <p><b>Project Information:</b> 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><b>Applicant Presentation:</b> Srinivas: Presented his project through a digital slide show. The project involves a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition of a master suite. The project also involves the demolition of the rear detached garage that currently is accessed via a driveway that cuts across the rear yard. A new single-car garage with attached carport is proposed at the rear of the property with a straight shot along the existing driveway, allowing for the rear yard to be opened up for other uses. The house itself will undergo substantial changes including a new façade with a double-height foyer. The interior programming is changing to accommodate the additions and exterior design changes. All windows will be Anderson clad windows, and they will add a new skylight to the master suite to provide more light. A Nichiha</p>

fiberboard cement rainscreen siding is being proposed for its ease of installation and durability. Two siding finishes are proposed, a metal-like finish and a cement-like finish. The gable roof will have a wood fascia and the roofing material will be a composite-like slate finish in gray. The owners may also install solar panels or solar shingles depending on cost and availability. The details of the railings will be metal railings with horizontal balusters and wood accents. The front door will have four horizontal lights and accentuating the horizontality of the house is desired.

**Questions/Discussion from the Board**

Lopez: Inquired if the corner detail on the fiberboard and metal siding was specifically a corner piece.

Rao: The corner is treated with a corner piece, and most of the finishes are pre-formed.

Lopez: Noted that the metal siding in the drawings was indicated as alternating in sizes, but the sample provided does not indicate that.

Rao: Noted that the drawing is accurate and that there are two color options for the metal finish.

Masterman: Inquired how the windows sit in the stucco walls, and if these windows have a fin.

Rao: Showed the Board a detail of the window as it sits in the stucco wall, and the window has a fin.

**Applicant Response:**

There were no additional responses from the applicant.

**Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

**Board Discussion:**

Masterman: Mentioned that she really appreciates the project.

Lopez: Noted that he prefers the glass railing in the 3d model as opposed to the metal railing that is proposed in the drawings.

Rao: Noted that the owner's preferred the metal railing out of safety for their kids, but from a design perspective, both material options could work.

Lopez: Noted that the project will sit well with the neighborhood, and appreciates that the architect pushed the second story addition towards the back, and that the materials are great. He also noted that the front elevation is deceiving in that it misconstrues the pitch of the roof as being elongated, since the pitch of the house and the pitch of the garage (even though at the rear and detached) have the same roofing plane. Expressed some concern with the proportion volume of the entry tower with the house, but understands why it was designed that way.

Smeaton: Wanted to thank the applicant for doing a nice job with the revisions to reflect previous DRB meeting comments.

Masterman: Would suggest that the windows in the stucco have some



		<p>dimension and depth to them.</p> <p>Rao: Noted that the north wall, which will be preserved has 2x4 studs, but the back wall which is new will have a 2x6 stud and that providing window depth will be looked at.</p> <p><b>Board Decision:</b> Masterman: Made a motion that the project meets all the findings and that it is APPROVED as submitted.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p> <p><b>APPROVED as submitted 4-0 and that the project meets the Findings.</b></p>
<b>Board Comments</b>	6.	None
<b>Staff Comments</b>	7.	None
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	8.	The Minutes from the May 2017 DRB meeting were not reviewed.
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	9.	The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on August 3, 2017 at 7 p.m.

Approved,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Contado Lopez, Chair

10.12.17  
Date