

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 5TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 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), Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune
Board Member Absent: Susan Masterman
Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

1. No items.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. **Project Address:** 2044 Monterey Road
Project Number: 2003-DRX
Applicant: Mary Chou, Architect
Potential Historic District: Not Applicable

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 575 sq. ft. single story addition to an existing 1,690 sq. ft. single story house on an 11,231 sq. ft. lot. The single story addition will consist of a new family room and a bedroom. The existing house will be changing to a Spanish design style. The proposed exterior material will consist of sand-float stucco, red clay tile roof, and vinyl windows. The property owner is also seeking the approval for the unpermitted conversion of the garage to a carport. The existing garage door was removed.

Presentation:

Ms. Chou presented the project and noted the changes from the previous meeting including a stucco chimney with a new metal spark cap. The applicant has also incorporated arched windows in all the front-facing windows. She presented a 3-D digital model including printed rendered images for the Board to view. The applicant also provided a specified garage door for the detached garage, which is proposed for repurposing from an office back into a garage.

Questions from the Board:

Smeaton: Thanked the applicant for providing the changes requested from the previous DRB meeting.

Lejeune: Asked the applicant why the far west front window is different in height and depth than the eastern living room windows.

Applicant Response:

Chou: The far west window is a children's bedroom window and it is shorter in height for safety reasons.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Board Discussion:

Fenske: Thanked the applicant and thought the project looked great.

Lopez: Believed the proportions and scale were correct, and that the project was a good design.

DECISION:

Fenske: Made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted and that it meets all the Findings.

Lejeune: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED (4-0, Masterman absent)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

- 3. Project Address:** 1609 Camden Parkway
- Project Number:** 2029-DRX
- Applicant:** Yan Wang
- 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.

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

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

NEW ITEMS

- 4. 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 will create a three vehicle garage.

Presentation:

Lujan: Presented the project and noted that the proposed third-car garage, new vinyl windows, front entry, and rear addition. He noted that he was informed by staff of the erroneous oversight in permitting the front entry that encroaches into the front setback, which will have to be revised for zoning compliance.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: Asked staff what the Board can review if the project is not compliant with zoning.

Staff: mentioned that the Board can still review the project, but will be unable to approve the project as submitted for reasons of the non-compliant entry volume, unless the Board wishes to conditionally approve the project with a revised front entry.

Smeaton: Asked the applicant if window details were provided, and why there were not included in the submittal.

Lopez: Noted that the purpose of the window details is to see how windows sit in the wall and if there are any trim pieces. The Board will also want to see a detail of the proposed balcony railing.

Lejeune: Asked if the existing garage was being shortened in width to accommodate the new garage. He also inquired about the exterior and if it will be all stucco.

Smeaton: Asked what the new roofing material will be and what will happen the existing S-tile.

Lopez: Noted that the Board will need a roofing sample, or a cut sheet of the new proposed material. The Board will also need a cut sheet of the proposed garage doors.

Fenske: Noted that the window and door schedule needs to be updated to include manufacturer information and reference of details.

Applicant Response:

Lujan: Noted that the existing two-car garage is not being reduced in size to accommodate the third car parking. He also noted that the exterior walls will be finished in La Habra stucco, and he explained that due to a larger roof surface with the addition, the roofing will now be asphalt shingle.

Public Comments:

Gwen McClain, 1319 Mountain View Avenue:

Noted the existing house is not attractive, but the proposed drawings are not attractive either. The proposed remodel looks like a tract house with vinyl windows and asphalt shingles. Most of the neighborhood is mid-century and this will not fit in the neighborhood. She also noted that there were inconsistencies with the dimensions on the plans and actual field measurements. She does not like that the owner can continue with the existing side yard setbacks as allowed in the Code. The measurements of the entry to the house were not accurate and do not consider the public right of way, or the fact that there is no sidewalk.

Sue Matz, 1324 Mountain View Avenue:

Noted that the applicant is missing a lot of dimensions and that it is unknown how far the front of the house is to the street curb. She also noted that the front yard is required to have no more than 45% hardscaping, but that the project does not appear to comply. There are no trees, and no landscape plan was indicated in the drawings. She would like to see landscaping to soften the front elevation and noted that quite a few homes on the street are slated for historic designation. She expressed concern with the house being so close to the street already, and having a negative impact on the street with the proposed entry that juts out. The small roof line of the entry, and the roof line of the garage is too busy, and a single roofline would be better.

Gary Brown, 1327 Mountain View Avenue:

Noted that the dimensions and the drawings are not accurate. The potential location of the HVAC system is a concern that was not noted on the drawings.

Stephen Degles, 1324 Mountain View Avenue:

There are three or four homes on the street that are up for consideration on the City's Historic Inventory. He feels that the house remodel should be consistent with the mid-century style of the neighborhood. It is a concern that there is little room landscaping. We would like to see and maintain a better standard of living for the neighborhood.

Board Discussion:

Fenske: Noted that the street is very narrow and that property damage has been done as people try to turn around in the middle of the street. The house is right on the street, and the house should have something to do with the street: the scale, the massing, etc. He expressed he wanted to see a comparison drawing between two adjacent homes and this property any possible relationships.

Lopez: Noted that the Board cannot require a survey be done, nor can City employees go onto private property and conduct field measurements as suggested by a concerned neighbor.

Smeaton: Asked staff if the landscape plan was sufficient as presented.

Staff: Noted that the landscape plans are not sufficient and that an actual proposed planting plan is required indicating plants with symbols. The maximum hardscape requirement for the front yard is 45% max.

Smeaton: Noted that vinyl windows are not great and that they site in the wall differently than other windows of higher quality. He asked the applicant to readdress the front elevation and consider the neighborhood.

Lopez: Noted that the house does not increase the height or the side yard encroachments, but the simple design is not detailed sufficiently. The Board needs to see extra detailing and better quality roofing material and eave details. He expressed concern for the three-car garage and that no other house in the neighborhood has a three-car garage. If this is going to be the case, the garage needs to be nice through the doors and finishes.

Lejeune: Noted that the addition of the third garage is a tactic for parking issues, but the proposed solution is reminiscent of tract-like developments. Everything is sitting out there right on the street, and it is very overwhelming. A 3-D model would be very helpful especially to see how the balcony is designed. He also asked if there were any existing trees in the front, to which the applicant responded no. Lejeune requested a detailed landscaping plan.

DECISION:

Fenske: Made a motion to CONTINUE the project to come back with a landscape plan, 3-D model, context elevations, door and window schedule with manufacturer information, door and window details, railing details, a more accurate site plan, ideally a survey, garage door specs, roofing specs, window specs, and to take into consideration what the neighbors have said.

Smeaton: Seconded the motion.

CONTINUED TO THE NEXT DRB MEETING BY 4-0 (Masterman absent)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 5. Project Address: | 516 Prospect Ave. |
| Project Number: | 2037-DRX |
| Applicant: | Gary Bouchard, Architect |
| Potential Historic District: | Buena Vista District |

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will consider a request for a residential remodel and a 1,320 sq. ft. second story addition to an existing 1,487 sq. ft. single story house on a 10,387 sq. ft. The addition consists of: two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, a study, a master bedroom, bathroom, and closet. The addition also consists of a second story balcony and an attached rear dining patio. The exterior materials will consist of: plaster siding (Santa Barbara finish), Nusku cedar wood siding, asphalt rolled roof, and aluminum-wood clad windows.

Presentation:

Bouchard: Noted that the project was approved last year, but the approvals expired before Plan Check and this is a reapplication.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: Asked if there were any changes from the last approval, and if there were details of the railings from the second floor balcony, and that he would like to see those details.

Smeaton: Asked why the windows at the north elevation were not full-size, and that the proposed high and small ones were odd.

Lejeune: Asked what the window material will be, and if the front door will have frosted or clear glass.

Applicant Response:

Bouchard: Noted that the balcony railing changed from a solid half wall to a more transparent wood railing. A deck from the back master bedroom has been removed, however most of the project is the same as previously approved. A detail of the railing was not included in the presented drawings. All windows will be wood, and the front door glass will be clear.

Owner: Mentioned that the north wall windows were designed to be high and small to appease the neighbors and their privacy concerns as those windows overlook their pool.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Board Discussion:

Lopez: Would like to see details of the railing, a sample of the proposed siding, and a sample of the roof. He also noted that it is difficult to go from one story to two, but that the two stories are not out of place in that neighborhood. The railings appear to be nice, but that the Board needs to see details.

DECISION:

Smeaton: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT with a Chair Review for the railing details, roof and siding samples and that it meets all the Findings.

Fenske: Seconded the motion

APPROVED with the CONDITION of a Chair Review to provide railing detailing, and samples of the roof and siding. 4-0 (Masterman absent)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

6. **Project Address:** 1030 Palm Ave.
Project Number: 2044-DRX
Applicant: Paul Naecker
Potential Historic District: El Centro/Indiana/Palm Addition District

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will consider a request for a residential renovation and a 1,038 sq. ft. addition to an existing 1,058 sq. ft. single story house on a 5,989 sq. ft. The addition consists of: one bedroom, two bathrooms, a laundry room, a study, chimney bay, and kitchen expansion. The addition also consists of a 204 sq. ft. enlarged covered front porch. There is also a 77 sq. ft. side deck and a 278 sq. ft. rear deck with a trellis above. The exterior materials will consist of: wood clapboard siding and decorative shingles, charcoal roof shingles with zinc metal roofing, and double-hung wood windows and doors.

Presentation:

Naecker: Presented the project as an expansion to the house and converting the existing design from vernacular square Mid-west to a Craftsman. The front has a completely enclosed front porch and the owner would like to create an open porch. The house will have open slatted detailing, wood siding, wood windows with Craftsman proportions and true divided lites. The end goal is to try and make the small house livable. There is an existing two-car garage at the back accessed via an alleyway. The project proposes the construction of one detached garage with and carport that will allow the carport to open up onto the yard and be utilized as yard space when there is no car parked there. There will be two full bedrooms and a small study room with the additions. The goal is to be in keeping with the Craftsman style predominate in the City.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: asked what the difference was with the option one or two. He also noted that the front of the house extends beyond the current and the rest of the neighboring houses. Overall, he thought it was a great job and very nice.

Smeaton: Noted that this was one of the best applications we received in a while. Noted that both options work well and that the preference was the steeper 7:12 pitch.

Lejeune: Wanted clarity on why the preference for a higher roof pitch. He also noted that the bay window was beautiful but the deck beside it seems more like a platform and if that was the real intention.

Lopez: Noted that the railing details will be need to be provided for the front porch and the side balcony.

Applicant Response:

Naecker: Noted that the two roofing options were for the feasibility of utilizing existing wall plate heights to accommodate higher ceiling heights. Option one is to use the existing roof pitch and scissor onto existing plates to extend the wall plates higher and allow for higher interior head clearance. Option two is to provide a new roof and provide a steeper roof pitch to accommodate interior head space, which is more expensive. He also noted that the house extends out to accommodate a front porch and is still within the front yard setback clearance. In addressing the platform look of the balcony, the applicant noted that the platform is actually a side balcony but the railing was omitted from the drawings for visual clarity, though railing is proposed.

Public Comments:

Chris Crocrott, 1020 Palm:

Expressed that he was very pleased with the design and thinks it will look great with the neighborhood. He noted the existing garage is not a two-car garage, but a one-car garage. He would like to see the 14' rear addition to be set back one foot to see a five foot side yard setback. He would also like to see the bay window converted to a casement for privacy concerns. He expressed concerns with where the construction dumpsters will be located.

Sharon Crocroft, 1020 Palm:

Had a question of the rear porch and what the height will be. She asked where the HVAC system will be. She also asked what will be done to the side yard fencing and if new fencing will be constructed.

1032 Palm:

Noted that the previous owner installed two large satellite dishes that overlooked her property and would prefer that the new owner removes them and does not reinstall them.

Applicant Response:

The bay window is to provide light into the kitchen and they are proposing to use permeable surfacing and relandscape the whole property as it is currently mostly paved. They will also recycle the concrete that is removed and reutilize it in the landscape. The HVAC system will be located in the rear yard. The rear addition will be 36 inches above grade, and there will be a basement where the mechanical equipment will be located.

Board Discussion:

Lejeune: Asked if the magnolia trees are going to be removed and if the exterior chimney will be brick.

Fenske: Expressed that he liked the project, and that he prefers option 1.

Smeaton: Liked the project and noted that he prefers the shallower roof pitch (new roof pitch, option 2).

Lejeune: Expressed that he liked option 1 (scissor onto the existing roof pitch).

Lopez: Expressed that he liked option 1. He also expressed that this is the best example of taking something simple and bumping it up. It is a beautiful project. The articulation of the massing is great. He would like to see the railing, but trusts it is going to be beautiful. Noted that he has an issue with the 18 inch front porch extension and would really it compared to the rest of the neighborhood. He asked the rest of the Board members what they thought of the porch extension.

Smeaton: Mentioned that he does not have a problem with the porch extension.

Lejeune: Mentioned that he is ok with the porch extension, and thinks the overall design is elegant.

DECISION:

Smeaton: Made a motion to APPROVE OPTION 1 with a CONDITION of a Chair Review for the railing detailing and that the project meets all the Findings.

Lopez: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED with the CONDITION of a Chair Review to provide railing detailing. 4-0 (Masterman absent).

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

7. **Project Address:** 1101 Mission Street
Project Number: 2045-DRX
Applicant: Carlos Souza
Potential Historic District: Mission West/Historic Business District Addition

Project Information:

Design Review request for a proposal of two wall signs with cut out letters and logo for the property. The two wall signs measure 12 feet in width and 39 inches in height and will not impede pedestrian traffic in any way. The total square area of the two signs is 39.75 sq. ft. The signs are not illuminated. The material for the signs will be ½" thick flat cut out clear acrylic letters with applied white vinyl. The signs will read "Divergent Crossfit"

Presentation:

Carlos Souza presented the project as two signage panels for each wall face of the cross fit studio. The signage will be colored acrylic.

Questions from the Board:

Lejeune: Asked where the color comes from on the signs and how they are going to be mounted.

Smeaton: Asked what the longevity of the paint is on the acrylic signs and the details of the logo portion of the sign.

Lopez: Expressed concern with acrylic/plastic signage in the Mission Street district and inquired what the cost differential will be if the signage were composed of metal instead. Lopez noted that other signs in the area are made of metal.

Smeaton: asked what the cost difference would be if the signage was ¾" instead of ½" as proposed to stop potential warpage.

Applicant Response:

Souza: Noted that the acrylic signage is white, and the colors will be achieved through paint. He also noted that each individual letter will be pin mounted into the brick façade of the building. The longevity of the acrylic signage is typically about 5-10 years. If the signage were made of metal, the cost premium would be about 60 percent, however, he could consider PVC to gain extra thickness and stay within cost.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Applicant Response:

Souza: Noted that through his experience, acrylic will not warp. Anything less than ¼" will warp, but thicker acrylic such as ½" will not warp. And because all letters are individually mounted, it adds additional protection against warpage as opposed to a large acrylic surface. The paint used on the signage is the same paint used on vehicles, so it is extremely durable and long lasting.

Board Discussion:

Lejeune: Noted that the acrylic signage works because the individual letters and shapes are relatively small.

DECISION:

Fenske: Made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted at ½" thick acrylic WITH THE CONDITION that the signs be maintained as originally approved and remain in good condition, and that the project meets all the Findings.

Lejeune: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED with the CONDITION of that the signs be maintained as originally approve and remain in good condition. 4-0 (Masterman absent).

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

BOARD COMMENTS

8. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS


9. No Staff comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

10. Minutes for the previous DRB meeting was not reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT

11. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 2, 2017.

APPROVED,


Conrado Lopez
Chair, Design Review Board

11.2.17

Date