

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

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 1ST DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2018

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 7:00 pm
Board Members Present: Susan Masterman, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune
Board Member Absent: Conrado Lopez, Jim Fenske
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. **Project Address:** 1325 Mountain View
Project Number: 2028-DRX
Applicant: Nabil Suleiman
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a total; 884 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; 385 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 118 sq. ft. deck on the front elevation. 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 122 sq. ft. garage storage area.

**** NOTE: THE PROEJCT WAS NOT HEARD AT THIS MEETING AND CONTINUED TO MARCH 2018.**

NEW ITEMS

3. **Project Address:** 5 Pasadena Avenue
Project Number: 2072-DRX
Applicant: Steve Dahl, Architect
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 5,839 two-story, 5-unit office building on a 15,299 sq. ft. lot. The new two-story commercial building will consist of 5-units with a first floor, mezzanine on the second floor with a balcony. The designated zoning for this proposal is Commercial General. The building will be Googie/Mid-Century Modern inspired architecture for this proposal. The proposal also includes a 14 spaces of parking including a handicap space with a total area of 7,079 sq. ft. Parking is located on the west side of the building. Landscaping will consist of 2,023 sq. ft. including along the

street side of the lot and 24" box crepe-myrtle trees between every 4 parking spaces. All windows and doors to be aluminum silver with green vision and tempered glass. The materials for this proposed office building include brick veneer and smooth stucco.

**** NOTE: ITEM WAS NOT DISCUSSED DUE TO ABSENCES AND PROXIMITY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CONTINUED TO MARCH 2018.**

4. Project Address: 335 Alta Vista Avenue
Project Number: 2082-DRX
Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval to build a new 477 sf. single story addition to an existing 1,289 sf. Mid-Century Modern single store house, built in 1954. The addition consists of remodeling the master bedroom and bath with an addition of a master walk-in-closet. A new family room and one additional bedroom are proposed. The new addition will extend south towards the rear of the property. The completed house will be 1,766 sq. ft. The new exterior will be built in the post and beam style with wood siding to match existing. All new windows will be metal frame, double glazed by Milgard series, anodized aluminum, to match existing frames. All new roof shingles and doors will match existing style and materials.

Presentation:

Tom Nott: noted that this is a 1950s post and beam structure that is set to be on the new Inventory, but since it has not been approved yet, it still falls under the DRB purview. The existing sheathing does not meet the current energy requirements, so the energy engineer recommended 3" ridged foam over the roof, which means the roof will have to be completely removed and replaced. New energy efficient windows will be installed. The exterior finish is 1x3 board and batten painted wood. He is duplicating the existing finish at the rear of the addition. The addition is most likely not visible from the street.

Questions from the Board:

Smeaton: noted that the architect is keeping the same exterior materials for the new addition, and the roof slope will be maintained as the original. It will be a nice complement to the existing home.

Lejeune: Noted that it will look like it's always been there and it will be beautiful.

Lir: noted that she liked the design and had no additional questions..

Public Comment:

Bobby burns: neighbor to the northeast, not opposed to the addition but expressed concern with how the project will impact her property, and if any trees will be removed and how long they anticipate construction to last due to the fact that they want to put their home on the market and don't want that to impact the sell.

Applicant Response:

Nott: noted that his son will be the general contractor and anticipates that the project is fairly simple and straight forward and that it should take about 4 months.

Board Discussion:

Lejeune: noted that the scale is right, the materials are all the same, and the debris bin will be temporary, and that overall he was in favor of the project.

Smeaton: Noted that he agreed with Lejeune and that the addition is consistent with the existing home.

Decision:

Lejuene: made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted.

Smeaton: seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (3-0; Fenske & Lopez absent)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

-
5. **Project Address:** 624 Camino Cerrado
Project Number: 2083-DRX
Applicant: Kate Meigneux
Potential Historic District: None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 424 sq. ft. single story addition onto an existing 2,536 sq. ft. two level house on a 15,060 sq. ft. lot. The addition consists of a new bedroom with a bathroom. The new addition will be located towards the front elevation of the property. The exterior siding will consist of asphalt roof shingles, stucco siding, and aluminum windows. The exterior materials will match the existing. A 24' Ficus Benjamina tree will be removed for the proposed addition. Please contact the Public Works Dept. at 626/ 403-7240 in regards to additional tree information.

Presentation:

Kate Meigneux: noted that she is the designer on the project and that the original owner from 1964 is still the current owner of the custom-built home. The owner would like to add an addition to the home to accommodate another bedroom. All exterior materials will match. The current entry is discreet and through a courtyard. Only about 3 feet of the property will be affected in the front to accommodate the addition. A ficus tree will be required for removal through Public Works, but the tree is also planted too close to the house anyway.

Questions from the Board:

Smeaton: noted that it was an interesting solution to unify the addition to the house at the corners. He noted he liked how the applicant resolved the addition with the floor plan.

Lejuene: asked if the wood ramp will be installed to make it more accessible.

Lejeune: also asked if the ficus tree is large.

Lejeune: asked what the wood deck was in between the building volumes.

Lir: Inquired about the windows and the inconsistencies with the size of the window additions compared to the existing.

Smeaton: asked what the undereave detail is.

Applicant Response:

Meigneux: The wood ramp is for accessibility purposes, and the ficus tree is large and has a lot of branches that are close to the house. The deck is small but can accommodate two recreational cots. The addition is for a bedroom and it opens up onto a garden area, while the undereave is closed.

Public Comments:

David Gleason: Noted that Susan (owner) has lived there in the house since 1964 and that she has been diagnosed with degenerative disease and may need care in the future. The addition will allow for Gleason and his family to move in and to care for Susan in the future.

Board Discussion:

Lejeune: noted that the project presents a good solution to the owner’s need but he suggested further refinement of the landscape to continue to tuck the house into the site as does so currently.

Smeaton: noted that he favors the project and that the designer did a nice job with the design..

DECISION:

Lir: made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted as it meets the findings.

Lejeune: seconded the motion.

**APPROVED as submitted.
(3-0; Fenske & Lopez absent)**

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

- 6. **Project Address:** 4935 Harriman Drive
- Project Number:** 2094-DRX
- Applicant:** Dino Tadiar, Architect
- Potential Historic District:** None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a facade change by removing the front door entry bridge and the front door. The front door will be replaced with a wood panel siding. A new front door entrance with an entrance canopy is proposed on the lower level to this 3,039 sq. ft. two level house on an 11,268 sq. ft. lot.

Presentation:

Dino Tadiar: presented the project and noted that the original concept was to continue the use of the pedestrian bridge, but the design evolved to change the space arrangements of the house and chose to make the public spaces on the ground floor and the private bedroom space on the second floor and thus the pedestrian bridge will be obsolete. The new entry will be to descend the front slope to the ground floor to the new ground floor entry. The new wood siding at the front facade will be wood composite.

Questions from the Board:

Lejeune: noted that the designs show that the circulation to the front door is a descent down the front slope, then another step up at the door and expressed concern with this.

Smeaton: Asked what the plant material will be for the redesigned front yard and to clarify the proposed wood composite siding for the front entry.

Smeaton: asked if the stucco finish will be smooth trowel finish.

Lejeune: asked if the railing will be new at the driveway bridge.

Smeaton: Noted that the verticality of the wood composite material is a concern, as it looks like it should be horizontal. If it was horizontal, it would help to ground the building along with the new entry canopy.

Lejeune: asked if the narrow window in the wood siding will be for a pantry.

Smeaton: again expressed concern with the vertical wood siding and its juxtaposition to the horizontality of the new entry canopy.

Lir: noted that the front yard will be a difficult site to grow succulents due to the shade it will receive.

Smeaton: asked if the project meets the threshold for a landscape plan.

Sissi: noted that the project does not meet the threshold for a required landscape plan.

Lejeune: noted that the inspiration image for the front entry and landscape provided by the applicant should be what is being proposed in the landscape plan with some trees to provide a softness for the project.

Smeaton: asked what color the new asphalt shingles will be

Lir: noted that the new house design will have a completely different feel compared to the new, and that the proposal is kind of cold.

Lejeune: asked if there was any divider between the two properties.

Applicant Response:

Tadiar: noted that the owner did not want to have any trees in the front and that they wanted to maintain a low landscape design so they are going to plant the front slope terracing with drought tolerant plantings that are low growing. Dino also noted that the project has obtained permits for the new roof and window replacements and is currently under construction for that and that they would like to retain as much of the original form of the existing house as possible.

Dino: Noted that there is some concern with the drainage and possible collection of water there, so this part has not been fully resolved. The siding will protrude from the wall, and the material has an L-corner piece to make it a solid looking application. He also noted that the stucco will be a sand finish and the railing will be new but the same design as the existing. He added that the client expressed a strong desire to have a vertical design element with the wood composite. He noted that there is currently no fence between the two properties and the owner will at a future time plan to provide a fence along the northern edge. The project is anticipated to be complete by mid-March with the facade change, and landscaping change pending approval with the Board tonight. The windows are being removed due to the internal layout of the rearrangement of the internal programming.

Public Comments:

Erick Mower (neighbor to the north): asked about the timeline and the anticipated completion date and what the impacts the project will or may have on him and his driveway which directly abuts the northern property line.

Board Discussion:

Lejeune: noted that he does not have a great concern with the verticality of the wood composite but understands the board's concerns. Upon closer inspection, he realizes that because it is just one piece, if it were to be applied elsewhere as well, the design will work better.

Smeaton: suggested that as a solution, if the applicant were to maintain the vertical wood composite as designed, but extend it to encompass the the entry area under the new entry canopy as well so they have a vertical and horizontal design element.

Lir: Noted that the landscaping plan is not sufficient, and that having a viable landscape plan is rather important.

Lejeune: noted that the image provided by the applicant is pertinent, because if that is the feeling or effect that the owner wants, then trees would be significant to have. He also added that it is significant to be the last house on the block before the landscape ascended up the wooded hillside and that a spattering of trees will assist with grounding the house at the base of the hill.

Lir: noted that the landing at the front entry might be too long and too narrow.

Tadiar: noted that the landscape architect will resolve the landscaping and the entry landing along with drainage concerns.

DECISION:

Lejeune: made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS, subject to Chair Review:

1. Continue the horizontal wood siding to encompass the front entry and the area under the new entry canopy.
2. Provide a landscape plane for Chair Review by Yael Lir prior to issuance of Building Permits.

Lir: seconded motion.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITION FOR CHAIR REVIEW OF ROOFING MATERIAL.
(3-0; Fenske & Lopez absent)**

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

7. Board Reorganization

Project Information:

The Board will conduct an election for the Chair and Vice Chair for 2018

****NOTE: ELECTION WAS POSTPONED TO THE MARCH MEETING DUE TO ABCENCES OF TWO BOARD MEMBERS**

BOARD COMMENTS

8. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

9. Sissi: Provided a reminder for the Board to attend the Joint meeting for the General Plan Update in the Library Community Room on February 13th beginning at 7 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ADJOURNMENT

11. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm to the next scheduled March 1, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton
Vice Chair, Design Review Board

02/20/2019
Date