


**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
 CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
 CONVENED THIS 15TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2016
 AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS: MAYOR'S CONFERENCE ROOM
 1424 MISSION STREET**

ROLL CALL		<p>The meeting convened at: 7:20 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, Planning Intern</p>
NON-AGENDA ITEMS	1.	None.
CONTINUED ITEMS	2.	<p>817 Orange Grove Place Project Number: 1750-DRX Applicant: Peter DeMaria, Architect Project Information:</p> <p>PROJECT NOT REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING.</p>
NEW ITEMS	3.	<p>111 Peterson Avenue Project Number: 1966-DRX Applicant: James Fenske, Architect Presented by: Laurie Dieckmann</p> <p>Project Information: A request for Design Review approval for the unpermitted removal of the siding and for the proposed cement board siding for the entire house.</p> <p><i>NOTE: APPLICANT AND DRB BOARD MEMBER JIM FENSKE IS THE ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR THIS PROJECT. HE RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE REVIEW AND EXITED THE PRESENTATION ROOM WHILE HIS WIFE PRESENTED THE PROJECT ON HIS BEHALF. JIM FENSKE DID NOT VOTE ON HIS OWN PROJECT.</i></p> <p>Presentation: Laurie Dieckmann: Apologized for the removal of the existing siding without obtaining the proper permits and approval. Presented three letters of support from neighbors. Ms. Dieckmann brought in material samples, a hardi-plank cement board is being considered for fire safety reasons. The applicant does not like the pre-textured materials, or pre-painted options. They will paint the new smooth siding in a gray color. The applicant will also be utilizing a 10 inch surface module due to the 8 foot doors found on the house and to coincide with the overall scale of the architectural features. The existing stucco siding will be retained. The applicant is also proposing to install three small operable windows in the loft spaces under the soffits of the roof ridges to allow for cross ventilation and eliminate the regular need for air conditioning</p> <p>Board Questions: Masterman: Wanted clarity on the scope of the project. The scope includes the replacement of the original siding with hardi-board, and the</p>

	<p>retention of the existing stucco siding, and the installation of three small windows.</p> <p>Smeaton: Inquired why the existing ombre-colored siding was being replaced. It is being replaced because the UV coating had failed before the manufacturer was able to fix the issue in later fabrication methods. Smeaton also inquired if the color was going to be integral. The applicant stated that the color will be painted gray, and the color of the material sample is the pre-prime hue.</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Frank and Dana Farrar, 4935 Harriman (Letter of Support): Supports the project proposal to remove and replace the siding of the house.</p> <p>Freyr Thor and Olga Plateado, 115 Peterson Ave (Letter of Support): As a direct neighbor to the applicant, they not only see the siding replacement as an improvement to the house but to the entire neighborhood.</p> <p>Stephen Michlin, 117 Peterson Ave (Letter of Support): Supports the new siding on the house.</p> <p>Anonymous response from a Harriman Avenue resident: Raised concerns with Jim Fenske's alleged construction violations including the dumping of concrete onto her property. Stated that Mr. Fenske begins construction at 6 in the morning on his hillside development projects and the disturbance the dump trucks have on the neighborhood. Raised the issue that Mr. Fenske is in conflict of interest by having his project reviewed by the Board on which he sits. Allegedly claimed that Mr. Fenske continuously breaks the laws and would like to know why the City lets him get away with it. Also alleges that Mr. Fenske leaves his property astray with debris.</p> <p>Freyr Thor, 115 Peterson Ave: Appreciated that Mr. Fenske recused himself from the review of his project by the Board. Also appreciates that Mr. Fenske is trying to improve his property with better siding. Mr. Thor raises no concerns with Mr. Fenske's projects or quality of craftsmanship as he lives in one of the houses next door to 111 Peterson that Mr. Fenske also designed and built.</p> <p>Anonymous response from a Harriman Avenue resident: Complained of the mess from Fenske's project, the dumping of dirt on the street and the alleged housing of workers on the property. Presented photographs of Mr. Fenske's property and the refuse strewn about at the lower garage. Also raised concerns with Mr. Fenske's project being presented before the Board on which he sits.</p> <p>Yuni Kwan, 133 Peterson and 1900 Peterson: Has noticed the work of Mr. Fenske in the neighborhood and praised the artistry of his work. She has plans in the future to hire Mr. Fenske to design and build her new smaller home on the same street. Ms. Kwan praised Mr. Fenske as an artist and that artists are good for the community.</p> <p>Applicant Response:</p> <p>Stated that the police and fire department were out every day during the construction of 111 Peterson to field complaints, in which no code violation was found. There was also no illegal concrete dumping onto another resident's property. The Fenske property is not housing illegal workers. The</p>
--	---

	<p>two single car garages in front of the property are staggered and one is used as a hobby shop for their son. The construction debris as shown in the photographs is the result of using the front of the property as a temporary staging area during the construction of the new siding of the house. The Fenske's do not break the law and do not use prohibited size trucks or work outside of the permitted construction hours.</p> <p>Board Discussion/Decision: Masterman: The project meets all the findings. Made a motion to APPROVE the project.</p> <p>Lopez: Seconded the motion.</p> <p>Smeaton: Likes the proposed colors and how it will blend into the hillside better. The scale of the new material will be more appropriate.</p> <p><i>The Board found the project met the required findings and voted to APPROVE the project as submitted, 3-0 with Fenske absent for purposes of recusal.</i></p>
4.	<p>1653 Amberwood Drive Project Number: 1972-DRX Applicant: Jerry Wise, Property Owner</p> <p>Project Information: A request for a façade change to the existing apartments. The façade improvements will consist of new balcony design and materials. The new exterior materials will provide a modern design to the existing apartments. THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD WILL ONLY BE DISCUSSING THE FAÇADE CHANGES ONLY.</p> <p>Presentation: Jerry Wise: Expressed a desire to improve and enhance the dilapidated apartment complex currently under his new ownership. Mr. Wise mentioned that a life-size mock-up was in place on one of the apartment balconies that incorporates horizontal slatted wood siding and replaces the chainlink that is currently in place. There are about (6) balconies in total that need retrofitting.</p> <p>Board Questions: Smeaton: Asked what type of wood the balconies were going to be and if they were stained.</p> <p>Wise: They will be a dark-stained redwood.</p> <p>Masterman: Wanted clarification on the scope of the work which is to include the balcony railings and the stone cladding of an existing CMU textile block screen wall. Also inquired if an alternate material has been chosen in place of the stacked stone cladding.</p> <p>Wise: The privacy screen sits above a patio to a unit.</p> <p>Lopez: Prefers the existing open screen of the CMU textile block wall in its retro form. Asked if the wall is in good condition and if it can be painted to help in its integrity.</p>

		<p>Wise: The retention of the wall was looked at as an option. It is not structural, but would need stabilization through reinforcements on the back (patio side), and the removal of two rows of blocks at the top.</p> <p>Public Comments: Catherine Harris (1640 Amberwood): Appreciates the efforts by the new owners to clean up the property and shows that they care about the property and the neighborhood. Would like the City to place more emphasis on Raymond Hill and ensuring that properties are maintained.</p> <p>Laura Page (1653 Amberwood): Understands that the building is 60 years old and needed a lot of care. The new wood balcony railings look great along with the new windows and doors. The overall improvements are great.</p> <p>Applicant Response: None.</p> <p>Board Discussion/Decision: Lopez: Thinks that the efforts to clean up the property and modernization efforts are great and the grey colors and balcony looks fantastic. Would like to see the original CMU textile block wall retained as an original architectural feature that is not readily seen anymore.</p> <p>Masterman: Believes the proposed stone cladding is not in keeping with the original mid-century modern style of the apartments, and is also in favor of retaining the CMU wall.</p> <p>Smeaton: Likes the efforts of design enhancements, and would like to see the CMU wall retained too, and possibly paint it a darker grey. Suggested a translucent panel to be placed on the inside face of the wall to allow for translucent screening while retaining the transparent screening effect of the wall on the outer public face.</p> <p>Lopez: Made a motion to approve as submitted and allow for the preservation of the CMU textile wall, allowing for the removal of two top rows of block and a hidden or translucent bracing structure/panel on the inside face.</p> <p>Fenske: Seconded the motion.</p> <p>The Board found that the project met the required findings and voted to APPROVE the project, 4-0 with the conditions for the CMU wall motioned by Chairman Lopez.</p>
Board Comments	5.	None.
Staff Comments	6.	None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7.	Minutes The Minutes were not reviewed.
ADJOURNMENT	8.	The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on January 5, 2017 at 7 p.m.
	9.	
	10.	
	11.	

Approved,



Conrado Lopez, Chair

2.6.17
Date