


**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
 CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA  
 CONVENED THIS 1<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER, 2016  
 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,</p> <p>Board Members Absent: Mark Smeaton</p> <p>Staff Liaison: Edwar Sissi, Planning Intern</p>  |
| NON-AGENDA ITEMS | 1. | None.  |
| CONTINUED ITEMS  | 2. | <p><b>817 Orange Grove Place</b><br/> <b>Project Number: 1750-DRX</b><br/> <b>Applicant: Peter DeMaria, Architect</b><br/> <b>Project Information:</b></p> <p>PROJECT NOT REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING.</p>  |
| NEW ITEMS        | 3. | <p><b>111 Peterson Avenue</b><br/> <b>Project Number: 1966-DRX</b><br/> <b>Applicant: James Fenske, Architect</b><br/> <b>Project Information:</b></p> <p>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><b>Presentation:</b><br/>         PROJECT NOT PRESENTED OR REVIEWED DUE TO A QUORUM NOT BEING ESTABLISHED AT THIS MEETING BECAUSE OF THE ABSENCE OF BOARD MEMBER SMEATON AND THIS BEING A PROJECT PRESENTED BY BOARD MEMBER FENSKE.</p>   |
| Discussion Items | 4. | <p><b>1707 Camden Parkway</b><br/> <b>Applicant: Susie Lau, Homeowner</b><br/> <b>(CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)</b></p> <p><b>Project Information:</b><br/>         A request for a conceptual review regarding the unpermitted installation of the metal roof mounted rods on the existing roof.</p> <p><b>Board Discussion:</b><br/>         Lopez and Masterman: Why was this project brought before the Board?</p> <p>Sissi: This was brought before the Board because a neighbor had filed a complaint about the roof ornamentation. The homeowner applied for a re-roofing permit and it was approved by Planning. Planning did not approve of the over-articulated "waves" in the re-roofing, but the Building and Safety Division had signed off for final approval. The roofing is not under the purview of this meeting because it has been finalized. The topic</p> |

of discussion is the decorative finials that were installed at the peak of each roof ridge.

Lopez: Expressed concern with the roofing because the homeowner changed the design of the roof with the new "waves." The roofing is a concern because the design has been changed and this design change did not come before the Board or Chair for approval. This was more than a re-roofing job, because there was a deliberate design intent by the homeowner that was not reviewed or approved by the Board.

Homeowner Applicant: The original roofing approved by permit was to use wood shake. But due to longevity issues, the homeowner chose a synthetic material that simulates wood shakes. The alternate material was approved via a material sample by the Building Division.

Fenske: Asked the contractor if they provided evidence of the intended design of the roofing via drawings or images, and the contractor said no.

Masterman: There are holes in the review process because it is not expected that a roofing will change design when a like-for-like re-roofing is planned. The homeowner went through all the proper channels but still ended up getting a roof that was not in-kind, not in keeping with the architecture or neighborhood. The finials are like "gilding the lilly" and are not necessary. They are beautiful objects, but do not enhance the architecture of the house.

Fenske: If the finials are temporary ornamental objects for Christmas, or other holidays, or if this was a Victorian style house, then the finials could be viewed as appropriate.

Homeowner: Came across the finials because of the Holidays, and their availability from Home Depot. They are temporary, but if they can leave them up they would like that and would like to see the finials weather since they are copper. The finials cost around \$420 each.

Lopez: Does not have a problem with the finials. He has a problem with the re-roofing which was not an in-kind re-roof. The responsibility lies with the homeowner, not the City if the homeowner had an intentional motive to add a design element to the roof, which is the case here. The City should require homeowners or contractors to provide a visual pattern of the intended roof shingle design. The material is not an issue, it is what the homeowner/contractor has done with the material.

Fenske: Asked the contractor how difficult would it be to take out the extra layer of roofing. The contractor mentioned that it would be very difficult, costly, and wasteful of the \$80,000 it cost to re-roof the house.

Masterman: The issue of the roofing is not within our purview because it is not officially before us tonight, but we can provide comment which we are doing. The finials are not necessary and they do not enhance the building. As a matter of discussion, the finials are fine as a temporary Holiday display, but as permanent objects, no. Recommends that the owners do not pursue the finial proposal. She explained that all projects before the Board must meet the required findings and that the Board must refer back to the City's Design Guidelines. Masterman pointed out finding number 4 in which the project is aesthetically appealing and of good

|                     |     |  |
|---------------------|-----|--|
|                     |     | composition where the Board is required to look back to the Design Guidelines and look at the style of the house and details and if these finials are appropriate for the character of the house. Masterman does not believe they are appropriate for the style of the house as they reinforce a vertical element to the house which is not associated with this particular architectural style.<br><br>Lopez: Expressed indifference with the finials, but agrees with Masterman that they do not go with the architecture. |
| Board Comments      | 5.  | None.  |
| Staff Comments      | 6.  | None.  |
| APPROVAL OF MINUTES | 7.  | Minutes<br>The Minutes were not reviewed.  |
| ADJOURNMENT         | 8.  | The meeting adjourned at 8:00 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