

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 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, and Mark Smeaton</p> <p>Board Members Absent: None</p> <p>Staff Liaison: Knarik Vizcarra, Assistant Planner</p>
NON-AGENDA ITEMS	1.	None.
CONTINUED ITEMS	2.	No New Continued Items
NEW ITEMS	3.	<p>1129 Diamond Avenue Project Number: 1926-DRX Applicant: John Corey, Architect Project Information:</p> <p>A request for Design Review approval for demolition of an existing single-story home and construction of a 1,934 square foot two-story (1,066 square foot first floor and 868 square foot second floor), Spanish Colonial Revival style house with a 420 square foot detached garage located at the rear of the property. Proposed exterior material for the project consist of clay mission tile roofing, wooden rafter tails, wrought iron railings, aluminum clad windows and adobe texture stucco.</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. Corey presented the project and explained that the current house proposed to be demolished has been identified as non-historic through a historical report. The new house will have a farther setback (30') than the average of the neighborhood houses (20').</p> <p>Questions from the Board: Board members asked about the details around the windows and doors. Mr Corey mentioned that the finish around the openings would be hand troweld return to inset the windows 2 inches with an 1-1/2 inch bullnose. There is no trim proposed around the windows with the exception of the quatrefoil window that will have a stone surround. Board members asked for a wrought iron balcony detail. Mr. Corey responded they are using a standard iron fabrication and that the balcony is intended as a flower pot balcony. Board members asked about the base and any special</p>

wainscoting treatment. Mr Corey responded that the base of the house will be obscured by the proposed landscape plan.

Public Comment:

David Gibson @ 1122 Diamond: stated concerns with the Spanish-style of the proposed house as being out of character with the predominantly bungalow-style housing of the neighborhood.

Lucia Wiltra @ 1120 Diamond: stated concerns with the Spanish-style of the proposed house as being out of character with the neighborhood. The only Spanish style housing are rental properties.

Monique Malling: 1114 Diamond: stated concerns with the Spanish-style of the proposed house as being out of character with the Craftsman-style South Pasadena is known for.

Kerry Oscher: 1107 Fairview: Concerned with the stucco finish, and window detailing, and roof ridge not being consistent with the orientation of the neighborhood.

Applicant Response:

The wood windows are metal clad wood windows. The orientation of the ridge line is deliberate to break up the monotony of the housing pattern of the neighborhood. The finish will be hand troweled with a smooth texture stucco finish. The garage will be new construction and will meet current setback requirements with a new foundation.

Board Discussion/Decision:

The Board mentioned the findings they are required to address when reviewing the projects. They mention that they are not allowed to choose between architectural style preferences. They must approve or deny projects based on compatibility as set forth in the Design Guidelines. New construction in a historic neighborhood does not have to duplicate the historic style of the neighborhood. The volume, scale and massing is deemed appropriate. The iron railing will need to be Chair reviewed for approval with better details. The body color should be revisited. The metal-clad wood windows are appropriate. The finish will be steel-troweld Santa Barbara finish. The exposed rafter tails should be 4x instead of 2x. All windows should be recessed with bullnose edge. The double-height entry should be diminished per the Guidelines. Paint color is not up to the discretion of the board, per Knarik's comments.

After discussion, Board voted to APPROVE 5-0 with the following conditions to be approved by Chair:

Specify wrought iron detailing, Remove stone, and faux foam finish surround on all windows, all windows to be simulated divided lights with 7/8 muntins. Stucco texture will be smooth Santa Barbara finish. Reduce the vertical height of the dual-height entrance. Provide an eave detail and a chimney cap detail.

	<p>1. 1829 Hill Drive Project Number: 1911-DRX Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect Project Information:</p> <p>A request for a DRB approval to change the façade of the house from the August 4, 2016 DRB approval. The proposed changes will consist of revising the entry canopy and the windows on the entry area.</p> <p>Presentation: Mr. Nott presented the continuance of the item discussing the stucco finish and the recess of the windows.</p> <p>Questions from the Board: Board members asked about the chamfer and if it to be found at all windows.</p> <p>Public Comment: No Comments</p> <p>Applicant Response: Windows will be flush at the sill, but beveled at the jam.</p> <p>Board Discussion/Decision: The Board will not approve nail on fin windows for an extensive remodel. They would like to see an alternative window system.</p> <p>Board voted to APPROVE (5-0) with the condition that the applicant provide a window sample for the Chair to approve.</p>
NEW ITEMS	<p>2. 817 Orange Grove Place Project Number: 1750-DRX Applicant: Peter DeMaria, Architect Project Information:</p> <p>A request for DRB approval to demolish the existing non-historic duplex and a proposal to build a new triplex on a 10,091 square foot lot. Unit A will consist of a single story, 1,031 sf unit. Unit B will consist of a 437sf single story unit, located below unit C. Unit C will consist of a 2,249 sf unit and it is located on the second floor.</p> <p>Presentation: DeMaria presented the project and noted that he accepted the project on the condition that the owner be respectful to the architectural culture of the City, the neighbors and the people of the community. DeMaria spoke about the alleyway and its unsafe conditions and other issues of property access and circulation. The architect developed a scheme that utilized both</p>

the alleyway and Orange Grove Place to minimize the traffic impact. The livable square footage is less than 4,000 square feet which was reduced from the original scheme of 4,500 square feet. The allowable square footage is over 5,000 square feet, but the preferred square footage was reduced to respect the scale of the developments on the street. The double gable design allows for height, but reduces the overall height of what a single gable would have. The front unit is a single-story to respect the building pattern of the street, while the double-height unit is located at the rear. The building design is appropriated from the existing neighborhood vocabulary and abstracted into the architecture.

Questions from the Board:

The board asked if the parking requirements were met through carports (yes) and what the lot coverage was (35%). The Board also asked what was currently on the lot (3 structures) and how many dwelling units (2 units). The board inquired about the density and density allowances, Staff replied that density is established by the General Plan and the General Plan is not for the Board's or Staff's discretion. The Board asked about the structural rigidity and subframe detailing of the lpe wood siding.

Public Comment:

816 Orange Grove Place: Resident noted DeMaria's community outreach. Has concerns with the overall square footage and mass of the building on the lot. Also has concerns with the driveway acting as a throughway and is fearful of non-residents utilizing the driveway as a thoroughfare.

Mike & Elizabeth Hollingsworth, 815 Orange Grove Place: Objections were raised to the number of bedrooms being proposed and would like to see the development limited to two units. Objections were raised about the roof form and material including the privacy intrusion of the elevated deck and it is no substitute for an actual yard. Concerns are raised about the massing and the through driveway.

1038 Orange Grove Ave: Issues were raised with current street traffic patterns and the increase that the development will have on the neighborhood. A traffic study is requested before project approval.

Board Discussion/Decision:

The Board suggested that a gate be installed to reduce the thoroughfare effect. The materials of the house should follow the traditional pallet of the neighborhood, but a modern pallet is acceptable. The rigid planes of the roof massing is found not to be compatible with the neighborhood. There is concern with the overall massing of the project and its effect on the neighborhood. There is concern with lot coverage, too much building for the size of the lot and not enough green space. There is concern about the privacy issue with the upper deck, but that can be resolved through

		<p>screening. The front round columns should be readdressed in design to be compatible with the contemporary design of the house. The Ipe siding should be utilized more to break up the massing of the side elevations. The continuity of the architecture from front building to rear buildings and carports in between make the building massing incompatible with the design guidelines. The layout and site plan should be readdressed including the raised deck over the carport to break up the connectivity, continuity and massing of the project to avoid a continuous wall of building footprint. The repetition of the roof planes, and the continuous wall on the west elevation is too monotonous, and the western walls need to be articulated with materials and massing volumes.</p> <p>After the discussion, the Board voted 4-0 to CONTINUE the project with expected revisions addressing the following: Provide a 3D model view of the project as it is seen driving down the street. Provide details of the windows, Ipe rainscreen, columns, and glass railings. Address the privacy issues with a redesigned upper deck. Provide better detailing along the side elevations with materials and volumetric articulations.</p>
DISCUSSION ITEMS	3.	<p>1746 & 1750 Hanscom Drive Applicant: Irene Acosta Project Information: 1746: A request for a Design Review Board approval for the demolition of a non-historic 316 square foot house for the construction of a new 2,332 square foot two-story house with an attached carport. The proposed home would be designed in a modern architectural design with flat roof line, metal framed windows, and exterior walls made of concrete, wood, and metal siding. The home is sited on a 6,663 square foot parcel in the RS zone.</p> <p>1750: A request for a Design Review Board approval for the demolition of a non-historic 760 square foot house and street-side detached garage for the construction of a new 2,278 square foot two-story house with an attached carport. The proposed home would be designed in a modern architectural design with flat roof line, metal framed windows, and exterior walls made of concrete, wood, and metal siding. The home is sited on an 6,511 square foot parcel in the RS zone.</p> <p>Presentation: Acosta presented the project, its materials, size, and overall design. The house at 1750 was kept at a single-story so that sunlight is not blocked for the northern address at 1746 Hanscom.</p> <p>Questions from the Board: There were questions regarding the abundance of trees on the property and that a species and a tree plan be provided. The poured-in-place (PIP) concrete walls will hopefully remain and not be value-engineered out of the construction. Also, the PIP would look great as a front feature.</p>

		Board Discussion/Decision: The Board greatly admired the design of both houses including overall massing, and materials. The roof profile should be maintained, even if it requires adding more roof drains on the flat roofs. The houses should be designed around the large specimen trees if they are determined to be protected trees. A maintenance detail should be provided for the bathroom window behind the wood slats for cleaning and overall maintenance. The applicant suggested a possible hinge design on the wood slats.
BOARD COMMENTS	4.	None.
STAFF COMMENTS	5.	None.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	6.	Minutes The Minutes were not reviewed.
ADJOURNMENT	7.	The meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 3, 2016 at 7 P.M.

Approved,



Conrado Lopez, Chair

2.6.17
Date