

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA, CALIFORNIA
CONVENED THIS 20TH DAY OF APRIL, 2017
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1424 MISSION STREET**

ROLL CALL

The Meeting convened at: 6:50 PM

Commissioners Present: Deborah Howell-Ardila (Chair), Mark Gallatin (Vice-Chair), Steven Friedman, and Rebecca Thompson

Commissioners Absent: None

Council Liaison Present: Robert S. Joe, Councilmember

Staff Liaison Present: John Mayer, Senior Planner

NON-AGENDA
PUBLIC COMMENT
PERIOD

1. None.

CONTINUED
APPLICATIONS

2. **2021 Le Droit Drive**
Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect
Project No.: COA-1976
Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for adding an 869 square foot second story addition to an existing 1,516 square foot single-story Spanish Colonial Revival house. The new floor addition will be located behind the roof ridge of the existing single-story front volume to minimize its massing impact on the historic façade. All exterior finishes are to match the existing house including wood windows, stucco walls and tile roofing. The house was constructed in 1923, has an historic rating of 5D1, and is located on a 7,500 square foot parcel.

Presentation:

Mr. Mayer recited a list of items that the Commission requested from the March 16, 2017 meeting.

Tom Nott (Project Architect) described the changes he made to the project. To address the neighbors' concerns about privacy, the size of the windows on the side elevation was reduced to 18 inches by four feet. To address concerns about the project's massing, the roof slope was changed to a 4:12 pitch, roof ridge lowered by 8 inches, and the second floor was stepped back an additional foot. Mr. Nott also spoke about the additional information he submitted including shadow and perspective drawings.

Public Comment:

Heather Heimstadt (2017 Le Droit) said that she is concerned that the project would cast a shadow on her house and reduce their privacy. She saw the shade analysis but has not seen revised plans.

Humphrey Chan (Property Owner) said that a large oak tree and its drip line would prevent him from building an addition into the rear yard area. He

also said that the garage would impede the addition. Mr. Chan explained that his family needs more space.

Mr. Nott responded to comments about the second story additions noting that he tried to address the primary concern with the massing and the character of the street. He also said there are a number of second story additions nearby and some are considerably higher. Mr. Nott responded to a question about the shade and shadow analysis.

Commission Discussion/Decision:

Commissioners discussed the project's effect on the potential historic district which are primarily one-story homes. Commissioners also spoke about how properties have been suggested for de-listing from the recent survey due to inappropriate second story additions. The applicant has not submitted any drawings to show that alternatives were considered.

Motion/Second (Howell-Ardila/Friedman) to **CONTINUE** the project so that the applicant can submit a scaled-back version of the project that considers a range of alternatives including a one-story option.

The motion carried 4-0.

NEW ITEMS

3. **2073 Milan Avenue**
Applicant: Mr. Xiao Qin Liu
Project No.: COA-1991
Historic Status Code: 5D1

Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 488 sq. ft. single story addition to a 1,632 sq. ft. English Revival house on an 8,560 sq. ft. lot. The addition will consist of a new master bedroom with a master bathroom, a laundry room and expanding the kitchen. The exterior materials will consist of stucco to match the existing, asphalt roof shingles, and vinyl windows for the addition.

The applicant was not in attendance; this item was continued to the May 18, 2017 meeting.

-
4. **1100 Fair Oaks Avenue**
Applicant: Cris Zamarano
Project No.: COA-1995
Historic Status Code: 5S3

Commissioner Thompson recused herself and left the room due to the property's location and a potential conflict of interest with a property in the vicinity.

Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for three proposed signs. The

first sign is located on Fair Oaks Avenue and it is a 48.99 sq. ft. wall mounted sign and it reads: BLAZE PIZZA (logo) FAST-FIRE'D. The second sign is another wall mounted and it is located on Oxley Street. The sign is 31.88 sq. ft. and it consists of a logo with BLAZZE PIZZA (inside the logo) and FAST-FIRE'D. The third sign is a blade sign and it is 4.91 sq. ft. it is a logo with BLAZE PIZZA (inside the logo). The colors for all the signs are: orange and white. The materials for the sign would be vinyl.

Presentation:

Cris Zamarano (applicant) spoke about the history of Blaze Pizza and presented his proposal for the signs. Mr. Zamarano said the signs were designed to fit within the architectural elements of the historic building.

Mr. Mayer responded to Zoning questions about sign area limits and the distance a blade sign can project from the wall face.

Mr. Zamarano responded to comments about the scale of the wall sign on the primary elevation (framed area) to allow more white space above and below the wall sign. He also responded to comments about lighting of the blade sign.

Public Comment: None.

Commission Decision:

Motion/Second (Gallatin/Howell-Ardila) to **APPROVE** the project with the following **CONDITIONS**: 1) the blade sign shall not exceed three feet off the face of the wall; and 2) the wall sign on the primary façade shall be reduced by 2'-6" height to allow more white space within the framed area.

The motion carried 4-0.

Upon consideration of the criteria identified in Section 2.64(b)(2) of the South Pasadena Municipal Code, Section 36.410.040 (required findings to approve the design review application, consideration of the application, and all written and oral testimony submitted, including the evaluation of the property by a qualified architectural historian and categorization of the property as set forth in the City's Cultural Heritage Inventory, the Cultural Heritage Commission found and determined that 1100 Fair Oaks Avenue as it exists, and as it is proposed to be altered, would reasonably meet national, state or local criteria for designation as a landmark or part of an historic district, and is exempt from CEQA under Class 31.

NEW BUSINESS

5. **Historic Resources Survey and Inventory of Addresses Survey Update**

Presentation:

Mr. Mayer introduced the item to explain the Commission's review of the historic resources survey and inventory of addresses update that was prepared by the City's consultant, Historic Resources Group (HRG). Mr. Mayer told the Commission that staff received a list of properties that would be removed from the Inventory. These include properties that have an evaluation rating of 6L (special consideration in local planning) and 6Z

(ineligible for local designation). According to the consultant those properties were either incorrectly surveyed in the past, substantially altered, or do not meet current eligibility requirements. Mr. Mayer noted that the 6Ls would remain under the Commission's review authority.

Mr. Mayer responded to questions about the number of 6Ls and 6Zs. Commissioners discussed the recent survey criteria compared to the previous survey.

Public Comment:

Odom Stamps (318 Fairview Avenue) opposes HRG's survey update recommendation. Although staff wants to streamline the process of design review, a 25% reduction of the Inventory is problematic. The City has been committed to fighting the 710 freeway and this is one of the most effective tools to review changes to homes and neighborhoods. He said that the properties rated in the 6s need special review and are part and parcel to the neighborhoods we are trying to protect and enhance.

Glen Duncan (2031 Berkshire Avenue) said he was on the Commission when the City first adopted the Inventory in 1993 and explained the history of how the original survey was done. He said that the new status codes are problematic and he doesn't trust them. Properties are either historically important or they are not; there shouldn't be a number attached to them.

Joan Hillard (534 Arroyo Drive) said that she understands why her property is historically significant and has no objections of it being on the Inventory. She is opposed to the way the survey process was communicated to the community. There should have been more public engagement with this new survey. Homeowners should know the advantages and disadvantages of being on the Inventory. A public outreach process should be developed.

Dillon Chang (1401 Via Del Rey) had questions about the age range of the homes included in the survey. He said he does not want his house to be included on the Inventory because he wants to be able to make changes to it. Mr. Chang has concerns about changes he wants to do to improve safety.

Don Cross (2013 Via Del Rey) said he worked with a designer and builder to create his house 48 years ago and was surprised to learn that it was identified in the survey. He is concerned about special restrictions and the Certificate of Appropriateness process if any changes are proposed. He had questions as to whether property owners have a right to object being added to the Inventory. Mr. Cross also noted that some of the pictures of homes in the City-wide Historic Context Statement are not included in the updated survey.

Glen Duncan (2031 Berkshire) added that he wants additional time to see if the City's historic and potential historic districts will still retain integrity and qualify as districts if some of the recommended properties are removed from the survey.

Odom Stamps (318 Fairview Avenue) noted that buildings that are not on the Inventory are not exempt from processes and restrictions because the

Design Review Board has authority over changes to them.

Discussion/Decision:

Commissioner Gallatin said he is grateful to have the comments from the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation and residents in the community. However, there needs to be a more meaningful analysis by the community stakeholders. Based on tonight's public comments, there seems to be a gap between reality and perception of what it means to be on the Inventory.

Commissioner Friedman said that he is not in favor of making a recommendation to the City Council until the preservation community has had a chance to review the extensive list of properties that the consultant is recommending be removed from the Inventory.

Commissioner Howell-Ardila spoke in favor of the mid-century modern portion of the survey and that there is a benefit of having new set of properties that will be added to the Inventory. However, she expressed concerns about the large number of properties that would be removed from the Inventory. Commissioner Howell-Ardila said that more analysis is needed to understand the logic behind some of the drastic changes in the evaluation rating codes for some properties. For example, properties with a rating code of 6Z should be ranked with a 6L because they do remain of interest to local planning.

Motion/Second (Friedman/Gallatin) to **RECOMMEND** to City Council that the properties, districts, and planning districts identified in phases one and two of the consultant's survey work be adopted as amendments to the Inventory. The commission is postponing a recommendation on the properties recommended for omission in order to evaluate the list and give the community time to provide insight and expertise.

The motion carried 4-0.

6. Cultural Heritage Ordinance

Presentation:

Mr. Mayer introduced the item explaining that the Commission is reviewing the latest draft of the new Cultural Heritage Ordinance which now includes procedures for demolition involving potential historic resources (over 45 years old) and the review of non-Contributing properties in Potential Historic Districts. Staff recommends that the Commission make a recommendation to the City Council.

Public Comment:

Joan Hillard (534 Arroyo Drive) spoke as a member of the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation and commented on the language in the ordinance with concerns that most people wouldn't understand it. She wants the Commission to compare the Foundation's mark up with the draft ordinance and be sure that the final draft meets the needs of the City.

Glen Duncan (2031 Berkshire) explained his efforts to present the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation's mark-up version of the ordinance to the City. He said that the Foundation's comments and suggested edits should be considered before a recommendation is made to the City Council.

Tom Field who is a board member of the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation said that the City's most important asset, aside from the school district, is its cultural heritage. He encouraged the Commission to defer its recommendation until Commissioners have had an opportunity to review the Foundation's comments.

Odom Stamps (318 Fairview Avenue) who is a signatory to the marked up version of the draft ordinance said that he is loath to slow down the review of the ordinance; however, he requested that the Commission table this matter until Commissioners have reviewed the form and substance of the Foundation's remarks and its recommendations.

Glen Duncan suggested that some members of the Commission, Foundation, and the City get together to discuss the recommendations contained in the Foundation's mark up. The City Council will be satisfied in knowing that everyone worked together to complete the ordinance.

Discussion/Decision:

Commissioners thanked staff for getting the draft ordinance to this point. Commissioners agreed that the comments of the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation must be considered in order to have full endorsement by the Commission. Commissioners Gallatin and Friedman volunteered to meet with the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation and staff to discuss the comments, edits, and recommendations regarding the draft Cultural Heritage Ordinance.

7. 921 Monterey Road (Conceptual Review)

Property Owner: John M. Itamura

Presentation:

Ken Rideout (prospective applicant) solicited comments from the Commission regarding a proposal to build a 93 square foot single story addition and a 307 square foot second story addition to an existing two story English Revival style house. A new 400 square foot garage would be attached to an 850 square foot guest house. The proposal also includes a 200 square foot carport.

Discussion:

Commissioners had questions about the new door and side lights on the garage, whether some windows and the barn door could be restored, and other questions about alterations to the garage.

Commissioners alerted Mr. Rideout to be mindful of the delineation between the original structure and new construction and pay homage to the original barn door if it cannot be re-used.

This item was for discussion purposes only; no decisions were made at this time.

8. Public Outreach for Property Owners Identified in the Survey

Commissioner Howell-Ardila said that the public outreach topic comes up frequently and suggested that the City seek funds to develop a program that will inform the residents and business owners about historic preservation: Mills Act incentives, stewardship obligations of owning a historic property, the ordinance and legal framework needed to maintain the character of the City, etc.

Commissioners suggested that a graphics consultant could be used to create attractive brochures and handouts that will cover various historic topics. Brochures could be mailed out with utility bills. Handouts could be made available at the counter. And, these can all be posted on the City's website and shared via social media.

9. Rialto Theater Subcommittee

The Commission discussed appointing a member to the standing subcommittee on all matters pertaining to information and updates on the Rialto Theater.

Public Comment:

Escott Norton introduced himself to the Commission as a founding member of the Friends of the Rialto organization. He said it originally started 30 years ago as South Pasadena Preservation Foundation committee. He is happy to see that the Commission will be a part of the ad hoc committee and that he is looking forward to working with them.

Commissioner Gallatin volunteered to be on the subcommittee.

COMMUNICATIONS

10. Comments from Council Liaison:

Councilman Joe briefed the Commission on a few items from the April 19th City Council meeting. The Council approved a contract for a consultant to assess all of the City facilities and identify necessary improvements. He also said that the Council upheld the Planning Commission's decision to approve two new homes at 1746 and 1750 Hanscom Drive.

11. Comments from Commission

Commissioner Howell-Ardila announced that she will be leaving the Commission early; her last meeting will be in June. She also expressed her thoughts about the City Council's decision not to honor the Commission's request for more information regarding the demolition of 1746 and 1750 Hanscom Drive. Commissioner Howell-Ardila explained her concerns about atrend towards dissonance with standard preservation practice.

Commissioner Thompson raised questions about time limits for members of

the public who speak. She also suggested that applicants be required to respond to questions on an application form that allows them to explain how a project complies with Secretary of the Interior Standards and the City's Design Guidelines. Forms could also include a checklist of items that are required for a project. Commissioner Thompson spoke about whether the Commission should consider an approval process for paint color schemes.

12. Comments from Staff

None.

MINUTES

13. Minutes of the regular meeting of February 16, 2017

This item was continued to the May 18, 2017 meeting.

14. Minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, 2017

This item was continued to the May 18, 2017 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

15. Meeting Adjourned at 9:40p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for May 18, 2017.

Deborah Howell-Ardila

Deborah Howell-Ardila, Chair

18 May 2017

Date