

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 19TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 6:45 pm
Commissioners Present: Mark Gallatin (Vice Chair), John Lesak, Rebecca Thompson, Steven Friedman, Victor Holz
Commissioners Absent: None
Council Liaison Present: Robert S. Joe, Councilmember
Staff Present: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

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.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

1. Jim Fenske, 111 Peterson Ave, South Pasadena.
Mr. Fenske raised questions regarding the accuracy in the transcribed minutes for the September 2017 CHC meeting and discrepancies with the audio recording. He asked for clarity on the direction from the Commission with regards to correcting his drawings from that meeting.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the projects Mr. Fenske is referring to are on today's Agenda and it would be better to address those concerns when those projects are called up.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. None

CONTINUED ITEMS

3. **2024 La France Avenue**
Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect
Project No.: 2008-COA
Historic Status Code: 5D1

Note: Item was recommended for continuance by Staff due to incomplete plans. However, Mr. Fenske presented a 3D digital model before the Commission and to review the Commission's comments from last month's meeting.

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 607 square foot contemporary style, second story addition to an existing 2,018 square foot one story, English Revival house on a 7,217 square

foot lot. The second story addition will consist of adding a master bedroom, a master bathroom, a closet, a sitting area, and a study. The proposed exterior materials for the addition will be smooth stucco siding with aluminum windows and doors. The project includes two-second story decks. One deck would be located on the rear elevation at 126 square feet; the other would be on the south elevation at 70 square feet. Both decks would feature guard rails made of steel cable.

Presentation:

Mr. Fenske presented a 3D digital model of the project and discussed the changes along with the Commission's comments from the September meeting.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the dormers are good, as they don't pop out. She thought that the gable at the rear looks odd with the three door panels. She also mentioned that the massing is overly complicated.

Commissioner Lesak: Inquired if the existing roof line has projecting eaves. He also inquired why there were so many different roof pitches and mentioned that the shed roof at the rear looks awkward.

Commissioner Holz: Inquired what the small window located on the side at the second level was for.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Fenske: Noted that the existing condition only has about a 5 inch eave projection, and that the addition will incorporate exposed rafter tails to differentiate between the new and the old. He also noted that the small window on the side elevation is for a closet. He mentioned that there were three roof pitches overall.

NEW ITEMS

4. 1029 Park Avenue

Applicant: Sam Pitnick, Designer

Project No.: 2022-COA

Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remodel an existing 1,285 sq. ft. single family home and convert the attic space into a habitable second level. The second story addition consists of 679 sq. ft. with: three bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a walk-in closet. The addition will have new wood windows and wood siding to match the existing. A small dormer will be added upstairs on the street side. The majority of the addition will be behind the existing gabled roof and not seen from the street. The height of the existing ridge will be increased in order to achieve code-require ceiling heights upstairs. There is also a 350 sq. ft. proposed car port in the rear yard. All wood members would be painted to match the existing house.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Pitnick presented the project and noted the addition is intended to accommodate a growing family. He noted that all materials will match existing. He spoke about the proposed rear tandem carport trellis to accommodate the required two car parking spaces.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the Commission received a memo from Staff regarding the setbacks and carport. He inquired why the assessor map indicates a lot tie that may provide an additional 15 feet of rear yard space and why this was not indicated in the site plan. This additional space can alleviate the cramped nature of the proposed site plan with the carport. He asked Staff if the 25% solid wall per the building code applies to the carport even if it were to be constructed of metal or other non-flammable materials. Mr. Sissi noted that this provision of the Building Code still applies regardless of fire resistance.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the applicant should conduct and pay for a survey to really know where the property lines are and to save the owners from potential legal problems that may develop later. She also inquired if the tandem carport trellis could be relocated to the north side yard. She expressed concern about the impact of the proposed carport eating up the entire rear yard instead of open space for the family. She also inquired if the windows on the addition were casement and if there are casements elsewhere.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Pitnick: Noted that he ran several options of the carport trellis including a side yard arrangement and that this arrangement did not work with required setbacks and still provide functionality. He also noted that there are existing casement windows and double hung windows on the house.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the rear addition's massing and the roof slope of 1:12 are not compatible with the existing. He also noted that the rear addition so big and blocky that it takes away from the character of the house. He also expressed concern with the front dormer as the dormer extends to the main roof ridge line and that dormers typically stop short of the ridge line. He believes that the proposed carport was just a response to fulfill code requirements and that a more creative solution be studied. The parking solution as presented is impractical and most likely will never be utilized. He noted that the massing of the addition is problematic and the windows on the south elevation are not compatible with the new existing windows. The addition has long rectangular windows that are not found elsewhere on the home. The gable end has square windows that should be similar in shape to the existing windows.

Commissioner Thompson: Suggested that the windows be changed to be more compatible with the existing if they can meet the Building Code egress requirements.

Commissioner Gallatin: Agreed with the comments from Commissioners Thompson and Lesak and would like to see the applicant work on the massing, the roof pitch, and the form of the front dormer.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the Commission's concerns stem from the Guidelines.

Commissioner Lesak: Asked Staff if a porte cochere will work. Staff noted that a porte cochere is attached to the residence, and therefore will have to meet the setbacks of the residence.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak made a motion to CONTINUE the project to address the concerns as expressed by the Commission. Motion seconded by Commissioner Freidman.

CONTINUED

(Ayes: 5; No: 0)

5. 612 Meridian Avenue
Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect
Project No.: 2041-COA
Historic Status Code: 5D1

Note: Item was recommended for continuance by Staff due to incomplete plans. Mr. Fenske asked the Commission for clarity on their comments from the September meeting. Commissioner Gallatin read over the September CHC minutes to Mr. Fenske for his item.

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 749 sq. ft. single story addition to a 864 sq. ft. Craftsman house on 5,264 sq. ft. lot. The addition will consist of; a new kitchen, a new bedroom, a new bathroom, a new master bedroom suite along with a walk-in closet and bathroom. The new exterior siding for the addition will consist of wood lapped siding to match the existing, wood windows to match the existing with wood trim, and fiberglass roof shingles. The patio attached to the garage will be removed. The applicant is also proposing to demolish an unpermitted 140 sq. ft. storage addition to the existing single vehicle garage.

6. 2070 Fremont Avenue
Applicant: Tom Nott, Architect
Project No.: 2046-COA
Historic Status Code: 5S3

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 424 sq. ft. single story addition to a 1,565 sq. ft. Brick Bungalow house on a 10,395 sq. ft. lot. The addition will consist of a new master bedroom suite along with a walk-in closet and bath. The addition also consists of a powder room, guest bedroom, and laundry. The new exterior walls will be clad in reclaimed brick (restored from demolished areas of the house) and new brick which will match color of existing brick.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Nott: Presented the project and noted that the existing building is brick cladding and the roofing is composition and the windows are all wood frame. The project consists of modestly-sized addition for a new master bedroom suite. He also noted that the brick is rare as it has vertical scoring on it which is unusual for brick in California. He mentioned that he researched if the vertical scoring pattern could be replicated on new brick, and all the masonry representatives told him no. He then spoke to his masonry contractor if the brick on this house could be reclaimed. He noted that the existing mortar is soft so it can be removed from the brick, although the mortar is not as soft as contemporary mortars. It was determined that the bricks could be reclaimed with an intensive restoration and cleaning effort. The new roof will be lower than the existing for differentiation, and they are also proposing to use solar tubes in the kitchen to address lighting issues. These solar tubes are hidden from primary views. Overall, he noted that he tried to maintain the existing characteristics of the existing structure.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Friedman: Asked why the casement window on the south elevation is proposed for removal, and why on the north elevation three divided lite windows are proposed for removal.

Commissioner Holz: Commended the applicant for proposing to reclaim the bricks.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the existing east elevation indicates a door to be removed, while the proposed north elevation shows a new door to be installed. He asked if the applicant can salvage the eastern elevation door and place it in the new north elevation door location. He also inquired if the 3-over-1 lite pattern on the windows as well as the muntins on the proposed windows will match the existing. He expressed concern with the applicant being able to match the existing mortar in width, joint, texture, and color.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Nott: Noted that the window removal was removed for energy efficiency purposes, but it can be retained. He also noted that the brick reclamation will double the cost of the brick cladding, and that his masonry contractor is highly skilled and will be able to match the mortar of the existing.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that it is preferred to differentiate between old and new and why the applicant is proposing to reuse the bricks.

Commissioner Friedman: Noted that differentiation can be achieved through other means aside from using new brick.

Commissioner Lesak: Believes that both options, to reuse the bricks or use new bricks, are acceptable. The massing is differentiated enough. He also noted that he just Googled striped, scored bricks, and found sources for the applicant if he needs that information. He expressed that he always encourages the reuse of materials, and appreciates the applicant's proposed efforts to reuse the bricks.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITION that the existing windows and doors be reused on the project, and that the project meets the design review findings, mandatory findings, and specific findings of: adding new living space to the rear while preserving the single-story character of the street-scape; and it is appropriate to the size, massing, and design context of the historic neighborhood.

Commissioner Friedman: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION TO REUSE REMOVED DOORS AND WINDOWS ON THE PROJECT

(Ayes: 5; No: 0). Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.

7. 1026 Indiana Avenue

Applicant: Dahl Architects

Project No.: 2049-COA

Historic Status Code: 5D1

Project Description:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a 1,122 sq. ft. addition to an existing 996 sq. ft. single story Craftsman style home, built in 1922. The single story addition will include a family room, kitchen, bedroom, master bedroom, and master bathroom. All of the addition will take place in the rear of the existing home and only minor changes will be made to the historic front of the home. The front

porch will be expanded and a new wooden railing will replace the current non-original aluminum railing. The new porch extension will be uncovered and the roof will not change. Overall, the roof will look very similar in the front. The new roof ridge in the rear will match the height of the current front ridge and will not be visible from the front of the house.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Dahl and Adrian Dahl presented the project along with a digital model on their laptop computer. Mr. Dahl noted that the applicant originally intended to add a second story, but then realized that there are no second stories within the historic neighborhood. As a result, the applicant developed a single-story addition at the rear yard. The addition will require the removal of a mature Chinese Elm tree, however as Mr. Dahl pointed out, this is not a native tree. The north side yard will remain consistent with the existing, while along the south side yard, a previous addition will help to obscure the new rear addition. Mr. Dahl noted that the original windows on the south side have been removed and filled in, but on the north side are original windows that have been covered, and will be restored. All the roof slopes will be consistent and match the existing of 1:12. The rear addition will have slightly different trim at all the doors, windows, and even crawlspace openings as a method of differentiation. There is an existing small historic garage that is intended to be retained, however, it is not suitable in size for a modern car. The applicant has proposed a rear detached carport trellis structure to allow for parking on the property and not overwhelm the existing garage that will be relocated to the south side to accommodate the new carport trellis.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Thompson: Inquired how the river rock came into play on the columns. She also noted that she would like to see better differentiation in the drawings between old and new. She asked why the kitchen was not directly adjacent to the dining room.

Commissioner Lesak: Inquired if there will be gutters on the house.

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked Staff in regards to the required setbacks for the proposed detached carport trellis. Mr. Sissi noted that there is allowable leeway for trellis structures and that they can follow the same rear/side yard setbacks as detached garages provided they meet Fire and Building Codes.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Dahl: Noted that the river rock was appropriated as a common historic element found throughout the City. He also added that the house will have rain gutters, and that the kitchen is not adjacent to the dining room because the owners wanted the kitchen to have direct access to the rear yard for indoor/outdoor connectivity that is available in Southern California and important for the most used room in the house.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that it is a good solution and the 3D model helped in understanding the project. He noted that the exterior door from the kitchen looks like it will get very wet in the rain.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that exterior doors are required to be recessed by four feet or be covered by four feet of overhang.

Commissioner Lesak: He expressed that he was okay with the concept of cladding the bases of the columns in river rock, but that his concern lies in the detailing of the front porch railing as it is located along primary street frontage. However, he mentioned that the overall concept of the addition, the porch extension and the relocation of the existing garage does not bother him.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the carport trellis will need knee braces or some other structural stiffening, which the applicant can explore.

Commissioner Gallatin: Commended the applicant for a good attempt at adding to the home. He believed that the river rock was false historicity, but appreciates the applicant's reasoning for it. He also expressed that he is comforted by the Commission's acceptance of the river rock.

Decision:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to APPROVE the project with the CONDITION of a Chair Review for the detailing of the porch railing at the front porch and the porch extension, the battered columns, and further refinement of the carport trellis detailing. The project meets the design review and mandatory findings and meets the following specific findings: the project is appropriate to the size, massing, and design context of the historic neighborhood; the project adds substantial new living space while preserving the single-story character of the streetscape; and enhances the appearance of the building without adversely affecting its original design, character, or heritage.

Commissioner Thompson: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION OF CHAIR REVIEW for the revised detailing of railing at the porch and porch extension, the detailing of the battered columns, the detailing of the relationship between the porch deck and the foundation wall, and the detailing of the rear detached carport trellis.

(Ayes: 5; No: 0). Project is Categorically Exempt under Class 31.

NEW BUSINESS

**8. 636 Alta Vista Circle
Karen Hallock (Owner)**

Description:

The owner is requesting a discussion about her property and its proposed inclusion on the Inventory of Historic Resources.

Note: Item was recommended for continuance to the November meeting at the request of Ms. Hallock.

9. 929 Buena Vista Mills Act

Description:

The Commission will consider a Letter of Intent to enter into a Mills Act contract for Landmark No. 41 (the Torrance Childs House). The Commission may appoint a subcommittee to review this request and set up an on-site meeting to inspect the condition of the property and discuss any potential items for restoration that may be needed.

Applicant Presentation:

The owner noted that they have lived in the house for 20 years and would like to restore the property as a great deal of work needs to be done and the Mills Act will greatly help with that.

Debbie Howell-Ardilla: Presented the proposed scope of work and estimated cost analysis of the restoration plan. She noted that the initial list of repairs is estimated to be \$1.7 million with 21 repair projects. The first 10 year term will address critical repairs and stabilize the house. If the contract is accepted, the owners would like to see the contract implemented by the end of the year.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Noted that the execution may not happen by the end of December as it still has to go to Council and the Ordinance states that applications are due in September. He suggested that instead of a sub-committee, the full Commission convene a special meeting at the subject site to speed up the review process.

Ardilla: Noted that she requested Staff to add the item to the September CHC Agenda, but it was not added.

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked Councilman Bob Joe what was the likelihood for the Council to consider the contract at their December meeting and if the last December meeting will be cancelled. He also asked Staff if he would have a conflict of interest if he sits on a non-profit board with the homeowner. Mr. Sissi responded that he doesn't believe there is a conflict of interest, but he can confirm with the City Attorney's office.

Councilman Bob Joe: Responded that the scheduling of the December Council meetings vary and that it is a matter of scheduling to review and adopt the Mills Act contract.

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked the Commission to look at their calendars and choose a date to convene a special meeting at the subject property.

The Commission made a motion to convene a Special Meeting on October 25th at 8am at the subject site.

10. 1810 Foothill Street

Applicant: Julie Phanstiel

Year Built: 1926

Architectural Style: Adobe Revival

Historic Status Code: 5B1

Description:

A request for a CONCEPTUAL REVIEW for the conversion of an existing attached garage into a master bedroom suite with some additional square footage. The applicant is proposing a new single-car garage with an attached tandem carport. The property is located in the RH zoning district, and tandem parking is allowed in this zoning district. The addition will vary slightly from the historic Adobe style of the home, but will be in keeping with the Adobe style.

Applicant Presentation:

Ms. Phanstiel: Presented an aerial photo of the subject property indicated the complexities of the site planning, and that the site does not sit on a public street and is not visible to the public. She noted that

she and her wife purchased the property in the summer and they are excited to live in South Pasadena. The owners have a design background and love adobe architecture. They would like to make the house more livable to accommodate their growing family by adding a new master bedroom suite, while respecting the historic adobe architecture.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Lesak: Asked if this was a true adobe house. He also wanted to see contextual photographs and how the project relates to the surrounding context so that the Commission can relate the project to its surroundings.

Commissioner Thompson: Agreed that the Commission needed to see photographs keyed to the site plan, along with an existing site plan. She expressed that the reused large window was a great part of the project. She asked the applicants what the intension of the addition was stylistically, to replicate adobe or not to replicate it. She wanted clarity on where the existing windows sit in the wall, if they are flush or recessed. She asked the owners to be cognizant of the gravity of the adobe walls in the addition and that adobe can be modernly replicated by building two walls, but discouraged the applicants from doing that.

Commissioner Gallatin: Asked if the new windows will be recessed. He noted that the plans called for a masonry post on the carport trellis and what that means. He also commended the applicants for their efforts.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Phanstiel noted that they had designs that were more conservative and more modern, but settled on this middle ground proposal that is a combination of new and old. The owners mentioned that upon finding the property it was like a hidden gem and the new design of the interior spaces will allow for the flow through of volumes. They also noted that the windows sit flush to the exterior walls, while the doors are recessed inwards.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Lesak: Expressed that he believed the applicants are moving in the right direction. He would prefer to see a clearer differentiation by shifting the new addition over two or so feet to enlarge the hyphen and really differentiate the new and old and really allow for the modern addition. A larger hyphen will allow for a true preservation of the existing adobe. He thought that the current proposal is too tight, and the additions should be pulled in more. He expressed to the applicant that if they want a contemporary addition, then it needs to be clear and that the new addition is too close in resemblance to the existing.

Owners: Noted that the existing garage wall abuts the adobe and they would like to maintain that alignment. They noted that the differentiation comes from the different direction of the roof pitch. They are also open to finishes and they initially wanted to pin down the form and massing then focus on the exterior finishes. They thought of brick, or even Spanish/Mexican tile to clad to the post of the trellis. They then sought confirmation from the Commission about the windows, and the massing, and location of the addition with respect to roof planes.

Commissioner Lesak: Mentioned, as an opinion, not a suggestion, that flat white smooth stucco would look great against the adobe. Masonry on the posts will look great if the bricks are correctly proportioned. Simple finishes look great against historic finishes. He also asked the owners on what the condition of the adobe is, and if it contains concrete.

Owners: Noted that the adobe bricks are sun-dried red clay with a plaster finish. They are not fired, and they appear to not have straw.

11. Historic Resources Survey and Inventory of Addresses Survey Update

Note: Item reshuffled on Agenda order to Item 3 by a motion made and unanimously voted on by the Commission.

Description:

The Commission will review the historic resources survey and inventory of addresses update that was prepared by the City's consultant, Historic Resources Group (HRG), review any changes based on the October 12, 2017 Special Meeting and make a recommendation to City Council.

Public Discussion:

Commissioner Gallatin opened the item for public comment.

Randy Hoffman (601 Fair Oaks Ave, Shakers Restaurant):

Request to be removed from Inventory.

Presented evidence to the Commission in the form of a letter, and photographs to support his request of removal from the Inventory update. Mr. Hoffman noted that the proposed Caltrans realignment of the off-ramp at Fair Oaks will have major impact on the integrity of the building.

Gwen McLain (1319 Mountain View):

Request to be added to Inventory.

Presented photographs to the Commission and expressed her desire to be added to the Inventory. She mentioned that her house was built in 1955 by architect Jon Galbraith. Ms. McLain asked what the City's role was in the Inventory update.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the Commission's role is to weigh evidence and make a conclusion on the recommendation of the Inventory.

Bianca Richards (1712 Raymond Hill Road):

Supportive of being added to the Inventory.

Ms. Richards represents a Family trust that owns the building, and she expressed the trust's support of being added to the Inventory. The family supports the inclusion and wants to make sure that it is added. She noted that the property is around the curve on Raymond Hill, and faces the water tower.

Thomas Thompson (1523 Indiana Ave.):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Mr. Thompson noted that he wanted to reiterate his position from the October 12th meeting that he would like to have this property removed from the Inventory. He noted that it categorized as a 7R, and that he presented evidence to Staff, which was forwarded to the Commission. He noted that the criteria needed for the property to be designated cannot be met. A historic designation might have detrimental impacts to potential future buyers even though the owners have no plans to sell in the near future. He also noted that the neighborhood is not historic and that it has a range of ages and styles. He expressed that the condition of the house leads to visitors calling it ugly and perplexed as to why the property is being considered for historic designation.

Sue and Mike Matz (1324 Mountain View Ave):

Request to be added to the Inventory.

Reiterated that they would like to see their property added to the Inventory, and noted that their property is difficult to survey due to trees and its downslope location. Photographic evidence and a letter of request was presented to the Commission.

Don Cross (2013 Via Del Rey & 1323 Via Del Rey):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Mr. Cross asked the Commission what the process of review was for historic properties if he wants to make changes to his building.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the process depends on the scale of the proposal. There is a Minor review process and a Major review process with Minor projects being handled by him, as a Chair Review, and Major projects being reviewed by the full Commission. He also added that if it is non-historic and non-hillside, changes to a building will go before the Design Review Board, and if it is a hillside development, it will go before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Thompson: Noted that the Chair of the Planning Commission, Steve Dahl, is sitting in the audience and if he would like to say something on the matter.

Commissioner Dahl: Noted that if a house sits on a property with a 20 percent or greater slope, it will be before the Planning Commission, but usually for non-hillside properties it should just be a one-stop shop between the owners and the CHC.

Mr. Cross: Noted that he could not argue with his property meeting the Criteria, rather it is a matter of him simply not wanting his property to be added to the Inventory.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the owner should present evidence to the Commission to prove why his property should not be included on the Inventory and support his wishes. He also mentioned that the recommendation decision is being delayed to allow additional time for property owners to gather and present evidence.

Kurk Nakagawa (1506 Indiana):

Request to be removed from the Inventory.

Mr. Nakagawa: Reiterated his request from the October 12th meeting that he would like to be removed from the Inventory. He feels that the decision to be added to the Inventory affects the property rights of him as a homeowner and would like to know how the Commission is taking that into consideration for like-minded owners that also do not want their properties added.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the Commission is only making a recommendation and not a decision. The City Council is the body that will make the decision.

Mr. Nakagawa: Asked if the Commission is taking into consideration facts as well as the feelings and personal objections of property owners to being added to the Inventory.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that the Commission will base their recommendation on a set of objective criteria, and the Commission will have to weigh facts against those objective criteria.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Friedman: Noted that the Commission has received several requests for additions and removal and that the City Council will not be open to making a decision until January. He suggested that the Commission move the recommendation of the Inventory to either the November or December regular CHC meetings. He also expressed concern with the schedules of the Commissioners for the month of December and verified with Staff what the CHC meeting dates were for November and December.

Mr. Sissi: Noted that the regular meeting of the CHC for November will be on the 16th, and the 21st for December.

Commissioner Friedman: Noted that the Commission should take careful consideration of the Inventory and the concerns with the owners being affected and not rush through the recommendation. He then made a motion to schedule the CHC recommendation of the Inventory to the December 21st meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lesak. (Ayes: 5, No: 0).

COMMUNICATIONS

12. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL LIASON:

Councilman Bob Joe provided an update from the previous day's Council meeting. He mentioned the adoption of a resolution to approve a 4-hour time limit and a 6-month review of the parking lot at Hope and Mound. The Council approved overnight parking at the Mission Meridian parking garage for LA County Public Works van pool vehicles. Council also approved a contract with the Housing Rights Center to provide a mediation service between tenants and landlords and address concerns about living conditions. On November 6th, Stephanie DeWolfe will start as the new City Manager and he expressed his belief that it will be good for the CHC to work with her guidance on the Inventory update. Council also directed the Public Works Commission and Freeway Commission to work with Nelson Nigard to develop transit solutions to the 710 tunnel. The first dispersal of money will be \$100 million to all five cities, so the first phase will be regional, and can go towards improvements such as light synchronization. He also noted that there is about \$700 million that will eventually be available.

13. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION:

Commissioner Lesak: Suggested the Commission develop a rational process for the Inventory and how the CHC should go about the process. This discussion should be on the November Agenda. He also inquired about the HSR for the Rialto and when the Commission will be reviewing that.

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted that Director Watkins has informed him that the HSR will be reviewed at a later time per the applicant's request. He also urged everyone to attend the Oktoberfest occurring this Saturday from 5-10 pm.

14. COMMENTS FROM STAFF:

Mr. Sissi: Asked the Commission to provide Staff with any direction on the Inventory.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

15. Commissioner Lesak: Mentioned that he would like to add a disclaimer to the Minutes stating that the Minutes are a summary and recorded transcripts are available with Planning.

Commissioner Thompson: Would like to see more visual clarity on the dates and headings of the Minutes.

AUGUST 2017 MINUTES:

Commissioner Lesak: Made a motion to approve the August 2017 Minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Friedman.

APPROVED (Ayes: 4; No: 0; Abstained: Holz).

SEPTEMBER 2017 MINUTES:

Commissioner Gallatin: Noted two corrections on page 2 and page 5.

Commissioner Friedman: Made a motion to approve the September Minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

APPROVED (Ayes: 4; No: 0; Abstained: Holz).

ADJOURNMENT

- 16. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 16, 2017.

APPROVED,



Mark Gallatin
Vice-Chair, Cultural Heritage Commission

1-18-18

Date