

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 2ND DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017**

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 7:00 pm

Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez (Chair), Jim Fenske (Vice Chair), Susan Masterman, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune

Board Member Absent: None

Staff Liason: 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 ITEMS

1. No items.

CONTINUED ITEMS

- 2. Project Address: 1609 Camden Parkway**
Project Number: 2029-DRX
Applicant: Yan Wang
Potential Historic District: Camden Court District

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will consider a request for the approval of a façade change. The change will consist of a 192 sq. ft. new patio with a pitch roof on the entry area and columns.

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

****Project not presented at this meeting****

-
- 3. Project Address: 1325 Mountain View**
Project Number: 2028-DRX
Applicant: Imran Chaudhry (Owner), Guillermo Lujan (Designer)
Potential Historic District: Not Applicable

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a total; 827.50 single story addition to an existing 959 sq. ft. single story house on a 5,327 sq. ft. lot. The single story addition will consist of; 365 sq. ft. family room and kitchen, a 345 sq. ft. master bedroom with bathroom, a 30 sq. ft. addition expanding an existing bathroom and laundry room, a 41 sq. ft. addition on the front elevation expanding a bedroom and a 48 sq. ft. entry addition. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco, asphalt roof shingles, and vinyl windows. The property owner is also seeking the approval for a new 194 sq. ft. garage addition. The proposal with create a three vehicle garage.

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

****Project not presented at this meeting****

NEW ITEMS

4. **Project Address:** 1559 Camino Lindo
Project Number: 2058-DRX
Applicant: Paul Corvino (Owner)
Potential Historic District: Not Applicable

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will review an application to approve unpermitted decorative guardrails on the top of the first story roof on the front elevation. The guardrails were added as a decorative design element to modernize the existing house design. All work, including the existing unpermitted work, will be required to comply with current building codes and permitting procedures including a field inspection.

Presentation:

Corvino: Presented the Board with photographs of the site and noted that this was a Mid-Century Modern home that had gone through many different changes over the years. He expressed that he has put a lot of work into the restoration of the Mid-Century design. An addition above the garage was constructed about 10 years ago and it was just a boxy wall with no way to reduce the massing. He apologized for the unpermitted installation of the roof-mounted railing. He mentioned that he installed the railing to break up the massing of the addition above the garage. The house has been restored with new stucco, new windows, new doors and new interior remodel. He mentioned that some of the neighbors have signed a letter of support for the railing and he mentioned that a majority of the work done to the house has been well received.

Questions from the Board:

Masterman: Inquired if the guardrail located at the existing balcony off the bedroom was original as it looks similar to the railing installed on the roof.

Lopez: Noted that the house is on the market and if it has been sold.

Smeaton: Inquired what the roofing material was at the flat roof areas where the roof railing was installed.

Applicant Response:

Corvino: Noted that the railing at the balcony is original and that the new roof railing was modeled after that. He also noted that the house is currently in escrow and that the flat roof areas are typical flat roofing material, and they are inaccessible. They can only be accessed by a ladder, and the railing is up to code height so it can be used as a guardrail if needed.

Public Comments:

Richard Garish of Delbeck Real Estate: Noted that he is the realtor that listed the house, and that the work in question was done before the house was listed. He mentioned that he is familiar with the house and how it lost its Mid-Century appearance over the years. He believes that Corvino's work is an improvement to the house and he has reduced the blockiness of the 2nd story addition. He is in support of the roof-mounted railing.

Board Discussion:

Smeaton: Mentioned that this was an unusual approach to breaking up the massing of an unattractive addition. He does not recall Neutra or Schindler using a rail as a general adornment without it being functional as well in response to the applicant's claim.

Masterman: Mentioned that she likes what the railing does to the composition of the massing above the garage. She referred back to the 1449 Via Del Rey railing that was recently before the Board and asked the Board Members if the railing has to function as a real railing. The Board concluded no.

Lejeune: Asked the Board what their options were.

Lopez: Noted that the railing installation is complete, but the Board can require the applicant to remove it as it was unpermitted.

Masterman: Noted that the Board has to base their decision on whether the project meets the required Findings.

Lejeune: Agreed with Masterman about the composition of the front railing above the garage, but not the railing at the north and rear of the house.

Corvino: Countered, saying the rear railing helps to balance out the front.

Lopez: Noted that he probably would not have approved the railing had it come before the Board as a proposal before installation because it is not the best example of introducing Mid-Century elements to break up the massing and reinforce horizontality. He suggested the second story could have been treated in a different surface to break up the blocky wall of the addition.

Smeaton: Noted that he likes the garage door as shown in the picture, including the new smooth stucco finish. But, he added, he is not sold on the railing as it almost acts like a mechanical equipment screening, and yet it does not even screen the roof-HVAC as seen in the photographs. He noted that while it does help to reduce the massing of the second story addition, it does not do a great job due to the railing's transparency.

Masterman: Asked how the railing was attached.

Mr. Shai (Contractor): Noted that the railing is bolted to the roof as indicated in the provided detail plan.

Lopez: Noted that the railing does not relate to the eaves or to the house volumes in general and the railing appears to be randomly placed upon the roof.

Fenske: Noted that he likes the idea of attaching the railing to block the wall of the second story, but that its linear form needs adjustment. He thinks the main problem is that it looks like a railing, when it is not intended as such. He believes that if the railing were more decorative, it would be better.

Lopez: Mentioned that the best solution to the issue was to just have the railing removed.

Lejeune: Noted that the railing should be redesigned and brought back to the Board for consideration.

Masterman: Noted that the front elevation image with the railing above the garage is compelling, but the guardrail to the north should be removed.

DECISION:

Masterman: Made a motion to APPROVE the railing above the garage and that it be painted to match the color of the fascia trim and to REMOVE the north and rear roof-mounted railing.

Fenske: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED WITH CONDITION FOR THE ROOF-MOUNTED RAILING AT THE GARAGE TO REMAIN, WHILE THE NORTH AND REAR RAILING BE REMOVED. THE RAILING SHALL BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE FASICA TRIM. (3 Ayes, Masterman, Fenske, Lejeune) (2 No’s, Lopez, Smeaton)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

- 5. **Project Address:** 1233 El Cerrito Circle
- Project Number:** 2059-DRX
- Applicant:** Karni Hadidian, Designer
- Potential Historic District:** El Cerrito Circle District

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will review an application for the proposal of a 132 sq. ft. single story addition, located on the front elevation of the existing 2,556 sq. ft. single story house on a lot of 9,148 sq. ft. The addition will consist of expanding an existing master bedroom, specifically adding a new closet and a new bathroom. The exterior materials will consist of stucco with fiber cement siding, one aluminum sliding door and aluminum windows for the entire house. The existing Palos Verdes stone will be removed from the house and replaced with stucco.

Presentation:

Ms. Karni: Presented the project and noted that she is proposing an addition, changing the exterior façade finishes, and rearranging the windows.

Questions from the Board:

Lopez: Asked if the stone cladding will be removed and replaced with a plaster finish. He also asked for specification material on the new garage door as it was not included in the presentation package.

Smeaton: Asked for clarity on the concrete finish note for the chimney. He also inquired if the roof is being replaced, if the proposed stucco finish will be a smooth hand trowel finish, and what the finish on the new front door will be.

Lejeune: Noted that the wood siding on the right of the property is existing and if it was being removed. He also asked about the color of the trim, base, stucco, and the material finish of the garage door.

Fenske: Inquired if any treatment will be applied to the existing block wall at the street.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Karni: Mentioned that the existing stone cladding will be replaced with the proposed stucco finish. She also mentioned that the chimney will be finished in stucco as well. The stucco finish will be smooth hand troweled, and that the owners may want to finish the block wall at the street in the same stucco finish at some point in the future. She continued in her response by adding that the colors of the project will be a variation of green hues. The wood siding is being replaced with fiber composite, and the front door will be cedar with a clear coat finish while the garage door will be metal to match the look of the new front door.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Board Discussion:

Masterman: Mentioned that she liked the project as proposed.

Lopez: Mentioned that he also liked the project along with the new proposed color scheme, the new front door, and the stucco finish with fiber composite siding.

DECISION:

Masterman: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT with the condition that the proposed garage door go through a Chair review and that the project meets all the Findings.

Lopez: Seconded the motion

APPROVED with the CONDITION of a Chair Review for the specification of the new garage door. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

- 6. **Project Address:** 2015 Hill Drive
- Project Number:** 2061-DRX
- Applicant:** Anna Baycher
- Potential Historic District:** None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 480 single story addition to an existing 975 sq. ft. single story house on a 7,500 sq. ft. lot. The new single story addition will consist of: a bedroom with bathroom and walk-in closet, linen closet, laundry room, and guest bathroom. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco and asphalt roof shingles to match existing materials. New windows and door materials on the proposed addition will match the existing construction

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15311, Accessory Structures. Class 11 (a) on-premise signs.

****Applicant did not show up and the project not presented at this meeting****

- 7. **Project Address:** 1233 Orange Grove
- Project Number:** 2062-DRX
- Applicant:** Alex Campos
- Potential Historic District:** None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 427 single story addition to an existing 1,637 sq. ft. single story house on an 11,968 sq. ft. lot. The new single story addition will consist of a new bedroom with bathroom and closet as well as extension of the existing dining area. Interior remodel of enlarging the kitchen and reconfigure the existing interior layout. The proposed exterior material will consist of stucco and asphalt roof shingles to match existing materials. New window and door materials on the proposed addition will match the existing materials.

Presentation:

Alex Campos: Presented the project and mentioned that the scope involves an addition for a master bedroom and closet at the rear along with the enlargement of the existing living spaces. All new materials will match what is currently existing.

Questions from the Board:

Smeaton: Inquired if all the roofing will be new.

Lopez: Noted that the existing house has window shutters and if they are to remain.

Applicant Response:

Campos: Noted that the existing roofing will remain, and the new roofing of the addition areas will tie in to match the existing. He also mentioned that the window shutters only exist on the front of the house, and those will remain. The windows at the addition areas will not have shutters.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Board Discussion:

Lopez: Noted that the project does not have existing elevations, and that it is hard to compare the changes.

Mr. Campos: Noted that the existing elevation drawings were emailed to Staff Interns this morning, but it was not forwarded to the Board Members. He provided a full-size print of the elevations to Board Members at the dais to review.

Smeaton: Mentioned that this project and its additions are rather straight forward.

Lopez: Agreed with Mr. Smeaton and thought that the project was simple and nice.

DECISION:

Smeaton: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED and that it meets the Findings.

Masterman: Seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class (e) Additions to existing structures.

BOARD COMMENTS

8. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

9. No Staff comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

10. Minutes for the previous DRB meeting were not reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT

11. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 7, 2017.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton
Vice-Chair, Design Review Board

07/20/2019

Date