

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA**

**CONVENED THIS 5<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2018**

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

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting convened at: 7:02 pm  
Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune, Jim Fenske, Yael Lir  
Board Member Absent: None  
Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

*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.*

1. No items.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

2. No Continued Items

**NEW ITEMS**

3. **Project Address:** 1101 Mission Street  
**Project Number:** 2142-DRX-SIGN  
**Applicant:** Juan Sermeno, R-Signs  
**Potential Historic District:** N/A

**Project Information:**

A request for Design Review request for a proposal of one wall sign with cut out letters and logo for the tenant space occupied by Heliyo Athlete Lab. The wall signs measures 10 feet in overall length, and 2'-7" in overall height. The total area of the sign will be 25.8 square feet and will be located along the building façade fronting Mission Street. The sign lettering will be directly adhered to the building façade and will not be illuminated. The material for the signs will be ½" thick flat cut out clear acrylic letters in blue and gray colors. The signs will read "Heliyo Athlete Lab."

**Presentation:**

Applicant: that he was proposing a new non-illuminated sign for a new business. It will be 1/2 inch acrylic that will be directly mounted to the wall.

**Public comments:**

No comments.

**Board Questions:**

Lopez: Inquired if this sign was similar to the one used at the Divergent Cross Fit located next to the business suite.

Smeaton: Inquired if the wall color, currently painted white is to remain.

**Applicant Response:**

Applicant: Noted that the signage is similar and this is the same signage company that fabricated that business' signage. He also noted the wall color will remain painted white.

**Board Discussion:**

Smeaton: noted that the sing is subtle and nicely designed.

**Decision:**

Lejeune: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT as submitted.

Fenske: Seconded the motion

**APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)**

**CEQA Categorical Exemption:**

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class 1(a); Interior or exterior alterations involving such things as interior partitions, plumbing and electrical conveyances.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- 4. **Project Address:** 92 Pinecrest Drive (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)
- Project Number:** 2024-DRX
- Applicant:** Steve Laub
- Potential Historic District:** None

**Project Information:**

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for the demolition of the existing 1,125 single story house on a 4,799 sq. ft. lot. A new 1,678 two story house with a 1,322 basement is proposed. **The demolition of the existing house requires Historic review and clearance by the Cultural Heritage Commission. This Agenda Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made.**

**Presentation:**

Laub: Noted that at the previous conceptual review, the Board requested the massing and height be reduced. He noted that the height has now been reduced by about 3 feet, and there is a rendering of the proposed project that has been provided to the Board.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board:**

Smeaton: noted that he still has some concerns with it being too big and too bulky. He also inquired why they were proposing dormer windows at the top roof when there is not a third floor proposed. It looks like the intention is to convert the attic space into a third floor.

Laub: noted that the attic is not intended as a third floor, and noted that there is not enough ceiling height for an additional floor. Smeaton noted that there was sufficient head clearance to convert the attic.

Laub: noted that the property is substandard in width at being only 40 feet wide which presents a narrow house given the setback requirements of four feet on each side. He also noted that he can lower the dormer window.

Lopez: noted that the design is a plaster box with roofs, and that the detailing needs to be focused on particularly with railings, projections, and other architectural stylings. He suggested additional design elements such as a base material, and a different facade treatment on the second floor.

Laub: inquired if the Board would be opposed to shutters on the windows.

Lopez: noted that shutters can be acceptable if they are acceptable to the style of the house. If they were going to put shutters on this design, he would say no to them because it would just be a false attempt at design. He wanted the applicant to add more architectural elements and detailing.

Fenske: suggested that the applicant review the design guidelines for information on how to break up massing, and how to add architectural detailing and elements. Fenske suggested a quick sketch by the applicant of four quick moves such as adding columns, clipping the roof, removing or lowering the dormer, and adding the balcony detailing and see what the result is. Fenske noted that there are many small moves that can be done to achieve a nice design that is not a big impact to the neighborhood of single-story homes.

Lejeune: noted that the idea of shutters does not make any sense as he only sees one window that they can be placed on in the front. He noted that the street elevation provided makes the house appear twice as tall as the neighbors. The side walls are just a massing of stucco that the neighbors will have to look at. The garage as presented in the rendering appears to be a good inspiration of architectural styling and detailing of the house.

Lopez: to reiterate the consensus of the Board, they would like to see better articulation, and better detailing.

John Yates (owner): noted that he has been living in the home since the 1980s and he has been living in a hole and this design helps him to come out of the hole. He noted that the other properties can be rebuilt as the majority of the lots are substandard so they will probably be converted to two-story houses in the future. He also noted that the proposed house is not three stories, but two stories.

Lopez: noted that the project as presented appears as a third floor with a very high attic space and that there were others ways to design a two-story house with a pitched roof that are not imposing in height.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comment

- 
5. **Project Address:** 2060 Meridian Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)  
**Project Number:** 2079-DRX  
**Applicant:** Kelvin Ni, Owner  
**Potential Historic District:** None

**Project Information:**

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for the demolition of the existing two vehicle garage and the construction of a new attached 1,982 sq. ft. two story duplex to the existing 1,413 sq. ft. single story house on a 8,638 sq. ft. lot. **The demolition of the existing detached garage received Historic clearance by the Cultural Heritage Commission. This Agenda Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made.**

**Presentation:**

Mr. Ni: presented the project as a project to construct a new second unit to an existing single-family house in a multi-family zone.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board:**

Lejeune: noted that in the photos presented, there are multi-family structures, but what were the other properties.

Kelvin: noted that on the south is a multi-family, on the north is a single-family, and two properties north is a multi-family and across the street is a multi-family.

Smeaton: noted that extensive use of maple trees in the proposed landscape plan. He noted that the new garage for the front unit seems to be made partially inaccessible by the HVAC and landscaping abutting the new second unit.

Kelvin: noted this might be an error in the drawings.

Smeaton: noted the applicants should take a look at the design guidelines, for window fenestration inspiration. The proposed window layout appears somewhat chaotic.

Kelvin: noted the large window on the ground floor of the second unit is intended to match the large window of the existing unit.

Lejeune: Appreciated the fact that the applicants are preserving the side and front elevation of the existing single-family structure. He inquired what the materials were for the windows.

Kelvin: noted that the windows are to be vinyl.

Smeaton: noted that the ceiling plates have 9 foot plates and inquired if that was necessary, but was not opposed to the heights given the nature of the predominantly multi-family neighborhood.

Kelvin: noted that they will try to match all the detailing of the original structure.

Lejeune: inquired about the proposed chimney and the existing one.

Kelvin: noted the new chimney on the addition will match the existing on the existing unit.

Lejeune: inquired what the parking requirements were

Sissi: noted a duplex property requires two covered spaces /unit + one guest space.

Lir: noted that it is a lot of hardscape and the only green area was in the front yard. Noted that the trees proposed are more bushes, and the proposed landscape plan is very minimal and will not soften the building. She noted the side elevation of the proposed building is so long and massive and there is nothing to soften it.

Kelvin: noted that he is going to propose a multi-layered planting of high, and low plantings and some will be drought tolerant. He also noted that the new driveway will be "green" as in will be composed of a mixture of grass and pavers or 'grass-crete'.

Lopez: noted that for the final presentation, the Board will want to see window details, window manufacturers, brochures of the windows, doors, and roofing.

Kelvin: noted that the new front door for the new unit will be custom to match the existing custom door of the existing house.

Lopez: noted that the elevations of the existing unit need to be accurate, because the drawings do not indicate the window detailing or the curvature of the roof.

Lir: noted that the existing oak tree in the front does not like a lot of water, so the front landscaping should be professionally designed to protect the oak tree. She also noted that there are only a few plants that can grow around oak trees, and they should pay careful attention to that. She also suggested that they soften the side/rear driveway and the narrow planters proposed will not support many plants that can help to achieve a softening of the second story addition. She also noted that there is a place before the garage of the front unit that can accommodate a nice garden space.

Lopez: noted that in general, the massing of the addition is acceptable.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comment

- 6. **Project Address:** 1116 Glendon Way (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)
- Project Number:** 2024-DRX
- Applicant:** Jim Fenske, Architect
- Potential Historic District:** None

**\*\*Note: Board Member Jim Fenske, recused himself from the Chambers during the duration of the hearing on this Item.\*\***

**Project Information:**

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for a façade change to the existing house. 1,100 sq. ft .will be removed from this existing house, creating a courtyard. The existing 600 sq. ft. attached garage will be converted to a new family room. **This Agenda Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision shall be made.**

**Presentation:**

Christina Fenske: presented the project on behalf of the Jim Fenske. She provided updated renderings of the project to the Board. She noted it was as single-family home that was previously illegally converted into a multi-family. The proposal is to change the haphazard internal layout to a functional single-family residence. The existing attached garage will be converted in to additional living area and a new attached single-car garage and attached single car carport.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board:**

Lopez: noted that for the next meeting, the drawings of the existing and proposed should be on the same page.

Lopez: noted he likes the design of the courtyard and the front porch and that the renderings presented were on the right track. He also noted that the plans were not clear because the front porch appears to be moving forward in the proposed project.

Ms. Fenske: concurred that the front porch is going to be move forward with a small addition.

Lopez: noted that the front porch should be okay, but the Board will need to see its relation to the neighborhood context. He noted that the garage proposed in the renderings is a glass box and if that was the actual proposal

Lejeune: inquired how the garage would function and if it would be completely enclosed in glass.

Mr. Zadeh (owner): noted that the garage is to function as a cabana during the times that a car is not parked in the space. He added that the design materiality is still being decided upon for the garage.

Lopez: inquired if the second floor volume in the back is existing.

Ms. Fenske: noted that the volumes are existing and will be modified to accommodate the new design proposal.

Lopez: loved the ideal of the proposed courtyard and that the scale and massing appears to be right for the proposed project.

Smeaton: Requested the applicant bring in material and product brochures and all architectural detailing.

Lir: also requested they include the trash enclosure for the property and that she does not want to see the trash cans from the front yard.

Lopez: noted that the submittal will need to include the proposed garage structure and what it is including design details along with a street contextual elevation.

Lejeune: noted that there is not front yard access to the front porch and that should be included in the submittal.

Lopez: noted that in general, the project seems nice, but the presentation needs to have its inconsistencies corrected to make sure everything is accurate with the renderings and the existing and proposed plans.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comment

**BOARD COMMENTS**

7. No Board comments.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

8. No Staff Comments

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

10. The meeting adjourned at 8:27 pm to the next scheduled August 2, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Breaton  
Chair, Design Review Board

03/18/2019

Date