

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

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 3RD DAY OF MAY, 2018

**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, Jim Fenske, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune, 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:** 1521 Meridian Avenue
Project Number: 2070-DRX
Applicant: Charles Yu
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a 529.5 sq. ft. single story addition and a new 487.5 sq. ft. second story addition to an existing 1,953 sq. ft. single story house on an 8,851 sq. ft. lot. The single story addition consists of a bedroom and a new living room. The second addition consists of two bedrooms and a bathroom. The proposed exterior materials will match the existing. Stucco with wood panels and asphalt roof shingles are proposed for the exterior. Vinyl windows are proposed for the additions.

Presentation:

Charles Yu: presented the project and noted that the project is a two-story addition at the rear and that it already went through a conceptual review where it was recommended for corner windows which were added. The FAR needed to decrease, so a small connective circulation element of the house from the kitchen was removed.

Board Questions:

No questions from the Board.

Public comments:

No comments.

Board comments:

Smeaton: Thanked the applicant for their efforts to follow the board’s conceptual recommendation. He believes the addition is fairly consistent with the rest of the house.

Lopez: Noted that he was not here for the conceptual review, but the project seems straight forward and compatible with the house and neighborhood.

Smeaton: Asked staff if the side yard setback can continue at the less than required 10 percent minimum

Sissi: Noted that the Code allows for established side yard setbacks to be continued.

Lopez: Inquired with staff about the 10 foot setback between structures.

Sissi: Noted that the addition is connected to the house, so the 10 foot setback does not apply.

Decision:

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

Lejeune: Seconded the motion

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

4. Project Address:	1482 Indiana Avenue
Project Number:	2097-DRX
Applicant:	Danille Terrasi
Potential Historic District:	N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a façade change to the existing house. The façade change will consist of a contemporary design. Two new decks are proposed. The first deck is 215 sq. ft. with a new flat roof on top of it. The deck is located on the front elevation and will expand the existing deck. The second deck 206 sq. ft. and it is on the third floor. The deck is located on the rear/side south elevation. The materials will consist of stucco and panel siding to match the existing, vinyl windows to match the existing, and a new garage door.

Presentation:

Danielle Terrasi: noted that she addressed the recommendations of the board from last month’s conceptual review.

Questions and Discussion from the Board with Applicant Response:

Fenske: Inquired if the roof was still a Louver roof system.

Terrasi: Yes, it will be an operable louver roof system.

Lopez: Inquired if the railing material is the same as flooring material.

Terrasi: Yes it is the same Trex decking material.

Lopez: Inquired about the sizing of the metal framing of the railing and those detailing components: the sizing and detailing of the metal framing for the railing has not been determined.

Lejeune: inquired if the 3rd floor balcony is solid as shown in the provided renderings.

Terrasi: Noted that was a mistake and the railing will be the same slatted decking as shown on the 2nd floor.

Lir: Asked if the railing will be painted: yes

Lopez: Asked staff about the encroachment into the front yard setback.

Sissi: Noted that the proposed project does not meet the required front yard setback as it increases a legal-nonconformity. The existing setback, as explained to the applicant on her computer drafting program is taken from the existing garage wall closest to the front property line and that front yard setback (11'-4") cannot be encroached upon by the 2nd floor front balcony as currently proposed. The applicant will have to inset the balcony by about 12 inches from its current proposal.

Lir: Inquired why the applicant wanted to use horizontal siding on the railing and that it was an antiquated design move.

Terrasi: The horizontal railing is what the owner wanted.

Lopez: Noted that the project is primarily about the balcony railing, and the railing is not well detailed, so it is critical to the project.

Smeaton: Suggested utilizing a modular design system for the railing and to continue the horizontal detailing which helps with the verticality of the house.

Fenske: Noted he wanted to see the detailing of the railing too.

Lejeune: Noted that he wanted to see the 3rd floor balcony railing corrected in the drawings.

Public Comment:

No Public Comment

Decision:

Lopez: made a motion to CONTINUE the project to resolve design issues.

Smeaton: seconded the motion.

CONTINUED (5-0)

5. Project Address:	1833 Atlantic Blvd.
Project Number:	2119-DRX
Applicant:	Ruth Parrini
Potential Historic District:	None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for replacing all of the existing signs. The existing pole sign will remain with a new face replacement, matching the existing dimensions 11'10" x 4'10" 57.2 square feet. The new signs will have the bank's new logo and will read "Bank of the West, BNP PARIBAS". The existing wall signs will also be replaced. The new north elevation wall sign is 17.9 sq. ft. and new east elevation sign is 17.9 sq. ft. The west elevation wall sign will be removed and it will not be replaced. There will be other on site traffic and direction signs changed. The color for the proposed signage will be the new Bank of the West corporate colors which are Black and Pantone 340 Green. The sign will be made of acrylic.

Presentation:

Parrini: Noted that the applicant is simply changing the signs to reflect a new branding of the bank.

Questions / Discussion from the Board:

Lopez: inquired if the existing wall sign is lit: there is no indication that the wall sign is lit.

Lopez: noted that one existing sign is being removed.

Fenske: asked staff about the pole sign and how they can continue to have it.

Sissi: Noted that the pole is legal non-conforming and they are allowed to keep it if they do not change the size, which they are not.

Applicant Response:

Parrini: The sign on the west elevation is being removed and the sign replacement will be 10 times smaller.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment

DECISION:

Lejeune: made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted as it meets the findings.

Lir: seconded the motion.

APPROVED as submitted. (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class 1, (g) new copy on existing on and off-premise signs.

- 6. **Project Address:** 1714 Monterey Road (Rear Lot)
- Project Number:** 2102-DRX
- Applicant:** John Rose, Owner
- Potential Historic District:** None

Project Information:

A request for Design Review to convert an existing 11 car garage into a 2,086 square foot single story single family house with an attached 537 square foot garage on a 6569 square foot flag lot. The proposed home will not be visible from Monterey Rd. Proposed exterior materials include stucco, aluminum windows and doors and torch down roof.

Presentation:

Paul Koehler: presented the project and noted he is the project manager and general contractor on this project. He presented a PowerPoint to the board explaining the project which consists of an existing 11 car garage storage facility constructed in 1939 and the desired plans to convert the structure into a single-family residence. He noted the owner, Mr. Rose, has applied to change the address to 1710 Monterey Road. The subject parcel was split from the front lot (1714 A Monterey Road) prior to the parcel's ownership by Mr. Rose who has owned it for forty years. Koehler noted that the site contains several mature oak trees, and Mr. Rose wants to preserve the oaks and actually reduce the existing building footprint to provide more room for the oaks. The existing garage structure has legal-non-conforming setbacks, which will not be increased.

Questions from the Board:

Fenske: asked if the applicant has a planting legend.

Applicant Response:

Koehler: Noted he did not have one but the owner intends to bring in a landscape designer at a later time.

Public Comments:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Lir: noted that the oaks should be surveyed so their exact locations can be noted.

Koehler: The plot plan indicates the exact location of the oak trees.

Lir: noted that the oaks should also indicate the drip lines.

Lopez: inquired with staff what the setback situation was and if they can proceed with the project being so close to neighboring houses.

Sissi: Noted that the setbacks are legal-non-conforming and as long as they are not encroaching further, the setbacks can remain.

Lir: Noted that the oaks should not have any grass planted underneath them.

Smeaton: Noted that now is the time for the applicant to hire a landscape architect to develop a landscape plan.

Lopez: Noted that he thought the project would be great, and the design is great and it will be an improvement to the neighborhood, but they would like to see a landscape plan.

Lir: Asked the board if they should provide a color board; the Board appeared to be pleased with the materials. She noted that she would like to see the colors of the building.

Koehler: Noted that the garage door will be silver anodized, the building itself will essentially be white stucco, and the roofing will be a gray white asphalt shingle.

Lejeune: Noted that he was envious of this type of property to be tucked in and be somewhat secluded from the city with open space (Edison easement) in front of the proposed house.

DECISION:

Lejeune: made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS, subject to Chair Review:

1. The applicant to provide a landscape plan and planting legend to be reviewed by BOARD MEMBER YAEL LIR. The landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of building permits.

Lopez: Seconded the motion

APPROVED WITH CONDITION FOR CHAIR REVIEW OF LANDSCAPE PLAN.

(5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

7. Project Address:	92 Pine Crest 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 a recommendation of approval by the Cultural Heritage Commission.**

Questions / Discussion from the Board:

Steve Laub: Presented the project and noted that the design is based upon the owner's request. He noted the project was a basement, with two stories above the basement.

Lopez: Asked if the dormers as shown are a third floor, the applicant noted that no it is a two-story structure with 9 foot ceilings.

Smeaton: Noted that the applicant is retaining the existing master bedroom to become a massive foyer and that they are building a full basement. He noted that the property is too narrow for this design, the design is too vertical for the neighborhood and it will not meet the Findings. The project's ceilings will be too high, and the high dormers indicating a third story will eventually become a third story.

Lopez: Noted that the project has to go through a demolition review with the CHC.

Lopez: Also wants to see a 3D model of the project with the neighboring properties to see how the project fits in with the neighborhood and adjacent properties. He mentioned he agreed with Mark that the project is too tall and too wide for the lot. He added that the front door seems to be in the wrong place and perhaps the door should be on the side. He noted the style of the house is inconsistent with the design guidelines, and this design is no improvement over what is existing, it is actually worse.

Smeaton: Noted that the front door should have some depth, and that it is flush with the facade. If this is a traditional style, the home is missing traditional elements and detailing.

Laub: Noted that an architectural historian's report was conducted. He also noted that a landscape plan will be provided, if it is needed.

Sissi: Noted that the front yard landscape plan is required for a project of this scope.

Lopez: Noted that the FAR of the project was not compliant with the 35% maximum.

Sissi: Noted that the FAR is at 34.97% as currently shown, and is in compliance.

Lopez: Noted that he also wanted to see a drawn streetscape elevation of the project with neighboring properties.

Sissi: Suggested to the Board that they have the applicant review the design guidelines for materiality, wall plane differentiation, fenestrations, etc.

Lopez: Noted the Board would like to see a clear design language and for the applicant to follow through on that design language.

Smeaton: Noted that the lot is 40 feet wide and very small, and that he might be acceptable of a 9 foot ceiling plate on the first floor, but not on the second floor.

Applicant Response:

No additional response.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment

BOARD COMMENTS

8. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

9. Sissi: No Staff Comments

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ADJOURNMENT

11. The meeting adjourned at 8:25 pm to the next scheduled June 7, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton
Chair, Design Review Board

Date

