

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
CONVENED THIS 4TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2018**

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 7:01 pm
Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez - Chair, Mark Smeaton – Vice Chair, Jim Fenske, Michael Lejeune, Yael Lir
Board Member Absent: None
Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Associate 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 Public Comment.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. **Project Address:** 1131 Marengo Avenue
Project Number: 2144-DRX
Applicant: Li Sy
Potential Historic District: Marengo/Virginia Place Group

Project Information:

The Design Review Board will consider a request for the approval in regards to a proposal for a 751 sq. ft. single story addition to the existing 1,337.6 sq. ft. single story house on a 5,998 sq. ft. lot. The existing 319 sq. ft. detached garage will be remodel with the proposal of a 181 sq. ft. addition towards the rear of the garage. The total size of the garage will be 500 sq. ft. The exterior materials for the addition and garage will match the existing and consists of smooth stucco and composite roof materials.

Presentation:

Sy: noted that she took the Board's comments into consideration and is keeping a fire place, but pushing it in to accommodate her car and driveway clearance. The fireplace will extrude 8 inches from the wall.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Questions/Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:

Smeaton: noted that the proposed design solution address the concerns of the Board and that he is satisfied with their solution that they have proposed.

Lopez: noted his appreciation of the owner's response to address the Board's concerns and requests.

Applicant Response:

No additional response.

Decision:

Lopez: made a motion to approve the project as submitted.

Lejeune: seconded the motion

APPROVED (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities, Class 1:

- (e) additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than, (2) 10,000 square feet, (A) the project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan, and (B) the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.
- (L) Demolition of existing small structures, (4) accessory structures including garages, carports, swimming pools, and fences.

Section 15303, New Construction of Small Structures, Class 3:

- (e) Accessory structures including garages, carports, patios, swimming pools, and fences.

NEW ITEMS

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 3. Project Address: | 817 Orange Grove Place |
| Project Number: | 1750-NID-DRX |
| Applicant: | Peter DeMaria, Architect |
| Potential Historic District: | N/A |

Project Information:

The DRB will review a proposal to demolish an existing duplex with a detached garage. The CHC has approved the Historic Evaluation Report and has recommended approval to demolish the existing duplex and the garage. The proposed project consists of a triplex on a 10,091 sq. ft. lot. Unit A will consist of a two story, 2,319 sq. ft. unit. Unit B will consist of a 1,187 sq. ft. single story unit, located below unit C. Unit C consist of a 1,471 sq. ft. unit and it is located on the second floor. Two carports for two vehicles are proposed. A 608 sq. ft. second story deck is proposed for unit C. 240 sq. ft. will be allocated to the common open space area and 205 sq. ft. will be allocated to the private area for unit B. Unit A will have 235 sq. ft. of private area. The exterior materials for structures will consist of smooth stucco siding, wood siding, metal standing seam roofing, frameless glass railing, aluminum windows and sliding doors.

Presentation:

DeMaria: Noted that he has been before the Board several times, and that each time was not successful, which explains why they are back here tonight. He noted that he has conducted neighbor outreach out of neighborliness. He presented several different design options, to the neighbors at the subject site, and the last neighborhood meeting was well received, however moods had changed at the time of the review before the DRB. He noted that he researched the City for similar street scales that is similar to orange grove place. He noted a house on 1035 Adelaine is a quaint two-story house with good massing, scale and plate height. This served as partial inspiration of the proposed design at the subject site. He noted that it was decided to demolish the existing structures at the subject site due to their condition. He presented a slide show and noted his contemporary designs in other cities such as Pasadena juxtaposed to traditional historic fabric. He presented the selection of the materials and architectural features such as siding, and doors. He noted that the client is not interested in developing

a low-budget project but wants a high-quality high-design project. There will be copper planters, standing seam metal roof, frosted glass railings, pavers and landscaping that will break down the scale. He noted the height limits will not be reached, exceeded or come close to it. He noted that all the required open space will be at ground level to eliminate excessive structure at the upper floors. He also presented a street elevation montage with the proposed project to indicate the contextual scale of the project. He noted that the front shows no garage doors, and all the parking is hidden, which is contextual for the neighborhood. The materials are selected for their quality and longevity.

Board Questions:

Lopez: inquired with staff why the project was listed as new business on the Agenda.

Sissi: noted that the project is continued, but due to a time lapse since the last review, the project needed to be renounced and placed under new business.

Lopez: inquired how many times the applicant has come before the Board and the different designs that have been presented each time.

DeMaria: noted that he has been at least two times before the Board and that the designs have evolved each time due to Board concerns and too many concerns of the neighbors.

Smeaton: noted that the meeting minutes from October 2016 in which the Board made comments to reduce the square footage from a maximum of 5000 to 4000 which he complied with. But now he is back at the 5000 max FAR.

Lejeune: Thanked DeMaria for his streetscape photo montage. He inquired if the house to the east is a single or multi-family project.

DeMaria: It is a single family.

Fenske: noted that he recalled the applicant reduced the scale and replaced the front unit with a small scaled unit that is reflective of the neighborhood building pattern and why he changed it back to maximize the development potential this time.

De Maria: noted that after unsuccessful reviews before the Board, he reviewed the zoning code to see what is allowed by right. That is why the project has changed to maximize the development possibility of the site.

Lejeune: inquired if the development has evolved to include more units, or if it has always been three units.

DeMaria: noted that the design has always included three units.

Public Comments:

Elizabeth Hollingsworth (815 orange grove place): expressed her concern with the larger project and less parking. She objects to the project for its scale, size, density and incompatibility of the neighborhood. She expressed puzzlement over the applicant's design that have consistently ignored the design recommendations of the DRB. She notes that several design criteria were not addressed with this design proposal. The size, scale, density of the project are not compatible and will create adverse traffic hazards along the alley way and orange grove place. She noted that Public Works has stated that the alleyway improvement cannot be funded solely by the City, and that the PW commission expressed concern with the traffic along Orange Grove Place. She noted that the street is one block long, and there is no cul-de-sac at the dead end where a car can turn around. The project is too big for this neighborhood. She urged the Board vote to deny the project.

Jane Schumeister (816 Orange Grove Place and 814 Orange Grove Place): She noted that she lives across the street from the project site. She is concerned with the compatibility of the project with the

neighborhood. She is concerned with the density of the neighborhood and that the neighborhood is already over populated. She urged the DRB to vote denial of the project.

Tara Kowakami (825 Orange Grove Place): She alleged that the owner, Ms. Chan, is utilizing intimidation and spite by hiring a lawyer to do what she wants. The owner has had numerous opportunities to revise her plans, and she has consistently rejected the requests of the Board and the neighborhood. She asked the Board to vote for denial.

Anna Uehara (1050 Orange Grove Avenue): she noted that she lives along the alleyway and that there is sufficient space to park cars and maneuver along the alleyway and orange grove place. She expressed that the owner should be able to construct her project and that her current property is in disrepair and a problem for the neighborhood. She expressed her support of the project.

Lydia Morton (828/826 Orange Grove Place): noted that she lives with her mother on the property whom has lived in the neighborhood for 26 years. She noted that the neighborhood is already packed with cars, and that Goldline users utilize the neighborhood as overflow parking.

She noted that her property is at the end of the road, and that her driveway is used by many people to turn their cars around. She does not feel the project is not right for this neighborhood and urged the Board to take the impacts of this project into consideration. She hoped the Board does not approve the project.

Botum Chay (813 1/2 Orange Grove Place): noted that she just moved to South Pasadena in June of this year from Sacramento and that she truly loves the city. She looks forward to the demolition of the project sites existing building, but she is not thrilled about what is proposed. She expressed that the project appears to be out of place with the neighborhood, and it does not blend in, and it is rather large. She believes a better solution can be achieved. She noted the oddity of the parking as not being sufficient. She wants to preserve the neighborhood charm, but she is not opposed to a new development at the property, but feels this design solution presented tonight is not right for the neighborhood.

Paul Zimmer (818 Orange Grove Place): noted that he grew up in the neighborhood. He expressed concern with the compatibility of the neighborhood and traffic with its size and proportion. He opposes the project and urges the Board to deny its approval.

Michael Childs (1043 Orange Grove Ave): noted that the concerns of the neighborhood are legitimate. The alleyway is not adequate and can only accommodate one-way traffic. He urged the owner to create a project that pleased the neighborhood and was more compatible with it.

Michael Hollingsworth (815 orange grove place): presented a county assessor map indicating the square footage of assessed living area in the neighborhood. He expressed his frustration at having to see the proposed project presented again tonight that rejects all the recommendations of the Board and the neighborhood. He noted that this latest iteration is a revenge tactic, and that the project site cannot fit another square foot due to its proposed size. He noted the generous additional non-bedrooms in the project and the overall size of the units. And urged the Board to deny the project.

Patrick Perry (property owner's legal counsel and architect): noted that there are two set criteria. The first criteria is the zoning requirements. This project complies with those requirements from density, height limits, lot coverage, parking, and FAR. He noted that the public works has provided a condition of approval that the alleyway be improved along with the street with new asphalt in front of the property. He noted that the project will make improvements to the surrounding infrastructure. The second criteria is subject to the design guidelines, and as expressed in his letter presented to the Board, the project complies with all of the design guidelines. He noted that the architect has taken measures to articulate the facade, and break up the massing including recessed windows, and differentiation of materials. He noted that the neighborhood is eclectic in architectural style, and that peter de Maria looked at the

neighborhood for architectural appropriation to tie the proposed project into the neighborhood. He noted that design issues can be subjective, but that the Board has a set list of objective criteria to decide upon and to follow through on that.

Board Discussion:

Fenske: noted that the project should be under code enforcement due to its dilapidation.

Sissi: noted that the applicant has received approval for the demolition of the rear unit, and they are obtaining permits for that. The graffiti of the garage has been painted over.

Fenske: noted that he understands the struggle of projects that are new construction next to existing old buildings such as is taking place in this neighborhood. He noted that the architect, though skilled, needs to take into consideration the concerns of the neighborhood. He liked the project when it was reduced in scale, and the front unit was brought down to one story as the front.

Lopez: noted that he and fenske have seen all the iterations of the project through the years as it has come before the Board. He expressed his disappointment at the current project. He noted the numerous hours spent reviewing the project regarding the scale, massing and compatibility of the project, and now the project has gone completely backwards. He noted that design is subjective, and opinions are subjective. Just because zoning says you can do it, doesnt mean you can. That is why the Board exists to ensure that projects are compatible with the City and the neighborhood.

Lejeune: noted that though the Board has specific review powers, these meetings are where the public can express their voice, and it is the Board's responsibility to ensure the neighbor's concerns are heard. We have to look at the project within the lens of the community, not just the pretty picture. He noted that the project is not heading in the right direction and that the overwhelming representation of the neighborhood in rejection of the project is an indicator the project as proposed is not right for the neighborhood.

Smeaton: noted that he wants to commend the architect for all his efforts. He understands why the project has evolved into what it is today due to client/owner requests. The project tonight is a backwards approach to addressing the concerns of the neighborhood and the Board. The massing at the rear unit is too vertical. He understands the difficulty of the neighborhood and compatibility with the zoning and that the neighborhood is probably incompatible for multi-family.

Lir: she expressed concern with the design because there is not green space, it is built out, and it does not fit into the neighborhood. She noted the design can be beautiful in another location, but not here.

Decision:

Lopez: made a motion to **DENY** the project because it does not meet Finding number 3 due to its massing, its architectural articulation and the numerous attempts the Board has expressed their recommendations only to have them ignored.

Smeaton: seconded the motion

DENIED (4 Ayes, 1 Nay-Fenske)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

The project is categorically exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the provisions of Sections:

- 15301, Class 1, Existing Facilities, Subsection (l)(2), Demolition of a duplex or similar multifamily residential structure.
- 15303, Class 3, New Construction, Subsection (b), A duplex or similar multi-family residential structure totaling no more than four dwelling units.

4. **Project Address:** 92 Pinecrest Drive
Project Number: 2024-NID-DRX
Applicant: Steve Laub, Owner
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

The DRB will review a proposal to demolish the existing single-family house with an attached carport. The existing structure consists of a 1,125 sq. ft. single story house on 4,799 sq. ft. lot. The CHC has approved the Historic Evaluation Report and has recommended approval to demolish the existing house with carport. The proposed project consists of 1,678 sq. ft. two story house with a 1,322 sq. ft. basement and a 465 sq. ft. attached garage. The first floor consists of: a foyer, a powder room, a kitchen and a dining/family room. The second floor consists of: a bedroom, a bathroom, a master bedroom a master bath room with a walk-in closet. A 66 sq. ft. second story deck is proposed on the front elevation and a 350 sq. ft. second story deck on the rear elevation. The exterior materials will consist of: Hardie Plank shingle siding, composition roof shingles, and vinyl windows and doors.

Presentation:

Architect: noted that he has addressed the recommendations of the DRB and reduced the height, and took out the dormer and created a better foyer entry.

Public Comment:

Gary (84 Pinecrest Drive): noted that he is a seismic and design engineer. he has serious concerns with the project. He noted that the hills and mountains, indicate close proximity to faults. And he is concerned with the two story project being located close to fault lines. The houses to the east and west are one story. Two story buildings need to be designed differently to handle the stress of the seismic faults, and the location of this two story building in a seismic location is not safe. He noted the building does not fit in context and proportion to the east and west neighboring properties. He expressed concern with the construction and traffic impacts on the street. He was also concerned with the demolition and the asbestos and lead and it being airborne which can be a safety hazard to his children.

Amanda knight (98 Pinecrest Drive): noted that she is a neighbor to the immediate east and she has lived there 20 years. She noted that she was overall supportive of the project. Her house sits higher than the existing house at the subject site, and none of her windows are frosted including her bathroom windows. She noted that since the project proposes a two story house, her views, privacy, and light will be compromised. She expressed concern with the noise of the existing pool pump and would like the applicant to consider the relocation of the pool pump and location of the new ac unit to be under the proposed rear yard deck. She was supportive of the overall design, but it appears to be a little too large for the site. She also did not want the applicant to install spot lighting along the sides, and that if the overhead wires can be relocated along the side.

Steve Laub, the applicant/contractor: noted that he can make a request to have the overhead wires moved. he noted that he can build a wall to obscure the noise of mechanical equipment, and the mechanical equipment can be relocated. Side lighting can be made to be at the single-story level only. The window privacy of the neighbor can be worked out with the neighbor. He noted that the house will undergo rigorous building and safety approvals, and that house is not that large at just under 1700 square feet. This size house does not require extensive materials and that the construction trucks can be small.

Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:

Smeaton: inquired about the windows and their specifications.

Architect: noted that the windows will be wood, but the specifications are still be worked out.

Fenske: noted that the window schedule lists Millard vinyl.

Architect: noted that wood windows can be installed with no problem.

Fenske: Inquired about the new landscape plan, and if the applicants did it.

Lopez: noted that all the structural, hazard abatement, construction hours, etc, are all administered through the City and their different departments.

Lopez: noted his appreciation to the designer for responding to the Boards previous comments and concerns and that the project has come a long way favorably. The level of detail expressed in the drawings is quite nice. He inquired what the door material was for the garage.

Luab: they would not prefer not to have wood doors, due to maintenance, but if the garage door needs to be wood per the Board, they can make it wood. And if it is not wood, it will be craftsman style either way.

Lejeune: noted that the garage is a small issue, whereas the front of the house is the most important. The neighborhood does not have any design consistency, and this proposed house presents a new wave of finesse for the neighborhood that should be welcomed. he noted that he would encourage a wood garage door, but he understands other more durable materials can be available. He would like to see the landscaping to be included as part of the proposal.

Lir: noted that the backyard does not tie into the new house design.

Lejeune: inquired if the pool will be removed for the project:

Laub: noted that the pool will be resurfaced, but will remain.

Fenske: would like to see more architectural details, such as the railings, siding, windows, etc.

Smeaton: noted he really appreciates the design movement and that the project is well on its way.

Decision:

Lejeune: noted that he would like to CONTINUE the project to see the following: architectural details, eaves, windows, railings, lights, material finishes, landscape plan, location of A/C unit, pool equipment, and garage door specification.

Lopez: seconded the motion

CONTINUED (5-0)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

The project is categorically exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the provisions of Sections:

- 15301, Class 1, Existing Facilities, Subsection (I)(1), Demolition of a one single-family residence.
- 15301, Class 1, Existing Facilities, Subsection (L) Demolition of existing small structures, (4) accessory structures including garages, carports, swimming pools, and fences.
- 15303, Class 3, New Construction of Small Structures, (a) One single-family residence.

5. **Project Address:** 1116 Glendon Way
Project Number: 2138-DRX
Applicant: Jim Fenske, Architect
Potential Historic District: N/A

***Note: Board Member Jim Fenske recused himself from the Chambers for the duration of this Item.*

Project Information:

The DRB will review a proposal for the remodel and the addition to an existing 2,906 sq. ft. two story house on an 8,285 sq. ft. lot. As part of the remodel, some of the existing square footage will be removed. The single story addition will consist of converting the existing 600 sq. ft. garage into a new kitchen and a new family room with a bathroom. The second floor will consist of a new remodel with a 500 sq. ft. addition. The second addition will be of two bedrooms and a bathroom. The existing master bedroom will be reduced in size. A new 520 sq. ft. second story deck is proposed on the south and east elevation of the house. A new 114 sq. ft. second story deck is proposed on the north elevation. An attached single vehicle garage with an attached carport are proposed. The exterior materials for the house will consist of smooth stucco, fiberglass roof shingles, and aluminum clad windows and doors. The house will also consist of a contemporary design.

Presentation:

Laura: noted the partial demolitions and the additions and the adjustment of volumes. She noted that the existing railings are wood, but they will be proposed to be wood. The stucco will have reglets/screeds that are not indicated in the renderings but they are in the drawings. The aluminum carport will have sliding glass doors that will fold. There will be new dormers, and the windows will be Jen weld aluminum black anodized. There will be new siding, and all new exterior finishes. New programming such as bathrooms were added within the existing footprint. The front will have a new 12 foot deep porch with 12x12 columns. Interior wise, there will be a nice sight line all the way through to the rear yard pool and through the new interior courtyard. All the new bedrooms will be located upstairs.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:

Lejeune: inquired about the functionality of the aluminum garage.

Laura: explained how the new garage will operate along with the adjacent carport Fenske: Inquired if the garage door spec was in the submittal.

Lopez: noted that he likes the nice changes proposed and that the design will be nice for the neighborhood.

Smeaton: noted his agreement with Lopez's statements.

Decision:

Lejeune: made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT.

Lopez: seconded the motion.

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED (4-0, Fenske Recused)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities, Class 1:

- (a) Interior or exterior alterations involving such things as interior partitions, plumbing, and electrical conveyances.
- (e) additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:
 - (1) 50 percent of the floor area of the structures before the addition

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 6. Project Address:** 2034 Marengo Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)
Project Number: N/A
Applicant: Steve Dahl, Architect
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for a conceptual review regarding the proposal for a 510 sq. ft. single story addition to an existing 1,438 sq. ft. single story house on a 6,599 sq. ft. lot. A 102 sq. ft. addition is proposed for the detached two vehicle garage. The exterior materials for the addition and garage addition will match the existing.

This Item is for discussion purposes only; no decision will be made.

Presentation:

Steve Dahl: noted the project and presented a new rendering of the proposed addition that will take place at the rear along the existing ground floor. The front will remain relatively as is, while the new rear addition will include a back porch. The existing windows are haphazard and mismatching, but all the windows will be replaced with aluminum clad wood windows.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Questions/Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:

Lopez: noted the massing is adequate, and that they are on the right tract. The formal review should include all the architectural detailing and drawings.

Lejuene: inquired if the drawings indicate existing solar panels on the roof.

Dahl: Yes

Lopez: inquired if the roofing will be replaced.

Dahl: yes it will be replaced with new roofing.

Lir: noted that she likes the existing east elevation and that it is charming. She would like to see a landscape plan with the formal review.

COMMUNICATIONS

7. Comments from the Board

No Board Comments

8. Comments From Staff

No Staff Comments

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ADJOURNMENT

10. The meeting adjourned at 9:18 pm to the next scheduled November 1, 2018.

APPROVED,


Mark Smeaton
Chair, Design Review Board

Date 06/17/19