

**CITY OF SAN GABRIEL  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**MONDAY, MAY 23, 2016  
7:00 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Nadolney called the regular meeting of the Design Review Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Cheng

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Associate Planner Jo-Anne Burns, Assistant Planner Nicholas Bezanson, Interim Planning Manager Mark Gallatin, Consultant City Architect Dale Brown, and Design Review Commission Secretary Jolie Su.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** None. No public present.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. 1427 S. Charlotte Avenue  
Planning Case No. PL-15-077  
Applicant: Hon Fai Cho**

**Project Summary:** This application is for a large site plan review to allow construction of a new two-story house in the R-1 zone.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Design Review Commission **APPROVE** Planning Case No. PL-15-077, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Assistant Planner Nicholas Bezanson presented the staff report for 1427 S. Charlotte Avenue, Planning Case No. PL-15-077. Mr. Bezanson asked the Design Review Commission to approve planning case PL-15-077 subject to the recommended conditions of approval and concluded the Staff Report.

Planning staff ensures the Design Review Commission that the massing and design fit the neighbor.

The applicant is present, but does not have anything to add to Mr. Bezanson's staff report.

**Design Review Commission Response:**

Commissioner Cheng asked if the home has to be occupied as a separate unit. Mr. Gallatin clarified that the main unit has to be owner occupied and cannot be sold separately. Commissioner Cheng asked about the two-car garage requirement and two carport parking for the secondary unit. Mr. Bezanson confirmed that these are the number of parking spaces required.

Chairperson Nadolney commented on the new entry porch, and asked if it is just a recess entry and if it is a part of the concrete deck. Mr. Bezanson confirms that is correct, and the concrete deck is included.

Commissioner Cheng asked if the concrete deck is included as part of lot coverage. Mr. Gallatin confirms that it does.

Ms. Burns did the calculation and stated that the project is still within the allowable lot coverage; at 30% lot coverage. The maximum allowable lot coverage is 35%.

Chairperson Nadolney recommended that the applicant revise the roof tiles to "Capistrano" which would work with a Spanish-style architecture as opposed to using the "Malibu" roof tiles which does not fit with the Spanish-style look.

Mr. Brown suggested they make a condition to review the exterior details. Both commissioners agree. Commissioner Cheng asked Mr. Brown if he can also look at the details of the architecture.

Chairperson Nadolney commented on the windows on the second-floor looking more like Ranch-style than Spanish-style, and said they are lacking in details and are too spread out. Commissioner Cheng agrees with Chairperson Nadolney. Commissioner Cheng would like the applicant to revise the window design.

Mr. Bezanson said the applicant understands the need to show the sill details at the end in order to show the Spanish-style.

Commissioner Cheng commented that there is still a lot of work needed to be done to the design. He is not sure if the project should be approved or should the Commission wait until these items are addressed.

Mr. Gallatin recommended the Design Review Commission approve the project upon conditions that must be met and asked Ms. Burns to read through the commissioners' recommendations to make sure we have all the items that need to be addressed.

- 1) Revise the second-floor windows to make it more consistent with a Spanish-style house. The "spread-out" design and placement of the windows are not consistent with the selected architectural style.
- 2) The selected 'Malibu' roof tiles are not consistent with the roof tiles that are illustrated on the building elevations. The roof tiles shall be revised to 'Capistrano.'

- 3) The window details on Page A-2.2 of the plans is not consistent with the windows as illustrated on the building elevations. Revise the window details so that it is consistent with the proposed windows indicated on the building elevations.
- 4) Identify the location of exterior lighting/light fixtures and verify that the location satisfies building code requirements. The proposed light fixture located on the north east side of the garage appears out of place and shall be removed.
- 5) Revise the floor plan (window and including interior door locations) to make it more consistent with the site plan and building elevations.
- 6) Revise the proportion of the entry archway.
- 7) Revise the proportion of the attic vents.
- 8) Remove the front deck/courtyard wall.
- 9) The applicant was recommended to work with the City Architect and Planning Staff in making the recommended revisions to the plans.

Mr. Gallatin commented, regarding the deck in the front, he asked the applicant if they would consider removing the deck and changing it into a walkway instead.

Commissioner Cheng made a motion to approve Planning Case No. PL-15-077 with the additional conditions of approval. Chairperson Nadolney did not second the motion. The motion failed. Chairperson Nadolney did not feel comfortable approving the project without reviewing the revised plans.

Chairperson Nadolney also felt that the project siting was intrusive to the neighborhood pattern established by the existing front setbacks of the adjacent homes due to the courtyard/deck area created by the 3'-0" tall wall. The Design Review Commission felt that the proposed second-unit's visibility from the rear alley is not desirable and suggested the applicant consider revising the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit design to a single-story structure.

Mr. Gallatin stated a new motion is needed to continue this case and asked if the applicant would like to continue with this project. Applicant stated they will continue with the project and will work with the commissioners' recommendations.

Mr. Gallatin clarified that if the applicant revises the design of the residence to a single-story, the project could be approved at the staff level and does not need Design Review Commission approval.

Commissioner Cheng made a motion to continue Planning Case No. PL-15-077 to a date uncertain to allow the applicant to make the suggested revisions. Chairperson Nadolney seconded the motion. Motion carried 2-0. Planning Case No. PL-15-077 will continue its project.

## **2. 1512 S. Gladys Avenue**

**Planning Case No. PL-15-066**

**Applicant/Architect: WHT Partners (Forrest Tsao) / Liya Su**

**Project Summary:** This application is for a Large Site Plan Review to allow construction of a new two-story house in the R-1 zone.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Design Review Commission **APPROVE** Planning Case No. PL-15-066, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Assistant Planner Nicholas Bezanson presented the staff report for this item.

Mr. Bezanson asked the Design Review Commission to approve Planning Case No. PL-15-066 subject to the recommended conditions of approval and concluded the Staff Report.

Chairperson Nadolney commented that the home is well designed. However, since most of the homes on that street are single-story she does not feel the design is compatible with the neighborhood, the proposal may be considered as mansionalization.

Mr. Bezanson asked the Commission to look at these projects based on today's standards and not compare them to the other homes in the neighborhood because the project meets city standards and guidelines for a two-story home.

Chairperson Nadolney is concerned with the setback. She cannot approve the case when considering the moratorium in place.

Commissioner Cheng suggested we look at 7-8 homes in the surrounding area for comparison. Commissioner Cheng felt mansionalization needs to be addressed right now so that in the long run it will be better for the city.

The Design Review Commission questioned the accuracy of the proposed floor area indicated in the project details. The Commission felt that the proposed floor area appears to be more than the lot should support.

City Architect Dale Brown stated that he did a rough calculation of the area utilizing the greatest dimensions provided on the plans and the proposed floor area appears to exceed the code requirement based on his estimate.

The Commission felt that the proposed house is out of scale with the surrounding predominately single-story homes present in the neighborhood. They stated that a neighborhood anomaly, such as the house on 1500 S. Gladys Avenue, should not be used as a basis of comparison when analyzing neighborhood compatibility.

The commission asked the applicant to come up to the stand to discuss this topic. The designer came up to speak and stated that he appreciates the feedback from the Commission and said he can scale down the size. The designer also agrees with the Commission on not to maximize the allowable space.

The Design Review Commission asked the applicant if he prefers to come back to the Commission with a redesigned project or if he would like the Commission to motion for denial. The applicant

preferred a continuance for redesign.

The Design Review Commission suggested that the applicant work with the City Architect and planning staff to redesign the project by reducing the overall scale and massing of the proposed house. The Design Review Commission requested that a chart be prepared containing information on the size and floor area ratios of neighboring homes. They suggested the proposed floor area not be dramatically greater than the average floor area in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Cheng made a motion to continue Planning Case No. PL-15-066 to a date uncertain to allow the applicant to redesign the project. Chairperson Nadolney seconded the motion. Motion carried 2-0. Planning Case No. PL-15-066 is continued.

### **3. 201-217 S. San Gabriel Boulevard**

**Planning Case No. PL-14-041**

**Applicant: Landwin Management**

**Project Summary:** This is an amendment to a Precise Plan of Design. On March 2015, the Design Review Commission approved an application for a proposal to construct a new mixed-use development with 159 residential condominium units and 16,549 square feet of commercial space. The proposed revisions include the elimination of 24 units spanning the Rubio Wash and relocates them throughout the development.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Design Review Commission **APPROVE** Planning Case No. PL-14-041, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Interim Planning Manager Mark Gallatin introduced 201-217 S. San Gabriel Boulevard on behalf of Senior Planner Larissa De La Cruz who is not present tonight. Mr. Gallatin asked the Design Review Commission to approve planning case PL-14-041 subject to the recommended conditions of approval and concluded the Staff Report.

The architect for the project is available to answer any questions the Commission may have.

The Design Review Commission asked for a detailed description of the proposed floor area, open space, and parking in comparison to the previously approved project.

Commissioner Cheng inquired about the designer who is working on the landscape design, and would like the residents who live on the back side of the wall to feel like they are part of the project. The Commission requested a more refined and detailed landscape plan. They expressed the need for an attractive connection bridge over Rubio Wash in order to integrate the units across the Wash with the rest of the community more effectively and make the design more harmonious. Commissioner Cheng recommended the landscape architect address this part of the design. Mr. Brown agreed with both Commissioners' comments and stated that if an area is eliminated, it would have to be replaced with mass somewhere else.

The Commission commented on the lack of massing offset on the northeast corner of the project. The Commission also stated that they preferred the building elevation design of the previous approval in comparison to the proposed building elevation.

The Architect stated he will work with their new landscaper to address the Commission comments.

Public Comment: Ms. Sandy Rosco supports this project and asked the Design Review Commission to approve the case. She stated the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce believe this project will bring added value to the city and more revenues.

Chairperson Nadolney commented she is not comfortable approving anything that is not resolved. Chairperson Nadolney also commented on not seeing enough character in the current plans as opposed to what was approved, and that some areas do not have any landscaping at all.

Mr. Gallatin asked the Commission, if the applicant can work out the architectural plans, and address the Commission concerns if they can come back with the landscape portion after they work out the details with their new landscape architect. Mr. Gallatin would also like the Commission to come to a concession with the plans. The applicant is ready to do demolition and to submit to plan check once the Commission approves the changes.

Commissioner Cheng does not have a problem approving the plans. He would like the architect to focus more on the details. Chairperson Nadolney has a problem with the conceptual plans and cannot approve it as presented.

Commissioner Cheng stated, that the case would not be approved because both Commission do not agree, he asked Mr. Gallatin for advice on how to proceed with the motion for this case. Mr. Gallatin suggested the Design Review Commission continue the project to the June 13<sup>th</sup> special meeting to allow the applicant to address the Design Review Commission comments.

The applicant asked the Commission for some clarification on what they should do to prepare for the June 13 meeting.

Mr. Roger Yuan works with the developer and came up to the stand to speak. He stated that part of the design change is based on the concerns of LA County regarding the Wash and tenants across the Wash. The plan is to address the county and city's concerns and stated they have been pushed several directions in trying to meet everyone's needs. Mr. Yuan added that the project will contribute the most affordable housing units for the city and will double the amount of affordable housing in the city. He stated that Mr. Chen will be ready to come back on June 13<sup>th</sup> in the joint meeting with the Planning Commission to re-present the project.

Commissioner Cheng made a motion to continue Planning Case No. PL-14-041 (amendment) to the special joint meeting with Planning Commission on June 13<sup>th</sup>. Chairperson Nadolney seconded

the motion. Motion carried 2-0. The Design Review Commission suggested that the applicant work with the City Architect and planning staff in addressing the Design Review Commission comments.

**4. 130 S. Mission Drive**

**Planning Case No. PL-07-057**

**Applicant: Padilla Garden Homes, LLC**

**Project Summary:** This is a review of the proposed public art for a mixed use development currently under construction and located within the Mission District.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Design Review Commission **APPROVE** Planning Case No. PL-07-057, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Interim Planning Manager Mr. Mark Gallatin presented 130 S. Mission Drive, Planning Case No. PL-07-057.

Commissioner Cheng and Chairperson Nadolney both liked the proposed public art and were very complimentary of the artist.

Artist, Ms. Jeanine Hattas Wilson, is here tonight to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Chairperson Nadolney asked how durable is the artwork on the floor. Ms. Hattas Wilson said it's very durable and only need retouching every 10-20 years.

Commissioner Cheng made a motion to approve Planning Case No. PL-07-057 (amendment). Chairperson Nadolney seconded the motion. Motion carried 2-0. Planning Case No. PL-07-057 is approved.

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION ACTION:**

Planning Case No. PL-15-077 and PL-15-066 were not approved. A motion was made to continue the cases to a date uncertain to allow the applicant time to redesign their project. Planning Case No. PL-07-057 was approved. PL-14-041 was not approved and was continued to June 13, 2016.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Minutes from the regular meeting on March 28, 2016 and April 25, 2016: The Design Review Commission were unable to review the March 28<sup>th</sup> and April 25<sup>th</sup> minutes and asked for these minutes to be carried forward to the next agenda.

**COMMENTS BY STAFF:**

None

**COMMENTS BY COMMISSIONERS:**

In reference to Planning Case No. PL-14-041, Commissioner Cheng suggested to the applicant that their architect, the City Architect, and planning staff work together on the redesigning of their project so they are better prepared to present their project again at the June 13 meeting with Planning Commission.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairperson Nadolney adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m. to a special joint meeting with the Planning Commission and Design Review Commission meeting on Monday, June 13, 2016 at 6:30PM.

\* \* \* \* \*

The complete text of the Design Review Commission meeting minutes is available on tape and may be reviewed within 90 days after the meeting in the Community Development Department office at City Hall during regular business hours.

---

Marla Nadolney, Chairperson  
San Gabriel Design Review Commission

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jolie Su  
San Gabriel Design Review Commission Secretary