

AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 23, 2009

Pre-meeting: 7:00 p.m. – Development Services Conference Room
Regular Meeting: 7:30 pm – Council Chambers Conference Room

CITY STAFF

RICHARD ABE, Architect
MURTHY SUDHAKAR, Architect

BOARD MEMBERS

GARY TSE, Chairman
MEGHAN WANG, Vice Chairman
YUNG KAO, Member
ADAM LAU, Member
CARLA PEMBERTON, Member

• **PRE-MEETING AGENDA: 7:00 PM – Development Services Conference Room**

A. Review of agenda items for the regular meeting.

• **REGULAR MEETING AGENDA: 7:30PM – Council Chambers Conference Room**

OPENING CEREMONIES:

A. Call Meeting to Order
B. ROLL CALL

CONSENT AGENDA:

All items listed on the consent agenda will be enacted in one motion in the form below unless a citizen or Board Member requests that an item be removed and considered by a separate motion.

1. 1728 W. Valley Blvd.

This is an application for new wall signage and a storefront color change.
(Jessica Ly)

Staff Comments: _This applicant has met with staff to address the signage and storefront for a new business in an existing commercial building. The graphic design and proposed size of the signage is acceptable and should have a reduced glare impact. The sign type is reverse channel letters with a brushed aluminum face. The storefront is currently a lavender color and the applicant is proposing a change to black. Overall, the proposal is acceptable and recommendation is for approval as submitted

2. 322 Elm Street

This is an application for legalization of an existing bathroom.
(Anthony R. Lopez)

Staff Comments: _This application is for the review and potential legalization of a bathroom addition already constructed. The existing condition is that the bathroom has been constructed on the second floor of a 2 story residence and projects from the mass of the residence at the second level only. It is supported by wood columns and braced. The addition is in the rear and has reduced visibility. The design has been revised to enclose the lower level as storage and to match detailing (albeit minimal) to the existing structure. Recommendation is for approval

HEARING AGENDA:

3. 1214 S. Campbell Avenue

This is an application for an existing front yard fence.
(Fanny Lee)

Staff Comments: _This application is for the review of a front yard fence and gate already constructed, presumably for its legalization. Based on the single photograph and the sketch provided in the packet in last months meeting (where the applicant was absent) the heights needed modification approval. Pending review of the modification the Board should consider how (if possible) the design can be modified to better integrate with the architecture of the house. Recommendation is for appropriate action

4. 401 East Valley Blvd.

This is an application for new replacement signage for Chase Bank.
(John Blue, Sign Tech)

Staff Comments: _This applicant proposes to replace relevant wall and free standing signage for Chase Bank. The corporate nature of the signage is generally acceptable. The layout of the main wall signage should be reviewed due to the space between lines and the vertical placement of the signage on the wall. Consideration should be for a placement that provides a more proportionate top margin and a smaller space between the English and Chinese copy. Recommendation is for approval with conditions

5. 412 North Olive Avenue

This is an application for a new second residential unit on an existing lot.
(Justo Castellanos)

Staff Comments: _This proposal for a guest house uses 9 foot ceilings and a 6 in 12 roof pitch. The plate heights vary on bearing walls yielding an asymmetrical condition in several areas. Although not inherently negative, the architectural approach can be seen as playful in massing. The traditional approach to fenestration and the disproportionate negative space above the windows and doors, however, imply that the massing is not intentionally playful and should be studied. The lack of vents and clerestories also contribute to a lack of facility in the design of the elevations. Recommendation is for appropriate action

6. 2548 Loma Vista Drive

This is an application for a new front deck.
(Roger Zhao)

Staff Comments: _This proposal is for a front deck replacing and extending the existing condition. The existing site has a right of way of less than 60 feet which necessitates a setback of 55 from street centerline. The implication is that the setback is potentially 30 feet not 25 feet, this issue should be addressed in the final zoning approvals since it is an objective issue of code compliance. The rolled roof material can be reconsidered to match the existing house (the existing roof is unspecified), however, there is a upslope to the visual condition. Recommendation is for appropriate action

7. 2 East Valley Blvd., #230

This is an application for a new window sign.
(Don Padilla)

Staff Comments: _The proposed window signage is for the second floor tenant of a commercial building with a Uniform Sign Program (USP). The USP does not specify any second floor window signage which by default does not allow for any window signage. To allow any signage would require an amendment to the USP. Code allows for a maximum of 10% (tenant window frontage only) but review should be made as to what is allowable for the second floor of a commercial building. Recommendation is for appropriate action

8. 1608 West Commonwealth Avenue

This is an application for a new front yard fence.
(Jimmy Jin Situ)

Staff Comments: _This application is for the legalization of an already constructed front yard fence. The subject fence is at the face of the building so the allowable height is 6'. It appears that the condition is code compliant. The wood fence is placed in front of a wrought iron fence. There is a unused path in the front landscape which should be addressed. Recommendation is for approval with conditions

9. 500 West Valley Blvd., #C

This is an application for new tenant wall signage for an existing building.
(Jeff Reich, Mall Signs and Service)

Staff Comments: _This proposal is for a multi tenant building with no Uniform Sign Program. If the evaluation is for an individual sign then an overall photo of the building would be beneficial. The sign itself has a logo, the company name and a box panel. The box should be revised to comply with zoning code as the City does not allow this sign type. The design itself is generally acceptable. Recommendation is for appropriate action

10. 2237-2239 West Main Street

This is an application for new condominium development.
(Tien H. Chu)

Staff Comments: _This applicant proposes the construction of 6 condominium units in 2 buildings. The larger building contains 4 units and the smaller, rear building contains 2. The parking level is partially subterranean with garages exclusive to each unit and some open parking. The primary concern is with the siting of the buildings in that Units 4 & 6 face each other with minimal distance between them. This also creates a constricted passageway between the buildings both visually and for vehicular access. Consideration may be given to an equal distribution of units (3 in each building) which could allow for better circulation and more space between buildings. The elevations are well presented but the window treatment at the bay windows

appears massive and the architectural treatment throughout lacks a specific style. The landscaping is also minimal. Recommendation is for appropriate action

11. 1509 W. Valley Blvd.

This is an application for exterior alterations to a commercial building
(Leo Wu, Architect)

Staff Comments: _This applicant proposes alterations to the exterior of an existing commercial building. The photographs provided suggest that the building is vacant and the property needs upkeep. The design proposed appears excessive but will be an improvement to its present state. The changes include new storefront systems, stucco, coping and wall treatments using moldings. In light of these revisions, consideration should be given to improving the parking area by planting trees in a manner which will not affect the parking count. Though a sign is indicated on the drawings it is not a part of this application. Recommendation is for approval with conditions.

12. 226 E. Valley Blvd.

This is an application for wall signage for a retail establishment.
(Gabriel Rousset)

Staff Comments: _This proposed signage is for a retail furniture business in a multi tenant building. There are no photos of other signs in the retail center or the number of tenants. Whereas the sign itself is acceptable in design color and copy, a current, compatible Uniform Sign Program does not exist for this property. If this design approach is acceptable, a condition of approval would be a corresponding USP. Recommendation is for appropriate action

13. 1152 S. Chapel Ave.

This is an application for a side yard fence.
(Foun Dang)

Staff Comments: _This applicant proposes a sideyard fence on a property at the corner of Chapel Avenue and Shorb Street. This application was reviewed by the Planning Commission for a height modification and was approved subject to the conditions that the height be no more than 5'-6", the design use a minimum of 3'-0" of steel fencing and that the design be approved by the DRB. Though technically a side yard fence it faces the street and will visually impact the house. Clarification is needed if the fence wraps around at the adjacent property on Shorb Street, which would make this fence the front yard fence of that residence. The design of the fence suggests a variety of materials, finishes and poorly coordinated design elements. The design relationship of the house and fence should be restudied. Recommendation is for continuance

14. 217 N. Primrose

This is an application for a single story residential addition.
(A.C. Bray)

Staff Comments: _This existing residence is a modest non descript structure in a neighborhood with no unifying architectural theme. The addition, while retaining the general roof line of the existing house, proposes the replacement of exterior siding with stucco and a complete change to the window treatment. Whereas the former may be acceptable the proposed window treatment is plain and consideration may be given to retaining the existing trim in the overall window design. The creation of a porch is an improvement but it is designed with a flat roof which is out of character with the overall roof configuration. Recommendation is for appropriate action.

- **OTHER BUSINESS:**

- **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

- **ADJOURNMENT:**

NOTICE: Americans with Disabilities Act: If you require special assistance to participate in any City meeting (including assisted listening devices), please contact the Development Services Department at (626) 570-5034. Notification of at least 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

Copies of applications and the other written documentation relating to each item of business described hereinabove are on file in the offices of the Department of Development Services in City Hall, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California and are available for public inspection during regular office hours which are 7:30am to 5:30pm, Monday through Thursday and 8:00am to 5:00 pm on Fridays. Should any person have a question about any of the above agenda items prior to the meeting described herein, he or she may contact the Director of Development Services either in person at the Department offices or by telephone at (626) 570-5034 during regular business hours.

Any decision of the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Planning Commission by the applicant or any aggrieved person(s) on or before July 02, 2009 .

Any item that is continued to the next meeting by the Design Review Board must have revised plans, renderings, material boards, etc. submitted to the Planning Department by July 06, 2009.