



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 26, 2016

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

City Council Chambers

111 South First Street

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

YUNG KAO, Chairman

RICHARD SANCHEZ, Vice Chairman

DANIEL AMAYA-FREIRE, Member

NORA HERNANDEZ, Member

WING HO, Member

ACTION ITEMS:

All items listed under Action Items are considered by the Design Review Board to be routine and will be enacted by one motion unless a citizen or Commissioner requests otherwise; in which case, the item will be removed for separate consideration.

1. MINUTES: January 12, 2016

Recommended Action: Design Review Board review and approve as submitted the minutes of the January 12, 2016 regular meeting of the Design Review Board.

2. 3201 West Valley Boulevard

This is an application for new signage for an existing ARCO gas station.

Applicant: A&S Engineering

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval as submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

3. 200 Hampden Terrace

This application is for the removal and modification to an existing wood deck and patio cover and conversion of attic space to living area including adding windows for an existing single family residence.

Applicant: Carlos Roberto Calderon

Recommended Action: APPROVAL - Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1) The mislabeled window B shall be corrected prior to Planning Commission review 2) Drawings of the balcony elements shall be provided to staff and reviewed prior to Planning Commission hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Citizens wishing to address the Alhambra Design Review Board on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Alhambra Design Review Board not on the Agenda may do so at this time. Please STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS CLEARLY for the record.

Please note that while the Alhambra Design Review Board values your comments, pursuant to January 1, 1987 amendments of the Brown Act, the Board cannot respond nor take any action until such time as the matter may appear as an item on a forthcoming agenda.

ADJOURNMENT:

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Alhambra Design Review Board will be held on Tuesday, February 9, 2016 at 7:30 p.m., in Alhambra City Hall Council Chambers, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California.

NOTICE:

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

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.

APPEALS: Any person wishing to appeal any decision of the Design Review Board to the Planning Commission may do so by filing an appeal in writing along with the appropriate appeal fee to the Development Services Department in City Hall within 10 calendar days of the Planning Commission decision. The appeal period for items on this agenda expires at the close of business on February 5, 2016.

MINUTES
CITY OF ALHAMBRA
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING

January 12, 2016, 7:30 p.m.

Alhambra City Hall

City Council Chambers

Call to Order: At 7:30 p.m. on January 12, 2016, the Design Review Board convened in the City Council Chambers of the Alhambra City Hall.

Roll Call/Introductions

PRESENT: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ

ABSENT: HERNANDEZ

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Rick Abe, City Architect

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of the Minutes.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed and approved, as submitted, the Minutes of the January 12, 2016 Regular Meeting of the Design Review Board.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

2. 86 South Garfield Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes new signage for the parking structure of the newly developed Alhambra Place shopping center and apartments. The signs are for entry identification purposes. There are two entries for the retail parking and one for the residents. The Retail and Residential Parking signs will be internally illuminated channel letters that sit along an aluminum tube raceway. The secondary signage, "Exit" & "Enter", will be acrylic letters flush mounted to the canopy. Clearance bars will be aluminum tubes with applied vinyl graphics. An address sign will be located between the retail and residential parking entries and will consist of aluminum pin

mounted letters. All signs are acceptable in size and design. It should also be noted due to seismic requirements a portion of the north elevation was slightly modified.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho made the motion for approval and Sanchez seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #2 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

3. 2215 West Mission Road

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes two new building signs for Alhambra Medical University in an existing commercial building. The building signs are located on the east and south street-facing elevations. The signs include the name and a logo and are to be foam letters with a vinyl overlay. Sizes and type are acceptable.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho made the motion for approval and Sanchez seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #3 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

4. 320 Cypress Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes a new wireless telecommunications facility for Verizon Wireless. The antennae proposed will be in the form of a monoecalyptus at 55 feet high. Similar methodology in the form of palm trees and pine trees have been used throughout the city successfully. This will be the first of its kind as a Eucalyptus tree. Based on photographs the proposal appears to be acceptable.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho moved to approve the application with the following conditions: 1) the lower sign will be removed from the application; 2) the monument sign will use an aluminum background with an illuminated red and blue logo; and 3) drawings will be revised and reviewed by staff prior to issuance of a building permit. Sanchez seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #4 and approved the application with the following conditions: 1) the lower sign will be removed from the application; 2) the monument sign will use an aluminum background with an illuminated red and blue logo; and 3) drawings will be revised and reviewed by staff prior to issuance of a building permit.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

5. 500 South Marengo Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes a 2,225 square foot addition to an existing Home Depot. The addition will be used for a new tool rental center. With this addition 21 parking stalls will be removed which are currently being used as a material staging area. The addition includes an enclosed area and a fenced in area for equipment. Material used will be CMU construction with cement plaster to match existing and is acceptable. Signage for the new rental center will be considered under a separate application.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho moved to approve the application, Sanchez seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #5 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

6. 300 West Grand Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes to replace the accent tile panels of an existing multi-family residence. The panels are located on the street facing elevation only. The existing orange ceramic tile will be replaced with a more neutral color ledger stone. The change in material will have minimal impact on the architectural style.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho moved to approve the application, Sanchez seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #6 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

7. 1 West Main Street

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes a new emergency exit door for an existing commercial building housing the Road to Seoul Restaurant. The proposed exit is located along the street elevation facing Main Street and is for the basement level. The door is incorporated within the existing storefront system with matching frame and glazing. There is minimal impact to the elevation and the proposal is acceptable.

Project discussion was as follows:

This item was approved without discussion under Action Items. Ho made the motion for approval and Sanchez seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #7 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
 Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
 Abstain: NONE
 Noes: NONE
 Absent: HERNANDEZ

DISCUSSION ITEMS

8. 309 East Hellman Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes a new unit and a single story addition to an existing single family residence. The addition is located at the rear of the existing unit and includes an attached two car garage. The existing garage will be removed to accommodate the new unit in the rear that includes a one car garage. The fenestration, details and materials of the front unit addition match the existing and is acceptable. Although it is not seen from the street, the second unit uses similar materials and is consistent with the existing unit. This project has been reviewed by staff multiple times with the initial iteration being two stories. Ultimately, the proposed one story configuration was deemed the best solution for this site.

Project discussion was as follows:

The owner was present and discussed the details. The Board accepted the approach taken to matching the existing house. Ho moved to approve the application as submitted, Sanchez seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #8 and approved the application as submitted.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
 Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
 Abstain: NONE
 Noes: NONE
 Absent: HERNANDEZ

9. 420 South Third Street

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes to relocate the existing garage and to add a second unit to an existing single family residence. The existing house is a good example of a single story flat roof Spanish bungalow. The new unit in the rear uses similar details and materials and is consistent with the main house. Currently there is no specification of the garage doors which should be provided to staff prior to planning commission review.

Project discussion was as follows:

The garage door specification was ambiguous as the note stated "the owner will choose". In the revision there needs to be a specified product that is consistent with the architectural style. The architect needs to meet with staff as necessary to choose and document the type and style of the door. It was also noted that on the front elevation the main window was too wide for a single hung and it should be two hung windows mullied side by side. There are inconsistencies in the drawings that should be corrected especially with regard to window type and style. There was extensive discussion regarding the automobile arch at the driveway. The owner wants to alter the arched opening for access purposes but there was no documentation for that work. The owner also stated that he wants a front gate which was also not shown. The Board questioned the extent of the landscape affect and any proposed gates/fences. Rather than a separate application filed for that work it was recommended that the item be continued. Ho recommended a continuance, Sanchez seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #9 and continued the application to allow applicant time to meet with Planning Staff and submit revisions to original design. The next hearing date of the Design Review Board to be determined by completion and the resubmittal of revised drawings.

Vote: Moved: HO Seconded: SANCHEZ
Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
Abstain: NONE
Noes: NONE
Absent: HERNANDEZ

10. 1140 South Chapel Avenue

Staff comments were as follows:

This application proposes a single story addition, front porch extension, a new four car garage/workshop and extensive exterior alterations to an existing single family residence. The existing home has some characteristics of a Spanish style home, but is not a prime example of the style. The applicant proposes to alter the exterior to create a Craftsman style home. Although it is an improvement with the new roof

plan, eave and porch details, other details such as window type, vent detail and the horizontal band should be looked at to better represent a Craftsman style. The window types have not been specified and it is recommended that single hungs be used wherever possible, the attic vent details should be more typically Craftsman in appearance and if the horizontal belly band is used then an alternate wainscot color or material should be considered.

Project discussion was as follows:

The owner was present but the architect was not in attendance. The applicant stated that over the past few years the windows were replaced and they are following that style of window. Kao stated that the architectural style of the home is being changed. The owner said that he was trying to do as little as possible and would only be added as necessary. Sanchez stated that with the size of the remodel the retention of the 4 year old windows as a cost savings is not significant. Ho found inconsistencies between the drawings, the existing photos and the elevational notes. He also noted that the north elevation window spec is also inconsistent. If the applicant agrees to use single hung windows per staff comments then the drawings should reflect that preference. The owner stated that he was accepting of the architect's drawings (elevations). The note regarding the steel attached grid is impossible to execute. Kao stated that for window trim a resawn wood should be used rather than a rough sawn wood which is what is called out. Sanchez stated that a gable end attic vent should be used instead of the rectangular louver. Ho questioned if the owner was open to siding, stone or shingles on the wainscot and the owner was accepting of the idea. The use of a darker color was also discussed. Discussion ensued and it was decided that all windows would be replaced. Wide windows were to be dual windows mulled side by side. Sanchez recommends the use of a quality window similar to a Milgard window. Sanchez moved to continue, Amaya Freire seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Action

The Design Review Board reviewed Item #10 and continued the application to allow the applicant time to submit revised drawings. The next hearing date of the Design Review Board to be determined by completion and the resubmittal of revised drawings.

Vote: Moved: SANCHEZ Seconded: AMAYA-FREIRE
 Ayes: AMAYA-FREIRE, HO, KAO, SANCHEZ
 Abstain: NONE
 Noes: NONE
 Absent: HERNANDEZ

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:00 p.m., as there was no further business for the Board to transact, the Design Review Board adjourned their respective meeting with unanimous consent to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held in the City Council Chambers, Alhambra City Hall on Tuesday, January 26, 2016 at 7:30 pm.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of January, 2016.

Yung Kao, Chairman



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

**ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 26, 2016**

APPLICANT: A&S Engineering

ADDRESS: 3201 West Valley Boulevard

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for new signage for an existing ARCO gas station.

PROJECT STATUS: First Time Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes to replace all graphics and signage for an existing ARCO gas station. The new signs are an updated version of the national brand. The fascia of the existing canopy will be replaced with a larger fascia to accommodate a larger sign. The canopy signs will be aluminum internally illuminated channel letters. The existing pole sign will be refaced and all vinyl graphics will be replaced with the new branding. All signs are acceptable in size and design.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval as submitted.



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

ALHAMBRA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT January 26, 2016

APPLICANT: Carlos Roberto Calderon

ADDRESS: 200 Hampden Terrace

PROJECT TYPE: This application is for the removal and modification to an existing wood deck and patio cover and conversion of attic space to living area including adding windows for an existing single family residence.

PROJECT STATUS: Continued Applicant

DESIGN ASSESSMENT: This application proposes to remove and modify an existing wood deck and patio cover and convert attic space to living area for an existing single family residence. This application was last heard at the July 22, 2014 Design Review meeting. At this meeting the Board approved the application with a condition to correct the submitted drawings. The prior approval has expired and the applicant is seeking a approval of their prior request.

The majority of the proposed changes from the original application remain the same which include: the attic space being converted to livable space, the deck being removed and the existing patio cover being reduced to respect the property line. The DRB's prime concern about a mislabeled window still remains and should be corrected.

There are also minor additional changes being made in this new submittal. Two new balconies are being added at the east and south elevations. These balconies, however, are not shown on the elevation drawings. Given the degree of the changes, a staff review of the new balcony elements should provide adequate direction for a conditional approval.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

1. The mislabeled window B shall be corrected prior to Planning Commission review.
2. Drawings of the balcony elements shall be provided to staff and reviewed prior to Planning Commission hearing