Planning Commission Agenda Report March 25, 2019 Page 10 of 15

Next Steps

The Commission shall take into consideration Staff's recommendation, the alternatives listed above, and any new evidence and/or testimony presented at tonight's Planning Commission meeting.

Background	d
Daving Cum	_

September 2014 The property owner, Patty Chan, was issued a correction notice for the unpermitted demolition of the second, rear, unit located at the

duplex property of 817 Orange Grove Place.

September 24, 2014 Gary Sewel, contractor, submitted a Design Review application to

the Planning and Building Department for the proposed demolition of the existing duplex project and the construction of a new triplex

development located at 817 Orange Grove Place. The new

development will be a gross 3,350 square feet with the front unit at 1,672 square feet and single story with three bedrooms and two baths. The new second and third units will be located at the rear in a two-story design and consist of 1,678 square feet each, each with two bedrooms and two baths. Parking will be provided in a new 744 square foot detached three vehicle garage and a new attached 636 square foot three car carport. The design was a mix of

Craftsman and Colonial Revival with materials that will consist of vinyl windows, wood siding, and composition asphalt shingles.

October 15, 2014 The application was deemed incomplete.

October 29, 2014 The applicant submitted revised drawings to reflect the requested

corrections.

December 2, 2014 The project was deemed complete.

December 16, 2014 The project was reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB) and

continued out of concerns with the proposed mix of architectural styles, the massing, lack of architectural articulation, and requested additional information to illustrate the design proposal such as a

digital model and architectural details.

January 29, 2015 The project was reviewed by the DRB as a conceptual review item,

in which no decision was made, only feedback was provided.

March 17, 2015 The applicant resubmitted architectural drawings to reflect

requested corrections.

May 5, 2015 The project was reviewed by the DRB as a conceptual review item

in which no decision was made. The DRB expressed concerns with the lack of alley access, the large roof plan of the rear units,

March 25, 2019 Page 11 of 15	2180-APPEAL
	the location of the required guest parking spaces, the mass and scale of the rear building, and the number of bedrooms in relation to the neighborhood.
July 7, 2015	The project was re-reviewed as a conceptual review item by the DRB. Chair Lopez noted the project was incomplete as submitted and therefore the project could not be discussed. Several neighbors expressed opposition to the project.
July 20, 2015	A meeting was held at City Hall between the applicant and staff to discuss the project.
November 13, 2015	An Architectural Historian report was provided at the request of the City to determine the eligibility of the existing structures proposed for demolition as potential Historic Resources. The Historian's report deemed the property ineligible as a Historic Resource.
Fall, 2015	The applicant submitted revised drawings and received additional corrections.
January 7, 2016	The application was reviewed by the Design Review Board and continued out of concern with the overall height of the structure, lack of architectural articulation and other site design issues including landscaping. Several neighbors expressed opposition to the project and its compatibility with the neighborhood.
January 12, 2016	Code enforcement citation issued regarding dilapidated site conditions.
January 15, 2016	Code enforcement case is resolved.
February 1, 2016	Architect Peter DeMaria is brought on the project as designer.
Spring through Fall 2016	New design submittals and corrections issued between Peter DeMaria and City.

Planning Commission Agenda Report

October 6, 2016

Revised triplex project consisting of a gross 3,717 square feet with Unit A at 1,031 square feet in a single-story, a 437 square foot Unit B at one story, and a 2,249 square foot Unit C located above Unit B. The project design is modern with contemporary finishes of glass railing, standing seam metal roofing, aluminum windows and

doors, and smooth stucco. The project was continued out of expressed neighbor concerns, a request to provide architectural details, and concerns with the proposed upper deck and privacy.

Planning Commission Agenda Report March 25, 2019

Page 12 of 15

November 3, 2016

Project was reviewed by the DRB with requested corrections addressed from October 2016. The project was continued out of concern with the architectural compatibility of the project with the neighborhood context, the massing of the proposed design, and continued neighbor concerns that were expressed.

January 5, 2017

Project was reviewed by the DRB and continued out of concern with the design and compatibility with the neighborhood. The Board expressed concerns with the massing, scale, the proposed 10-foot plate height, and the project's verticality. Numerous neighbors expressed opposition to the project.

2017

Staff and applicant hold continued correspondence regarding design revisions and DRB concerns.

Spring 2018

Applicant submits preliminary redesign indicating an expansion in scope to enlarge the project and development potential.

July 19, 2018

Proposed demolition is reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) for the demolition of non-historic structures over 45 years of age. The CHC clears the project of eligibility as a Historic Resource, in concurrence with the provided Architectural Historian's report, with the recommendation that the applicant retain the existing front unit and incorporate it into the new development. Due to the dilapidated state of the partially demolished rear second unit, the CHC approved of the immediate demolition of the rear unit as recommended by Staff, with the demolition of the front unit and rear detached garage subject to the approval of the overall development by the DRB.

October 2, 2018

The property owner received demolition permits from the Building and Safety Division for the demolition of the dilapidated second rear unit. The demolition is complete with a final inspection pending by the Building Inspector.

October 4, 2018

Revised project is reviewed by the DRB for a proposed triplex consisting of a gross 4,977 square feet. The front Unit A will be two stories and 2,319 square feet, Unit B will be one-story and consist of 1,187 square feet, and Unit C will be located above Unit B and consist of 1,471 square feet. The DRB expressed repeated concerns with the project and dismay at the proposed development that ignored the previous recommendations of the DRB hearings. Numerous neighbors expressed opposition to the project. The DRB denied the Design Review because required Finding number 3 could not be made. The denial decision was made by a margin of 4-1.

Planning Commission Agenda Report March 25, 2019 Page 13 of 15

October 17, 2018	The DRB denial was appealed by appellant, PRT Chan, LLC.
January 11, 2019	The public hearing date was noticed in the South Pasadena Review regarding the appeal before the Planning Commission.
January 18, 2019	Individual public noticing advertising the January 28, 2019 project appeal before the Planning Commission were mailed out to individual properties within a 300 foot radius of the project site.
January 23, 2019	Staff received two letters of support regarding the proposed development.
January 24, 2019	At printing time of this Staff Report, Staff received no additional comments.
January 28, 2019	The Planning Commission continued the public hearing for the item to their February 25, 2019 meeting to allow the appellant an opportunity to mediate with the neighborhood and develop solutions to address the concerns expressed by members of the neighborhood and by members of the Planning Commission with regards to the project that was denied by the DRB.
Early February 2019	The City Fire Inspector toured the Orange Grove Place neighborhood to inspect the alleyway encroachments and reach out to the property owners regarding their encroachment and blockage of the alley right-of-way.
February 19, 2019	Members of the neighborhood met with staff to discuss the denied project and the appeal.
February 19, 2019	The appellant's legal representative and architect met with staff to discuss the appeal, and the public discussion at the January 28 th Planning Commission. They also made a provided a preview of a revised project design for the site that began to address the concerns expressed by members of the Planning Commission.
February 20, 2019	Staff received an additional letter of support to uphold the appeal from a neighborhood resident.
Late February, 2019	Staff received letters supporting the denial of the appeal and the upholding of the DRB decision to deny the proposed tri-plex development.
February 25, 2019	In concurrence with the appellant, and at Staff's recommendation, the Planning Commission continued the item to allow the appellant

Planning Commission Agenda Report March 25, 2019 Page 14 of 15

	additional time to formally submit revised drawings for the project and allow Staff time for review.
March 14, 2019	The appellant's architect formally submitted the revised project drawings that were previewed on February 19, 2019. The square footage calculations were revised from February, but the overall redesign of March 2019 indicated consistency with what was previewed in February 2019.
March 15-18, 2019	Members of the neighborhood reviewed the revised design changes at the Planning and Building counter and reiterated their concerns with the project and its compatibility with the neighborhood.
March 18, 2019	Corrections were submitted to the appellant's architect. Requested corrections included additional drawings, annotations, visual clarity on the elevations, architectural details, additional project calculations, and a formalized landscape plan.
March 21, 2019	The applicant submitted corrected drawings to Planning and Building.
March 21, 2019	At printing time of this staff report no additional comments were provided verbally or in writing.

Legal Review

The Assistant City Attorney has reviewed this Staff Report.

Fiscal Impact

Not applicable to this Agenda Item.

Environmental Analysis

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.

Public Notification of Agenda Item

The public was made aware that this item was to be considered this evening by virtue of its inclusion on the legally publicly noticed agenda, posting of the same agenda and reports on the City's website and the Item's original notice in the South Pasadena Review and mailings to properties within a 300 foot radius of the subject property.