

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF MONTEREY PARK
AGENDA**

**REGULAR MEETING
Monterey Park City Hall Council Chambers
320 West Newmark Avenue**

**Tuesday
January 15, 2019
7:00 PM**

MISSION STATEMENT

**The mission of the City of Monterey Park is to provide excellent services
to enhance the quality of life for our entire community.**

Documents related to an Agenda item are available to the public in the Community and Economic Development Department – Planning Division located at 320 West Newmark Avenue, Monterey Park, CA 91754, during normal business hours and the City's website at www.montereypark.ca.gov.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS

You may speak up to 5 minutes on Agenda item. You may combine up to 2 minutes of time with another person's speaking. No person may speak more than a total of 10 minutes. The Board Chair and Board Members may change the amount of time allowed for speakers.

Per the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please call City Hall at (626) 307-1359 for reasonable accommodation at least 24 hours before a meeting. Council Chambers are wheelchair accessible.

CALL TO ORDER Chair

ROLL CALL Elizabeth Yang, Gay Q. Yuen, Ivan Lam, and Tammy Sam

AGENDA ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, CHANGES AND ADOPTIONS

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Related to Items NOT on the Agenda). While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow the Commission to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Commission may briefly respond to comments after Public Communications is closed. Persons may, in addition to any other matter within the Commission's subject-matter jurisdiction, comment on Agenda Items at this time. If you provide public comment on a specific Agenda item at this time, however, you cannot later provide comments at the time the Agenda Item is considered.

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

[1.] PRESENTATIONS - None

[2.] CONSENT CALENDAR -

2-A APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It is recommended that the Design Review Board:

- (1) Approve the minutes from the regular meeting of and September 18, 2018 and December 18, 2018; and
- (2) Take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

[3.] PUBLIC HEARING -

3-A. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING ADDITION GREATER THAN 2,000 SQUARE FEET – 1034 RIDGECREST STREET (DRB-18-22)

The applicant, Winnie and Kevin Lam, are requesting design review approval to remodel and add to an existing single-family dwelling with an attached 2-car garage and 1-car garage that will result in a total square footage greater than 2,000 square feet at 1034 Ridgcrest Street in the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):

The project is categorically exempt under § 15303, Class 3 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) in that the project consists of the development of a single-family residential dwelling in an urbanized area that is zoned for residential use.

- (1) Opening the public hearing;
- (2) Receiving documentary and testimonial evidence;
- (3) Closing the public hearing;
- (4) Approving the requested Design Review Board (DRB-18-22) application; and
- (5) Taking such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

[5.] NEW BUSINESS

[4.] OLD BUSINESS

[6.] BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS

[7.] STAFF COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS

ADJOURN

Next regular scheduled meeting on February 5, 2019.

APPROVED BY:

MICHAEL A. HUNTLEY	
-----------------------	---



Design Review Board Staff Report

DATE: January 15, 2019

AGENDA ITEM NO: 2-A

TO: Design Review Board
FROM: Michael A. Huntley, Community and Economic Development Director
BY: Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Design Review Board Minutes

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Review Board consider:

- (1) Approve the minutes from the regular meeting of September 18, 2018 and December 18, 2018; and
- (2) Take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

None.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Huntley
Community and Economic Development Director

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: September 18, 2018 DRB regular meeting minutes
- Attachment 2: December 18, 2018 DRB regular meeting minutes

ATTACHMENT 1

September 18, 2018 DRB regular meeting minutes

**UNOFFICIAL MINUTES
MONTEREY PARK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
September 18, 2018**

The Design Review Board of the City of Monterey Park held a regular meeting of the Board in the Council Chambers, located at 320 West Newmark Avenue in the City of Monterey Park, Tuesday, September 18, 2018 at 7:12 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Elizabeth Yang called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planner Tewasart called the roll:

Board Members Present: Chairperson Elizabeth Yang, Member Ivan Lam, and Member Tammy Sam

Board Members Absent: Vice-Chair Gay Q. Yuen

ALSO PRESENT: Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner, Jeffrey Rimando, Assistant Planner

AGENDA ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, CHANGES AND ADOPTIONS: None

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

[1.] PRESENTATIONS: None

[2.] CONSENT CALENDAR:

2-A APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 4, 2018

Action Taken: The Design Review Board approved the minutes from the regular meeting of September 4, 2018

Motion: Moved by Chairperson Yang and seconded by Member Lam, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Members: Yang, Lam, and Sam

Noes: Members: None

Absent: Members: Yuen

Abstain: Members: None

[3.] PUBLIC HEARING:

3-A. MASTER SIGN PROGRAM – 138 EAST GARVEY AVENUE (DRB-18-11)

The applicant, Lavender Fung of Signs Express Manufacturing Co., is requesting design review approval for a new Master Sign Program at 138 East Garvey Avenue in the C-B, P-D (Central Business, Planned Development) Zone.

Action Taken: The Design Review Board (1) opened the public hearing; (2) received documentary and testimonial evidence; (3) closed the public hearing; and (4) approved the requested Design Review Board (DRB-18-11) application, subject to the conditions of approval as stated in the staff report with an added condition.

Added:

- 1) Condition 15. At the time of plan check submittal, a revised final master sign program must be submitted to the Planning Division that illustrates the approved sign colors to be acrylic black (#2025), green (#2108), red (#2793), vinyl black (#022), green (#076), red (#033), and established corporate colors. White acrylic (#7328) and vinyl (#20) to be allowed as a background color only.

Motion: Moved by Chairperson Yang and seconded by Member Lam, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Members: Yang, Lam, and Sam
Noes: Members: None
Absent: Members: Yuen
Abstain: Members: None

3-B. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING ADDITION GREATER THAN 2,000 SQUARE FEET – 1901 BROCKWELL AVENUE (DRB-18-14)

The applicant, Ngon Le, on behalf of the property owner, is requesting design review approval for a new 210 square foot first floor addition, 704 square foot second floor addition, and interior remodel to an existing single-family dwelling that will result in a total square footage greater than 2,000 square feet at 1901 Brockwell Avenue in the R-1 (Single- Family Residential) Zone.

Action Taken: The Design Review Board (1) opened the public hearing; (2) received documentary and testimonial evidence; (3) closed the public hearing; and (4) approved the requested Design Review Board (DRB-18-14) application, subject to conditions of approval as stated in the staff report.

Motion: Moved by Member Lam and seconded by Chairperson Yang, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Members: Yang, Lam, and Sam
Noes: Members: None
Absent: Members: Yuen
Abstain: Members: None

[4.] OLD BUSINESS: None.

[5.] NEW BUSINESS: None.

[6.] BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS: None

[7.] STAFF COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for consideration, the Design Review Board meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Next regular scheduled meeting on October 2, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Michael A. Huntley
Director of Community and Economic Development

ATTACHMENT 2

December 18, 2018 DRB regular meeting minutes

**UNOFFICIAL MINUTES
MONTEREY PARK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
December 18, 2018**

The Design Review Board of the City of Monterey Park held a regular meeting of the Board in the Council Chambers, located at 320 West Newmark Avenue in the City of Monterey Park, Tuesday, December 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Elizabeth Yang called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planner Tewasart called the roll:

Board Members Present: Chairperson Elizabeth Yang, Vice-Chair Gay Q. Yuen, Member Ivan Lam, and Member Tammy Sam

Board Members Absent: None

ALSO PRESENT: Michael A. Huntley, Director of Community and Economic Development, Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner

AGENDA ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, CHANGES AND ADOPTIONS: None

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

[1.] **PRESENTATIONS:** None

[2.] **CONSENT CALENDAR:** None

[3.] **PUBLIC HEARING:**

3-A. MODIFICATION TO NEW CONSTRUCTION GREATER THAN 10,000 SQUARE FEET – COURTYARD BY MARRIOTT – 521-633 NORTH ATLANTIC BOULEVARD (DRB-18-20)

The applicant, Ethan Capital, LLC, is requesting design review approval to modify an exterior building finish that was previously approved for a hotel development at 521-633 North Atlantic Boulevard in the R-S, P-D (Regional Specialty, Planned Development) Zone.

Ivan Ivanov of AXIS/GFA stated that they are requesting to substitute metal panels with a synthetic plaster product. They have researched different metal manufacturers and could not come up with a good enough solution that would give the desired design intent and also guarantee that they would not get panels that would deform or result in oil canning. This is a product that has been in the market for awhile that has been used on boutique hotels in downtown. It comes with a 10 year warranty and it comes from a credible company Dryvit. A representative from Dryvit is present to speak more about the product. The sheen and smoothness will

emulate a metal panel and it can also give the desired size that they have, which is quite big. The reason for the size is because they have it on the corner towers, so they did not want to let it get panelized or fragmented into smaller pieces, which is what would have happened with sheet metal. The metal will remain on the first floor level because people will bump up against it, they will touch it, knock on it. When you are that close it, it is not just the look, but the tactile quality. The colors can be completely matched. There is also an eyebrow that separates the two materials. The synthetic plaster material will be quite high up in the air, so people will not be able to tell if it is really metal or simulating metal.

Member Yuen stated that she would like to learn more about what this material is like, maybe some of the characteristics of this substitute material.

Chuck Bundrick with Dryvit Systems based in Bloomfield, Colorado stated that it is pearlescent coating that has a pigment that is added to it that they have developed about roughly 10 years ago to specifically simulate metal panel whether design intent or economic reasons or availability in the market. They have seen more and more success with it in terms of the projects where architects have moved towards this product for various reasons. What they have introduced into the market so far they have not seen any of the projects having to go back to do any kind of recoating or touch ups because they are able to limit the weather edging or sealant joints depending on the size of the panels. Because of the way they are able to make this product and the way it is installed they have a little more flexibility in how long the weather edges are, so that allows the owner to have a little bit of a reduction on their maintenance. So it becomes a little bit more of a preferable product for designers and owners. They can match colors. Because it has a pearlescent coating it works well and has not faded to any degree where people would notice a diminished in value in the color.

Member Yuen inquired about the difference in weight between the metal and the plaster. Speaker Bundrick replied that their product is a coating that comes in a pail and is applied onsite. This will be over a cement plaster system, so it is a heavy system. It can be installed over an installation system, so it can be a light system. It is much lighter than a metal panel. The weight comes from what it is going on top of.

Member Lam stated that visually he cannot tell the difference between the metal material and the proposed material, but in time would the color change or deteriorate enough where you can tell that there is a difference. The product has a 10 year fade resistant warranty on it. They have had the product in the market for about 10 years. They put that warranty on because a few years ago they moved towards a strata tone pigment which is some of the best pigment in the industry for making color because those pigments are so strong they are able to add some of these fade resistant warranties. They have had products in the market for 8 years that did not have those stronger pigments in it and they have not seen any projects that have had to go back and do anything or noticed that kind of degradation in the color of original product, so it has held its color very well. A lot of it is because it has a metallic pearlescent quality about it. Where when you have a regular acrylic product it does have the ability to do a little bit of fading, so this holds up a lot better.

Member Lam inquired if the durability is similar to the metal material. Speaker Bundrick replied that it is comparable to that.

Member Sam inquired about the thermal properties of the material and the material of the seam in between the panels and if there is a sealant or some kind of backer rod sealant combination and how each panel is sealed. Speaker Bundrick replied that this project is a cement plaster system so there are going to be controlled joints that are designed in the assembly, so those break points will be done with a backer rod and sealant. There is no thermal property in that system by itself, but as far as weather sealant it would be backer rod and sealant at those locations.

Member Sam inquired about the areas with large expanse and the number of control joints and breaks. With a plaster system over time with expansion and contraction there will be cracks and inquired about how it will be controlled. Speaker Bundrick replied that is more of a question for the designer and applicator. Speaker Ivanov replied that the control joints would be much less than if they had metal panels. Member Sam stated that metal panels are separate, so they do not crack. Speaker Ivanov replied that this system will have flexible control joints and the pieces can move slightly against each other.

Director Huntley stated that staff went through the layers of plaster and the last few coating there is a mesh and some additional fine plaster on top of it and base on that the mesh is suppose to hold it together and minimize the cracking and that is one of the concerns that staff had also.

Speaker John Jorgenson of Eagle Storm Group is the construction manager for the owner and his obligation is to make sure that the product is approved and also has the quality. There is waterproofing on the exterior part of the building and the three coat stucco system and then the fiber mesh and the the thin shield finish coat.

Member Sam inquired if cracking has been an issue in the past. Speaker Jorgenson replied that it is a four layer system. The final layer is fiber mesh, so it reduces the cracking and allows a little bit of movement. A regular stucco system is a three-coat system and this will be a four-coat system. Speaker Bundrick stated it is stucco assembly with a three-coat system, a scratch then a brown and then a reinforcing mesh and that reinforcing mesh is a fiberglass mesh and it has a base coat on it, which has a mixture of cement and acrylic. There will be more acrylic as it goes out to the outer layer and the fiberglass mesh combination is adding to the tensile strength into that exterior of the stucco.

Member Sam inquired about the repair of a cracked panel. Speaker Bundrick replied that those sections can just be repaired on-site.

Member Yuen inquired if there are currently any buildings in the Monterey Park that has this type of material. Director Huntley replied no.

Action Taken: The Design Review Board (1) opened the public hearing; (2) received documentary and testimonial evidence; (3) closed the public hearing; and

(4) approved the requested Design Review Board (DRB-18-20) application, subject to the conditions of approval as stated in the staff report.

Motion: Moved by Member Lam and seconded by Vice-Chair Yuen, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Members: Yang, Yuen, Lam, and Sam
Noes: Members: None
Absent: Members: None
Abstain: Members: None

[4.] OLD BUSINESS: None.

[5.] NEW BUSINESS: None.

[6.] BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS: None

[7.] STAFF COMMUNICATIONS AND MATTERS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for consideration, the Design Review Board meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Next regular scheduled meeting on January 1, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Michael A. Huntley
Director of Community and Economic Development



Design Review Board Staff Report

DATE: January 15, 2019

AGENDA ITEM NO: 3-A

TO: Design Review Board
FROM: Michael A. Huntley, Community and Economic Development Director
BY: Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Addition to single-family residential dwelling greater than 2,000 square feet – 1034 Ridgecrest Street (DRB-18-22)

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Review Board consider:

- (1) Opening the public hearing;
- (2) Receiving documentary and testimonial evidence;
- (3) Closing the public hearing;
- (4) Approve the requested Design Review Board (DRB-18-22) application, subject to conditions of approval contained therein; and
- (5) Take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act):

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, the project is categorically exempt under § 15303, Class 3 (a) (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) one single-family residence in a residential zone.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The applicants, Kevin and Winnie Lam, are requesting design review approval for an addition to an existing single-family dwelling that will result in a total square footage greater than 2,000 square feet at 1034 Ridgecrest Street. The property is zoned R-1 (Single-Family Residential) and is designated LDR (Low Density Residential) in the General Plan.

Property Description

The property is located on the south side of Ridgecrest Street, one street south of Monterey Pass Road. The lot is 9,212 square feet in size, slopes down towards the rear, and is currently developed with a 2,026 square foot one-story single-family residential dwelling with an attached 2-car garage.

The surrounding properties located to the north, south, east and west are R-1 zoned lots developed with single-family residences. The subject and adjacent properties are on a hillside. The design and character of the surrounding residential dwellings have a mid-century architectural style consisting of single and two-story dwellings with attached 2-car garages located within the front portion of the property, and a mixture of hip and gable roof designs constructed in 1959.

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to demolish and rebuild almost the entire existing dwelling unit with the exception of a 115 square foot bathroom on the first floor, the 2-car garage, and the east and west exterior building walls. Most of the first floor will be reconstructed approximately within the same building footprint as the existing house. The proposed second floor addition will be 1,654 square feet. The total proposed living area will be 3,680 square feet. Based on the lot area of 9,212 square feet, the maximum living area that can be built is 3,684 square feet. The building height of the dwelling will be 30 feet, which is the maximum building allowed in the R-1 Zone. The proposed addition will meet the required side setbacks of 5 feet for the first floor, 10 feet for the second floor, and 25 feet from the front and rear property lines. The existing swimming pool in the rear yard will remain.

The first floor will include a living room, dining area, kitchen, laundry room, bedroom, and bathroom, and an attached 2-car garage and 1-car garage. The second floor includes 4 bedrooms, and 4 bathrooms. Based on the total number of bedrooms, the existing 2- car garage and new 1-car garage will meet the required parking for the single-family dwelling.

Architecture

The existing house was built in 1959 and has a mid-century architectural style with a hip roof and stucco and vertical wood siding covered exterior walls. The proposed architectural style will be a modern interpretation of Tuscan. The exterior walls will have light beige sand-finish stucco (La Habra Stucco: Meadowbrook X-48). The center tower as well as the front, north elevations of the 1-car and 2-car garage will have stone veneer (Whiz Q: Rustic – Highland Thin Veneer). The windows will be dual-pane, sliding vinyl windows (Milgard: Tuscany Grid, Bronze). The front entry door will be custom made with round top, plank with wood straps in a Tuscany style and bronze color. The balcony railings will be custom black wrought iron. The exterior light fixtures will be a wall lantern (Gama Sonic: Royal Bulb) weathered bronze powder coated finish aluminum with clear glass and LED lighting.

The roof will be a combination of gable and hip style with S-shaped roof tiles (Eagle Lite: 8709 El Morado Blend). The roof eave fascia boards will be wood painted a light bronze color (Behr: Mocha Latter PPU5-04) and the window trims will a composite wood painted the same color as the roof fascia boards. The rain gutters and downspouts will be aluminum painted bronze to match the trim color. The garage door will be aluminum bronze with no windows (Custom Architectural Garage Door: Tuscany Style - Bronze).

Landscaping

As part of the new construction of the single-family residential dwelling, the property will include the preservation and relocation of most of the existing landscaping as well as the existing irrigation system within the landscaped areas. The trees include 8-inch diameter palms within the front, rear, west setback areas and rose bushes along the east side of the dwelling. Staff believes that the proposed architectural style and the preservation of the existing landscaped areas are in keeping with the residential character of the area.

CONCLUSION:

Staff reviewed the application and believes the proposed second floor addition and exterior remodel of the dwelling are appropriately designed for the site and compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood, with the recommended conditions. The proposed modern interpretation of Tuscan architectural style fits within the character of the neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Huntley
Community and Economic Development Director

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: Conditions of Approval
- Attachment 2: Site, floor, and elevation plans
- Attachment 3: Color elevations
- Attachment 4: Existing site photographs

ATTACHMENT 1

Conditions of Approval

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. All work performed must be in substantial conformance with the plans date-stamped December 20, 2018, unless changed by any of the succeeding conditions. Future modifications that are not in substantial conformance, as determined by the Planner, shall require modification of this approval subject to the provisions of MPMC § 21.36.120.
2. Quality of all finished work shall be per planner's approval before approval from Planning on building permit final.
3. The property must be kept free of trash and debris at all times.
4. The applicant/property owner must sign and have notarized an affidavit acknowledging acceptance of the conditions of approval and return it to the Planning Division within 30 days of the effective date of this approval, or prior to the issuance of Planning's stamp of approval for building permit.
5. This approval is for a 3,680 square foot two-story single-family dwelling with an attached one-car and two-car garages (case no. DRB-18-22), and is not an approval of building permits, which must be applied for separately with the Building Division.
6. A complete copy of these conditions, as approved, shall be listed on the second sheet of plans submitted for a building permit pertaining to this project.
7. All conditions of this approval must be complied with prior to issuance of Planning Division's final approval for building permits.
8. Decision by the Board will be finalized 10 days after the date of the meeting. Appeal of the Board's decision must be submitted on appropriate forms to the City Clerk prior to midnight of the tenth day. After the ten days are barring an appeal, you may submit your plans for approval and apply for permits.
9. All landscaped areas and existing irrigation system must be properly maintained at all times.
10. The HVAC Condenser unit must be located in the rear or interior side yard screened from public view and cannot be located any closer than 5 feet to a side or rear property line that abuts a residential zoned property.

ATTACHMENT 2

Site, floor, and elevation plans

ATTACHMENT 3

Color Elevations

ATTACHMENT 4

Site photographs