



**CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2022 AT 6:30 P.M.

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1424 MISSION STREET, SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030**

CALL TO ORDER:

The Regular Meeting of the South Pasadena Design Review Board was called to order by Chair, Samantha Hill, on Thursday, July 7, 2022 at 6:52 p.m. The meeting was conducted from the Council Chambers located at 1424 Mission Street, South Pasadena, California.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

Samantha Hill, Chair
Melissa Hon Tsai, Vice-Chair
Joe Carlson, Board Member
Brian Nichols, Board Member
Kay Younger, Board Member

STAFF

PRESENT:

Angelica Frausto-Lupo, Community Development
Director
Matt Chang, Planning Manager
Braulio Madrid, Associate Planner
Sandra Robles, Associate Planner
Lilian Estrada, Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Majority vote of the Board to proceed with Board business.

MOTIONED BY CHAIR HILL, CARRIED 5-0, to: approve the Agenda, as presented.

DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Disclosure by Board of site visits and ex-parte contact for items on the agenda.

Board Member Younger spoke to the architect of Item No. 3 (260 Saint Alban Avenue, Project No. 2460-DRX)

PUBLIC COMMENT**1. Public Comment – General (Non-Agenda Items)**

Administrative Assistant, Lillian Estrada, announced that there were no general public comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM**2. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2022**

No changes to the minutes.

VOTED BY BOARD MEMBERS, CARRIED 5-0, to approve the minutes as submitted.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING *(Item continued from June 2, 2022)***3. 260 Saint Albans Avenue (APN: 5311-010-040), Project No. 2460-DRX – To allow the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with an attached two-car garage within the Residential Single-Family (RS) zone.****Recommendation:**

Approve the project, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner, Braulio Madrid, presented the staff report. No presentation from applicant.

Board Members did not have questions for staff.

Public Comments:

With no requests to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Board Member Discussion:

Board Member Nichols commented that changes have been made per previous suggestions.

Board Member Carlson asked about ADU square footage being exempt from FAR.

Staff confirmed that the ADU ordinance allows for 800 square feet to be exempt from FAR.

Vice-Chair Hon Tsai had a question about the rendering of the porch in west elevation; the arch looks higher than the one on the south, but in the front it looks like the same opening. There are no dimensions, just need clarification.

Applicant representative said they are meant to be the same height.

Vice-Chair Hon Tsai said that the drawing is the same height, but not the elevations.

Chair Hill had a similar question regarding renderings, as they do not match the elevations; arches on the second story, show a small window in the middle of the rendering, then the elevations show a half arch. Renderings are different from the elevations.

Staff mentioned that the drawings are accurate.

Chair Hill asked if the applicant wanted to say anything.

Applicant, Deepati Pareek, said there was nothing to add, but would like to get started with construction and hoping that the project is approved.

Chair Hill closed the public hearing comments, as there were no comments. Chair Hill asked the subcommittee for a summary of their discussion.

Vice-Chair Hon Tsai said that the applicant addressed a lot of the concerns and stated that the balance and arches have come together. She added that the front porch in the south elevation seemed out of proportion to have the limestone corner. However, she was pleased with the way it turned out. Vice-Chair Hon Tsai mentioned that the little arch on the west elevation was still not great because it is squared off, but was not a deal breaker, as everything else is great. She concluded that she was ready to approve.

Board Member Nichols agreed with Vice-Chair Hon Tsai's comments.

Chair Hill asked the Board Members for additional comments.

Board Member Younger said it will be a beautiful house.

Board Member Carlson asked the architect if the material for the façade of the garage and entry way is all limestone.

The applicant representative, Mahetzi Hernandez, provided the materials board.

Board Member Carlson stated that he had no other comments.

Chair Hill stated that the project had great improvements and continuity throughout. She added that the removal of spiral staircase was a positive. Chair Hill stated that she looked at the landscape plans, because a member of the public was concerned about the bamboo and wanted to make sure this does not become a concern. She asked the applicant if the bamboo will remain.

The applicant said the bamboo will remain.

Chair Hill wanted to bring that to the attention of Staff and she added that generally, the materials are great, in addition to the massing and cleaning up of the windows. Chair Hill stated that she is also ready to approve.

Action and Motion:

MOTIONED BY BOARD MEMBER CARLSON, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER YOUNGER, CARRIED 5-0, to: approve the project based on staff recommendation with conditions of approval.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. **107 South Lane (APN: 5311-006-038), Project No. 2480-DRX – To allow the construction of a 240-square-foot uncovered rear balcony, visible from the public right-of-way, and modifications to the front façade. The subject two-story residence is located within the Residential Single-Family (RS) zone.**

Vice-Chair Hon Tsai and Board Member Nichols recused themselves, as both have property interest within 1,000 feet.

Recommendation:

Approve the project, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner, Braulio Madrid, presented the staff report. No presentation from applicant.

Chair Hill moved to questions for staff.

Board Member Carlson asked if there was a photograph of the rear of the house where the deck will be.

Mr. Madrid said that the rear of the home backs into a cul-de-sac and does not have images form Collis Avenue.

Board Member Carlson said he was curious because it is large and wanted to see how it would look. He further asked if the project will be going through Plan Check, as he expressed concerns about the cantilever deck support.

Chair Hill wanted to clarify if this project is coming before the DRB because of the balcony.

Mr. Madrid stated that both the addition and deck triggered the meetings.

Public Comments:

With no requests to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Board Member Discussion:

Chair Hill requested that the applicant representative approach the podium.

Architect, Gary McKee, with Knotts Associates approached the podium.

Board Member Carlson asked if the front of the house lighting fixtures were being centered over the windows, as it makes more sense to center over the entry way. He mentioned that adding a third fixture would balance it out.

Chair Hill stated that there can be further discussion regarding the lighting and the balcony. Chair Hill noted that the balcony has a 12-foot cantilever, which she stated to be excessive and asked about structural support for the weight.

Mr. McKee said that if they were to add steel, it would be smaller and added that the firm he works for has a structural engineer.

Chair Hill asked if the design would look different if metal is added for structural support or if posts are needed.

Mr. McKee stated that they will not add posts and added that if beams were too large, they would run into the office and bathroom and would be a problem and added that it would likely be one steel beam or two.

Chair Hill stated that she understands that the applicant wants more outdoor space, but is concerned with the cantilever. Chair Hill asked if the cantilever was sitting above houses.

Staff stated that the balcony is right behind the subject site and there is a cul-de-sac. Staff added that there will not be a home within the straight view, but that there will be homes surrounding the property.

Chair Hill asked if other homes face the back and about the location of the balcony compared to other homes.

Mr. McKee said the balcony would be about 100 feet away.

Chair Hill stated that the information was helpful and did not have further questions.

Mr. McKee added that all windows are staying.

Chair Hill stated that the front door looks great and added that if there are significant changes in design due to structural support, a Chair Review would be required.

Staff stated that if there are any changes of materials, outside of wood, the project would require a Chair Review.

Chair Hill stated that she wanted to discuss the lights and asked to see the front elevation.

Board Member Carlson asked if light fixtures were on either side of the entry way.

Chair Hill said that the image is helpful because previously, the elevation looked like the front door sits in front, but it does not. Chair Hill recommend that the lights highlight the entry; to balance it, maybe one on either end and possibly two by the entry to balance. Chair Hill stated that this was only a recommendation, not a condition.

Chair Hill made motion to approve the project with one condition; if the design changes, then it becomes a Chair Review.

Mr. McKee asked if they have to add steel for the beam, would that be considered a design change, because they can box the beam.

Chair Hill clarified that if it is visually changing, then yes, but if it is covered and boxed and changes would not be seen, then it not would require a Chair Review.

Action and Motion:

MOTIONED BY CHAIR HILL, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER YOUNG, CARRIED 3-0, to: approve the project based on staff recommendation with conditions of approval and an added condition for the applicant to apply for a Chair Review if there is a design change.

ADMINISTRATION

5. Comments from Board Members

None.

6. Comments from Subcommittees

None.

7. Comments from Staff

Community Development Director, Angelica Frausto-Lupo, provided the Design Review Board with staff hiring updates and stated that the Department has additional help for completing meeting minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

8. Adjourn to the regular Design Review Board meeting scheduled for August 4, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.

There being no further matters, Chair, Samantha Hill, adjourned the Design Review Board meeting at 7:51 p.m.

APPROVED,



Samantha Hill, Chair – Design Review Board

11 / 03 / 2022

Date