



**CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2023 AT 6:30 P.M.

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

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chair Tsai called the Regular Design Review Board meeting to order on Thursday, October 5, 2023 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was conducted as an in-person meeting from the Council Chambers located at 1424 Mission Street, South Pasadena, California.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

Melissa Hon Tsai, Vice-Chair
Samantha Hill, Board Member
Joe Carlson, Board Member

ABSENT:

Brian Nichols, Chair
Kay Younger, Board Member

COUNCIL LIAISON

PRESENT:

Janet Braun, Councilmember

STAFF

PRESENT:

Matt Chang, Planning Manager
Sandra Robles, Associate Planner
Lillian Estrada, Administrative Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Majority vote of the Board to proceed with Board business.

There were no changes requested and the Agenda was approved as submitted.

DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

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

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

2. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 2/4/21

3. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 4/1/21

4. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 11/3/22

5. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 12/1/22

The Consent Calendar items were approved as submitted.

PUBLIC HEARING

6. Project No. 2416-DRX/AUP:

A request for a Design Review Permit (DRX) to add 63-square-foot, first-story addition and a 619-square-foot, second-story addition to an existing 916-square-foot one-story single-family dwelling at 1033 Park Avenue (APN: 5318-015-020). The project also includes a request for an Administrative Use Permit (AUP) to allow for tandem parking to count towards the parking requirement.

Recommendation:

Finding the project exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301 Class 1 (Existing Facilities). Approve the project, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Presentation:

Associate Planner Robles presented the staff report.

Vice-Chair Tsai asked if the only addition on the first floor would be on the northeast corner.

Associate Planner Robles stated that the only addition was on the northeast corner.

Applicant Presentation:

Associate Planner Robles stated that the applicant did not have a presentation but was available to answer questions.

Vice-Chair Tsai asked the applicant/architect if the front door was staying where it was.

Architect Janet Suen explained that the door was not moving but the window in the hatch area had shifted since they extended the living room out. She added that this addition was narrow to accommodate a wider landing at the entrance.

Vice-Chair Tsai stated she was referring to the area on the left side of the front.

Ms. Suen stated there was no change in the area size in that corner.

Vice-Chair Tsai asked why they chose to keep the front door to the left and not center it since they made the entry wider.

Ms. Suen stated that this was done so that the person visiting would have more room to the opening side of the door.

Public Comments:

None.

Board Member Discussion:

Board Member Carlson mentioned there was a letter of support for the project from one of the neighbors and proceeded to read the letter.

Board Member Hill stated that the project made sense to her including massing and height. She added however, that the fence materials were inconsistent with wood and masonry in places and just wood in other places. She asked the applicant if the fencing was existing.

Ms. Suen stated that the fencing was existing.

Vice-Chair Tsai stated that she agreed that the fencing should be consistent and added that the tandem parking was a reasonable request since the lot was so small. She added that overall it was a sensible addition and that she liked how they raised the first floor roofline and her only issue was with the front door and porch area looked awkward.

Board Member Hill stated she agreed that the front door looked unbalanced and that the applicant should consider replacing the front door light. She suggested that the applicant bring the portion of the front façade where the door is currently located, closer to the street thereby creating two planes instead of three.

Vice Chair Tsai stated that since they are adding a second story, it would not be hard to move the first floor structural beam to accommodate centering the front door.

Vice-Chair Tsai asked if there was a minimum requirement to setback the porch.

Associate Planner Robles said the code does not specify a minimum requirement to setback the porch.

Board member Hill stated she felt the applicant should revisit the entry design.

Board Member Carlson stated he understood the other Board Members' comments but did not feel as strongly as they did. He added that he agreed that the off-center front door stood out but did not care as much about extending the roofline to make it two planes instead of three.

Vice-Chair Tsai stated that just the porch area needed more work and she would feel comfortable approving the project with a Chair Review after the applicant does some work on the porch element and lighting. She added that the three planes did not bother her too much either.

Board Member Carlson stated that he felt asking the applicant to center the front door sounded reasonable if the house would need to be re-framed anyway.

Board Member Hill stated that after hearing Vice-Chair Tsai's comments, she thinks the front door looks more like a back door. She stated that she was comfortable working on it as a Chair Review.

Vice-Chair Tsai stated that she knows Chair Nichols is not here but she is fine to do the chair review herself since she is here and has a history with the project.

Action and Motion:

MOTIONED BY BOARD MEMBER HILL AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CARLSON, CARRIED 3-0, to approve the project with a Chair Review looking at centering the front door within the entryway and studying the entryway itself, specifically considering the alcove and the plane of the front entry door as well as the roofline and roof design.

ADMINISTRATION

7. Comments from City Council Liaison

Councilmember Braun thanked the Board for their fine work and time. She stated the City Council recently approved the new General Plan, the Downtown Specific Plan and some Zoning Ordinances.

8. Comments from Board Members

Board Member Hill asked if there was anything she, or Vice-Chair Tsai, needed to do at this point, regarding the recently formed ad-hoc committee to review the Objective Design Standards.

Planning Manager Chang stated that he believed the ad hoc committee was created to give comments to the team regarding the Objective Design Standards before they brought back another draft.

9. Comments from Subcommittees

None.

10. Comments from Staff

Planning Manager Chang stated that Vons Plaza was going to do a façade remodel with signage proposal and Associate Planner Robles will bring the project to the Board in the next couple of months (November or December).

ADJOURNMENT

11. Adjourn to the regular Design Review Board meeting scheduled for November 2, 2023 at 6:30 p.m.

There being no further matters, Vice-Chair Tsai adjourned the Design Review Board meeting at 7:09 p.m.

APPROVED,



Brian Nichols, Chair – Design Review Board

2-5-24

Date