

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA**

**CONVENED THIS 7<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2019**

**AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS, JR. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
1424 MISSION STREET**

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting convened at: 8:30 pm

Board Members Present: Mark Smeaton, Chair; Samantha Hill, Vice-Chair; Michael Lejeune, Yael Lir, Kay Younger

Board Member Absent: None

Staff Liason: Darby Whipple, Senior Planner

*Please Note: These Minutes are a summary of the meetings and are not a fully transcribed record. An audio recording of the meeting can be made available upon request with the City Clerk's Office.*

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

1. No items.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

2. No Continued Items

**NEW ITEMS**

3. **Project Address:** 1422 Alhambra Road  
**Project Number:** 2179-NID-DRX  
**Applicant:** Jim Fenske, Architect  
**Potential Historic District:** N/A

**\*\* Note: Project review was moved down the Agenda due to the applicant being tardy.**

**Project Information:**

The Design Review Board will consider a proposal to demolish an existing 400 square foot detached, two-vehicle garage and a change of design to the existing single-family house. The existing structure is 1,382 sq. ft. single-story house on a 6,740 sq. ft. lot. The new design for the house is a Mediterranean/Santa Barbara style architecture. The proposal is regarding a 1,065 sq. ft. second story addition. The addition will consist of two bedrooms, a bathroom, a master bedroom with a master bathroom and walk-in closet. A 50 sq. ft. balcony is proposed on the rear second floor master bedroom addition. The exterior materials will consist of stucco siding, clay roof tiles, and wood clad windows. A new 417 sq. ft. detached garage is proposed at the rear of the property. Three trees will be removed from the property - two palm trees in the rear of the property and one Liquid Amber tree that shall be subject to approval from the Public Works Department.

**Presentation:**

Jim Fenske and the owner presented the project.

**Public comments:**

No public comment

**Board Questions & Applicant Response:**

Hill: Will there be an ADU?

Fenske: No

Lejeune: Asked for clarification on height and color.

Fenske: The house will 23 feet in height and painted an off-white.

Smeaton: Noted the box at rear could be better integrated, and the massing needs additional work.

Lejeune: Noted former façade details are being replaced in new design (Porch, windows, add scuppers). Suggested increasing front massing to integrate with rear better.

Hill: Inquired why there are two separate massings.

Fenske: Noted the project is floor plan driven and he is keeping the bulk of existing front so as to not make it taller.

Lir: Noted the project is missing a front entry course of travel, and that the side entry from the driveway is odd.

**Board Discussion:**

No further discussion

**Decision:**

Lejeune: Made a motion to CONTINUE THE PROJECT

Hill: Seconded the Motion

**CONTINUED (5-0)**

**CEQA Categorical Exemption:**

Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities:

(a) Interior or exterior alterations

(e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:

(2) 10,000 square feet if:

(A) The project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and

(B) The area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

(L) Demolition and removal of individual small structures

(1) One single-family residence

(4) Accessory (appurtenant) structures including garages, carports, patios, swimming pools, and fences

|                                     |                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>4. Project Address:</b>          | <b>1326 Fair Oaks Avenue</b>  |
| <b>Project Number:</b>              | <b>2204-DRX</b>               |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                   | <b>Steven Dahl, Architect</b> |
| <b>Potential Historic District:</b> | <b>N/A</b>                    |

**Project Information:**

A proposal to add a 622 sq. ft. of outdoor dining area with a minor façade change to the existing 1,901 sq. ft. restaurant building on a 10,710 sq. ft. lot. The outdoor dining area will be located on the first floor

of the front elevation and on the south side elevation of the building. A 23' 9"ht. two story outdoor dining tower is proposed on the front elevation of the building. A 53 sq. ft. addition is proposed on the south side elevation. A new "Hi Life Burger" wall sign and a blade sign are proposed. The signage is not a part of this approval and will be reviewed in another DRB meeting. The proposed exterior materials for the outdoor dining tower and the addition will match the existing. There is no change to the existing parking. The outdoor dining will be subject to the approval of an Administrative Use Permit per South Pasadena Municipal Code Section 36.350.130.

**Presentation:**

Owner, Niko Tsianos: Presented the project along with architect Steve Dahl, and gave a history of the restaurant.

**Public Comment:**

Andrew Vogel – 1616 Bank St: Spoke in opposition, outdoor dining should not be along a residential street.

Christine Vogel – 1616 Bank St: Spoke in opposition to the proposed tower. Noted South Pasadena Design Guidelines calling for the preservation of small town character, fabric of district, promoting simple rectangular forms, and encourage a street wall on Fair Oaks - not Bank Street.

Gavin Wasserman – 1630 Bank St: Spoke in opposition to the expansion and feels the structure is too large for site.

Mitchell Sawasy – 1510 Oxley St: Supports the idea of outdoor dining but feels the "party hat" on the tower is not compatible design.

Quyen Hoang – 1409 Marengo: Spoke in opposition to the project and felt she was not properly noticed for prior DRB meeting (Discussion Item only noticed on Agenda). She also felt the project description for this notice was inaccurate, and feels the proposed materials do not match and does not approve of proposed landscaping removal.

Linda Wasserman – 1630 Bank St: Spoke in opposition to the project and expressed concern about noise and believes that outdoor dining will make problem worse. She feels addition will be a traffic safety issue for cars/pedestrians visibility at corner.

Dahl: Noted photos shared with staff for AUP showed empty restaurant parking lot, but Bank Street was full due to activities at Middle School. The restaurant does not influence on street parking. Reiterated the intent of the design is a fun burger joint, not museum architecture. The additions to the exterior will help to block existing and future traffic noise from Fair Oaks Ave. Corner sight lines will be improved by removal of monument sign. Design follows criteria that includes building out to property edge, to street.

**Board Questions/Discussion & Applicant Response:**

Smeaton: Commented that project is much improved over conceptual. Asked if the seating is further down Bank Street.

Dahl: Seating is primarily at front along Fair Oaks

Hill: Asked about the lighting

Dahl: The outdoor dining will be limited to recessed lighting

Lejeune: Clarified that seating does in fact face Bank Street, but only at corner.

Dahl: Noted that this is only at corner and only on first floor.

Hill: Asked about change to solid stairwell vs prior open design.

Dahl: Noted the solid stair is better to block impacts of restaurant and provide outdoor storage closet.

Lir: Felt that metal stairs will be noisy, and minimal landscaping could be improved.

Hill: Concurred about landscaping being minimal, asked for better option for tower roof.

Younger: Offered alternative to tower roofing material

Lejeune: Noted the closed stair does help with impacts. Noted the mesh wall panels is not inviting, at an angle they appear solid, agreed that the tower roof was not optimal. The second story is the bulk of issue.

Smeaton: Building discourages pedestrian travel up Bank St retaining activity on Fair Oaks. The solid roof is imposing. Asked if the goal was to create visibility with "commercial" tower?

Dahl: Noted that, yes, visibility critical and noted the new proposal for the Pavilions site proposes coming out to street.

**Decision:**

Lejeune: made a motion to CONTINUE THE PROJECT

Lir: Seconded the motion

**CONTINUED (5-0)**

**CEQA Categorical Exemption:**

Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities:

(a) Interior or exterior alterations

(e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:

(1) 50 percent of the floor areas of the structures before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less.

Section 15311, Class 11 – Accessory Structures:

(a) On-premise signs

---

**5. Project Address: 621 Camino Cerrado**  
**Project Number: 2113-DRX**  
**Applicant: Ernie Benavides**  
**Potential Historic District: None**

**Project Information:**

The DRB will consider a Design Review proposal regarding a 614 square foot single story addition to an existing 2,152 single story house on a 10,619 square foot lot. The 614 square foot addition is comprised of 570 square feet to the rear of the house and 44 square feet at the entry. The remodel will allow for a new family room and bedroom, as well as remodeling to the kitchen, master suite and laundry area. New materials will match the existing stucco finish. One Kassod tree (Senna Siamea), an unprotected tree, will be removed for the addition.

**Presentation:**

Benavides: Provided an overview and presented the project.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:**

Lejeune: Inquired where the former addition is.

Benavides: Board and Batten toward rear on right side indicates the former addition area.

Smeaton: Sought confirmation that the door at rear of entry is moving to front façade and clarity on the roof band indicated in the drawings.

Benavides: Yes, the door will be moved to allow more interior space and the band is drawing notation only.

Hill: Noted only a small portion of the rear addition visible from front.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

**Public Comments:**

No Public Comment

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. **Project Address:** 1105-1115 Mission Street (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW)  
**Project Number:** 2034-CUP-COA-DRX-VTPM  
**Applicant:** Mission Bell Properties, LLC  
**Potential Historic District:** None

**Project Information:**

The Design Review Board will provide input on a proposed three story mixed use project with two levels of subterranean parking on an approximately 31,113 square foot site. Restaurant and general retail commercial uses are proposed on the first level fronting Mission Street and Fairview Avenue. Residential uses are proposed on the ground floor level at the rear of the commercial uses and within two stories above commercial uses. Residential uses consist of 36 condominium units in a mix of one bed lofts and one and two bedroom units. The project site is comprised of two parcels developed with three commercial buildings, one of which is listed on the "City of South Pasadena Inventory of Historic Resources" (Inventory). Pursuant to the City's Zoning Code, the Planning Commission will be the design review body because the project also requires approval of a CUP, Tentative Parcel Map, and Certificate of Appropriateness. For this reason the Design Review Board will not be taking an action on the proposed project but will provide input to the applicant on the overall design.

***\*\*Note: No Decision will be made, the DRB will only provide input and design recommendations.***

**Presentation:**

Dwight Bond, architect: presented the project.

**Public Comments:**

Mitchell Sawassy – 1510 Oxley: Spoke in support of project noting good mixed use design and accomplishes filling in missing tooth along Mission Street.

John Halminsky – 1108 Mission St: Spoke in favor of the project noting how it will increase foot traffic.

Curt Oliver – 1126 Oxley: Noted the design and additional walking traffic is good. Conveyed concern for car traffic moving toward residential areas to get to Monterey.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:**

Lejeune: Asked for clarification on decoration of parking entrance and if there will be dividers on private balconies. He added that the mix of materials is done well.

Smeaton: Asked for description of brick choices, and pavement surfaces.

Hill: Asked if affordable housing was proposed, if balconies were ADA, and for a description of the courtyard. She noted that the choice of materials could be tightened up.

Lir: Noted the good use of landscaping and plants.

Bond: The die cut metal at parking entrance is similar to the former bottling company that existed on the site. The brick is similar to other examples on site varying in size/color. Details near windows are still being developed. All units will be market rate and balconies would be researched for any necessary ADA requirements. The proposed courtyard will include various concrete, trees and landscaping that will be open for community events. LID would be met through green roof and basement water storage tanks for irrigation.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

---

|                                     |                                |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>7. Project Address:</b>          | <b>1675 Amberwood Drive</b>    |
| <b>Project Number:</b>              | <b>N/A</b>                     |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                   | <b>John Cataldo, Architect</b> |
| <b>Potential Historic District:</b> | <b>None</b>                    |

**Project Information:**

The Tropical Gardens apartment Complex located at 1675 Amberwood Drive, South Pasadena, was built in 1957. The 26 unit apartment building is located in the Residential High Density zoning district (RH). Dry rot caused by water intrusion occurring over an extended period of time has damaged the Complex's four cantilevered balconies to such an extent that the balconies cannot be repaired and must be removed. The removed balconies are to be replaced with an element consisting of a slightly angled vertical façade that is identical to numerous such elements that currently exist at the Complex. Accordingly, the proposed facades seamlessly marry with and preserve the existing style and look of the Complex. Additionally, the proposed facades do not carry with them the seismic risks associated with the cantilevered balconies. The balconies currently provide limited private open space for the existing tenants as may be required currently by SPMC Section 36.350.190.

***\*\*Note: No Decision will be made, the DRB will only provide input and design recommendations.***

**Presentation:**

Whipple: Dwight Bond, architect: presented the project and noted that there is lack of clarity in the zoning ordinance regarding the private outdoor space requirement, and that a determination will be conducted upon a formal application submittal of the project.

Cataldo: summarized the project and emphasized the issues with the existing balcony design and water damage.

**Public Comments:**

No public comments.

**Questions / Discussion from the Board & Applicant Response:**

Hill: Suggested breaking up the massing of singular length balconies.

Smeaton: Agreed that smaller balconies are better design than existing.

**Applicant Response:**

No additional response.

**8. Board Reorganization**

**Information:**

The DRB will consider its annual reorganization to select a Chair and Vice-Chair

**Decision:**

The Board voted to appoint Mark Smeaton as Chair, and Samantha Hill as Vice-Chair. (5-0)

**BOARD COMMENTS**

9. The Board requested that all plans for Agenda deliveries be scalable true-half size, and that there be one full-size set for the public in the Chambers.

**STAFF COMMENTS**


10. No Staff Comments

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

11. The Board voted to adopt the minutes from May, June, and July 2018 (5-0).

**ADJOURNMENT**

12. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 pm to the next scheduled April 4, 2019.

APPROVED,  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Smeaton  
Chair, Design Review Board

Date 4/30/2019