CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 AT 6:30 P.M.

## AMEDEE O. "DICK" RICHARDS JR. COUNCIL CHAMBERS 1424 MISSION STREET, SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030

## South Pasadena Planning Commission Statement of Civility

As your appointed governing board we will treat each other, members of the public, and city employees with patience, civility and courtesy as a model of the same behavior we wish to reflect in South Pasadena for the conduct of all city business and community participation. The decisions made tonight will be for the benefit of the South Pasadena community and not for personal gain.

## NOTICE ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION \& ACCESSIBILITY

The South Pasadena Planning Commission Meeting will be conducted in-person from the Amedee O. "Dick" Richards, Jr. Council Chambers, located at 1424 Mission Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030.

The Meeting will be available:

- In Person - Council Chambers, 1424 Mission Street, South Pasadena
- Via Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83530439651 Meeting ID: 83530439651

To maximize public safety while still maintaining transparency and public access, members of the public can observe the meeting via Zoom in the following methods below.

- Go to the Zoom website, https://Zoom.us/join and enter the Zoom meeting information; or
- Click on the following unique Zoom meeting link:
https://us02web.zoom.us///83530439651

| CALL TO ORDER: | Chair | Laura Dahl |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ROLL CALL: | Chair | Laura Dahl |
|  | Vice-Chair | Lisa Padilla |
|  | Commissioner | Amitabh Barthakur |
|  | Commissioner | John Lesak |
|  | Commissioner | Arnold Swanborn |
| COUNCIL LIAISON: | Mayor | Jon Primuth |

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Majority vote of the Commission to proceed with Commission business.

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

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

## PUBLIC COMMENT GUIDELINES (Public Comments are limited to 3 minutes)

The Planning Commission welcomes public input. If you would like to comment on an agenda item, members of the public may participate by one of the following options:

Option 1:
Participate in-person at the Council Chambers, 1424 Mission Street, South Pasadena.

## Option 2:

Participants will be able to "raise their hand" using the Zoom icon during the meeting, and they will have their microphone un-muted during comment portions of the agenda to speak for up to 3 minutes per item.

## Option 3:

Email public comment(s) to PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov. Public Comments received in writing will not be read aloud at the meeting, but will be part of the meeting record. Written public comments will be uploaded online for public viewing under Additional Documents. There is no word limit on emailed Public Comment(s). Please make sure to indicate:

1) Name (optional), and
2) Agenda item you are submitting public comment on, and
3) Submit by no later than 12:00 p.m., on the day of the Planning Commission meeting.

NOTE: Pursuant to State law, the Planning Commission may not discuss or take action on issues not on the meeting agenda, except that members of the Planning Commission or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising public testimony rights (Government Code Section 54954.2). Staff may be asked to follow up on such items.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

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

## CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

2. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of September 8, 2020
3. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of October 13, 2020
4. Minutes from the Special Meeting of November 17, 2020
5. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of January 12, 2021
6. Minutes from the Special Meeting of January 26, 2021
7. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of February 9, 2021
8. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of March 9, 2021

## PUBLIC HEARING

9. Project No. 2563-CUP - A request for a Conditional Use Permit for the on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 ABC license) for an existing bona fide restaurant (Silverlake Ramen) located at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue (APN: 5315-004-066). In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption under Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities).

Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution taking the following actions:

1. Finding the project exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities.
2. Approve Project No. 2563-CUP, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.
3. Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR - A request for a Hillside Development Permit (HDP) and Design Review Permit (DRX) to add a 343-square-foot, first-story addition and a 585 -square-foot, second-story addition to an existing 1,134-squarefoot, one-story single-family dwelling, with an existing 350 -square-foot basement located at 1808 Hanscom Drive (APN: 5308-018-025). The project also includes two Variance (VAR) requests: 1) To allow for a retaining wall that will exceed six (6) feet in height with the highest portion of the retaining wall being twelve (12) feet in height; and, 2) To allow for a deck that will exceed six (6) feet in height, the proposed deck is eight (8) feet and two (2) inches in height, as measured from grade to the top of the landing. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption under Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities).

Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution taking the following actions:

1. Finding the project exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities.
2. Approve Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

## ADMINISTRATION

## 11. Comments from City Council Liaison

12. Comments from Planning Commissioners
13. Comments from Staff

## ADJOURNMENT

14. Adjourn to the Regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for October 10, 2023.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO AGENDA DOCUMENTS AND BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS
Planning Commission meeting agenda packets are available online at the City website: https://www.southpasadenaca.gov/government/boards-commissions/planning-commission/test-planning-commission-agendas-minutes-copy

## AGENDA NOTIFICATION SUBSCRIPTION

Individuals can be placed on an email notification list to receive forthcoming agendas by emailing CityClerk@southpasadenaca.gov or calling the City Clerk's Division at (626) 403-7230.

## ACCOMMODATIONS



The City of South Pasadena wishes to make all of its public meetings accessible to the public. If special assistance is needed to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Division at (626) 403-7230. Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

I declare under penalty of perjury that I posted this notice of agenda on the bulletin board in the courtyard of City Hall at 1414 Mission Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030, and on the City's website as required by law.


Date
Matt Chang, Planning Manager

City of South Pasadena
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 8, 2020, 6:30 PM
Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Janet Braun on Tuesday, September 8, 2020, at $6: 32 \mathrm{pm}$. This meeting was held via Zoom teleconference, in accordance with AB 361.

## ROLL CALL

| Present: | Chair: | Janet Braun |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Vice-Chair: | John Lesak |
|  | Commissioners: | Laura Dahl, Richard Tom and Lisa Padilla |

City Staff

| Present: | Joanna Hankamer, Planning and Community Development Director |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney |
|  | Kanika Kith, Planning Manager |
|  | Margaret Lin, Manager of Long-Range Planning \& Economic Development |
|  | Malinda Lim, Associate Planner |

## Council

Present: Council Liaison Diana Mahmud, Mayor Pro Tem

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

## Motion carried, 5-0.

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Chair Braun, Vice-Chair Lesak and Commissioner Padilla visited 804 Valley View Road, Item 1 on tonight's agenda. Chair Braun also visited 901 Fair Oaks Avenue, the Chipotle site, Item 2.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Planning Manager Kith reported that one verbal comment was received from Sally Kilby, which was posted on the website and played at the meeting.

## PUBLIC HEARING

## 1. 804 Valley View Road, Project No. 2298-DRX/HDP/TRP - A Design Review and Hillside Development Permit for a new single-family residence on a hillside lot and Tree Removal Permit located at 804 Valley View Road (APN 5310-020-029) (continued).

## Recommendation:

1. Adopt an addendum to a Negative Declaration for the proposed project, Project No. 2298DRX/HDP/TRP, Design Review and Hillside Development Permit; and
2. Approve Project No. 2298-DRX/HDP/TRP, Design Review and Hillside Development Permit for the construction of a new 3,125 square-foot tri-level single-family residence and Tree Removal Permit located at 804 Valley View Road, subject to conditions of approval.

## Staff Presentation:

Planning Manager Kith introduced the PowerPoint presentation.

## Questions for Staff:

The Commissioners had a robust discussion regarding the previous 2017 approved plans on this site, including consideration of requesting an updated historic resources report and an updated arborist report to identify if there are any historic trees on the property before approval of the new plans.

City Attorney Highsmith recommended that the Commissioners gather the information before proceeding because they must approve the Negative Declaration first before they could take action on the project and because of CEQA reasons.

Commissioner Padilla asked for a process clarification from staff. Planning Manager Kith explained that because this project is a new hillside development project and is for new home construction, it does not go before the Design Review Board. Because this project deals with vacant land where the applicant wants to put up a new home, it is under the Planning Commission.

## Public Comments:

Staff received six (6) written comments and three (3) public comments submitted by phone regarding this item. The voicemail messages were played for the Commissioners.

## Applicant's Presentation:

Staff introduced the PowerPoint presentation from the Applicant, DKY Architects.

## Applicant's Rebuttal:

Principal Architect David Streshinsky of DKY Architects addressed the public comments.

## Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Dahl asked if the architect was still involved with the neighboring site and requested any updated status. The architect confirmed his firm was still involved and reported that the project had a new owner. The plans were approved in 2017 and are currently in plan check.

## Discussion:

The Commissioners had a robust discussion regarding the previous 2017 approved plans and documentation, including the CEQA historic resource analysis and prior arborist report. They agreed the Applicant's presentation was very helpful. The Commissioners thought it is prudent that new reports be provided before a decision was made because of the potential CEQA impact, the concern from residents in the area, and taking into consideration the City Attorney's comments.

## Decision:

Commissioner Tom motioned, seconded by Commissioner Padilla, to continue this item to the next monthly hearing of the Planning Commission or until such time as the cultural resource and tree survey or vegetation survey recommended by staff are completed. If the studies are not completed, this item would continue until such time as those studies are completed.

Roll call:
Vice-Chair Lesak Aye
Commissioner Dahl Aye
Commissioner Tom Aye
Commissioner Padilla Aye
Chair Braun Aye
Motion passed, 5-0.
Amendment to the above motion includes instructions to address the cultural resource question; trees questions; the wall between 808 and 804 Valley View; the layout of the design, including a site plan relative to other properties; the historical Sanborn map; and the issue of traffic plan. With regard to design, the Commissioners requested clarification and additional justification of the form, scale and massing - to explain how those are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood - to help the Commissioners make the required finding.

Roll call:
Vice-Chair Lesak Aye
Commissioner Dahl Aye
Commissioner Tom Aye
Commissioner Padilla Aye
Chair Braun Aye

## Motion passed, 5-0.

## 2. 901 Fair Oaks Avenue, Project No. 2290-CUP-A Conditional Use Permit for sales of beer and wine for on-site consumption (Type 41 License) as an ancillary use to the main restaurant operation at 901 Fair Oaks Suite $B$ and the adjacent patio and shared patio areas. (APN 5315-003-058).

## Recommendation:

Approve as submitted by staff, subject to the conditions of approval.

## Staff Presentation:

Associate Planner Lim presented the PowerPoint presentation. She also presented a proposed Amendment requested by the Applicant to expand the area where alcohol consumption can be. The original proposal was for the Chipotle patio. The request is to expand it to all the patio area, which is along Mission Street and Fair Oaks Avenue.

## Questions for Staff:

Vice-Chair Lesak inquired about the ramifications of exceeding the Department of Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) limits set per the census tract.

Commissioner Padilla asked if there have been other instances where an applicant has asked for an exterior zone for consumption of alcoholic beverages beyond the storefront area and if there was a precedent for that.

Commissioner Tom asked if staff had knowledge if other occupants were going to also seek to have a license for beer and alcohol.

The Commissioners, staff and City Attorney Highsmith discussed that the CUP license is not specific to a user. The license runs with the land. Further, if the license is approved for the tenants to sell alcohol in all the patio areas, ABC would also be reviewing it and putting in restrictions or regulations for compliance, including identifying the boundary of the alcohol sale area or serving area and putting up proper signage.

Commissioner Braun asked if Chipotle was going to sell beer and wine - if that patio is truly shared among the tenants.

City Attorney Highsmith commented that that would be their burden. She mentioned that in the agenda packet, staff included an internal document from Chipotle explaining all of the staff rules for enforcement of the conditions of an ABC permit.

## Public Comment:

One (1) written comment in support of this project was received and provided to the Commissioners as an additional document.

## Applicant Presentation:

None. Brett Engstrom, representing the Applicant, thanked the Commissioners. He clarified when a letter of public convenience or necessity (PCN letter) in the case of a Type 41 License or a Type 47 License might be required by the ABC. He also addressed the question about outside areas beyond the vision of the restaurant tenant.

Commissioner Dahl asked about Chipotle's reference to its alcohol as beer and margarita and if the reference is to some kind of a wine or beer margarita, not a tequila margarita. Mr. Engstrom explained that for this particular application, it is a beer and wine only license being applied for, a Type 41 License, and so it will be for beer and wine only - no margaritas.

## Commissioner Discussion:

The Commissioners voiced support for the project and its Amendment.

## Decision:

Vice-Chair Lesak motioned, seconded by Commissioner Tom, to approve the CUP for the sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption, a Type 41 License, at 901 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite B , and with the Amendment that the exterior area be extended to all the patio areas available for 901 Fair Oaks. Additionally, that they adopt the findings as included in Section 2 of the Draft Resolution.

Roll call:
Vice-Chair Lesak Aye
Commissioner Dahl Aye
Commissioner Tom Aye
Commissioner Padilla Aye
Chair Braun Aye
Motion passed, 5-0.

## DISCUSSION

## 3. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Appeal.

## Recommendation:

a. Review and provide comments regarding the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation appeal efforts;
b. Appoint two members of the Planning Commission to participate in the temporary RHNA Appeal Ad Hoc Committee to work with staff on matters related to the City's RHNA allocation appeal.

## Staff Presentation:

Manager Lin presented a PowerPoint presentation.
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## Questions for Staff:

Vice-Chair Lesak inquired about the transportation study delay and if the subcommittee would hold any public working sessions.

Director Hankamer responded that the subcommittee had 45 days to compile, research and put together the best appeal they could. There was no time within that period to have a public working session. They anticipate reporting the status of their work at regularly scheduled meetings.

Commissioner Tom asked who exactly in SCAG (Sothern California Association of Governments) considers the appeal. Manager Lin responded that initially SCAG staff would review the appeals and provide a recommendation to the subcommittee. The RHNA subcommittee is comprised of elected officials that participate within the SCAG Board.

Commissioner Tom asked if there had been discussion or effort amongst the jurisdictions to do things together or is everybody in this for themselves. Director Hankamer responded that they had not reached out to other cities to join in their efforts to put together an appeal.

Council Liaison Mahmud shared that the 45-day time period was established by statute, not by SCAG.

Chair Braun remarked that there were many residents that have been very focused on this issue. The City will have a better effort with the collective input of staff and residents. In addition, the City Council has made this an official ad hoc committee which will be more powerful to SCAG - the concerted effort among City Council, the Planning Department and the residents.

## Public Comment:

Three (3) written comments and one (1) voicemail comment from Josh Albrektson, which was played for the Commission, were received.

Chair Braun, Commissioner Tom and Commissioner Dahl volunteered to be on the Ad Hoc Committee. Vice-Chair Lesak also volunteered after discussion of the schedule and time expectations.

## Decision:

Commissioner Tom motioned, seconded by Commissioner Padilla, that Chair Braun and ViceChair Lesak serve as members of the Committee to work on the RHNA appeal.

Roll call:
Vice-Chair Lesak Aye
Commissioner Dahl Aye
Commissioner Tom Aye
Commissioner Padilla Aye
Chair Braun Aye
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## Motion passed, 5-0.

## 4. Accessory Dwelling Unit Policies and Programs:

## Recommendation:

Provide direction regarding additional Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) policies and programs for consideration:
a. To update the ADU Ordinance this fall, and
b. For future ADU policies and programs for consideration in the 2021 Housing Element Update to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations.

## Staff Presentation:

Manager Lin presented a PowerPoint presentation.

## Questions for Staff:

Vice-Chair Lesak asked if staff planned to have the design standards as part of the updated ordinance or would that come later. Director Hankamer replied that they would bring forward some initial design standards for inclusion in the ordinance and welcomed feedback.

Commissioner Dahl asked about the number of projected ADU units. Director Hankamer explained the methodologies and calculations used by HCD. PlaceWorks Senior Associate Amy Sinsheimer also spoke on this topic.

Commissioner Tom asked about the process and the timing with regard to the Housing Element.

Commissioner Padilla asked about the ADU policy mentioned in the presentation that would allow two ADUs or a duplex on a lot. Director Hankamer responded that there was a lot more interest from residents in JADUs and in ADUs.

Commissioner Padilla also asked for clarification of the phrase without Code Enforcement action mentioned in the proposed Amnesty Program. Director Hankamer answered that it referred to without penalty or being barred from applying for any permits, planning approvals or permits for five years. She mentioned that in the Amnesty Program they could extend the Amnesty Program beyond the five years that State law has provided for and they can streamline the process by which they work with a property owner to actually lower the life safety standard.

Chair Braun spoke about the need at some point to address the parking issues, some of which are not necessarily created by ADUs.

The Commissioners had a robust discussion regarding staff's presentation and offered several suggestions to augment staff's recommendations.
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## ADMINISTRATION

## 5. Comments from City Council Liaison:

Mayor Pro Tem Mahmud reported that SCAG does not anticipate issuing final RHNA numbers until February of 2021. The RHNA Appeals Committee has the same composition as the original committee that developed the RNHA numbers. She thanked the RHNA Ad Hoc Committee volunteers. On behalf of the entirety of the City Council, she thanked the Commissioners for their service and remarked that it is a very experienced and dedicated Planning Commission and our community can only benefit from it.

## 6. Comments from Planning Commissioners:

All of the Commissioners expressed concern about the number of pages in this month's agenda packet and the challenge to manage the information on their computers. They recommended inserting digital tabs or having each staff report be a separate pdf to make it easier to review the information.

Chair Braun thanked everyone, including residents, City Council and Commissioners.

## 7. Comments from Staff:

Director Hankamer announced that there would be two community meetings on the Housing Element - September $23^{\text {rd }}$ at 6:30 pm and September $26^{\text {th }}$ at 10:00 am. These workshops will be more participatory for people in consideration of being a Zoom meeting and the difficulty of the public being able to participate.

Planning Manager Kith announced that Chipotle is opening next month as well as the Habit Burgers. She also reported that City Council approved alfresco dining to allow restaurants to have outdoor dining in parking lots and now also on the parking lanes.

Director Hankamer added that with regard to alfresco dining, there will be concrete barriers going up on Mission Street soon. Staff is very grateful for the help from the Chamber of Commerce and their work with businesses.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Braun adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at $9: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on October 13, 2020 at 6:30 pm.

[^0]CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 13, 2020, 6:30 PM
Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A scheduled meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Braun on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 at 6:31 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Present: Chair: Janet Braun
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Vice-Chair: } & \text { John Lesak } \\ \text { Commissioners: } & \text { Richard Tom, Lisa Padilla Laura Dahl }\end{array}$

## City Staff

Present: Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Margaret Lin, Manager of Long-Range Planning \& Economic Development
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Nick Pergakes, Contract Planner
Council
Present: Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor Pro Tem

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Tom made a motion to adopt the agenda as submitted by staff Vice Chair Lesak seconded the motion

Motion carried, 5-0

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Commissioners Dahl, Tom, and Padilla drove by the sites. Vice Chair Lesak received an email against the Meridian project and two emails in support of item
3. Chair Braun drove by both sites and was added on emails sent to the Planning

Department.

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

## PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 804 Valley View Road, Project No. 2298-DRX/HDP/TRP - A Design Review and Hillside Development Permit for a New Single-Family Residence on a Hillside Lot and Tree Removal Permit Located at 804 Valley View Road (APN 5310-020-029) (Continued).

## Staff Presentation:

Contract Planner Pergakes presented the project. Staff found that the project will not create any potentially significant environmental impacts.

## Recommendation:

Approve the Hillside Development Permit and Tree removal Permit for the project and approve the addendum to the 2017 Negative Declaration.

## Questions for Staff:

Chair Braun clarified that 8 trees would be kept.
Commissioner Dahl asked what the preferred traffic route would be. Staff received public comments asking to avoid Meridian and whether project is accessible from the Valley View. Commissioner Dahl asked if this was a superior route. Staff clarified that Public Works Dept. staff found this route would have the least impact on traffic.

Commissioner Padilla asked if the drawings were the last updated version. Staff clarified that everything was the same except the tree report, but none of the design changed.

## Public Comment:

Commenter was concerned about the possible ramifications for her property due to new developments that could shift the hillside. Additional concern was for the
noise of construction while residents were working from home. Final concern was regarding the legality of the sale history for the property.

## Applicants Presentation:

Applicant David provided a prerecorded presentation and made himself available for rebuttal.

Applicant responded to the public comment on geology and stated that the site had been examined by a geological engineer in 2016 and received a positive report and the soil engineer found no evidence of landslides and the hill was stable, in fact the development would reinforce the hillside.

Applicant responded to comments about trees, stating that it was not historically significant.

## Questions for Applicant:

No questions

## Commissioner Discussion:

Vice Chair Lesak commented that the changes to the previously approved application better fit the neighborhood characters and was comfortable with the project.

Commissioner Dahl thanked the staff and applicant for their urgency in responding to public and commissioner concerns.

Commissioner Tom had some concerns about the historical significance of the trees but given the additional research feels comfortable about the project.

Commissioner Padilla thanked the applicant for being responsive and appreciated the background presentation and was excited about the rainwater retention system.

Chair Braun commented this was an example of how the community could help and appreciated the professionalism of all parties involved.

Vice Chair Lesak made a correction to condition P11. Staff clarified that the city uses the state standard and only needs a qualified architect and have worked with architectural historians before to assess items. Staff will move P11 as a condition to receive a building permit and P12 as a condition for a final inspection.

## Motion:

Chair Braun made a motion to adopt an addendum to the Negative Declaration for the proposed project and approve the project as amended.

Vice Chair Lesak seconded.
Chair Braun asked for Roll Call.
Motion carried, 5-0
2. 1312 Meridian Ave, Project No. 2205-NID/HDP/DRX/VAR, Notice of intent to demolish Design Review, Hillside Development Permit, and Variance for modification and addition to a single-family residence at 1312 Meridian Avenue (APN:5319-029-017)

Commissioner Padilla recused herself as her property is within 1000 ft . of the project.

## Staff Presentation:

Associate Planner Lim presented the staff report.
At a previous CHC meeting, the project did not meet the criterion for historical properties.

## Question for Staff:

Vice Chair Lesak asked for clarification on the height of the north elevation walls. Staff replied that the applicant was asking for a variance on the north, front, and south elevations.

Commissioner Dahl asked if there were any trees that needed to be considered for protection. Staff replied there were not.

## Public Comment:

Commenter said the demolition and the construction would potentially damage her property and herself. Asked the commission if there were any safeguards.

Commenter Joanne Nuckols said that the property is actually historic and the increased size would not be in the character of the neighborhood. Various comments on new additions straying from the original design.

Commenter Delaine Shane and Susan Sulsky inquired about any plans for managing construction traffic on Meridian. Recommends that the Public Works Dept. collaborate with SPUSD to ensure students are not affected by the work. Finally added that the windows, half timbering should match the original.

Commenter Miluka Matlovsky says that she has protected trees that would be impacted by this project and wishes her written comments would be read.

## Applicant Presentation:

Presented concerns about having no driveway on a busy street, as neighbors have driveways.

Architect Melissa Tsai responded to public comment and would be open to an arborist report if requested.

Chair Braun clarified that written comments are read prior to the meeting.
Architect Melissa Tsai responded to window comments, saying they are actually aluminum and they will be removed and grids will be added to all windows. Garage will have windows to allow for natural light. The massing of the roof was addressed by adding a dormer and splitting up the separate planes, and is sloping back. Asked the commission to consider that the drawings are 2D and multiple planes have been considered.

Architect Melissa Tsai clarified that a soil engineer and civil geologist have no concerns with the project. As stated, Architect reminded that an arborist could come and propose a plan. With regards to the pool, the soil engineer found bedrock very shallow that the pool could be anchored to.

## Questions for Applicant:

Vice Chair Lesak asked about the door in relation to the stucco wall. Applicant showed it was to the left of the wall, and there is a sconce above the door. Vice Chair Lesak asked if there was enough landing space for a door to be added. Applicant said there was 3 feet inside. Vice Chair Lesak asked about the side windows. Applicant showed where the cantilever windows would be placed.

Commissioner Dahl asked how the project would be affected if the 15 ft . wall variance was to be denied. Applicant replied that the existing front side was already 15 ft . would be demolished. Dahl asked if the variance was applied only to the front side. Applicant replied no addition would be possible since the ceiling height would not meet code.

Commissioner Tom asked for the reason for the height variance. Applicant replied that due to the sloped property and remain in code with the street level garage, more massing was required.

Chair Braun asked if the roofline could come down a few feet. Applicant responded that the windows on the stucco wall were facing the living space, windows on the brick wall were the master bathroom and could not.

## Commissioner Discussion:

Vice Chair Lesak stated his main issue was the height of the upper ridge, since he felt it could be brought down due to varying roof pitches. Added that with gables, the corner should come to the ground, but the walls seemed very high. Continued that the stairs felt awkward, as did the reorienting of the timbering.

Commissioner Dahl was concerned about the height of the south elevation with windows as it would reduce the privacy of the neighbors, and was unconvinced about the necessity of the height variance. Added it would be helpful if the findings for variances were separated instead of clumped in the report.

Commissioner Tom felt that the design could be thought through a bit more
Chair Braun agreed with Commissioner Tom and also felt that an arborist report was needed. Asked if it was allowed to send the project to the DRB. Staff replied that the commission could asked the DRB for a recommendation.

Vice Chair Lesak volunteered to lead a subcommittee.
Commissioner Tom thought moving it to DRB was more appropriate.
Commissioner Dahl also thought moving it to DRB was best, but if Vice Chair Lesak wanted to lead the subcommittee she would support him.

Chair Braun asked what the purpose of the DRB review would be. Staff answered that it would be mainly to assess the roof forms and bring the height down. Staff also felt the fastest way to get the project approved was to give direction to the architect so they present a revised plan to the DRB.

## Motion:

Commissioner Tom motions to have the applicant work with the Vice Chair to redesign and present to the DRB and come back to the planning commission with an arborist report.

Commissioner Dahl seconds
Motions carries, 4-0

## DISCUSSION:

3. Tenant Protection - Impacts of State Law relating to Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (AB 1482) on local tenant protection opportunity
4. Lisa Alexander expressed support.
5. Elizabeth Bagasao expressed support, especially as City Council has not passed previous meaningful renters protection.
6. Martine Turnan expressed support.
7. Diana Sussman expressed support.
8. James Lucero expressed support.
9. Robin Adelku expressed support, as her landlord has been defying COVID moratoriums and has illegally intimidated tenants.
10. Jan Marshall expressed support.
11. Brandon Young expressed support, said that a local landlord was able to serve 50 day notices to tenants using a renovation loophole.
12. Ella Hushagen disagreed with the legal analysis by staff on the relation between state and local ordinances.
13. Alan Ehrlich disagreed with the legal analysis by staff, claiming the commission is being misled.
14. Evelyn Zneimer expressed support.
15. Todd Edwards expressed support.
16. Katrina Bleckley expressed support.
17. Jacinta Linka expressed support

Staff recommends to table issue and revisit on a later date.
Councilmember Mahmud asked the City Attorney whether or not the California Department of Housing and Community Development has set outlines on significant renovations. Additionally, is there anything stopping the City Council from outlining their own definition of significant renovations.

City Attorney Highsmith clarified that there were clear outlines on significant renovation available and was unclear on what additional protections were desired.

Chair Braun reminded that the commissioners still have to decide to table the proposition or not.

Vice Chair Lesak asked about community outreach. Director Hankhamer clarified it would be brought back to Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dahl stated that renters protection lead to a stable community.
Commissioner Tom asked staff if there was any deadline to take action. Director Hankhamer clarified there is no time limit besides preventing more potential evictions from happening.

Commissioner Tom thought it would be useful to inform tenants faced with eviction what their courses of action would be. Additional public outreach as he did not pay much attention to rent control over the past few years.

Commissioner Padilla underscored the importance of the issue and would like to have a roadmap laid out for implementation.

Chair Braun feels that community input is needed to make an informed decision.
Chair Braun asked everyone for suggestions on how to move forward.
Commissioner Tom suggested that City staff participate in an outreach program to be able to properly address the issue and to understand how the city will engage with landlords in the future. Commissioner Tom asked staff if it could be done by November of this year. Director Hankamer felt November was too soon.

Commissioner Padilla asked if it would help if City Council took a look at the issue while staff worked on the ordinance Chair Braun suggested the commission make a recommendation to the City Council. Director Hankamer suggested 6-month time frame with regular updates. Commissioner Padilla noted that the previous materials were still available on the city website. Director Hankamer thought that additional outreach was still necessary.

Chair Braun motions to continue this item to a date uncertain and in the meantime ask staff to organize community outreach with a status report in November.

Commissioner Tom seconds
Motion carries, 5-0

## ADMINISTRATION

4. Comments from City Council Liaison

Council Liaison Mahmud thanked the commission.

## 5. Comments from Planning Commissioners

Commissioner Dahl thanked Chair Braun and asked if the order could be switched up occasionally.

## 6. Comments from Staff

Director Hankamer provided an update on the RHNA appeals process. The City Council has ratified an additional 3 members to the committee. Director Hankamer listed a number of concerns the committee is looking at concerning water, public transportation, school capacity, and preservation of historic resources. A draft of the report will be submitted to City Council at the end of the week that will be submitted in a letter to SCAG.

## ADJOURNMENT

7. Adjournment to the Special Planning Commission meeting scheduled on November 17, 2020.

There being no further matters, Chair Braun adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.

Janet Braun, Chair

## CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA <br> Planning Commission <br> Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 17, 2020, 6:30 PM
Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A scheduled meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Braun on Tuesday, November 17, 2020 at 6:31 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Present: Chair: Janet Braun
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Vice-Chair: } & \text { John Lesak } \\ \text { Commissioners: } & \text { Richard Tom, Lisa Padilla, Laura Dahl }\end{array}$

## City Staff

Present: Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Margaret Lin, Manager of Long-Range Planning \& Economic Development
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Council
Present: Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor Pro Tem

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Tom made a motion to adopt the agenda as submitted by staff Vice Chair Lesak seconded the motion

## Motion carried, 5-0

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Commissioner Dahl visited the 7 patios site. Commissioner Padilla visited the 7 patios site. Commissioner Tom visited the 7 patios site. Vice Chair Lesak visited the 7 patios site. Chair Braun visited the 7 patios site.

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

## PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 1312 Meridian Ave, Project No. 2205-NID/HDP/DRX/VAR, Notice of intent to demolish Design Review, Hillside Development Permit, and Variance for modification and addition to a single-family residence

Commissioner Padilla recused herself due to the proximity of the project to her residence

Staff Presentation:
None

Recommendation:
Move this item to the December meeting
Questions for Staff:
None
Public Comment:
None

## Motion:

Commissioner Tom motioned to move the item to the December meeting. Commissioner Dahl seconded.

Chair Braun asked for Roll Call.

Motion carried,4-0
2. Project No. 2171-CUP/DRX/TTM/TRP-Seven Patios Mixed-Use Residential and Commercial Project at 845/899 El Centro Street

Staff Presentation:

Planning Manager Kith presented the project. Project requires a Conditional Use Permit for mixed-use in the Mission Street Specific Plan (MSSP) zone, Design Review, Tentative Tract Map, Tree Removal Permit for 20 trees, and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

## Staff Recommendation:

Adopt a resolution adopting the MND and approving the applications for the 7 Patios project subject to conditions of approval.

Recommend to MTIC (Mobility Transportation Infrastructure Commission): evaluate traffic and parking issues, expand the Mission-Meridian parking district.

Within one year of the final inspection, a traffic study will be provided.

## Question for Staff:

None

## Public Comment:

Commenter brought up the fact that Orange Grove was not paved and was unsuitable for large development, and the surrounding streets are too narrow for parking. Additionally concerned about the noise levels as previous projects were extremely loud.

Ella Hushagen was concerned that the project provides no affordable housing, even though the project is next to the metro stop which many middle-income residents rely on.

Joshua Albrekston expressed support for the project due to its proximity to the metro station.

Lilia Morton asked that the project be scaled down by $1 / 3$ due to concerns about traffic and parking. Additionally, she expressed concern that traffic studies were conducted during COVID which is not an accurate description of normal traffic conditions.

Mario Hernandez was disappointed in what he called the "overbuilding" of South Pasadena.

Commenter requested that the developers set aside parking for the homes on Orange Grove that do not have a garage or driveway as increased traffic would block homeowners on Orange Grove from parking next to their house.

Tina Chang was concerned about the increased traffic of the project.

## Applicant Presentation:

Architect Stefanos Polyzoides presented graphics outlining the project from multiple angles. Believes the project will bring more vibrancy to the city.

Applicant's Representative Burke Farrar stated they were doing everything they could to avoid having residents park on Orange Grove, and provided adequate parking for all residents. Additionally were providing as many EV chargers as the city requested.

Applicant's attorney Richard replied to a few public comments. Stated that mandating a traffic study after the final inspection is illegal under CEQA. Attorney reminded the Commission of the RHNA mandate to build more housing of all types and the intense pressure to build housing around the metro stations. The Housing Accountability Act (HAA) prevents downscaling the project.

## Questions for Applicant:

Commissioner Dahl asked about the applicant's plan for overhanging the sidewalk. Applicant's representative Farrar said they would get a permit from the Public Works Dept. Commissioner Dahl also asked about changing the brick to a rustic style. Architect Stefanos Polyzoides said they would prefer to make it out of a single brick.

Commissioner Tom asked if there was a way to walk through the townhouses to the apartment complex. Applicant's representative Farrar clarified that the townhouses were accessible for the townhouses but the complex could only be accessed from El Centro.

Commissioner Padilla asked what the envisioned price is for each of the units. Applicant's representative Farrar responded that the units won't go on sale for 3 years and they can't provide an accurate estimate. Commissioner Padilla followed up by asking why there were no affordable housing units. Applicant's representative Farrar responded that the neighbors already have a problem with the current density, $35 \%$ more would cause an uproar. Commissioner Padilla asked what would prevent a bungalow resident for using the hammerhead for parking. Applicant's representative Farrar responded it was a public safety issue that created the hammerhead and they would mark it was a fire lane.

Vice Chair Lesak asked about the east elevation. The applicant clarified that the massing of the building on the plans were incorrect and the plans were changed accordingly.

Chair Braun asked the applicant if they are willing to build EV charging ports at every parking place. Applicant's representative Farrar said that was correct. Commissioner Padilla asked if they could build an outlet next to every parking space which would allow EV drivers to slow charge overnight. Applicant's representative Farrar said they would provide the electricity to give the resident the option to EV charge but to track and charge for electricity would require individual wiring to each unit which is impractical.

## Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Tom appreciated the effort the developer took to reach out to the community but was worried about further unanticipated concerns of the community.

Commissioner Dahl was concerned about the lack of a demolition plan due to the large impact on the neighborhood. Specifically wanted no trucks or workers to go through Orange Grove Place. Planning Manager Kith replied they could add the truck route as a condition of approval.

CEQA consultants stated that construction traffic would be dispersed over multiple roadways and the construction would be short-term only. All factors are added in and have been addressed.

Chair Braun asked if the designated restaurant space had to be a restaurant. Planning Manager Kith replied that a minimum percentage of the site had to be a restaurant.

Commissioner Dahl asked if the building conditions on EV was consistent with the plans. Additionally noted it was a poor look to have no affordable housing on a project of this scale.

Commissioner Padilla raised concerns about bike and pedestrian safety on El Centro and requested bike warning signs. Commissioner Padilla agreed with the MTIC take a look at the traffic impact and was concerned that Orange Grove Place didn't have parking restrictions. She thought it was important to not have fire exiting routes count as open space in the general plan. Commissioner Padilla wanted a chair review on the east elevation.

Vice Chair Lesak thought that the project was well designed and a good project for South Pasadena, though the project could provide affordable units but
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understandable the points made by the applicant. Additionally, it would be open to creating more open space. Finally thought the EV plan was adequate.

Chair Braun echoes the lack of affordable housing units and wanted the infrastructure for a charging station on every space. She understood the concern regarding bike lanes but was unclear on how that would be approached. Mentioned that the biggest concern was parking and traffic. Asked staff how the parking entrance worked. Planning Manager Kith clarified that the garage doors were open 5 am to midnight and would swing open into the garage. Chair Braun requested Orange Grove Place be resident only parking. Planning Manager Kith clarified that the commission could provide a recommendation to MTIC and though the traffic report did not raise traffic concerns residents brought up parking concerns.

Commissioner Dahl asked if there would be another traffic study done after the final inspection. Planning Manager Kith clarified that was the case to check for any unexpected problems that may arise.

Commissioner Tom asked if the traffic study was focused on traffic patterns at nearby intersections or on specific driveways. Planning Manager Kith clarified the past study focused on Mission Bell, but the new traffic study would be along Fairview and Mission.

Chair Braun asked if anyone had a list of open items. Planning Manager Kith summarized that the commission would like to add a condition about parking and construction routes on Orange Grove Place, a condition to specific the restaurant to a boutique restaurant, and strike the option to move the building back 18 inches, revise the condition on the bike lanes, and to allow the brick design. Chair Braun asked if it was infrastructure for all parking or the 11 chargers. Planning Manager Kith replied that was the case and added that of the 65 spaces, 36 were public.

Planning Manager Kith brought up that no consensus was reached on the traffic study. Chair Braun asked how much a traffic study costs. Traffic Consultant Carlo estimated it would be anywhere between $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 10,000$. Commissioner Padilla requested that additional intersections be included in the study. Chair Braun supported that. Commissioner Dahl wanted the study to be conducted after the units began being occupied. Planning Manager Kith specified that was the intention of the one year post final inspection.

Commissioner Dahl requested at least two bike warning signs be added.

## Motion:

Vice Chair Lesak motions to approve the Conditional Use Permit, Design Review Permit, Tentative Tract Map, Tree Removal Permit, and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project at 845-899 El Centro with the modified conditions as previously discussed. In addition, formally recommend that the MTIC study the effects of extending the Mission Meridian parking district to the Orange Grove Place and Orange Grove Avenue, and the EV charging stations.

Commissioner Padilla seconded.

Commissioner Dahl requested a double-check of all the conditions.
Motions carried, 5-0

## DISCUSSION:

3. Tenant Protection - Impacts of State Law relating to Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (AB 1482) on local tenant protection opportunity

Manager Lin advised commissioners it might be best to return to this topic after the City Council meeting on the $18^{\text {th }}$. Commission agreed to move the meeting to the scheduled meeting on November 19, 2020.

## Motion:

Commissioner Tom motioned to move this item to the November 19, 2020 meeting.

Vice Chair Lesak seconded.
Motion carried, 5-0

## 4. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation Appeal Update

Manager Lin provided an update on the RHNA appeal and thanked the ad hoc committee for their work. Out of the 191 cities, 47 have appealed. South Pasadena's appeal is centered on faulty calculations for determining housing units and distribution, as well as insufficient water, sewer and school resources. No comments have been made on South Pasadena's appeal.
5. Accessory Dwelling Units Ordinance Update

The City has received an invitation from Arup to work with them to look at South Pasadena's ADU program. Director Hankamer added that they would provide a scope of work, but would delay the ADU update by about 6 weeks.

Public Comment:
Josh Albrektson expressed that the proposed ADU number in the Housing Element is unrealistic.
6. Inclusionary Ordinance

Motion:
Chair Braun moved to continue this item at the December 2020 meeting. Vice Chair Lesak seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

## ADMINISTRATION

## 7. Comments from City Council Liaison

Council Liaison Mahmud thanked the commission.

## 8. Comments from Commissioners

Commissioner Padilla thanked Chair and Vice Chair for their work, as well as everyone on the RHNA ad hoc committee.
9. Comments from Staff

None

## ADJOURNMENT

10. Adjournment to the Special Planning Commission meeting scheduled on November 19, 2020.

There being no further matters, Chair Braun adjourned the meeting at 10:19 p.m.

[^1]CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 12, 2021, 6:30 PM
Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A scheduled meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Braun on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

ROLL CALL

## Present:

Chair: Janet Braun
Vice-Chair: John Lesak
Commissioners: Richard Tom, Lisa Padilla, Laura Dahl

## City Staff

## Present:

Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Liz Bar-El, Planner

## Council

## Present:

Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Tom made a motion to adopt the agenda as submitted by staff Vice Chair Lesak seconded the motion

## Motion carried, 5-0

DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS
None

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

## PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 807 Rollin St., Project No. 2341-HDP/DRX/VAR/TRP - Hillside Development Permit, Design Review, Variance and Tree Permit to allow the construction of a 3,411 square foot, multi-level home with an attached 538 square-foot garage on an undeveloped site (Continued)

Commissioner Padilla recused herself due to the proximity of the project to her residence

Commissioner Dahl recused herself due to her spouse being the architect on the project.

## Staff Presentation:

Staff provided a prerecorded slideshow.
Recommendation:
Approve the Hill Development Permit, Design Review Variance and Tree Removal Permit.

## Applicants Presentation:

Applicant provided a prerecorded slideshow

## Questions for Applicant:

No questions

## Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Tom thought the project was very well planned out.
Vice Chair Lesak agreed that the project was well designed, but requested that the applicant show the house in relation with the surrounding houses.

Chair Braun liked the roofline, breaking of the massing and thought it was creative.

## Motion:

Commissioner Tom moved to accept the project as submitted with staff condition P12.

Vice Chair Lesak seconded.
Motion carried 3-0.
2. Tenant Protection - Impacts of State Law relating to Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (AB 1482) on local tenant protection opportunity

Staff presented a brief history of the movement of the ordinance.

## Questions for Staff:

Commissioner Padilla asked if permits had to be provided to the tenant as proof of a renovation. Director Hankamer clarified that it is the case, in addition to a write up of why the renovation is being done, and why the renovation cannot occur in an occupied unit.

Commissioner Padilla asked if it was appropriate to comment on rent relocation assistance. Director Hankamer replied that the comments would be appreciated.

Commissioners asked if housing meant public, institutional, or multifamily housing. City Attorney Highsmith replied that it was the state law. The City wants the landlord to provide the tenant with the permits, scope of work, and timeline of renovation upon serving an eviction notice.

Vice Chair Lesak asked if the difference in a building permit being ready to issue and approved had been considered when drafting the language of the ordinance. Director Hankamer replied that they had not considered that, but in the discussions only one landlord brought up the permitting steps.

Chair Braun asked if this would be a new section of the municipal code. Director Hankamer affirmed that. Chair Braun asked if it necessary to restate the entire state law since the state law might change and there would be a discrepancy between the municipal code and the state law. City Attorney Highsmith clarified that only a part of AB114 had been cut out, and the city moratoriums would not expire when the state was planning to look at the code. Director Hankamer added that the state was looked at AB34, and the
reason for including the state law was so residents did not have to look between pieces of law, they could see it in one place.

Vice Chair Lesak wanted to consider the entire permit process in the language of the ordinance.

Chair Braun asked how often substantial remodels of apartment buildings occur. Director Hankamer replied that nobody tracks those activities but unpermitted construction happens often. Chair Braun asked how long it takes between a permit application to being issued a permit. Director Hankamer replied it can be anywhere between 2 weeks to 6 months. Vice Chair Lesak added it was important that all parties have an idea of what was expected in terms of documentation.

## Motion:

Commissioner Tom motioned to recommend to City Council to adopt the Tenant Protection Ordinance as submitted.

Vice Chair Lesak seconded.
Motion carried 5-0.

## DISCUSSION

## 3. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Update

## Staff Presentation:

Planner Bar-El mentioned the Commission that the staff report was in their packets, and would be ready with a recommendation on the $26^{\text {th }}$. Director Hankamer added that the goal would be to give HCD a preview of the Housing Element, and ask any questions about ADUs.

## Questions for Staff:

Vice Chair Lesak asked if it would be possible to get the sites in advance to visit. Director Hankamer had 5 potential sites, the ostrich farm, Ralphs site, and Shakers site. Vice Chair Lesak asked what the target was. Director Hankamer replied that the immediate goal was to meet RHNA requirements, sites being chosen on size and transportation. Planner Bar-El added that the aforementioned sites were special sites, and many more sites would be presented to HCD.

Chair Dahl asked if there was any meeting before the ordinance is presented to council. Director Hankamer replied there would be a housing meeting.

Commissioner Tom felt that South Pasadena needs to and should grow, and the current plan balances a need for more housing with a desire to maintain the small town atmosphere.

Commissioner Padilla thought the subcommittee recommendation was helpful, but including developers might introduce bias into the equation. Planner Bar-El and Director Hankamer agreed, but thought it was good to introduce all potential views.

Commissioner Dahl asked if there was any way to let housing developers know of recent updates. Planner Bar-El updated the commission of an email list that developers could be added to.

## Motion:

Commission recommends staff meet with HCD regarding RHNA to combine the inclusionary/density bonus to develop the sites inventory.

## ADMINISTRATION

## 4. Comments from City Council Liaison

Mayor Mahmud thanked the RHNA ad-hoc committee and reminded the commission that along with all other cities, South Pasadena's appeal was rejected but the city representative on the committee. Mayor Mahmud recognized Commissioner Tom's work in the city, with the commission, and with the clean power alliance. Updated council that she will again be the liaison for Planning Commission.

## 5. Comments from Commissioners

Commissioner Dahl thanked Commissioner Tom.
Commissioner Padilla thanked Commissioner Tom.
Vice Chair Lesak applauded the clean power in the SGV, and thanked Commissioner Tom.

Vice Chair Lesak thanked Commissioner Tom.

Commissioner Tom thanked the entire commission for their hard work, and hoped they will continue to improve South Pasadena.

Chair Braun thanked Director Hankamer and the rest of the ad hoc committee.

## 6. Comments from Staff

The RHNA appeal took place January $11^{\text {th }}$ along with all the other SGV cities and all lost, but noted that challenging the states unit allocation is resonating across the SCAG Region. Director Hankamer thanked the rest of the ad hoc committee, Mayor Mahmud, Commissioner Tom, and staff.

## ADJOURNMENT

7. Adjournment to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled on January 26, 2021.

There being no further matters, Chair Braun adjourned the meeting at 8:32 p.m.
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## CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

## Tuesday, January 26, 2021, 6:30 PM <br> Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A special meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Braun on Tuesday, January 26, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Chair: Janet Braun
Vice-Chair: John Lesak
Commissioners: Amitabh Barthakur, Lisa Padilla, Laura Dahl

## STAFF PRESENT

Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Elizabeth Bar-EI, AICP, Interim Manager of Long Range Planning

## COUNCIL

Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Braun made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted by staff.
Vice-Chair Lesak seconded the motion.

## Motion carried, 5-0

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

None

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

## BUSINESS ITEMS:

## 1. Planning Commission Reorganization

Chair Braun nominated Vice-Chair Lesak for the new Chair.
Vice-Chair Lesak seconded.

## Motion carries, 5-0

Chair Lesak nominated Commissioner Padilla for Vice Chair and Commissioner Dahl for Secretary.

Commissioner Braun seconded.

## Motion carries, 5-0

2. 2019 Annual Report of 2020 Work Plan (Continue)

Grammatical/wording mistakes were brought up and corrected.
Vice-Chair Padilla motioned to approve the 2020 Planning Commission Work Plan.

Commissioner Braun seconded.
Motions carries, 5-0

## PUBLIC HEARING:

3. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

Staff Presentation:
Manager Bar-El presented the proposed Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.
Regional Housing Trust Administrator Acevedo presented the SGV Regional Housing Trust.

## Recommendation

Staff recommends to hold a public hearing to discuss the draft and propose revisions. Staff also recommends to adopt a resolution recommending the City

Council approve the proposed amendment to the South Pasadena Municipal Code.

## Questions for Staff:

Vice-Chair Padilla asked if the graphs could be more legible for the Planning Commission and City Council.

Vice-Chair Padilla asked if the in-lieu fee projects would count towards the South Pasadena RHNA requirement. Manager Bar-El replied that if the units were built outside the city, it could not be counted toward RHNA. Director Hankamer added that the in-lieu trust was to be shared for all SGV cities who need additional funding on a specific project.

Vice-Chair Padilla asked if there was a way to ensure that projects approved with a development agreement have an affordable component. Manager Bar-El replied that the agreement allows the city to negotiate more with the developer and are adopted by ordinance, which often allows more affordable housing to be built in exchange for incentives.

Commissioner Dahl asked if all the opportunity sites are covered under the ordinances. Manager Bar-El confirmed that. Commissioner Dahl asked if one incentive was to allow for a slightly smaller unit size. Manager Bar-El confirmed that, as long as it was comparable with market size.

Commissioner Barthakur asked if South Pasadena projects had utilized the state density bonus before. Director Hankamer confirmed a project that was approved last year. Director Hankamer later clarified it was a senior project and they were all rented and age-restricted. Planning Manager Kith clarified there were no active state density bonus projects. Commissioner Barthakur asked if the SGV trust fund considered incentives to be put in place to have cities be included as beneficiaries of projects created elsewhere.

Commissioner Braun asked if staff had looked at the LA County inclusionary housing ordinance for SGV in preparing the city's ordinance. Manager Bar-El replied they had not.

Chair Lesak asked if the in-lieu fee would be adjusted yearly. Manager Bar-EI replied that the fee would be set by the City Council and adjusted as appropriate. Chair Lesak asked if there were any minimums or maximums. Manager Bar-EI clarified there were not.

## Public Comment:

Mr. Albrektson felt that the ordinance did not reflect the community input that was given on the inclusionary housing ordinance last year and created numbers that were too harsh and would discourage any new housing.

## Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Braun brought up the specific income levels to illustrate how it might not be financially viable for developers. Also brought up that LA County exempted anything under 5 units and had different requirements for rental and ownership units.

Commissioner Barthakur commented that calibrations should be based on financial feasibility. Additionally, he added that staff should take a look at Alhambra and Pasadena's housing market and IHO's to see what the market responds to.

Commissioner Dahl added that from her experience cities have to amend their IHO multiple times, primarily because developers exploit loopholes.

Vice-Chair Padilla commented that there will never be a perfect ordinance. The developers might take up valuable sites that could be affordable and that developers want to do work in South Pasadena which gives the city leverage over the IHO .

Chair Lesak asked how fast this would get to City Council. Director Hankamer replied that it could be as soon as next month. Director Hankamer also added that when Pasadena changed their HOO to $20 \%$ there was no effect on the housing numbers built.

Commissioner Barthakur asked if more clarity was needed on the difference between rental and ownership properties.

Commissioner Braun agreed that there should be a difference. Also added that South Pasadena's specific needs should be taken into account.

Chair Lesak further agreed, stating a 15 unit development in LA is nothing while it is a major project in South Pasadena.

Mayor Mahmud was concerned with the ambiguity in the charts shown and reminded the commission that City Council does not have related experience needed to tackle the IHO. Mayor Mahmud asked that more time be spent on revising the IHO .

Commissioner Dahl asked if anyone else wanted to comment on the 3-4 unit development exemptions proposed by Commissioner Braun.

Commissioner Barthakur asked how the rounding would work. Manager Bar-El replied three units are exempt, four units are not. Manager Bar-El then asked if the commission wanted higher rates for condos or apartments. Commissioner Barthakur thought requirements should be higher for condos and emphasized there should be a clear path for developers to comply.

Director Hankamer reminded the Commission that a significant amount of housing has to be built for the RHNA mandate. Chair Lesak brought up that the city needs to be more flexible in the specific plan areas. Director Hankamer reminded the Commission that the sites identified on the map are not cleared for projects, they are just anticipated sites for future building.

## Motion:

Chair Lesak motioned to continue this item to the March $9^{\text {th }}$ Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Braun seconded.
Motion carries, 5-0

## ADMINISTRATION

4. Comments from City Council Liaison

Mayor Mahmud brought up a concern about having affordable condos for sale due to her observations with struggles Caltrans is having with selling the homes it purchased, mainly due to low-income families unable to find proper financing for the home. Mayor Mahmud thanked the Commission.

## 5. Comments from Planning Commissioners

Commissioner Barthakur thanked the Commission for updating him on what has happened regarding the IHO .

Commissioner Dahl welcomed Commissioner Barthakur and confirmed with staff that there would be two meetings in February. Director Hankamer confirmed that.

Vice-Chair Padilla thanked Commissioner Braun for serving as Chair the last year.

Chair Lesak thanked staff and the subcommittee and the rest of the Commission and staff.
6. Comments from Staff

Director Hankamer thanked the Commission and welcomed Commissioner Barthakur.

## ADJOURNMENT

7. Adjournment to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled on February 9, 2021.

There being no further matters, Chair Lesak adjourned the meeting at 9:13 p.m.

John Lesak, Chair

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 9, 2021, 6:30 PM
Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Lesak on Tuesday, February 9, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Chair: John Lesak
Vice-Chair: Lisa Padilla
Commissioners: Amitabh Barthakur, Janet Braun, Laura Dahl

## STAFF PRESENT

Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Elizabeth Bar-EI, AICP, Interim Long Range Planning \& Economic Development Manager

## COUNCIL

Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Lesak made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted by staff.
Commissioner Braun seconded the motion.
Motion carried, 5-0
DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS
None

## PUBLIC COMMENT

None

## PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 725 Fair Oaks Avenue, Project No. 2380-CUP/AUP -Conditional Use Permit and Administrative Use Permit to allow the operation of a 3,329 square-foot martial arts studio (APN: 5315-002-049)

## Staff Presentation:

Contract Planner Jennifer Williams presented the project.
Recommendation
Approve the Conditional Use Permit and Administrative Use Permit, subject to conditions of approval.

Questions for Staff:
None

Public Comment:
None
Commissioner Discussion:
All commissioners expressed approval.
Commissioner Braun asked if the applicant planned to do something other than martial arts between 9 am and 3 pm. Planning Manager Kith clarified the applicant could only teach martial arts.

Motion:
Commissioner Braun motioned to approve the Conditional Use and Administrative Use Permits for 725 Fair Oaks Avenue, subject to the attached conditions of approval.

Vice-Chair Padilla seconded.
Motion carried, 5-0

## ADMINISTRATION

2. Comments from City Council Liaison

Mayor Mahmud thanked the commissioners in advance for all the upcoming regular and special meetings in 2021.
3. Comments from Planning Commissioners

None.
4. Comments from Staff

Director Hankamer thanked Vice-Chair Padilla and Commissioner Dahl on the IHO Ordinance. She also mentioned the upcoming ADU community meeting and future plans before presenting the proposed ADU Ordinance to the Planning Commission for consideration.

## ADJOURNMENT

5. Adjournment to the Special Planning Commission meeting scheduled on February 23, 2021.

There being no further matters, Chair Lesak adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

[^3]CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA<br>Planning Commission<br>Meeting Minutes<br>Tuesday, March 9, 2021, 6:30 PM<br>Via Zoom Teleconference

## CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the South Pasadena Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Lesak on Tuesday, March 9, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was held Via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Chair: John Lesak
Vice-Chair: Lisa Padilla
Commissioners: Amitabh Barthakur, Janet Braun, Laura Dahl

## STAFF PRESENT

Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney
Joanna Hankamer, Planning \& Community Dev. Director
Kanika Kith, Planning Manager
Malinda Lim, Associate Planner
Elizabeth Bar-EI, AICP, Interim Manager of Long-Range Planning

## COUNCIL

Council Liaison: Diana Mahmud, Mayor

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commission Braun made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted by staff. Chair Lesak seconded the motion.

## Motion carried, 5-0

## DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISTS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Commissioner Braun received a text message asking for how to view PC meetings.

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

Josh Albrektson made comments regarding the legality of the City's Housing Plan as well as the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

## PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Recommendation to Adopt an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (Continued from January 26, 2021)

## Staff Presentation:

Manager Bar-El presented the proposed Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

## Recommendation

Staff recommends to adopt a Resolution recommending that the City Council approve the proposed amendments outlined in the presentation as well as incorporate the proposed changes to the South Pasadena Municipal Code.

## Questions for Staff:

Commissioner Braun asked if the required affordable unit for condos would be moderate income. Manager Bar-El affirmed that but if the units were for-rent then it would have to be at the affordable level of other projects. Commissioner Braun asked if an ownership project would be eligible for the in-lieu fee. Manager Bar-El affirmed that, and clarified the in-lieu fee is determined by the City with the intention to charge the developer the amount that it would cost to build the affordable unit. Commissioner Braun then asked for specific costs. Manager Bar-El used Santa Monica as an example with each unit costing \$500,000. Commissioner Braun asked what projects the ordinance would apply to. Manager Bar-El clarified it will apply to all new projects that require affordable housing.

Commissioner Barthakur asked if the 20\% applied to base units would be the norm as Pasadena had switched to it and then away from it. Manager Bar-El thought that Pasadena switched back due to general confusion about calculations. Commissioner Barthakur asked about the mechanism of the in-lieu fee. Manager Bar-El replied that any project had to provide staff with financial details and the City would then decide what the in-lieu fee would be after a third party source assessed the financials of the project.

Commissioner Dahl mentioned that an in-lieu fee calculated on a case by case basis is not optimal and asked for a timeline of decision. Director Hankamer replied that it was being introduced to City Council soon.

Vice-Chair Padilla asked if the SGV Housing Trust was already in place for the inlieu fee option. Director Hankamer confirmed it was but City Council would decide whether to send funds to the trust or keep it for other more local purposes.

## Public Comment:

Josh Albrektson brought up concerns that the IHO set unrealistic goals that were not matched by any other city in California and did not reflect what the community wanted.

Gail Maltun brought up concerns that the IHO was far higher than neighboring communities and any developer would skip over South Pasadena in favor of nearby cities.

## Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Dahl approved of the IHO as submitted.
Vice-Chair Padilla had some concerns on the $20 \%$ on base but was comfortable with the rest of the IHO since that part could be revisited later.

Commissioner Barthakur thought that the IHO was well calibrated but could be adjusted later.

Commissioner Braun felt that 20\% would chase developers away and discourage more housing and would prefer $15 \%$.

Chair Lesak felt that the zoning codes and laws should be dynamic, not static, fine tuning the numbers every few years or so.

Vice-Chair Padilla feels like the IHO is making up for lost opportunities. Vice-Chair Padilla also mentioned that if the percentage is calculated on the base, the number is closer to $15 \%$ not $20 \%$.

Commissioner Barthakur agreed with Commissioner Braun's points. Commissioner Barthakur thought that the success of Pasadena's ordinance should be a sign that the proposed IHO would be successful, but recognizes the higher density of development in Pasadena.

Vice-Chair Padilla mentioned that the populations of each category are different than before COVID and emphasis should be placed on the lower levels.

Chair Lesak asked staff that the marketing plan would focus on local low-income residents. Manager Bar-El confirmed that.

## Motion:

Chair Lesak motioned to recommend the City Council adopt the amended ordinance adding Division 36.375 inclusionary housing to Chapter 36 of the South Pasadena Municipal Code as presented within the resolution.

Commissioner Dahl seconded.
Motion carries, 4-1 (Commissioner Braun noes)

## ADMINISTRATION

## 2. Comments from City Council Liaison

Mayor Mahmud thanked the Commission for their work.
3. Comments from Planning Commissioners

Commissioner Dahl thanked staff for meeting with her and Vice-Chair Padilla and thanked staff for giving the commission public comments well in advance.

Commissioner Barthakur mentioned that building new affordable housing is the most expensive way to create affordable housing and suggested converting units to be affordable. Additionally thought that the city should keep the in-lieu fees for that goal rather than give it to the SGV trust.

Commissioner Braun thanked everyone.
Vice-Chair Padilla thanked everyone.
Chair Lesak thanked everyone.

## 4. Comments from Staff

Director Hankamer thanked everyone and reminded the commission that on March $17^{\text {th }}$, the ordinance would go to City Council. Director Hankamer gave an update on the SCAG RHNA allocations that are now final and an update on the appeals. South Pasadena now has an allocation of 2,067 units.

Planning Manager Kith reminded commission that Commissioner Braun will be giving a Planning Commission recap of the last year at the next City Council meeting.

## ADJOURNMENT

5. Adjournment to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled on April 13, 2021.

There being no further matters, Chair Lesak adjourned the meeting at 9:13 p.m.

## Planning Commission Agenda Report

DATE:
September 12, 2023
FROM:
Angelica Frausto-Lupo, Community Development Director Matt Chang, Planning Manager

## PREPARED BY: Mackenzie Goldberg, Assistant Planner

SUBJECT: Project No. 2563-CUP - Request for a Conditional Use Permit for the on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type-41 ABC license) for an existing bona fide restaurant (Silverlake Ramen) located at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue (APN 5315-004-066) and finding that the project is exempt pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301.

## RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution:

1. Finding the project exempt under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15301.
2. Approving Project No. 2563-CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for an existing restaurant with an outdoor dining area located at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue.

## BACKGROUND

On May 2, 2022, the Planning Division provided planning approval for tenant improvements for the restaurant tenant (Silverlake Ramen) at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue.

On April 17, 2023, the applicant, PSB Pasadena Inc., submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for on-site consumption within the suite and adjacent patio areas.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant, PSB Pasadena Inc., is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption (Type 41 License) for an existing restaurant in a multi-tenant commercial building. PSB Pasadena Inc. is requesting the alcohol CUP be for the interior dining area and adjacent outdoor patio dining. The restaurant tenant, Silverlake Ramen, occupies an approximately 1,787 square foot tenant space, having 44 interior
seats, and an adjacent patio area of approximately 314 square feet, having 18 outdoor seats. Hours of operation are from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. daily. No alterations are proposed to the exterior or interior of the building.

The project site is located within the Vons shopping center, which extends from Monterey Road north to Oxley Street, and from Fair Oaks Avenue west to Mound Avenue. The specific location is at the north end of the the commercial building abutting Oxley Street. Other uses in the same building include two restaurants (Jamba Juice and a forthcoming Ono Hawaiian BBQ) and an optometrist. Adjacent uses within the Vons center include the Vons supermarket, restaurants, retail, and other commercial uses. Located across Oxley Street are two residences, an office building, and the Rialto Theater. All of the surrounding properties are zoned Commercial General.

## Surrounding Land Use Characteristics

| Direction | General Plan | Zoning | Existing Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | General Commercial | CG | Rialto Theater |
| South | General Commercial | CG | Parking Lot |
| East | General Commercial | CG | Restaurant |
| West | General Commercial | CG | Multi-tenant |

An aerial image showing the location of the project site outline in red is provided in Figure 1 and Figure 2 shows the tenant space and patio area within the multi-tenant building.

Figure 1: Aerial View of Project Site


Figure 2: Tenant Space \& Existing Patio Area within Multi-Tenant Building Site


## PROJECT ANALYSIS

## General Plan Consistency

The General Plan land use designation of the site is General Commercial, which per the General Plan, provides for a variety of retail, service, office, automotive establishments, entertainment facilities, convenience goods and services to residents in the immediate neighborhood. In addition, this category includes "convenience" commercial uses that provide retail goods and services to residents in the immediate neighborhood. According to the General Plan, the project site sits within subarea A, the "Central District," of Focus Area 3, "The Fair Oaks Corridor."

The proposed project conforms to the following goals and policies of the General Plan:

### 2.5B Economic Development/Commercial Revitalization

Goal 2: To maintain the character of South Pasadena's "main street" commercial areas, support the proprietary businesses of the city, avoid deterioration of commercial areas and the business tax base, and promote those forms of economic development that will provide additional jobs, services and opportunities to the city and its residents.

Policy 2.2: Strengthen retail. Encourage retail and sales tax producing businesses to remain in, expand in, or come to South Pasadena to promote healthy retail areas.

Policy 3.10: Encourage convenience business. Encourage the appropriate "convenience" commercial to serve residents within walking distance of homes.

The proposed project supports the goals and policies of the General Plan by allowing a business to sell and dispense beer and wine at an existing restaurant, which would allow for the growth of local economic activity. The addition of alcohol will not substantially change the nature of the business, but will however, provide a new amenity to the surrounding community. Therefore, the request is consistent with the General Plan.

## Zoning Code Compliance

The zoning for the site is Commercial General (CG), which is intended for a wide range of commercial retail and service land uses. The existing restaurant conforms to the allowable uses within the CG zone and is consistent with the General Commercial land use designation in the General Plan.

The operation of Silverlake Ramen with outdoor dining is a permitted use under a separate Conditional Use Permit, which was approved by the Planning Commission on March 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$, 2010, Project No. 1358-CUP-AUP-DRX. While carried out by the previous tenant (Penguin's Frozen Yogurt), Silverlake Ramen is permitted to continue operating under the previous approval pursuant to SPMC Section 36.420.060.

The sale of alcohol is also permitted in the CG zone with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Conditional Use Permits are intended to allow for activities whose effect on a site and its surroundings can only be determined after the review of the configuration, design, location, and potential impacts of the proposed use and the suitability of the use to the site.

A Conditional Use Permit is required to authorize proposed activity identified by SPMC Section 36.230 .030 as being allowable in the applicable commercial zoning district subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

## Conditional Use Permit

Pursuant to South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC) Section 36.410.060(D), the Planning Commission may grant a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for any use listed in Article 2 of Chapter 36 (Zoning) as requiring a CUP. Alcoholic beverages for "on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine" (Type 41 license) are subject to a CUP pursuant to SPMC Section 36.350.040 and, therefore, would require an approval from the Planning Commission.

The applicant proposes the sales of beer and wine for on-site consumption as an ancillary use to the main restaurant operation. The applicant proposes the sales of beer and wine for on-site consumption to be limited to the tenant space at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue, and the adjacent patio area of approximately 314 square feet. In Figure 3, it shows the floor plan with the interior dining area outlined in green to indicate where alcohol will be served and consumed.

Figure 3: Silverlake Ramen Floor Plan


The South Pasadena Police Department and Fire Department also reviewed the proposed alcohol CUP and had no objections to the proposal.

The Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) puts a limit on the number of on-site and off-site licenses it uses, based on the population of people within a given census tract. Silverlake Ramen is located within census tract 4805, as illustrated in Figure 4. According to ABC

Figure 4: Census Tract 4805 Boundary
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Licensing Reports, Census Tract 4805 currently holds three (3) active on-site licenses and zero off-site licenses; however, based on the number of active on-sale retail licenses for the zip code, staff believes there are additional active licenses within the census tract. Table 1 lists businesses with an active alcohol license, derived from the ABC Licensing Report for the Zipcode 91030.

Table 1: Active Alcohol Licenses in Census Tract 4805

| Type | Business Name | Address |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 - On-Sale General Eating <br> Place | Shiro Restaurant | $1505-1507$ Mission Street |
| 47 - On-Sale General Eating <br> Place | Ai Japanese Restaurant | 1013 Fair Oaks Avenue |
| 47 - On-Sale General Eating <br> Place | Huntington Catering Company | 1929 Huntington Drive |
| 58 - Caterer's Permit | Huntington Catering Company | 1929 Huntington Drive |
| 41 - On-Sale Beer \& Wine - <br> Eating Place | Round Table Pizza | 1127 Fair Oaks Avenue |
| $41-$ On-Sale Beer \& Wine - <br> Eating Place | Blaze Pizza | 1100 Fair Oaks Avenue, STE 1 |
| $41-$ On-Sale Beer \& Wine - <br> Eating Place | Chipotle Mexican Grill | 901 Fair Oaks Avenue |
| $41-$ On-Sale Beer \& Wine - <br> Eating Place | Golden China | 1115 Fair Oaks Avenue |
| TOTAL: | Eight (8) On-Sale License Types |  |

The approval of this CUP for on-site sales and consumption of beer and wine are typical in this type of business and would be consistent with the surrounding uses. It is staff's analysis that allowing the sale of alcohol at this location would be an additional item(s) to the menu that Silverlake Ramen offers. As such, staff recommends approval of the proposed CUP for the onsite sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 License).

Based on the discussion above, staff recommends that the Planning Commission make the findings for approval as described in more detail in the Resolution, included as Attachment 1, pursuant to South Pasadena Municipal Code Section 36.410.060.

## Conditional Use Permit Findings

In order to approve a CUP, the Planning Commission must make certain findings listed in SPMC section 36.410.060. The required findings are listed below.

1. The proposed use is allowed with Conditional Use Permit approval within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of this Zoning Code;

The project site is zoned Commercial General (CG) which is intended for the development of a wide range of commercial retail and service land uses. The sale of alcohol at a restaurant is permitted in the CG zone with approval of a Conditional
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Use Permit. The proposed Conditional Use Permit for sale of beer and wine for onsite consumption (Type 41 License) as an ancillary use to the main restaurant operation and the project meets all the standards in the underline zoning district.
2. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan.

The General Plan land use designation of the site is General Commercial which provides for a variety of retail, service, office, automotive establishments, entertainment facilities, convenience goods and services to residents in the immediate neighborhood, and parking facilities. The proposed CUP is within the Central District of the Fair Oaks Corridor focus area which is intended to be a revitalization, adaptive re-use, and new development capitalizing on the historic fabric of commercial shops and storefronts fronting both Mission Street and Fair Oaks Avenue.

The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of Chapter IV (Economic Development \& Revitalization) or the General Plan by allowing a business to sell and dispense beer and wine at an existing restaurant, which would allow the growth of local economic activity. The availability of alcoholic beverages in conjunction with food service is an increasingly expected amenity within restaurants. Approval of the request will enable the tenant to maintain viability. Further, a variety of commercial uses, including restaurants, are an intrinsic part of the mix of uses necessary for the success of a vibrant commercial area. As such, authorizing the use would meet the needs of the focus area and improve the economic vitality of the neighborhood.
3. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use would not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use.

The proposed sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption is an ancillary use to the restaurant operation, and is reasonable given the restaurant's location in a competitive commercially zoned area. As conditioned, the sale of beer and wine will be limited to hours of operation and all alcohol orders will be in conjunction with food orders. The restaurant's hours of operation are from 10:00 A.M. to 11:00 P.M., seven days a week. Nevertheless, conditions are also imposed to ensure the proposed use is not detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the general public.
4. The use, as described and conditionally approved, would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

Approval of the Conditional Use Permit, as conditioned, would not be detrimental or injurious to the property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general
welfare of the City. Conditions are included requiring no loitering on the property, and required training for employees who will serve alcohol to ensure that the sales of alcohol would not be detrimental to the community.

The proposal meets all the conditions of approval as described in the SPMC. Therefore, the proposed use would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
5. The subject site is adequate in terms of size, shape, topography, and circumstances and has sufficient access to streets and highways which are adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity and quality of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed use.

Silverlake Ramen is an existing, bona fide restaurant at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue with additional operating locations all across California. The proposed request for on-site beer and wine sales (Type 41 license) does not involve any expansion to the size of the existing commercial building or any roadway modifications. Therefore, the project site is adequate in size and has sufficient access to existing streets in order to continue accommodating the existing restaurant use.
6. The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity, in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, impacts on neighboring properties.

The proposed Conditional Use Permit is compatible with existing commercial land uses within the vicinity, including similar restaurant uses in the area. No alterations are proposed to the exterior or interior of the building as a part of this Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land use in the vicinity in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, and views protection.

## Environmental Analysis

This project is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities. A Class 1 Categorical Exemption includes the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, involving negligible or no expansion of existing use. The project does not involve any expansion or alteration to the size of the commercial building. As such, no significant environmental effects would result from this project and the use of a categorical exemption is appropriate.

## Staff Recommendation

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution:

1. Finding the project exempt under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15301.
2. Approving Project No. 2563-CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for an existing restaurant with an outdoor dining area located at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue.

## Alternatives to Consider

If the Planning Commission does not agree with staff's recommendation, the following options are available:

1. The Planning Commission can Approve the project as is or with modified condition(s) added or removed and provide findings; or
2. The Planning Commission can Continue the project, providing the applicant with clear recommendations to revise the proposal; or
3. The Planning Commission can Deny the project if it finds that the project does not meet the City's CUP requirements.

## Public Notification of Agenda Item

A Public Hearing Notice was published on September 1, 2023, in the South Pasadena Review. Hearing notices were sent to all properties within a 300-foot radius on August 31, 2023. In addition, the public was made aware that this item was to be considered at a public hearing by virtue of its inclusion on the legally publicly noticed agenda, and the posting of the same agenda and reports on the City's website.

## Attachments

1. P.C. Resolution with Exhibit "A" - Conditions of Approval
2. Project Narrative
3. Site and Floor Plan

## ATTACHMENT 1

Resolution with Recommended Conditions of Approval

## P.C. RESOLUTION NO. 23-09

## A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA CONDITIONALLY APPROVING PROJECT NO. 2563-CUP CONSISTING OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR ONSITE SALE AND CONSUMPTION OF BEER AND WINE (TYPE 41 LICENSE) AT 1105 FAIR OAKS AVENUE (APN: 5315-004-066), AND MAKING A DETERMINATION OF EXEMPTION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

WHEREAS, on April 17, 2023, a representative of PSB Pasadena Inc., (applicant) on behalf of the tenant (Silverlake Ramen), submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for on-site consumption at the existing restaurant, Silverlake Ramen, located at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number: 5315-004-066); and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Division evaluated the project for consistency with the City's General Plan, South Pasadena Municipal Code, and all other applicable state and local regulations; and

WHEREAS, on August 31, 2023, the public hearing notice was mailed to each property owner within a 300 -foot radius of the project site in accordance with the requirements of South Pasadena Municipal Code declaring the project review by the Planning Commission for the hearing on September 12, 2023; and

WHEREAS, on September 1, 2023, the City of South Pasadena Planning Division, published a legal notice in the South Pasadena Review, a local newspaper of general circulation, indicating the date, time, and location of the public hearing in compliance with state law concerning Project No. 2563-CUP; and

WHEREAS, the South Pasadena Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on September 12, 2023, at which time it considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony, and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public concerning Project No. 2563-CUP and considered the proposed Conditional Use Permit for the on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for an existing bona fide restaurant at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA DOES HEREBY FIND, DETERMINE, AND RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated and made an operative part of this resolution.

## SECTION 2: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDING

The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), under Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities of the California Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA. Class 1 consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of existing use. The project does not involve any expansion or alteration to the size of the commercial building. As such, no significant environmental effects would result from this project and the use of a categorical exemption is appropriate.

## SECTION 3: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

Based upon the entire record made available at the September 12, 2023 public hearing, including the public hearing, the staff report, the oral presentation, and related documents submitted to the Planning Commission prior to and at the public hearing, the Planning Commission finds and determines that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable findings for approval of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC) Section 36.410.060, as follows:

1. The proposed use is allowed with Conditional Use Permit or Administrative Use Permit approval within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of this Zoning Code;

The project site is zoned Commercial General (CG) which is intended for the development of a wide range of commercial retail and service land uses. The sale of alcohol at a restaurant is permitted in the CG zone with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed Conditional Use Permit for sale of beer and wine for onsite consumption (Type 41 License) as an ancillary use to the main restaurant operation and the project meets all the standards in the underline zoning district.
2. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan.

The General Plan land use designation of the site is General Commercial which provides for a variety of retail, service, office, automotive establishments, entertainment facilities, convenience goods and services to residents in the immediate neighborhood, and parking facilities. The proposed CUP is within the Central District of the Fair Oaks Corridor focus area which is intended to be a revitalization, adaptive re-use, and new development capitalizing on the historic
fabric of commercial shops and storefronts fronting both Mission Street and Fair Oaks Avenue.

The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of Chapter IV (Economic Development \& Revitalization) or the General Plan by allowing a business to sell and dispense beer and wine at an existing restaurant, which would allow the growth of local economic activity. The availability of alcoholic beverages in conjunction with food service is an increasingly expected amenity within restaurants. Approval of the request will enable the tenant to maintain viability. Further, a variety of commercial uses, including restaurants, are an intrinsic part of the mix of uses necessary for the success of a vibrant commercial area. As such, authorizing the use would meet the needs of the focus area and improve the economic vitality of the neighborhood.
3. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use would not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use.

The proposed sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption is an ancillary use to the restaurant operation, and is reasonable given the restaurant's location in a competitive commercially zoned area. As conditioned, the sale of beer and wine will be limited to hours of operation and all alcohol orders will be in conjunction with food orders. The restaurant's hours of operation are from 10:00 A.M. to 11:00 P.M., seven days a week. Nevertheless, conditions are also imposed to ensure the proposed use is not detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the general public.
4. The use, as described and conditionally approved, would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

Approval of the Conditional Use Permit, as conditioned, would not be detrimental or injurious to the property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City. Conditions are included requiring no loitering on the property, and required training for employees who will serve alcohol to ensure that the sales of alcohol would not be detrimental to the community.

The proposal meets all the conditions of approval as described in the SPMC. Therefore, the proposed use would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
5. The subject site is adequate in terms of size, shape, topography, and circumstances and has sufficient access to streets and highways which are adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity and quality of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed use.

Silverlake Ramen is an existing, bona fide restaurant at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue with additional operating locations all across California. The proposed request for on-site beer and wine sales (Type 41 license) does not involve any expansion to the size of the existing commercial building or any roadway modifications. Therefore, the project site is adequate in size and has sufficient access to existing streets in order to continue accommodating the existing restaurant use.
6. The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity, in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, impacts on neighboring properties.

The proposed Conditional Use Permit is compatible with existing commercial land uses within the vicinity, including similar restaurant uses in the area. No alterations are proposed to the exterior or interior of the building as a part of this Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land use in the vicinity in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, and views protection.

## SECTION 4: RECORD OF PROCEEDING

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's decision is based, which include, but are not limited to, the staff reports, as well as all materials that support the staff reports for the proposed project, and are located in the Community Development Department of the City of South Pasadena at 1414 Mission Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030. The custodian of these documents is the City Clerk of the City of South Pasadena.

## SECTION 5. DETERMINATION

Based upon the findings outlined in Sections 2 through 3 above and provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena hereby conditionally approves Project No. 2563-CUP consisting of a Conditional Use Permit for the on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine (Type 41 License) for an existing bona fide restaurant at 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue, subject to the Conditions of Approval attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

## SECTION 6: APPEALS

Any interested person may appeal this decision or any portion of this decision to the City Council. Pursuant to the South Pasadena Municipal Code, any such appeal must be filed with the City, in writing, and with appropriate appeal fee, no later than (15) days, following the date of the Planning Commission's final action.

## SECTION 7: CERTIFICATION OF THE RESOLUTION

The Secretary shall certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena at a duly noticed regular meeting held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ day of September 2023.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this $12^{\text {th }}$ day of September 2023 by the following vote:

## AYES:

NOES:

## ABSENT:

## ABSTAIN:

1105 Fair Oaks Avenue 2563-CUP

Laura Dahl, Planning Commission Chair

## ATTEST:

$\overline{\text { Amitabh Barthakur, Secretary to the Planning Commission }}$

# EXHIBIT "A" <br> CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL PROJECT NO. 2563-CUP <br> 1105 Fair Oaks Avenue (APN: 5315-004-066) 

## PLANNING DIVISION:

P-1. The following approvals are granted as described below and as shown on the development plans submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2023:
A. Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption at an existing restaurant (Type 41 License).

P-2. This approval and all rights hereunder shall terminate within twelve (12) months of the effective date of their approval by the Planning Commission unless otherwise conditioned and/or unless the use is established or action is taken. The on-sale beer and wine license (Type 41) shall be acquired by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) prior to the termination period.

P-3. Approval by the Planning Commission does not constitute a building permit. No structural modifications were proposed as part of this CUP request.
P-4. All other requirements of any law, ordinance, or regulation of the State of California, City of South Pasadena, and any other government entity shall be complied with.
P-5. Compliance with and execution of all appropriate conditions listed herein shall be necessary prior to obtaining any occupancy inspection clearance and/or prior to obtaining any occupancy clearance.

P-6. The applicant and each successor in interest to the property which is the subject of this project approval, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of South Pasadena and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul any approval of the City, City Council or Planning Commission concerning this approval. In the event of any claim or lawsuit, the applicant and/or successor shall submit a deposit in such amount as the City reasonably determines necessary to protect the City from exposure to fees, costs or liability with respect to such claim or lawsuit.
P-7. The sales of beer and wine shall be limited to the hours of operation of the restaurant, 10 a.m. to 11 p.m. daily.
P-8. No sale or consumption of beer and wine shall be permitted until the customer/s have been seated.
P-9. The sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption shall only be incidental to the operation of the restaurant. Sale of alcohol for off-site consumption within the restaurant shall be prohibited.

P-10. Quarterly gross sales of alcohol shall not exceed quarterly gross sales of food within the restaurant. Quarterly records shall be maintained to separately reflect gross sales of food and gross sales of beer and wine and shall be made available to the City of South Pasadena upon request.
P-11. The restaurant premises shall be continuously maintained as a bona fide eating establishment, and shall provide a menu containing an assortment of foods typically offered in restaurants.
P-12. No advertising for alcoholic beverages may be displayed in store windows or outside of the store.
P-13. All alcohol sales cases/displays shall be located in such a manner to prevent "grab-and-run" thefts of alcohol. The sales cases/displays shall be located in sight of the sales counter at all times, if possible.
P-14. The employees who will be engaged in the sale of alcohol must complete the State Alcoholic Beverage Control's mandated training, as well as the store's internal training on the sale of alcohol.

P-15. The consumption of beer and wine shall be permitted only within the restaurant and in the adjacent patio area as outlined in green in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Silverlake Ramen Floor Plan


P-16. Any individuals discovered loitering on the property shall immediately be informed to leave the premises, by the owner. Should the owner fail to abate the problems, the South Pasadena Police Department and/or other enforcement agencies reserve the right to take appropriate enforcement actions to abate the problem, and the permit/alcohol licenses may be subject to revocation.

P-17. The store management shall regulate the arrival and departure of all employees and restrict the "late hour" use of the exit for trash removal and unnecessary opening. Adequate security measures shall be instituted to eliminate any unauthorized access.

## ATTACHMENT 2

Project Narrative

Silverlake Ramen<br>1105 FAIR OAKS AVE, SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030

Silverlake Ramen is a popular ramen franchise that has garnered loyal fans since opening its first location in Silverlake in 2012.
We're very excited to open our new location in South Pasadena and it's been well received since opening in early 2023.
We are requesting to modify condition no. 14 to allow the sale and dispensing of beer \& wine for on-site consumption in conjunction with food orders. We are operating from 10AM to 11PM daily and will be serving beer \& wine during operational hours.

## ATTACHMENT 3

Site \& Floor Plan

## PROJECT SUMMARY

## PROJECT ADDRESS:

1105 FAIR OAKS AVENUE,
SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

INTERIOR TENANT IMPROVEMENT OF AN EXISTING RESTAURANT SPACE "PENGUNS" FOR A NEW "sIlvERLAKE RAMEN" ReStaurant.

## SCOPE OF WORK

WORK TO INCLUDE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW INTERIOR WALLS FOR CONFIGURATION OF KITCHEN, DINING AND RESTROOM AREAS, RESTAURANT KITCHEN EQUIPMENT, INTERIOR FINISHES, CEILING SOFFIT, \& LIGHTING WORK THROUGHOUT.

## CODE ANALYSIS:

2019 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
2019 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
2019 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
2019 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
2019 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
2019 GREEN BUILDINGS STANDARDS CODE
2019 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE
CALIFORNIA RETAIL FOOD CODE

## ARCHITECT / MEP:

GWA ARCHITECTURE
1000 CORPORATE CENTER DR., SUITE 550
MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754
PH: (626) 288-6898

## TENANT

## PSB PASADENA, INC

dba Silverlake Ramen
1105 Fair Oaks Avenue, South Pasadena,
CA 91030
ATTN: JIMMY \& JIN HEO
PH: (213) 5004201 / (213) 9259840
EMAIL: jinsu77com@gmail.com / Heojin76@gmail.com

## LANDLORD:

RICHARD WAGNER

| CONSTRUCTION TYPE: | $\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{N} /$ NON-SPRINKLERED | OCCUPANT LOAD: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ZONE: | CG (COMMERCIAL GENERAL) | PICK UP/DINING AREA |

## SITE PLAN (FOR REFERENCE ONLY)





DATE:

FROM: Angelica Frausto-Lupo, Community Development Director Matt Chang, Planning Manager

## PREPARED BY: Sandra Robles, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR - A request for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review Permit to add a 343-square-foot, first-story addition; a 585 -square-foot, secondstory addition; and a 372 -square-foot deck to an existing 1,134-square-foot, one-story, single-family dwelling, with an existing 350-square-foot basement, located at 1808 Hanscom Drive (APN: 5308-018-025); two Variance requests: 1) To allow for a retaining wall that will exceed six (6) feet in height with the highest portion of the retaining wall being twelve (12) feet in height; and, 2) To allow for a 178-square-foot deck that will exceed six (6) feet in height, the proposed deck is eight (8) feet and two (2) inches in height, as measured from grade to the top of the landing; and finding that the project is exempt pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301.

## Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution (Attachment 1) taking the following actions:

1. Find the project exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities).
2. Approve Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR, subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval (Attachment 1).

## Background

The subject site is an 18,541-square-foot, irregularly shaped lot located within the Southwest Monterey Hills area and zoned Residential Single-Family (RS). The subject property is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the north, south, and west; the parcel adjacent to the eastern part of the property is zoned Open Space (see Figure 1,
to view the Aerial). The surrounding neighborhood includes an eclectic mix of architectural styles including $20^{\text {th }}$ Century Modern, Minimal Traditional, and Ranch-style, amongst others (see Attachment 2 and 8 for Site and Neighborhood Images).

Figure 1: Aerial


The subject site is currently developed with a 1,134 -square-foot, one-story single-family residence consisting of two bedrooms and one bathroom at the main level; a 350-squarefoot basement, inaccessible from the interior, with a second bathroom and a laundry area; and, a 170-square-foot subterranean, one-car garage. Originally constructed in 1927, the Spanish Colonial Revival home has undergone the following exterior modifications:

1949: Addition to rear of property; approximately 126 square feet.
1964: New windows and doors; the northwest deck was noted as unpermitted construction that would require a variance.
1980: Reroof.
2006: Reroof.
2013: Remodel of basement laundry into laundry room with full bath.
2018: Repair 6 '-6" high retaining wall.
The subject site has an average slope of 26.1 percent; slopping upward from the front property line and leveling off into a building pad towards the center, where the addition is proposed. Towards the rear of the lot, the terrain slopes downward toward the Open Space area (see Figure 2, on the following page, to view of cross-section of the subject property).

Figure 2: Site Cross-Section


## Project Description

The applicant is requesting approval to add a 343 -square-foot first-story addition and a 585 -square-foot second-story addition (928 total square feet) to an existing 1,134-squarefoot, one-story, single-family dwelling. The project also includes a 372 -square-foot deck located along the north elevation.

## Entitlements:

The applicant is requesting the following entitlement applications for the proposed project:

1. Hillside Development Permit (HDP) for the proposed 928 -square-foot addition, 372-square-foot deck, and proposed retaining wall on a site with an average slope of 20 percent or greater;
2. Design Review Permit (DRX) for the review of the design aspects of the proposed development; and,
3. Two Variances (VAR) to deviate from development standards to allow the project to provide the following:
a. An increase in the height of a retaining wall, which will be 12 feet in height along the front of the property to accommodate guest parking. Per South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC), Section 36.340.040(I) retaining walls are limited to 6 feet in height and shall avoid a uniform plane; and,
b. To permit an unpermitted 178 -square-foot deck and to allow for it to maintain at $8^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ in height as measured from grade to the top of the landing. Per SPMC, Section 36.340.050(D), no portion of the walking surface of a deck with visible underpinnings shall exceed a height of six feet above grade.

The architectural drawings, plans, and are included as Attachment 8.
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## Project Analysis

## General Plan Consistency

The General Plan land use designation of the site is Low Density Residential, which allows for detached single-family units at a density of 3.51 to 6 units per acre. The proposed project does not involve the addition of another dwelling unit; therefore, the project is consistent with the General Plan.

## Zoning Code Compliance \& Development Standards

The subject property is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS) which is intended for the development of detached, single-family homes. A two-story residence is a use anticipated in this zoning district. The purpose of the Residential Design Review process is to ensure that the proposed site layout and building design are suitable and compatible with the City's design standards and guidelines.

The proposed project meets the requirements of the City's adopted Design Guidelines for alterations to single-family residences on hillside sites. The applicable development standards for this project are listed in SPMC Sections 36.340.050 (Hillside Project Development Standards) and 36.220.040 (Residential Zoning District General Development Standards for the RS Zone). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the existing conditions of the proposed project and its compliance with SPMC Section 36.220.040 regulating residential land uses.

Table 1: Residential District General Development Standards

| Standard | Requirement | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Coverage | $40 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |
|  | (7,416 SF max. allowed) | $(1,364 \mathrm{SF})$ | $(1,707 \mathrm{SF})$ |
| Floor Area | $35 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ |
| Ratio (FAR) | ( $6,489 \mathrm{SF}$ max. allowed) | $(1,134 \mathrm{SF})$ | $(2,072 \mathrm{SF})$ |
| Rear Setback | $25^{\prime}$ | $118^{\prime}$ | $99^{\prime}$ |

## Hillside Development Permit

Pursuant to SPMC Section 36.340.020, any development on a site with an average slope of 20 percent or greater requires a Hillside Development Permit, as further detailed in Division 36.340 of the SPMC and discussed below. The proposed project requires a Hillside Development Permit because the subject site has an average slope of 26.1 percent. The purpose of the Hillside Development Permit is to ensure that developments are designed to preserve the City's scenic resources, encourage appropriate grading practices, and encourage appropriate design to maintain the hillside in a natural, open character.

Table 2 provides a summary of the Hillside Project Development Standards (SPMC Section 36.340 .050 ), existing conditions at the subject site, and proposed changes for the project.

Table 2: Hillside Project Development Standards

| Standard | Requirement | Existing | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front Setback | 10 ft . | 25'-5" | 25'-5" |
| Side Setback | $10 \%$ of lot width, min. of 4 ft ., max. of 10 ft . Lot Width=100' <br> Side Setback Requirement=10' | North: 52' <br> South: 3'-6" <br> (existing) | Complies <br> North: 52' <br> South: 4' (existing, legal nonconforming) |
| Building Height | Maximum height for structures with a roof pitch of $3: 12$ or greater is 28 ft . If a roof pitch is less than $3: 12$, the maximum height is 24 ft . | 19'-4" | $\begin{gathered} \text { Complies: } \\ 23^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ |
| Siting Restrictions | Structures shall not be placed so that they appear silhouetted against the sky when viewed from a public street | Complies | Complies |
| Placement Below Ridgeline | 50 ft . between top of the structure and the top of the ridge or knoll | Complies | Complies |
| Height of Lowest Floor Level | Vertical distance between the lowest point where foundation meets grade and the lowest floor line of the structure shall not exceed 6 ft . | Complies | Complies |
| Downhill <br> Building Walls | No single building wall on the downhill side of a house shall exceed 15 ft . in height above grade. | Complies | Complies |
| Decks | No portion of the walking surface of a deck with visible underpinnings shall exceed a height of six feet above grade. Decks should be integrated into the architecture of the house, not appearing as an "add-on" to the primary building mass | $\begin{gathered} \text { 8'-2" } \\ \text { (unpermitted) } \end{gathered}$ | Variance Requested |
| Driveways | Driveway shall not have a grade steeper than $5 \%$ within 10 ft . of the garage or carport entry. Finished grade of driveways shall not exceed an average of $15 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Natural State | A minimum of $25 \%$ of the lot area plus the percentage figure of the average slope must be remediated to its natural state in terms of slope and vegetation. | N/A | N/A |
| Height of New Retaining Walls | 3 ft . max in front setback, otherwise 6 ft . | - | Variance Requested |

## Grading

The addition is situated on a relatively flat building pad, as such, the grading for the residence will be minimal, as would normally be expected for structures constructed on building pads. However, the location of the proposed retaining wall exceeds a slope of 30 percent. The applicant is proposing a retaining wall to accommodate a guest parking space, as is required in the Southwest Monterey Hills area. SPMC Section 36.340.050(H) provides, in relevant part:

## Southwest Monterey Hills Guest Parking Space

An application for a new house, or addition to an existing house that lacks the required off-street parking, shall provide details on the location and dimensions or required guest parking space(s), which shall be located perpendicular (or as close as possible to 90 degrees) to the right-of-way, and within or partially within the required front setback. If physical constraints preclude this location, the applicant shall provide written documentation of these constraints and provide the required off-street guest parking parallel to the street and at least 10 feet wide by 24 feet deep.

Originally constructed in 1927, the existing residence does not conform to current hillside regulations-adopted by the South Pasadena City Council in 2002-specifically relating to parking standards. The existing home was approved with a one-car garage-the existing development standards requires that new homes built within the Southwest Monterey Hills, include two covered parking spaces and one uncovered off-street guest parking space. The applicant is permitted to add to their existing nonconforming residence without having to update the covered parking requirements, so long as they do not increase the density; however, the section referenced above requires that an applicant shall provide the required off-street parking space when adding to an existing home. As such, the area in which the applicant is proposing to construct a retaining wall to accommodate the off-street guest parking is located within the front setback (see Figure 3, on the following page, with the proposed guest parking space highlighted in yellow and Figure 4 to view a cross-section of the proposed cut).

Figure 3: Proposed Location of Off-Street Guest Parking


Figure 4: Cross-Section of Proposed Cut


The topography of the lot is unique in that it slopes upward from the street, levels off into a building pad towards the center of the property, and then drops dramatically towards the rear. At the front of the property, the slope is significant and in order for there to be minimal impact to the slope, the applicant is adding the guest parking space parallel to the street, as opposed to the preferred perpendicular parking. The slope at the proposed
guest parking location is currently held by a low, concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall, and does not appear to be engineered as a retaining wall, due to noticeable gaps and tilting (see Figure 5 below).

Figure 5: Image of Existing Retaining Wall


The proposed retaining wall will result in 108 cubic yards of cut. No imported fill is proposed. SPMC 36.340.050(G) states "Grading plans shall be prepared in compliance with the Municipal Code and the General Plan. Grading on slopes over 30 percent shall be permitted when sufficient technical information has been provided to support the determination that such development would have no negative impacts on the subject property, adjacent properties, or on the safety and welfare of the public. Grading shall utilize landform grading techniques." As conditioned, the project will comply with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan as follows:

Goal 19: "To ensure that new development within hillside areas of South Pasadena does not adversely impact the character of the City."

Policy 19.7: "Discourage Hillside Grading which damages the integrity of hillside areas in order to create views."

The retaining wall was designed parallel to the street to reduce grading. The documents reviewed by the City include a topographic map, slope analysis, and preliminary grading plan prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer. The applicant will provide a final grading plan prepared by Registered Professional Engineer. As required and conditioned, the final grading plan will be approved by the Public Works Department and the Building Division prior to grading permit issuance. As such, the grading for the retaining wall would
not impact the safety of the site, adjacent properties, or the general safety and welfare of the public. The applicant is required to submit a draft Construction Management Plan to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department to reduce potential construction impacts on nearby residents (see Attachment 1 for Conditions of Approval).

## Variance 1: Increased Retaining Wall Height

The average slope of the subject site is 26.1 percent and at the front of the property, the slope is more significant, as such, retaining walls are needed to properly secure the hillside in order to accommodate the required off-street guest parking space. This variance request is to permit the height of retaining walls to exceed the 6 -foot standard is common for Hillside Development Permit projects. SPMC Section 36.340.040(I) provides, in relevant part:

Large retaining walls in a uniform plane shall be avoided. Retaining walls shall be divided into terraces with variations in plane and include landscaping to break up the length of the walls and to screen them from view. No retaining wall shall be higher than six feet, and should incorporate a three-foot recessed off-set feature every 30 feet, or other methods of articulation. Retaining walls more than three feet high that are visible from off the site should be screened with landscaping.

The retaining wall is proposed at 12 feet in height and is located at the front of the property, parallel to the street. The property currently has three mature trees (two Pines and one Toyon) that stabilize the front hillside at the northern portion of the lot (see Attachment 5 to view the Arborist Report). In order to comply with the terracing requirement, due to the steepness of the slope, the grading cut would be increased further into the property, resulting in the removal of the trees. The applicant is requesting a variance to deviate from the retaining wall height limitation to save the trees and maintain the stability of the hillside (see Figure 6 to view a cross-section of the proposed retaining wall in relation to the existing trees).

Figure 6: Cross-section of Retaining Wall and Tree Location


To comply with the landscaping requirement and to minimize the visual impact of the wall, the applicant is proposing to add a planter at the end of the guest parking space, which will be planted with Santa Barbara Sage, a bush that grows up to three feet in height, and Cleveland Sage, a perennial shrub that is native to Southern California and can grow to four feet in height. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to cover the wall with the wallclimbing vine, Star Jasmine (see Figure 7 for an elevation of the proposed landscaping along the proposed retaining wall).

There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which consists of an average slope of 26 percent and towards the front of the property, where the retaining wall is proposed, the slope is significant. As such, the added height for the retaining wall is needed to properly secure the hillside to accommodate a guest parking space, as is required in the Southwest Monterey Hills area, and to save the mature trees.

Figure 7: Proposed Landscaping for Retaining Wall


## Variance 2: Increased Deck Height

The subject property currently has three decks-the front deck, allowing access to the dwelling, a 178 -square-foot deck located at the northwest corner of the dwelling, and a free-standing deck located on the northwest corner of the subject lot. The front deck is the only permitted deck, as such, the applicant will be removing the free-standing deck and is requesting to keep the unpermitted deck located to the northwest corner of the dwelling and is proposing a new 372 -square-foot deck to the northwest corner (see Figure 8, on the following page, to view both decks requested as part of this project). This
variance request is to permit the height of the deck to exceed the 6 feet in height, as required by SPMC, Section SPMC 36.340.050(D):

No portion of the walking surface of a deck with visible underpinnings shall exceed a height of six feet above grade. Decks should be integrated into the architecture of the house, no appearing as an "add-on" to the primary building mass.

Figure 8: Proposed Decks - Deck 1 is unpermitted and 178 square feet; Deck 2 is proposed at 372 square feet


The unpermitted 178 -square-foot deck was first observed by the City in 1964, when the previous owner pulled permits for window and door change-outs. The Building Inspector at the time, noted that the deck was unpermitted and would require a variance. As such, the applicant is requesting a variance to permit the deck, which at the lowest grade is 8 feet 2 inches in height from grade to the top of the landing. The deck is painted with a color scheme matching the existing home and is utilized to access the basement, which can only be accessed from the exterior. The deck is situated along the front façade of the property, which is uphill from the street view and setback 25 feet from the front property line, as such, it does not create a visual impact to the property (see Figure 9 to view the North Elevation with the deck and Figure 10 to view an image of the deck as it looks today).

There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which consists of an average slope of 26 percent and the front of the property is steeper. The deck is set back 25 feet from the front property line, but where the grade meets the residential building,
there is a decline of the grade making it necessary to increase the height of the deck for easy access the basement. The deck is currently existing and has not constituted a danger to the surrounding property. With the proper permitting process, the applicant will be required to undergo inspections by the Building Division that will ensure the continued safety of the existing residents and the surrounding neighborhood.

Figure 9: North Elevation with Deck


Figure 10: Street View Image of the Deck


## Design Review

## Hillside Design Guidelines

The Hillside Development Design Guidelines in Section 36.340.040 of the SPMC and the City's residential design guidelines for hillside lots apply to the proposed project. To approve the project, the Planning Commission must find that the proposed project is consistent with City's design requirements and must make the findings for approval for Design Review. These guidelines and findings require projects to be compatible within the neighborhood context and surrounding architectural characteristics so as not to adversely impact the character of the City. The City's adopted Design Guidelines for Residential Single-Family Buildings on Hillside Lots, state the following:

1. Neighborhood Compatibility and Character: Alterations to existing hillside homes should be designed with consideration for the character and scale of the existing development in the vicinity. Compatibility should be developed in the design of residence following a review of exiting site conditions, visibility of the site, and the size, scale, and character of existing development within 500 feet of the site.

The proposed addition is situated to the rear of the property and is set back 35 feet from the front wall plane, which will result in a minimal visual impact from the front street view. The character of the existing neighborhood is a mix of architectural styles and sizes, consisting of a variety of one- and two-story homes, as such, the rear addition will complement the scale of the existing neighborhood.
2. View Protection: Preservation of views from adjoining hillside lots should be carefully considered in the design of a new home or addition to an existing home on a hillside lot.

The views from the properties located west from the subject property (across the street), will not be visually impacted from the addition, as the subject property is located uphill and the western homes to not have a view from the east. The property to the north will not be affected, as the side yard setback is approximately 52 feet from the northern property line and is downhill from the subject property. The property to the south is situated slightly uphill from the subject property and will have minimal view impacts, as the proposed project was designed with a flat roof and the height will not reach that of the adjacent property to the south, which is currently developed with a three-story, 3,929-square-foot single-family dwelling. Additionally, the primary views for the property to the south are from the west and from the east-the proposed addition is located to the north of the adjacent property.
3. Scale and Massing: Vertical building walls should not exceed 15 feet in height above grade. Any vertical walls above 15 feet should be stepped back from
adjacent lower walls by a minimum distance of ten feet. Flat building walls over one story in height and over 25 feet in horizontal dimension are discouraged to minimize unarticulated wall mass.

The downhill building wall requirement would not apply to this addition, as the addition will be situated on a building pad, which does not allow for a stepped design. Although there are walls over 15 feet in height, the total height of the addition is less than 25 feet, as such, the proposed project is in compliance.

The surrounding neighborhood includes a mix of large, multi-story homes and small, onestory homes and a variety of architectural styles. The proposed addition will be to the rear of the property and will have minimal view impacts from hilltop homes. The proposed addition is designed with consideration of the character and scale of the existing multistory residential developments in the vicinity.

## Design Review

The existing building consist of two bedrooms and one bathroom at the main level with a basement, inaccessible from the interior, consisting of a full bathroom and laundry room. The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing 126 -square-foot addition, permitted in 1949 and located to the rear of the property, which served as an extension to a bedroom. The first floor will be reconfigured to accommodate one downstairs bedroom with a walkin closet, a small laundry room, and a hallway with a desk area. The hallway will lead into the new family room, with a half bathroom, and the outdoor eating area will consist of a 372 -square-foot deck with a maximum height of 4 feet, 4 inches from grade to the top of the landing. The second floor will include two new bedrooms and a full bathroom.

The proposed addition boasts a modern architectural style with large windows, a sleek deck, and a flat roof. The architectural features include large aluminum clad wood casement and awning windows manufactured by Sierra Pacific Windows. The exterior walls will be cladded with Merlex Stucco in Alabaster color and the stucco texture will be a float finish. The applicant is also proposing to add shiplap to the outdoor eating area and aluminum folding doors to create an indoor/outdoor feel (see Figure 11 for proposed materials).
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Figure 11: Proposed Materials


As shown in the photo rendering and front elevations (Figures 12, 13 and Attachment 8), the mass and scale of the proposed project, would be well-proportioned and harmonious with the established neighborhood. The applicant is proposing large windows from all elevations, but to address privacy concerns, the applicant has reduced the number of windows and size of windows to the south elevation (see Figures 13-16 to view elevations and Attachment 8). The overall design of the project would result in an attractive and orderly development as intended by the General Plan and design guidelines. As required and conditioned, the final design, materials, and construction documents would be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division and Building Division prior to permit issuance.

Figure 12: Photo Rendering of the Second-Story Addition


Figure 13: Front (West) Elevation with Retaining Wall


Figure 14: Proposed East Elevation


Figure 15: Proposed South Elevation
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Figure 16: Proposed North Elevation


PROPOSED ELEVATION NORTH

## Findings

In order to approve the project, the Planning Commission shall find that the design and the proposed layout comply with the findings for a Hillside Development Permit, Design Review, and a Variance as stipulated in the South Pasadena Municipal Code. All findings for the proposed project may found within the resolution (Attachment 1).

## Environmental Analysis

This item is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Class 1 exemption includes additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet, in which the project site is in an area where all public facilities are available and is not located in an environmentally sensitive area.

## Alternatives to Consider

Planning Commission may also consider the following alternatives to this recommendation:

1. The Planning Commission may approve the project with modified/added conditions;
2. The Planning Commission may continue the project to address comments discussed; or
3. The Planning Commission may deny the project.

## Public Notification

Hearing notices were sent to all properties within a 300-foot radius of the property and to all properties located within the Southwest Monterey Hills Notification Area on August 31, 2023. A Public Hearing Notice was published on September 1, 2023 in the South Pasadena Review. In addition, the public was made aware that this item was to be considered at a public hearing by virtue of its inclusion on the legally publicly noticed agenda, posting of the same agenda and reports on the City's website.

## Public Comments

At the time of writing this report, staff received eight (8) public comments regarding the proposed project. The letters are in support of the project and are included as Attachment 7.

## Next Steps

If the Planning Commission approves the project, a 15-day appeal period will commence in which any person affected by the decision may appeal the decision for a public hearing by the City Council. Should there be no appeals during this 15-day period, the applicant may proceed through the Plan Check Process with the Building Division and staff will review the construction plans to ensure that all conditions are satisfied.

## Attachments:

1. Resolution \& Conditions of Approval
2. Neighborhood Images
3. Project Narrative
4. Materials Brochures
5. Arborist Report \& Tree Photos
6. Link to Soils \& Engineering Report
7. Public Comments
8. Architectural Plans

## ATTACHMENT 1

Resolution \& Conditions of Approval

P.C. RESOLUTION NO. 23-10


#### Abstract

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA APPROVING PROJECT NO. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR FOR A HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A 343-SQUARE-FOOT, FIRST-STORY ADDITION, A 585-SQUARE-FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION, AND A 372-SQUAREFOOT DECK AND TWO VARIANCES FOR A RETAINING WALL AND A deck exceeding six feet in height at an existing singleFAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 1808 HANSCOM DRIVE (APN: 5308-018-025); AND MAKING A DETERMINATION OF EXEMPTION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)


WHEREAS, on July, 2021, Eda Katharine Tinto and Brendan Vitt (the "applicant") submitted applications for a Hillside Development Permit (HDP) and Design Review Permit (DRX) to add a 343-square-foot first-story addition and a 585-square-foot secondstory addition to an existing 1,134-square-foot, one-story, single-family dwelling, with an existing 350-square-foot basement, located at 1808 Hanscom Drive (APN: 5308-018025). The project also includes requests for the addition of a 400-square-foot deck and the following two variances (VAR) : 1) retaining wall that will exceed six feet in height with the highest portion of the retaining wall being twelve feet in height; and, 2) deck that will exceed six feet in height as the proposed deck is eight feet and two inches in height, as measured from grade to the top of the landing (the above-referenced applications and requests are referred to herein as the "project" or "proposed project"); and

WHEREAS, the subject property is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS) and has a General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 Existing Facilities. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment because the project falls under a Class 1 - Existing Facilities exemption as an addition to an existing structure that will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet;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 is not located in an environmentally sensitive area; and

WHEREAS, the Community Development Department evaluated the project for consistency with the City's General Plan, South Pasadena Municipal Code, the City's Design Guidelines, and all other applicable state and local regulations; and

WHEREAS, on September 1, 2023, the City of South Pasadena Planning Division, published a legal notice in the South Pasadena Review, a local newspaper of general circulation, indicating the date, time, and location of the public hearing in compliance with state law concerning Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR. On August 31, 2023 said public hearing notices were also mailed to each property owner within a 300-foot radius of the project site and within the Southwest Monterey Hills Notification Area in accordance with
the requirements of South Pasadena Municipal Code declaring the project review by the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the South Pasadena Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on September 12, 2023, at which time it considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony, and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public concerning Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR.

## NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA DOES HEREBY FIND, DETERMINE, AND RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated and made an operative part of this resolution.

## SECTION 2: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS

The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Class 1 exemption includes the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures involving negligible or no expansion of existing or former use. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment because the project falls under a Class 1 - Existing Facilities exemption as an addition to an existing structure that will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet; 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 is not located in an environmentally sensitive area.

## SECTION 3: HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS

Based upon the entire record made available at the September 12, 2023 public hearing, including the public hearing, the staff report, the oral presentation, and related documents submitted to the Planning Commission prior to and at the public hearing, the Planning Commission finds and determines that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable findings for approval of a Hillside Development Permit pursuant to the South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC), Section 36.410.065(F), as follows:

## 1. The proposed use complies with requirements of Division 36.340 (Hillside Protection) and all other applicable provisions of this Zoning Code.

The project uses thoughtful site design which conforms to the hillside development standards and design guidelines. The project is considerate of the character and
scale of the existing single-family developments in the vicinity. With the exception of the two variances being requested: 1) to exceed the 6 -foot height limitation of the retaining wall, proposed at 12 feet in height, and 2) to allow a previously unpermitted deck, which exceeds the allowable 6 -foot height to 8 feet, 2 inches, the project as designed and conditioned, will comply with the Hillside Protection Ordinance and the RS standards in the SPMC.
2. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan;

The General Plan land use designation of the site is Low Density Residential, which allows for detached single-family units at a density of 3.51 to 6 units per acre. The proposed project does not involve the addition of another dwelling unit; therefore, the project is consistent with the General Plan. The project is not located within a specific plan.
3. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use would not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use;

The neighborhood is developed with a mix of hillside homes in both architectural style and scale; as required and conditioned, all construction documents, including grading plans and calculations, would be prepared by professional architects or engineers and must be formally reviewed and approved by the appropriate City departments prior to issuing permits. The proposed use of a single-family residential home will remain unchanged and as designed and conditioned, would not be detrimental to the health and safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood.
4. The use, as described and conditionally approved, would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City; and,

Prior to commencing construction, the project is required to comply with and obtain all applicable building permits, including those necessary for grading, utilities, public works, and fire prevention. Additionally, the applicant shall provide a construction management plan, as required in the Southwest Monterey Hills Construction Plan area, prior to the issuance of building permits.
5. The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity, in terms of aesthetics, character, scale, and view protection.

The proposed use of single-family residential will remain unchanged and the addition is consistent with the established residential neighborhood. The proposed addition is set back 35 feet from the front wall plane, which will result in a minimal visual
impact from the front street view. The scale of the project is appropriate in size, when compared to the surrounding neighborhood and the topography of the land and the configuration of neighboring properties minimizes view impacts. With the exception of the variances requested, the proposed design complies with the City's Hillside Design Guidelines, the Hillside Protection Ordinance, and the SPMC, including but not limited to building mass, scale, respect of the topography, and lot coverage

## SECTION 4: DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

Based upon the entire record made available at the September 12, 2023 public hearing, including the public hearing, the staff report, the oral presentation, and related documents submitted to the Planning Commission prior to and at the public hearing, the Planning Commission finds and determines that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable findings for approval of a Design Review Permit pursuant to the South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC), Section 36.410.040(I), as follows:

1. Is consistent with the General Plan, any adopted design guidelines and any applicable design criteria for specialized areas (e.g., designated historic district or other special districts, plan developments, or specific plans);

The General Plan designation for the subject property is Low Density Residential and the project complies with the density of one dwelling and use. With the exception of the two variances being requested by the Applicant, the proposed project complies with the City of South Pasadena's Design Guidelines for Hillside Homes as to architecture, scale, building mass, building height, lot coverage, and compatibility with the neighborhood. The surrounding neighborhood includes a mix of large, multistory homes and small, one-story homes and a variety of architectural styles. The proposed addition will be to the rear of the property and will have minimal view impacts from hilltop homes.
2. Will adequately accommodate the functions and activities proposed for the site, will not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of the neighboring, existing, or future developments, and will not create adverse pedestrian or traffic hazards;

The project involves construction of an addition to an existing single-family home. The addition will provide additional space for residential living, with indoor and outdoor areas incorporated into the design. The ground level addition will include a family room and a half bathroom and the second-story addition will accommodate two additional bedrooms and one full bathroom. With the variance for the retaining wall height, the property will be in compliance with the Southwest Monterey Hills guest parking requirement. The proposed addition is consistent with the design standards. Based upon the height and mass of the proposed addition and its location to the rear of the property, the addition will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring, existing, or future developments. As conditioned, the project's mass, scale, bulk, and temporary construction activities would not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of the neighboring, existing, or future developments, and will not create
adverse pedestrian or traffic hazards. A construction management plan will be reviewed and approved by staff during the Building and Public Works permitting process.
3. Is compatible with the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood and that all reasonable design efforts have been made to maintain the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by SPMC Section 36.410.040 and the General Plan; and

The project site is surrounded by multi-story residential buildings of different architectural styles and sizes. Except for the two variances sought, the project complies with all the development standards for zoning and hillside lots. The proposed addition is compatible with the neighborhood and with a 35-foot step back from the front wall plane, it will have minimal street view impacts. The building height, size, and form fits the size of the lot. As proposed, the project complies with requirements contemplated by SPMC Section 36.410.040 and the General Plan.
4. Would provide a desirable environment for its occupants and neighbors, and is aesthetically of good composition, materials, and texture that would remain aesthetically appealing with a reasonable level of maintenance and upkeep.

The proposed project has been designed with consideration to its future occupants and neighbors. The proposed project uses appropriate materials that complement the existing architecture with stucco wall cladding. The home features large clean straight lines; glass railing systems at the lower level; large windows at the north, east, and west elevation; minimal windows at the south elevation for added privacy with the adjacent property; shiplap, and a flat roof. The proposed project incorporates a composition of high-quality materials that further assists in allowing for the preservation of a desirable and aesthetically appealing presentation with reasonable maintenance.

## SECTION 5: VARIANCE FINDINGS FOR INCREASE IN RETAINING WALL HEIGHT AND INCREASE IN DECK HEIGHT

Based upon the entire record made available at the September 12, 2023 public hearing, including the public hearing, the staff report, the oral presentation, and related documents submitted to the Planning Commission prior to and at the public hearing, the Planning Commission finds and determines that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable findings to grant a Variance for: A) increased retaining wall height, and B) increased deck height, pursuant to the South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC), Section 36.410.080, as follows:

1. There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property (e.g., location, shape, size, surroundings, topography, or other conditions), so that the strict application of this Zoning Code denies the property owner privileges enjoyed by other property owners in the vicinity and within the same zoning district, or creates an unnecessary and involuntarily created hardship, or

## unreasonable regulation which makes it impractical to require compliance with the development standards;

## Retaining Wall

There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which consists of an average slope of 26 percent and towards the front of the property, where the retaining wall is proposed, the slope is significant. As such, a retaining wall is needed to properly secure the hillside to accommodate a guest parking space, as is required in the Southwest Monterey Hills area, in accordance with SPMC, Section 36.340.050(H).

Addtionally, the property currently has three mature trees (two Pines and one Toyon) that help stabilize the front hillside at the northern portion of the lot. In order to comply with the terracing requirement, due to the steepness of the slope, the grading cut would be increased further into the property, resulting in the removal of the trees. To comply with the landscaping requirement and to minimize the visual impact of the wall, the applicant is proposing to add a planter at the end of the guest parking space, which will be planted with Santa Barbara Sage, a bush that grows up to three feet in height, and Cleveland Sage, a perennial shrub that is native to Southern California and can grow to four feet in height. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to cover the wall with the wall-climbing vine, Star Jasmine.

This variance request to permit the height of retaining walls to exceed the 6-foot standard in SPMC 36.340.040(I) is common for Hillside Development Permit projects. In order for there to be minimal impact to the slope and to save the three mature trees, the applicant is adding the guest parking space parallel to the street, as opposed to the preferred perpendicular parking. The retaining wall is proposed to be 12 feet in height to safely facilitate the use of this residentially zoned site.

## Deck

There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which consists of an average slope of 26 percent and the front of the property is steeper. The deck is set back 25 feet from the front property line, but where the grade meets the residential building, there is a decline of the grade; as such, the applicant is requesting a variance to permit the deck, which at the lowest grade is 8 feet 2 inches in height from grade to the top of the landing. The deck is painted with the color scheme matching the existing home and is utilized to access the basement, which can only be accessed from the exterior and would create a hardship if the applicant did not have direct access to the basement.

## 2. Granting the Variance would:

a. Be necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other property owners in the same vicinity and zoning district, and denied to the subject property owner;

## Retaining Wall

The subject site is surrounded by existing single-family residences of varying architectural styles and sizes. The existing home was built before the City Council's adoption of the current hillside regulations, adopted in 2002, as such does not conform to parking standards. The applicant is proposing an addition to the existing home, but shall first comply with the off-street guest parking requirement of the Southwest Monterey Hills area. As such, the applicant is proposing a 12 -foot retaining wall to accommodate the required parking. The parking space will be parallel to the street to reduce the impacts of the wall on the surrounding residential neighborhood and excavation of the hillside. The wall, positioned parallel to the street, also has minimal impact to the three mature trees.

## Deck

The residential dwelling, originally constructed in 1927, was built with a small basement that is not accessible from the interior. As such, the deck is necessary to provide access to the basement.

## b. Be consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan, and the limitations established by the 1983 initiative;

The proposed retaining wall and deck are consistent with the General Plan, the City's adopted Design Guidelines for additions to single-family residences on hillsides, and the height limit established by the 1983 initiative. The proposed addition is designed with consideration of the character and scale of the existing single-family developments in the vicinity.

As conditioned, the project will comply with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan as follows:

Goal 19: "To ensure that new development within hillside areas of South Pasadena does not adversely impact the character of the City."

Policy 19.7: "Discourage Hillside Grading which damages the integrity of hillside areas in order to create views."

The retaining wall was designed parallel to the street to reduce grading. The documents reviewed by the City include a topographic map, slope analysis, and preliminary grading plan prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer. The applicant will provide a final grading plan prepared by Registered Professional Engineer. As required and conditioned, the final grading plan will be approved by the Public Works Department and the Building Division prior to grading permit issuance. As such, the grading for the retaining wall would not
impact the safety of the site, adjacent properties, or the general safety and welfare of the public.
c. Not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district; and

The granting of the Variances for the retaining wall and deck would not constitute a grant of special privileges that are inconsistent with the limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district. The subject site consists of a steep uphill slope and sits within the middle of developed parcels in a densely developed residential neighborhood consisting of singlefamily homes on substandard hillside lots and narrow streets. The subject site has a steep terrain and the increased retaining wall height will save the three mature trees and will also accommodate the additional guest parking requirement, as required in the Southwest Monterey Hills area.
d. Not be materially detrimental to the public convenience, health, interest, safety, or welfare of the City, or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zoning district in which the property is located.

## Retaining Wall

The excavation into the hillside has been minimized as much as possible, as it is situated parallel to the street, and 12 -foot high retaining wall is proposed to help maintain the hillside.

## Deck

The deck is currently existing and has not constituted a danger to the surrounding property. With the proper permitting process, the applicant will be required to undergo inspections by the Building Division that will ensure the continued safety of the existing residents and the surrounding neighborhood.
3. The proposed project would be compatible with the existing aesthetics, character, and scale of the surrounding neighborhood, and considers impacts on neighboring properties.

The architectural style of the neighborhood surrounding the project site is mixed with various architectural styles. Retaining walls and raised decks are commonly found in the area. The requested retaining wall and deck are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

## SECTION 6: RECORD OF PROCEEDING

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's decision is based, which include, but are not limited to,
the staff reports, as well as all materials that support the staff reports for the proposed project, are located in the Community Development Department of the City of South Pasadena at 1414 Mission Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030. The custodian of these documents is the City Clerk of the City of South Pasadena.

## SECTION 7: DETERMINATION

Based upon the findings outlined in Sections 2-5 above and provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena hereby approves Project No. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR and the applications for a Hillside Development Permit, Design Review Permit, and two Variances for the addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 1808 Hanscom Drive, subject to the Conditions of Approval that are attached hereto as "Attachment 1 ".

## SECTION 8: APPEAL

Any interested person may appeal this decision or any portion of this decision to the City Council. Pursuant to the South Pasadena Municipal Code, any such appeal must befiled with the City, in writing, and with appropriate appeal fee, no later than fifteen (15) days, following the date of the Planning Commission's final action.

## SECTION 9: CERTIFICATION OF THE RESOLUTION

The Secretary shall certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena at a duly noticed regular meeting held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2023.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this $12^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2023 by the following vote:

## AYES:

NOES:

## ABSENT:

## ABSTAIN:

Laura Dahl, Chair

## ATTEST:

Amitabh Barthakur, Secretary to the Planning Commission

## EXHIBIT "A"

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

## PROJECT NO. 2435-HDP/DRX/VAR

1808 Hanscom Drive (APN: 5308-018-025)

The following approvals are granted as described below and as shown on the development plans submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2023:

1. Hillside Development Permit (HDP) for a proposed 343-square-foot, first story addition and a 585-square-foot, second-story addition (928 total square feet) to an existing 1,134-squre-foot, one-story, single-family dwelling, with a 350 -square-foot basement and a 170 -square-foot one-car garage. The project also includes a proposed 400 -square-foot deck;
2. Design Review Permit (DRX) for the review of the design aspects of the proposed development; and,
3. Two Variances (VAR) to deviate from development standards to allow the project to provide the following:
a. An increase in the height of a retaining wall, which will be 12 feet in height along the front of the property to accommodate guest parking. Per South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC), Section 36.340 .040 (I) retaining walls are limited to 6 feet in height and shall avoid a uniform plane; and,
b. To permit an unpermitted 178 -square-foot deck and to allow for it to maintain at $8^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ in height as measured from grade to the top of the landing. Per SPMC, Section 36.340.050(D), no portion of the walking surface of a deck with visible underpinnings shall exceed a height of six feet above grade.

Note: As a convenience to the applicant, the development requirements from applicable Departments/Agenc ies are listed herein. These requirements list what the applicant will be required to comply with in order to receive a Building Permit, a Certificate of Occupancy, or other Departmentissued entitlement.

## PLANNING DIVISION:

P1. Approval by the Planning Commission does not constitute a building permit or authorization to begin any construction. An appropriate permit issued by the South Pasadena Building Division must be obtained prior to construction, enlargement, relocation, conversion or demolition of any building or structure on any of the properties involved with the project.

P2. All other requirements of any law, ordinance, or regulation of the State of California, City of South Pasadena, and any other government entity shall be complied with.
P3. Compliance with and execution of all conditions listed herein shall be necessary prior to obtaining any occupancy inspection clearance and/or prior to obtaining any occupancy clearance.

P4. Any changes to the proposed project shall be submitted for review and approval to the Planning

Division.
P5. The applicant and each successor in interest to the property which is the subject of this project approval, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of South Pasadena and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul any approval of the City, City Council or Planning Commission concerning this approval. In the event of any claim or lawsuit, the applicant and/or successor shall submit a deposit in such amount as the City reasonably determines necessary to protect the City from exposure to fees, costs or liability with respect to such claim or lawsuit.
P6. The construction site and the surrounding area shall be kept free of all loose materials resembling trash and debris in excess of that material used for immediate construction purposes. Such excess may include, but is not limited to: the accumulation of debris, garbage, lumber, scrap metal, concrete, asphalt, piles of earth, salvage materials, abandoned or discarded furniture, appliances or other household fixtures.
P7. The applicant shall sign the Southwest Monterey Hills Construction Regulations Affidavit prior to submitting a Building Permit Application with the Building Division.
P8. The hours of construction shall be limited to the following: 8:00 am and 7:00 pm Monday through Friday, 9:00 am and 7:00 pm Saturday, and construction on Sundays limited to 10:00 am to 6:00 pm.
P9. During construction, the clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations that cause excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular water or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures:
a. All material excavated or graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferable in the late morning and after work is done for the day;
b. All material transported on-site or off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust;
c. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust; and
d. Visible dust beyond the property line emanating from the project shall be prevented to the maximum extent feasible.

P10. All on-site landscaping, including the front yard and parkway areas, which are damaged during construction shall be revitalized upon completion of construction, as necessary, prior to final building permits. All landscaping, including the parkway, shall be maintained in a healthy, green, pruned, growing condition.
P11. A construction sign with contact information for the contractor shall be posted on-site during construction.

P12. The applicant shall submit a proposal to the Planning Division to legalize any unpermitted structures and fences on site, prior to final building permit issuance. Structures and fence shall comply with the regulations stipulated in the South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC) and California Building Code. If the structures or fences cannot comply, the applicant shall obtain a demolition permit to remove the unpermitted structures or fences.

## BUILDING DIVISION:

B1. The second sheet of building plans is to list all conditions of approval and to include a copy of the Planning Decision letter. This information shall be incorporated into the plans prior to the first submittal for plan check.

B2. Plans prepared in compliance with the code in effect shall be submitted to Building Division for review prior to permit issuance.

B3. Prior to the application of a building or grading permit, a preliminary Geotechnical report that specifically identifies and proposes mitigation measures for any soils or geological problems that may affect site stability or structural integrity shall be approved by the Building Official or his/her designee. The applicant shall reimburse the City for all costs incurred to have the project soils report evaluated by an independent, third-party, peer-level soils and /or geological engineer. Approval letter of the geotechnical report review shall be copied and pasted on the first sheet of building and grading plans.

B4. School Developmental Fees shall be paid to the School District prior to the issuance of the building permit.

B5. Park Impact Fee to be paid at the time of permit issuance.
B6. Per Chapter 16A of the City of South Pasadena Municipal Code, Growth fee to be paid at the time of permit issuance.

B7. Plans shall be prepared under the supervision of an architect licensed in the State of California or a civil or structural engineer registered in the State of California. Each sheet of the plans and the cover sheet of the calculations is to be stamped and signed by the person preparing the plans. 5353 and 6730 of the State Business and Professions Code

B8. Structural calculations prepared under the direction of an architect, civil engineer or structural engineer shall be provided.

B9. The owner shall retain the soils engineer preparing the Preliminary Soils and/or Geotechnical Investigation accepted by the City for observation of all grading, site preparation, and compaction testing. Observation and testing shall not be performed by another soils and/or geotechnical engineer unless the subsequent soils and/or geotechnical engineer submits and has accepted by Building Division, a new Preliminary Soils and/or Geotechnical Investigation.

B10. A geotechnical and soils investigation report is required, the duties of the soils engineer of record, as indicated on the first sheet of the approved plans, shall include the following:
a) Observation of cleared areas and benches prepared to receive fill;
b) Observation of the removal of all unsuitable soils and other materials;
c) The approval of soils to be used as fill material;
d) Inspection of compaction and placement of fill;
e) The testing of compacted fills; and
f) The inspection of review of drainage devices.

B11. The geotechnical and soils engineer shall review and approve the project grading and foundation plans to show compliance that their recommendations have been properly implemented.

B12. A grading and drainage plan shall be approved prior to issuance of the building permit. The grading and drainage plan shall indicate how all storm drainage including contributory drainage from adjacent lots is carried to the public way or drainage structure approved to receive storm water.

B13. Stormwater Planning Program LID Plan Checklist (MS4-1 Form) completed by Engineer of Record shall be copied on the first sheet of Grading Plans. The form can be found at the following link
https://www.dropbox.com/s/5p4yf08beipzyot/SP\ MS41\ LID\ Determination\ Form.pdf?dl=0

B14. Existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures shall comply with redevelopment requirements per City's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance when such projects create, add, or replace ten thousand square feet of impervious surface area, or involve two thousand five hundred square feet or more in disturbed area where any portion of the disturbed area includes either or both an existing earth (native or otherwise) surface or a man-made surface (whether impervious or not) with an existing slope that is equal to or greater than twenty-five percent when calculated in accordance with the methods prescribed by the current Zoning Code.

B15. Foundation inspection will not be made until setback on the south side of the addition has been surveyed and the setbacks determined to be in accordance with the approved plans by a land surveyor licensed by the State of California. THIS NOTE IS TO BE PLACED ON THE FOUNDATION PLAN IN A PROMINENT LOCATION.

B16. Project shall comply with the CalGreen Residential mandatory requirements.
B17. Separate plan review and permit is required for each detached retaining wall.
B18. When required by Fire Department, all fire sprinkler hangers must be designed, and their location approved by an engineer or an architect. Calculations must be provided indicating that the hangers are designed to carry the tributary weight of the water filled pipe plus a 250pound point load. A plan indicating this information must be stamped by the engineer or the architect and submitted for approval prior to issuance of the building permit. A separate permit is required for Fire Sprinklers.

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:

PW1. The applicant shall pay all applicable City and LA County fees, including Public Works Department plan review fee and permit fees per the current adopted Master Fee Schedule which can be found on the City's website. This includes all costs incurred by the City and the Public Works Department for the use of professional services or consultants in the review, investigation, and/or plan check of the public improvement plans. The applicant shall provide receipts of all applicable fees paid prior to submitting plans for review.

PW2. The applicant shall provide a deposit of $\$ 12,000$ for a Deputy Inspector for hillside construction. Whenever the balance drops below $\$ 6,000$, the applicant shall be required to make an additional deposit of $\$ 6,000$. Any unused funds will be refunded to the applicant at the completion of the project.

PW3. The applicant shall obtain City approval for any modifications or revisions to the approval of this project.

PW4. All sheets shall be stamped, if necessary, and signed by the appropriate persons in responsible control of plans, specifications, and instruments of service per Business and Professions Code Section 5536.2.

PW5. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the Public Works Department for any work proposed within the public right-of-way.

PW6. If applicable, the applicant shall provide a covenant for unconditional and indefinite maintenance of any private improvements within the public right-of-way. This covenant shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department and the City Attorney and a fully executed covenant, in recordable form, shall be provided to the City prior to obtaining a permit.

PW7. Hanscom Drive shall be photographed and video recorded before the start of construction and after construction for assessing the damage caused to the street by construction related activity/traffic. The applicant will be responsible to restore the public right-of-way to its original condition and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. These video recordings and photographs shall be submitted to the City before the start of the project and immediately upon completion of the project.

PW8. The applicant shall provide a Construction Management Plan to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of permits. The Construction Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, types of proposed construction activities, an on-site staging plan, haul route, construction schedule, and shall indicate a contractor parking location. All vehicles including workers' vehicles shall not be parked on the streets or public right-of-way. An offsite parking with a shuttle service should be provided if necessary.

PW9. The applicant shall provide a construction schedule for each stage of any major activities (i.e. demolition, grading, material delivery, etc.) and the timing of special access if necessary, as it relates to site staging, traffic, and access. If there are any changes to the construction schedule, the applicant shall submit a revised schedule to the Public Works Department.

PW10. Any construction activity that may require roadway closures will require a traffic control plan prepared by a CA licensed civil or traffic engineer or a C-31 licensed contractor to be submitted for review. Safe pedestrian access, including ADA and bicycle, must be maintained at all times. At least 48 hours advance notice shall be given to all impacted businesses and residents for street and lane closures. All street closures will require an encroachment permit from the Public Works Department. Street closures are only allowed within the time limits specified in SPMC Chapter 19A. Approved street closures require

Portable Changeable Message Signs (PCMS) to be placed in advance of the project site.
PW11. The applicant shall obtain oversize/overload permits from the Public Works Department for any oversized equipment used during the stages of construction, including, but not limited to: demolition; clearing and grubbing; grading; material disposal; drilling for piles and/or caissons; trenching for footings; excavation for retaining walls; core sampling of soils; etc.

PW12. If applicable, the applicant shall provide a traffic control plan prepared by a CA licensed civil or traffic engineer or C -31 licensed contractor for the duration of the construction and include the City's standard notes for traffic control.

PW13. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide an erosion control plan for dust control techniques to be implemented during project construction which shall include, but not be limited to, use of appropriate BMPs, plans for daily watering of the construction site, limitations on construction hours, and adherence to standard construction practices such as watering of inactive and perimeter areas.

PW14. The applicant shall provide a detailed drainage plan signed and stamped by a CA licensed civil engineer. Cross lot drainage is not permitted. Provide a copy of the approved plan from the Building \& Safety Department.

PW15. Temporary bins (low boy), if used, shall be "roll off" style to be provided by Athens Services. Athens Services has an exclusive agreement with the City for the provision of trash removal services: only Athens dumpsters can be used. Any dumpsters placed on the roadway shall require a protective barrier underneath (such as plywood) to protect the pavement. The applicant shall obtain a dumpster permit from the Public Works Department.

PW16. No overnight storage of materials or equipment within the public right-of-way shall be permitted.

PW17. The applicant shall show all existing and proposed trees, including size and species, and indicate their disposition. If any trees are to be removed, the applicant shall apply for a tree removal permit with the Public Works Department per City Ordinance No. 2328 amending Section 34.10 of SPMC. See SPMC Section 34.12 for the required information and process for the trees that are proposed to be removed and/or impacted during construction. Replacement trees shall be planted per SPMC Section 34.12-5. If existing trees are to remain on the site, the applicant shall note on the plans "no trees to be removed" and provide methods of protecting existing trees during construction.

PW18. The applicant shall show the existing grade, location, and dimensions of all existing and proposed conditions within the public-right-of-way including, but not limited to: curb and gutter, sidewalk, driveway, traffic striping, signage, utilities, storm drain facilities, trees, and other features.

PW19. If applicable, the applicant shall construct a retaining wall along the perimeter of the property for slope protection and to prevent sloughing of dirt onto the sidewalk.

PW20. The applicant shall provide a 24 -hour emergency contact number for the applicant and contact information of all utility agencies involved/impacted/potentially impacted by this
project on the title sheet of the plans.
PW21. If applicable, the applicant shall provide clearance letters from utility companies for any proposed relocation of utility lines that encroach on the properties prior to obtaining permits for the project.

PW22. The applicant shall show all utility poles adjacent to the properties and note to protect-inplace.

PW23. The applicant shall show the location of all existing utilities (i.e. sewer lateral and water utility service lines) on adjacent street(s), as well as location and size of all existing or proposed utility service lines serving the property. Show all utility points of connection (POC).

PW24. The applicant shall show the location and area of trench sections for any proposed sewer and water line connection within the public right-of-way. The applicant shall provide a trench restoration detail per City standards if any new utility connections are proposed.

## FIRE DEPARTMENT:

FD1. Required Code References: Current South Pasadena Municipal Code (SPMC); 2022 California Fire Code (CFC); 2022 California Building Code and NFPA standards.

FD2. Fire Sprinklers are required. Submit a separate plan to City for approval.

FD3. (CFC 903.1) General. Automatic Sprinkler systems shall comply with this section.
FD4. (CFC 903.2.8) Group R. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section
903.3shall be provided throughout all buildings with a Group R fire area.

FD5. Fire sprinklers shall not be able to shut off unless the domestic line to the property is shut off. There shall be no other means to turn off water to the sprinkler system. Ensure this sprinkler system is installed by an approved C-16 licensed company. Please provide a drawing of the sprinkler system to the Fire Department prior to beginning of work.

FD6. (CFC 903.3.5) Water Supplies. Water supplies for automatic sprinkler systems shall comply with this section and the standards referenced in Section 903.3.1. The potable water supply shall be protected against backflow in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 13114.7.

FD7. (CFC 507.1) Required water supply. An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection shall be provided to premises upon which facilities, buildings or portions of buildings are hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction.
FD8. (CFC 507.3) Fire flow. Fire flow requirements for buildings or portions of buildings and facilities shall be determined by an approved method or Appendix B.

FD9. 507.4 Water Supply Test. The fire code official shall be notified prior to the water supply test. Water supply tests shall be witnessed by the fire code official or approved documentation of the test shall be provided to the fire code official prior to final approval of the water supply
system.
FD10. 903.2.11.9 Additions and Alterations. All existing buildings and structures, regardless of the type of construction, type of occupancy or area, shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system conforming to Section 903.3 and this code upon the occurrence of any of the following conditions:

1) An addition of over 750 square feet to any building or structure which creates a fire area large enough that if the existing building or structure plus proposed work were being built new today, an automatic sprinkler system would be required under this code;
2) Any addition to an existing building which has fire sprinklers installed;
3) Within any twelve (12) calendar month period of time, any alteration, including repairs, to any existing building or structure, where the valuation of the proposed work exceeds fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the valuation of the entire building or structure, as determined by the Building Official, and where such alteration, including repairs, creates or alters a fire are large enough that if the existing building or structure were being built new today, and automatic sprinkler system would be required by this code;
4) Within any twelve (12) calendar month period of time, combination of any addition and alteration to any existing building or structure where the valuation of the proposed work exceeds fifty percent (50\%) of the valuation of the entire building or structure, as determined by the Building Official, and where such addition and alteration creates or alters a fire area large enough that if the existing building or structure were being built new today, an automatic sprinkler system would be required by this code;
5) An automatic sprinkler system shall be installed throughout any existing Group $R$ Occupancy building when the floor area of the Alteration or Combination of an Addition and Alteration, within any twelve (12) calendar months, is $50 \%$ or more of area and or valuation of the existing structure and where the scope of the work exposes building framing and facilitates sprinkler installation and is such that the Fire Code Official determines that the complexity of installing a sprinkler system would be similar as in a new building.

FD11. New and existing buildings shall have approved address numbers, building numbers or approved building identification placed in a position that is plainly legible and visible from the street or road fronting the property. These numbers shall contrast with their background. Where required by the fire code official, address numbers shall be provided in additional approved locations to facilitate emergency response. Address numbers shall be Arabic numbers or alphabetical letters. Numbers shall be a minimum of 4 inches ( 101.6 mm ) high with a minimum stroke width of 0.5 inch ( 12.7 mm ). Where access is by means of a private road and the building cannot be viewed from the public way, a monument, pole or other sign or means shall be used to identify the structure. Address numbers shall be maintained.

FD12. Notwithstanding anything else in this code, or any other code incorporated, herein, by reference any new roof shall be of Class "A" roof material.

FD13. Groups R-2, R-2.1, R-3, R-3.1, and R-4. Single or multiple-station smoke alarms shall be installed and maintained in Groups R-2, R-2.1, R-3, R-3.1 and R-4 regardless of occupant load at all of the following locations:

1) On the Ceiling or wall outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of
bedrooms;
2) In each room used for sleeping purposes.
3) In each story within a dwelling unit, including basements but not including crawl spaces and uninhabitable attics. In dwellings or dwelling units with split levels and without an intervening door between the adjacent levels, a smoke alarm installed on the upper level shall suffice for the adjacent lower level provided that the lower level is less than one full story below the upper level.
FD14. Where more than one smoke alarm is require to be installed within an individual dwelling unit or sleeping unit in Group R-1, R-2, R-3, R-3.1, or R-4, the smoke alarms shall be interconnected in such a manner that the activation of one alarm will activate all of the alarms in the individual unit. The alarm shall be clearly audible in all bedrooms over background noise levels with all intervening doors closed (CFC 907.2.11.3).
FD15. For new construction, required carbon monoxide alarms shall receive their primary power from the building wiring where such wiring is served from a commercial source and shall be equipped with a battery back-up. Alarm wiring shall be directly connected to the permanent building wiring without a disconnecting switch other than as required for overcurrent protection.
FD16. Carbon monoxide alarms combined with smoke alarms shall comply with all applicable standards, and requirements for listing and approval by the Office of the State Fire Marshal, for smoke alarms.
FD17. Group U private garages and carports accessory to Group R-3 occupancies. Carports with habitable space above and attached garages, accessory to Group R-3 occupancies, shall be protected by residential fire sprinklers in accordance with this section. Residential fire sprinklers shall be connected to, and installed in accordance with, and automatic residential fire sprinkler system that complies with Section R313 of the California Residential Code or with NFPA 13D. Fire sprinklers shall be residential sprinklers or quick-response sprinklers, designed to provide a minimum density of $0.05 / \mathrm{ft}^{2}(2.04 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{min})$ over the area of the garage and/or carport, but not to exceed two sprinklers for hydraulic calculation purposes. Garage doors shall not be considered obstructions with respect to sprinkler placement.

FD18. Buildings under construction shall meet the condition of "Chapter 33 Fire Safety During Construction and Demolition" of the 2022 California Fire Code. Structures under construction, alteration or demolition, shall be provided with no less than one 2A10BC fire extinguisher as follows:

1) At each stairway on all floor levels where combustibles materials have accumulated.
2) In every storage and construction shed.
3) Where special hazards exist included but not limited to, the storage and use of combustible and flammable liquids.
FD19. For any questions regarding water meter, please contact Public Works at 626-403 7240.
FD20. The City of South Pasadena Fire Department reserves the right to change or otherwise modify requirements based upon receiving additional project information or other unforeseen circumstances.

## ATTACHMENT 2

Neighborhood Images


1807 Hanscom Drive
1803 Hanscom Drive
Directly across the street from 1808


1815 Hanscom Drive
1811 Hanscom Drive
Edge of 1807 Hanscom Drive

ATTACHMENT 3
Project Narrative

## Project Narrative for Proposed Addition to 1808 Hanscom Drive

This project proposes to add a 2 -story addition off the back of the existing single-family home. The existing home is currently a 1-story, 2 bedroom, 1 bath home of approximately 1069 square feet. The project will add approximately 818 square feet, resulting in a 3 bedroom, 2.5 bath home with a family room.

The existing house is set on top of a ridgeline and is accessible from a stairway up to the house from the street below. The proposed addition is off the back off the house, into the existing large yard area. Because the addition will be off the back of the existing house, only the upper portion of the second floor of the addition will be visible from the street below.

The existing house has a one-car garage. Due to the large, mature trees on the front of the property, the project seeks to add one uncovered parallel parking spot as the required guest parking spot. The project requests a variance related to this new parking spot. Variance 1: Given the slope of the hillside at the front of the property and the location of the trees, we are requesting permission to use a retaining wall over 6 feet high to construct this new parking spot.

There is currently an unpermitted deck on the existing home which has a height over six feet. The deck is an extension of the living/dining room of the existing house. This deck was part of the home when we purchased the home for our family in 2017. Variance 2: We are requesting a variance to allow us to retain the deck at its current height and obtain the proper permit.

The existing home is a Spanish-style home. The proposed addition will use fine sand stucco for exterior walls and will maintain the same existing style of a flat roof and windows with wooden trim. The existing home currently has a rough stucco exterior with hand-drawn lines made in the stucco. As part of this project, we plan to change the stucco texture and paint colors of the existing house, returning to a more traditional Spanish-style look with an off-white fine sand stucco finish, black window frames, and a complimentary paint color for the window wood trim. The family room (the room on the first floor of the addition) will have an exterior door that slides open to the yard and new deck. Please see the 4 included brochures from Merlex Stucco, True Exterior Siding and Trim, Sierra Pacific Windows, and Panoramic Doors.

We currently have a front garden of native and drought-tolerant plants. As documented in our landscape plan, we plan to continue to use native and drought-tolerant plants in the area above the new parking space, and to create natural terraces that will allow for further plantings. We also plan to design the area of the parking spot and the new retaining walls to allow for plantings.

## ATTACHMENT 4

Materials Brochures

DEOADES OF CBMOR
Merlex Stucco
KEEPING IT PREMIOM SINCE 1963
Phone: $714-637-1700$ vacrice@merleasom

## COLOR CHART

## STANDARD COLORS

P-1210
MOROCCAN SAND (B Base)
COLOR $\quad$ P-174 (B Base)
DESERT BEIGE (B




P-505 AGATE (B Base)


P-706
COTTONSEED (A Base)


P-192
CARAMELO (B Base)

Please order a stucco sample prior to placing your order.


P-1963 SWEET PEA (B Base)


P-1527
IRON MOUNTAIN (B Base)


P-872 MYSTIC PINE (B Base)

P-6
EL DORADO (A Base)


P-450 CAFÉ MOCHA (B Base)


P-124
IVORY POWDER (A Base)


P-171
FLINTRIDGE (B Base)

## PREMIUM COLORS

There is a nominal extra charge for our premium colors.


LAMPS PLUS
The Nation's Largest Lighting Retailer

# Outdoor Lighting to match existing outdoor lighting on existing house 

^ / Outdoor Lighting / Security / 10 in. high or less / Black / Style \# 86X26


MOST POPULAR<br>Arnett 10 1/2" High Black Dusk-to-Dawn Outdoor Wall Light

8 Reviews

## SALE

## $\$ 99.95$

$\$ 149.99$ (i) | Save $\$ 50.00$ | Ends 9/25/23

FREE SHIPPING \& FREE RETURNS*
Ships Today if ordered in the next 3 Hr . 32 Min .

## ADD TO CART

OSAVE

P Product Help \& Store Availability


## Product Details

( ${ }^{\star}$ * Dark Sky
Dusk to Dawn

Complete with a dawn-to-dusk photocell, this barn-style outdoor wall light illuminates a dark outdoor space.

## Additional Info:

A careful balance of rusticity and elegance, this outdoor wall light is the perfect addition to your patio or balcony. In a classic urban barn style with a curving neck, it invokes a charmingly old-fashioned feel. A smooth black finish gives this fixture a clean, almost contemporary touch. It requires vertical installation and is equipped with a built-in dawn to dusk photocell that provides lighting you don't have to worry about.

## FRANKLIN IRON WORKS ${ }^{*}$

Bulbs for Style \#86X26

- 12 1/4" wide $\times 10$ 1/2" high. Extends 14 $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ from the wall. Backplate is $71 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ wide $\times 1^{\prime \prime}$ deep. Shade is $121 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ wide $x$ $4^{\prime \prime}$ high. Weighs 2.9 lbs .
- Uses one maximum 100 watt standardmedium base Type-A bulb (not included).
- Barn-style outdoor wall light with gooseneck arm. Inspired by industrial and barn lighting. From the Franklin Iron Works ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ brand.
- Dusk-to-dawn photocell built-in. Turns the light automatically on at night, off at sunrise. Black finish dome, arm, and wallplate. Aluminum construction.
- Vertical installation only with light pointed down as shown. Distance from mounting point to top of fixtur $T^{2}$ Chat $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$.

Specifications

Product Attributes

| Finish | Black |
| ---: | :--- |
| Style | Farmhouse |
| Brand | Franklin Iron Works |
| Dark Sky | Yes |
| Dusk to Dawn | Yes |

Technical Specifications

| Height | 10.50 inches |
| ---: | :--- |
| Width | 12.25 inches |
| Weight | 2.90 pounds |
| Max Wattage | 100 watts |

More You May Like I View All


Franklin Iron Works Arnett 10 1/2" High Black Outdoor Wall Light
\$79.95 Sale


Gough 12 1/2" High Bronze Motion Sensor Outdoor Wall Barn Light
\$99.95 Sale


Danbury 5" High Black Dark Sky LED Outdoor Barn Wall Lights Set of 2
\$129.99


Possini Euro Ratner 5 1/2" Modern LED Outdoor Wall
\$129.99

Related Items


Franklin Iron Works Arnett 10 1/2" High Black Outdoor Wall Light
\$79.95 Sale


Arnett 10 1/2" High Black Dusk-to-Dawn Outdoor Wall Lights Set of 2
\$199.95 Sale


Arnett 10 1/2" High Black Outdoor Barn Light Wall Lights Set of 2
\$229.99


Franklin Iron Outdoor Wall \$79.95 Sale


PRODUCT BROCHURE


## ALUMINUM FOLDING DOORS

Energy Efficient Aluminum Doors In Any Color
The Signature Series aluminum door system incorporates an integrated thermal break to maximize thermal efficiency. Unlimited widths up to 10 ' tall. Over 200 colors.

## KEY FEATURES

+ High-quality extruded aluminum for strength and performance
+ Ideal for hot and cold climates
+ Main swing door on every system
+ Unlimited width system
+ Inswing or outswing
+ Up to 10 ' tall
+ Panel width of 20-40"
+ Interlocking tongue and groove for superior seal and security
+ Concealed multi-point locking system for ease of operation and security
+ Robust panels suitable for all environments
+ Thermal core for reduced thermal transfer
+ White, bronze, and black textured
+ Over 200 RAL colors
+ Custom colors available
+ Add a screen system for year-round comfort and protection


## OPTIONS

Unlimited Colors
Standard Colors: Black, Bronze, and White
Premium Color: Clear Anodized
Architectural Colors: 23 Modern Design Colors
mal cuve $\sim 1$ Colors
Custom Colors. Matching services available


Black Textured Si tuary Bronze


$200+$ RAL Colors

Real Wood Interior
Enjoy the luxurious feeling of a real wood interior.
Standard


Premium





## Signature

The Signature Series aluminum door offers ultimate versatility and options. This energy-efficient, thermally broken door utilizes our eeCore (Energy Efficient Core) Technology for optimal thermal performance, durability and beauty while enjoying maximum comfort with energy savings. The Signature Series door is our most versatile option allowing for extra wide systems, postless corner systems, and flag door (door + window) configurations. Available in unlimited system widths up to 10 ' high with panel widths of 20-40".

## ABSOLUTE

The Absolute Series vinyl door is an aluminum-reinforced vinyl door built in a stile and rail design. While most vinyl doors are constructed with fusion-welded corners, our design incorporates mechanically fastened corners giving it clean sightlines and a refined appearance perfect for any home or office. The Absolute Series door is our most affordable system available in sizes up to $19{ }^{\prime} 6$ " wide and up to $8^{\prime}$ tall with panel widths up to 38 ".
eeCore
Energy-Efficient Doors

Our eeCore energy-efficient doors combine our unique design with high-quality materials to ensure your home or business is protected yearround from the elements. With eeCore technology, your home will not only look great, but it will also feel great!

Aluminum . 32 U -value | SHGC . $\mathbf{1 8}^{*}$ Vinyl . 29 U-value | SHGC .18*

When using dual pane Low-e3 and argon*


AWARD WINNING

## INNOVATION

The Panoramic Door has received multiple awards for our "Innovative Design and Technology". With the Panoramic Door you are getting a state-of-the-art door with unique features unlike any other.


GLASS MAGAZINE AWARDS

MOST INNOVATIVE HARDWARE

## Window \& Door

Cnvstal Achievement Award MOST INNOVATIVE DOOR COMPONENT

## Winidollonr

## Window \& Door

Crystal Achievement Award
MOST INNOVATME DOOR

## INSPIRED DESIGN BEAUTIFULLY CRAFTED



Five Beautiful Choices, One Exacting Standard. Sierra Pacilic windows and doors are crafled in four unique manufacturing style Each delivers its own design and performance advar This is the no bad choices, only good ones.
materials of the windows


Aluminum Clad Wood
The best of both worlds, combining beauliful wood inside with low maintenance aluminum cladding oulside. Wood is select pine, or upgrade to one of eight other species, all protected by CoreGuard Plus ${ }^{\circ}$ wood preservalive. Double thick cladding is linished with a powder coating process that leads
the industry in durability the industry in durability
and environmental safely.

## All-WOOD

For a classic, distinclive look, our all-wood windows and palio doors offer limeless elegance with exceptional thermal performance. As with all our wood products, long-term durability is ensured by CoreGuard Plus ${ }^{\circledR}$, a leading wood treatment against rot and insects.

H3
Inventive Fusion Technology"' integrates itree components (extruded aluminum, vinyl and wood) inlo one perfect window wilh greater energy efliciency and performance. Double thick aluminum exteriors are prolecled by our industry-leading powder coaled finishes, while the wood interior is preserved with CoreGuard Plus

## FEELSAFE ${ }^{\mathrm{mm}}$

Our hurricane-resistant windows and patio doors Teature high-strenghh, laminaled glass, plus highly reinflorced engineering and construction. ney re built lo withstand heavy slorm impact as well as delermined burglars.

All the benefils of vinyl windows and patio doors with Sierra Pacific DNA, our vinyl new construction and replacement products offer many of the same teaures and design oplions as our premium wood products. Choose from a complete lineup of operatin styles, sizes and shapes.



Exterior trim in Black 023




METALLIC ANODIZED Collection


Interior Trim in Pine, Contemporary




Standard Awning
Windows in marked places

## FUNCTIONAL AND FLEXIBLE No matuer what windows you pair hem with, our awning window designs can be customized window designs can be customized with many grille paltern choices.



## 

## EXTERIOR TRIM

 Group A on page 17

## REVERSIBLE SHIPLAP-NICKEL GAP

TruExterior Siding \& Trim's Reversible Shiplap/Nickel Gap siding panels offer two authentic, on-trend looks in one for increased versatility and convenience. The profile comes in two formats: one features smooth Nickel Gap on one side and woodgrain Shiplap on the other; the second combines woodgrain Nickel Gap with smooth Shiplap on the flip side. A rabbeted edge ensures panels install with authentic spacing depending on which side is installed-the tight joint appearance of Shiplap or the nickel-sized space of Nickel Gap. Four widths are available for 16 total profile combinations.

Finish Options:

- Smooth Nickel Gap with Woodgrain Shiplap
- Woodgrain Nickel Gap with Smooth Shiplap

Smooth Nickel Gap, horizontal, will match color with stucco color, on North Side


SHIPLAP GAP SIDE

| Nominal <br> Size | Actual <br> Thickness (A) | Actual <br> Width (B) | Reveal (C) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \times 4$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $3-3 / 32^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $1 \times 6$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-3 / 32^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $1 \times 8$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $7-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | $6-13 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $1 \times 10$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $9-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | $8-13 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ |

NICKEL GAP SIDE

| Nominal Size | Actual <br> Thickness (A) | Actual <br> Width (B) | Reveal (C) | Gap (D) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \times 4$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $3-3 / 32^{\prime \prime}$ | $5 / 64$ " |
| $1 \times 6$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $5-3 / 32^{\prime \prime}$ | $5 / 64^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $1 \times 8$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $7-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | $6-13 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $5 / 644^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $1 \times 10$ | $11 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $9-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | $8-13 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ | $5 / 64$ " |



## ATTACHMENT 5

## Arborist Report \& Tree Photos

June 7, 2021

## Prepared for:

Eda Katie Tinto \& Brendan Vitt
Homeowners of 1808 Hanscom Drive, South Pasadena, CA 91030

## Arborist Report

On May 5, 2021, we inspected various trees at the residential property at 1808 Hanscom Drive in the city of South Pasadena. A follow up visit was done on June 3, 2021 to collect additional information.

## Objective

The purpose of this report is to document several trees on the property, as a result of proposed construction.

## Background

The homeowners said they were in the process of constructing an addition on the property. They explained the City of South Pasadena is requiring additional parking space due to the increased building footprint. This report was requested by the City of South Pasadena as part of a parking variance request. Documentation from the homeowners states:
36.340.050 Hillside Project Development Standards subsection H... The formal application shall include details for the selected location and variance from the two-covered parking stall requirement. If mature trees are one of the reasons, the submittal should include a site plan showing the location and drip line of all trees, accompanied by an arborist report detailing the size and health of each tree that physically limits the potential for additional parking.

We were also provided with architectural renderings that plot several trees and a proposed parallel parking space along Hanscom Drive. The homeowners stated that if a garage were constructed (not just a parking space), it would be located along the undeveloped hillside on Hanscom Drive.

## Limitations

This report is based on a visual, ground level inspection. The trees were not climbed. No soil disturbance was conducted as part of this inspection. Property lines are presumed based on boundary fencing.

All trees present some level of risk. Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.

## Observations

The lot at 1808 Hanscom Drive is located on a hillside. The inspected trees were located in the southwest area of the property, immediately uphill from Hanscom Drive. These established trees

stand together in a cluster, creating a small forest. They are a mix of pines, native toyon, sapote, and cotoneaster.

One of the pines (\#1 below) appeared to be on the neighbor's property. It is included in this report due to its proximity to the proposed parking space.

The trees all appeared to be in good health, with full canopies and healthy leaf/needle color, except one small toyon. These tree species are common in Los Angeles and typically do well in this area. Toyon are native to southern California. The area around the trees had been kept natural. The "forest" floor was covered in pine needles.

Each tree was given a Tree Condition Rating (A-F), with "A" being optimum and " $F$ " meaning dead, not salvageable, or extremely hazardous. An "A" rating is defined as excellent condition with no immediate action recommended. A " $C$ " rating is defined as Fair with routine maintenance needed.

The eight (8) observed trees are listed below:

|  | Tree | Trunk Diameter <br> (Inches) | Tree Height <br> (Estimated-Feet) | Canopy Spread <br> (Estimated-Feet) | Condition |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Aleppo pine <br> (Pinus halepensis) | 31 | 65 | 55 | A- Excellent |
| 2Toyon <br> (Heteromeles arbutifolia) | $6,1,1,2$ <br> (multiple trunks) | 6 | 15 | F-Dead/Not <br> Salvageable |  |
| 3 | Toyon <br> (Heteromeles arbutifolia) | $9,10,18$ <br> (multiple trunks) | 25 | 45 | A- Excellent |
| 4 | Aleppo pine <br> (Pinus halepensis) | 31 | 65 | 51 | A- Excellent |
| 5 | White sapote <br> (Casimiroa edulis) | 10 | 30 | 25 | B-Good |
| 6 | Toyon <br> (Heteromeles arbutifolia) | $4,3,3,3,3,2,1,1,1,1,1$ <br> (multiple trunks) | 15 | 15 | A- Excellent |
| 7 | Canary Island pine <br> (Pinus canariensis) | 27 | 50 | 47 | C- Fair |
| 8 | Cotoneaster <br> (Cotoneaster spp.) | $50-100$ individual <br> trunks | 15 | 15 | A- Excellent |

One of the toyon was given an "F" rating because the main trunk had large cracks and appeared dead, though some live growth was visible on other remaining limbs.

The Canary Island pine was given a "C-Fair" rating. Some large dead branches were observed in the canopy. The trunk was co-dominant, meaning that it split into multiple trunks in a way that makes it more likely to fail. Pruning to remove dead limbs and cabling to reduce risk from the codominant stems would increase the rating to A or B .

The enclosed site plan (see Photo 3) shows the locations of the trees in proximity to the proposed parking space.

## Discussion

A parking space parallel to Hanscom Drive would likely only have minimal impact to the existing trees. However, the construction of a covered garage anywhere along Hanscom Drive would likely require the removal of the large toyon (\#3) and one of the Aleppo pines (\#4).

This cluster of trees accounts for the majority of the trees on the property. They are also some of the largest trees on the street. They provide many benefits to the property and the neighborhood, including:

- Shade
- Hillside erosion control
- Beauty
- Privacy screening between neighbors
- Noise buffering from the road


## Recommendations

1. Proceed with the construction of a single, uncovered parking space oriented in line with the direction of the street to minimize construction stress to adjacent trees.
2. Get the input of an ISA Certified Arborist during construction to provide oversight. If roots larger than 3 inches in diameter are discovered during the excavation process that would need to be cut, an arborist should be consulted.

Should you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (323) 384-7770 or nick@treecarela.com.

Sincerely,


Nick Araya
Owner, TreeCareLA
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist \#WE-7751B
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
office: 323-327-1611
cell: 323-384-7770
www.treecarela.com


Photo 1: Aerial view of property with residence to the south and trees to the northwest. Photo source: Google Maps.


Photo 2: View from Hanscom Drive looking northeast towards cluster of trees.


Photo 3: Site plan with trees plotted by approximate location and dripline.


Photo 4: Two large Aleppo pines visible in background. The neighbor's pine (\#1) is to the left. The Aleppo pine (\#4) located on the client's property is to the right.


Photo 5: Trunk of neighbor's Aleppo pine (\#1) seen over property line fence.


Photo 6: Small declining toyon (\#2) highlighted in red.


Photo 7: Small declining toyon (\#2) with visible cracks along main branches, a sign of brittle and dead wood underneath.


Photo 8: Duplicate of Photo 4, this time highlighting the trees in the foreground from left to right: toyon (\#3), sapote (\#5), and toyon (\#6).


Photo 9: Canary Island pine (\#7) just barely visible in the background behind the toyon.


Photo 10: Large, multi-trunked cotoneaster (\#10) visible near patio/deck area.












## ATTACHMENT 6

Link to Soils \& Engineering Report

Click Here for Link to Soils Report

Click Here for Link to Soils Report Addendum
Click Here for Link to Engineering Report

ATTACHMENT 7
Public Comments

AUVG $292023 \quad$ Terence Chan/Teri Lee
ctry or soum pasaucar PLANNING AND BULLDNG DEPT.

1905 Hanscom Drive South Pasadena, Ca 91030

To: City of South Pasadena Planning Department 1414 Mission St
South Pasadena
RE: 1808 Hanscom Drive house addition
To Whom It May Concern:
I support Brendan \& Katie with their house addition of $\mathbf{8 1 8}$ square foot to their main house.

I also agreed for the change of the color/paint to the house considered they already have a very existing color.

Regards to the addition of the uncovered parking; it's good to have extra parking to their addition.

Katie \& Brendan recently moved into the neighborhood and they are very friendly couples with 2 beautiful kids \& their cute dog. We are very fortunate to have this family; they transforming their home into a very beautiful and comfortable place to live and raise their family.

We are exited and can't wait to see when the addition to the house is done!



August 30, 2023

To the South Pasadena Planning Commission,

My name is Paul Yrisarri and I live at 1817 Hanscom Drive. I am writing to let you know my support for the building project of the Vitt family.

The Vitt family are wonderful neighbors and I fully support their proposed addition.

Thank you for your consideration of their project.

Sincerely,


# RECEIVED 

August 31, 2023

## SEP J / 2023

 3
To the South Pasadena Planning Commission,

I live across the street from Brendan Vitt, Katie, and their two daughters. I have gotten to know them over the years and have enjoyed watching their girls grow up. They are wonderful neighbors and an important part of the life on our street here on Hanscom Drive. I give my full support to their proposed addition to their home.

Thanks,


Joel Correa


1807 Hanscom Drive


## SEP 072023

## city or south pasabena PLANMW AM

Jenny Sauk and Andreas Mauer
1812 Hanscom Drive
South Pasadena, CA 91020
-

August 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}, 2023$

To whom it may concern,

We are writing this letter in support of the Katie Tinto and Brendan Vitt, who have graciously reviewed with us their plan for an 818 square foot, two story addition to their home. As their immediate neighbors, our property will be most impacted by this addition. We are fully supportive of their efforts to enhance and develop their property and have no objections to the nature or scope of the proposed work. Please feel free to reach out to us directly if in any way helpful.


# RECEIVED <br> SEP U $/ 2023$ 

CITY OF SCUTH PASADENA
PLAMNHNG AND DULDNH BEPT.
Gail Wetmore
1840 Hanscom Drive
South Pasadena, CA 91030

September 1, 2023

To the South Pasadena Planning Commission,

I am a long time resident of Hanscom Drive and I have gotten to know the Vitt family over the years through walking our dogs together in our neighborhood.

I am fully supportive of their plans to add an addition to their home. I want to make sure the City supports families like the Vitt family so they can stay in our community to raise their children.

Sincerely,
Gail Wetmore
$=$

September 1, 2023

## RE: Proposed addition at 1808 Hanscom Drive

To the South Pasadena Planning Commission,

SEP 072023

## CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNWG AND BULDNHE DEPT.

I am in full support of the proposed addition to the 818 square foot addition to the existing home at 1808 Hanscom Drive. The addition will have no impact on those who live across the street and will not be seen from the street. The addition of a parking space is also not an issue.

Unlike many other projects Hanscom Drive, the owners, Katie Tinto and Brendan Vitt, are very respectful of keeping the architecture and landscaping consistent with the original Spanish design of this house and in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. They did a great job replacing the retaining wall in front of the house a few years ago.

It is important to save our existing older homes while at the same time making them work for the modern family. This project does both!

Thank you.


Betty Emirhanian
1815 Hanscom Drive
South Pasadena

I am writing this letter in support of Katie Tinto and Brendan Vitt's plan to expand their the existing residence ( 1808 Hanscom Drive) by 818 square foot off the back of their existing house. Katie and Brenden have been exceptional neighbors and are extremely supportive of our neighborhood. I am confident their expansion/construction plans will have a positive impact on our neighborhood and its residents.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.


Dr. Kevin Chu
1825 Hanscom Drive, South Pasadena CA 91030

To the South Pasadena Planning Commission,

> SEP $0 / 2023$
> CITY OF SOLTM PASRDENA PLARNMN AND BUMGON NEPT.

I am a resident of South Pasadena for the past 5 years and I've had the pleasure of getting to know the Vitt family during this time. I pass by their house and street every day as part of my commute and have appreciated the improvements they have made since purchasing it and have been consistently impressed by their character, dedication and commitment to maintaining our neighborhood's harmony and aesthetics. From day one, they were kind enough to invite me to their home as I had asked them for carpenter referrals. As they started improving their front yard, Brendan and his daughters were donating some of their plants to the neighborhood so I was able to get some and still own to this day. In our minds, the Vitt family has been a great addition to this community. Seeing them walk around our neighborhood with their kids and family dog is a sight for sore eyes as they are positive, warm and friendly. Their approachability and willingness to collaborate have undoubtedly strengthened our sense of unity within this community.

Some of the homes in Monterey Hills are neglected so we appreciate a family that has pride in their home and that takes care of it. They have shown exceptional care for their property, consistently keeping it well-maintained. This dedication reflects their sincere desire to contribute positively to our community's appearance and value. I have no doubt that this same level of commitment will extend to their proposed home addition. With that in mind, we are fully supportive of their plans to add an addition to their home so they can continue to raise their kids in their home and this city.

Thank you for considering my input, and I trust you will make a decision that benefits our community as a whole.

Sincerely,
Fernando \& Maia Durant
1921 Illinois Dr

## ATTACHMENT 8

Architectural Plans


## VICINITY MAP



2SS. ELIMOLINO AVE,
PASADENA, CA 91101

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

 BEDROOMS AND FULL BATH ON THE SECOND FLOO

| ZONE <br> FRONT YARD SETBACK SIDE YARD SETBACK: EXISN YARD SE YARD SETBACK HEIGHT LIMIT MAX FAR (FLOOR AREA RATIO) MAX LOT COVERAGE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT DATA |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| BUILDING HEIGHT: |  |  |
| BuILING AREA: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| R AREA: ECOND FLOOR AREA | $\begin{array}{rr}\text { 349.4 SF } & 0 \mathrm{SF} \\ \text { 1146.0 SF } & \text { 342.7 SF } \\ 0 \text { SF } & 584.2 \mathrm{SF}\end{array}$ | 349.4 SF 1488.7 SF |
| total area for far calculation (BASEMENT EXEMPI) | 1146.0 SF 926.9 SF | 2072.9 SF |
| fat (lloor afea ratio): | 6.2\% | 11.2\% |
| Lot coverage: | 7.4\% | 11.3\% |
| APPLICABLE CODES |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTES: <br> COB CODE OF REGULTIOSSTHLE 19 AND 24 REOURRMENTS ENERGY AND DIIABEE AND JURISOICTION OVER ANY PORTION OF THIS WORK |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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 (3) PROPOSED BASEMENT GROSS FLOOR AREA



|  | LOor gross aras |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pipoov | ExSTMG AREA (SF) | Proposea are |
| Easment | 349.4 | 339.4 |
|  | 11460 | $\underbrace{\frac{1488.7}{5892}}$ |
|  | ${ }_{218,1}^{18,5}$ |  |
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(2) EXIITTING FIRST FLOOR AREA

| oscciplon | Exsting area asf | Proposseafea (s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bassenev | ${ }_{36,9}$ | ${ }_{326.9}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {Preme }}^{\text {frifloor }}$ | 10695 |  |
| DECCterinyP | ${ }_{218.1}$ |  |

( ${ }^{3}$ PROPOSED BASEMENT FLOOR AREA
(A.03) EXISTING BASEMENT FLOOR AREA
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1. EXISTING ELEVATION NORTH



(Bis) BULLDING SECTION $\qquad$

(s.80) BULILING SECTION
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## WINDOW GENERAL NOTES

 TITLE 24, PART G, CHAPTER 2 SECTION 11 O



## WINDOW SECURITY NOTES

## LOUVERED WINDOWS SHALL BE PROTECTED BY METAL CONSTRUCTED TO PRECLLLDE HUMAN ENTRYY. (6715.3)

2. OTHER OPENABLE WINDOWS SHALL BE PROVIDED WTH SUBSTANTAL LOCKING DEVCEES. IN B, F, M AND S OCCUPANCIES, SUCH DEVICES SHALL BE GLIDE


SLLING WINDWS SHALLL BE EQUPPPED WTTH LOCKING DEVCES AND SHAL BE SO CONSTRUCTED AND INSTALLED THAT THEY REMAN INTACT AND
 LOCATED ON THE INSDE OF THE ADJAC
OR SIMLAR DEVICES THAT EXCEEDS TWO INCHES IN ANY DIMENSION

## DOOR GENERAL NOTES

 THE DOOR OR THROUGH VIEW PORTS I T TE DEOOR OC ADJONNNG WALL. (G706)

3. ALL PNNTTPEDOOR HINGES ACCESSIBLE EROM OUTSIDE SHALL HAVE NON-REMOVABLE HINGE PINS. HINGES SHALL HAVE MN. $1 / 4$ D DA. STEEL JAMB STUD




NONREMOVABLE THUMBTURN WHICHIS INDEPENDENT OF THE DEADLOCKING LATCH AND WHIICH MUST BE SEPARATELYOPERATED, SHALL NOT BE









## GLAZING NOTES

1. GLAZED OPENNGS WTTHN 40" OF THE DDOR LOCK WHEN THE DOOR IIS IN THE CLOSED POSTIION, SHALL BE FULLY TEMPREED GLASS OR APPROVED



 CFMF OF OF RESIDENTAL DOOR AREA, 0.3 CFM
TTLLE 24, PART $G$, CHAPTTRR 2 , SECTION 116.
 SECTION 116 .
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| promer |
| :---: |
| NAME |


| $\substack{\text { Name } \\ \text { Porber } \\ \text { Number }}$ | 20.093 |
| :--- | :--- |
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| prouct |  | LarR＊ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A35 Clus ．LT44Llips |  | 25814 | Er．012 |
| Smpson Hou Hol oowns |  | 25720 | ER2330 |
| smpson trot hol oowns |  | 25926 | EER－133 |
| cs，cmst，\＆Mst stremb |  | 25713 | ESR2175 |
| smmposo popm．Sooms |  | 25669 |  |
| smmson strong walls |  | 25427 |  |
| smmpons setrep eoxr |  | 2574 |  |
|  |  | 2574 |  |
| SIMPSON＂TITEN HD＂SCREW ANCHOR <br> FOR CRACKED \＆UNCRACKED CONC． <br> SIMPSON＂TITEN HD＂SCREW <br> ANCHOR FOR CMU |  | 2574 |  |
|  |  | 25550 |  |
| i－LEVELWEYERHAEUSE COMPANY | т | 25538 | EsP－115 |
|  | pst．tu，Lst | 2502 |  |
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AT 3 3/2"X, $57^{\prime \prime}$ "X OR 7 "X PSL BEAM
$\left(\frac{5}{5.13}\right.$ TYP. WOOD BEAM TO POST CONNECTION




(14.) TYP. PLAN-VIEW OF WOOD WALL CORNER \&




$\left(\frac{13}{13}\right)$ TYP. DETALL OF REINFORCEMENT OF NOTCH
STUDS IN BEARING WALL
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| P/BC 2017-024 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION/ SIGNIFICANT CONSTRUCTION STAGES <br> (Only Checked items are required) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Construction | Construction Type | Elements/Comnections to be observed |
| Foundation |  | Renvorcma |
|  |  | Renvorama |
|  |  |  |
| Wall |  | Renverama |
|  |  |  |
| Frame | $\square$ Steel Moment Frame Steel Braced Frame $\square$ Others: |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Diaphragm | Q ConcreteQ Steilecka woodOOthers: |  |
|  |  |  |
| Others |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| DECLARATION BY OWNER OR OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE <br> I, $\square$ the owner of the project $\square$ the owner's representative, declare that the above listed firm or individual is hired by me to be the Structural Observer. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Signatur of Structural obsenver |  | Dato |
| Remesempt |  |  |
| Smememmeame | Ememememata |  |
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