

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

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA

CONVENED THIS 7TH DAY OF JUNE, 2018

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting convened at: 7:00 pm

Board Members Present: Conrado Lopez, Mark Smeaton, Michael Lejeune,

Board Member Absent: Jim Fenske, Yael Lir

Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Assistant Planner

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

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

1. No items.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. No Continued Items

NEW ITEMS

3. **Project Address:** 1482 Indiana Avenue
Project Number: 2097-DRX
Applicant: Danille Terrasi
Potential Historic District: N/A

Project Information:

A request for Design Review Board approval for a façade change to the existing house. The façade change will consist of a contemporary design. Two new decks are proposed. The first deck is 215 sq. ft. with a new flat roof on top of it. The deck is located on the front elevation and will expand the existing deck. The second deck 206 sq. ft. and it is on the third floor. The deck is located on the rear/side south elevation. The materials will consist of stucco and panel siding to match the existing, vinyl windows to match the existing, and a new garage door.

Presentation:

Ms. Terrasi: presented the project. And noted that she made some changes from the previous meeting to resolve the front yard encroachment. She also noted the railing details were clarified.

Public comments:

No comments.

Board Questions:

Lejeune: inquired if the applicant added a cap to the railing; the Board agreed it was a nice touch. Lejeune mentioned he really appreciates the addition of the railing cap.

Smeaton: noted that in the railing details, the section detail number # 4 notes a base plate that is covered by the decking floor, while in detail # 1, it indicates a base plate that is exposed above the deck floor.

Applicant Response:

Danielle: also noted that she revised the specifications of the horizontal railing boards and presented material samples to the Board. She noted that the owners prefer a darker finish on the railing, but she is trying to convince them to go with the lighter gray to complement the proposed white paint of the house. She also noted that detail # 1 was drawn in error, and the preferred condition will be for the base plate to be covered by the deck floor as shown in detail # 4.

Board Discussion:

No further comments from the Board.

Decision:

Smeaton: Made a motion to APPROVE THE PROJECT as submitted.

Lopez: Seconded the motion

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. (3-0; 2 absent)

CEQA Categorical Exemption:

Section 15301, Existing Facilities. Class 1(a); Interior or exterior alterations involving such things as interior partitions, plumbing and electrical conveyances.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 4. Project Address: | 1326 Fair Oaks Avenue (CONCEPTUAL REVIEW) |
| Project Number: | N/A |
| Applicant: | Linda Hames/Steve Dahl, Dahl Architects |
| Potential Historic District: | None |

Project Information:

A request for a conceptual review regarding a proposed outdoor seating “dining tower” at the southwest corner of the existing Hi-Life restaurant. The tower will not be enclosed and will accommodate two levels of outdoor dining space. The materials of the proposed tower will match the existing materials of the restaurant, and an 8 foot setback will be maintained along Fair Oaks Avenue and Bank Street. The applicant is also proposing new signage. There will be no increase to the enclosed interior space. **The demolition of the existing house requires a recommendation of approval by the Cultural Heritage Commission.**

Presentation:

Mr. Dahl: Presented the project. He noted the owner of Hi-Life was in the audience. He requested brutally honest feedback on the schematic sketches presented to the Board tonight. He presented photos of a restaurant in Culver City he had done and its super graphics. He would like to do something similar to the Hi-Life Restaurant to push the limits of what is a sign, and provide visibility and impact. He noted that the existing building is actually 8 feet away from the property line on Fair Oaks and Bank Street.

He also noted that according to the Code, no additional parking is required for outdoor dining areas. The owner would like to add another floor level, which was the original plans in the 1994 when the building was converted from the A&W drive through for budgetary reasons. Dahl also provided a

revised sketch design that still accommodates a hexagonal two-story tower at the southwest corner, and a redesigned stair way access. A total number of 39 seats and 21 on the second level will be added as outdoor dining, nearly doubling the amount of seating for the restaurant. The design intention is to make the tower addition look like it is a part of the original building. All materials will match including the standing seam metal roof. He noted that the restaurant typically has four meal periods including the after-school kid clientele, and this project is catered to them to be fun and exciting.

Questions / Discussion from the Board:

Smeaton: noted he preferred the second revision presented tonight. He wants the project to be more real, substantial, and less circus-like. He asked if there was an issue with the setbacks, and staff noted that the project is located in the CG zone, which has a zero setback.

Lopez: inquired if the tower element was covered with a solid roof, and yes they are proposing it.

Lejeune: asked if they are going to retain the existing mansard standing seam roof, and they noted that they want to keep the roof type to have a seamless transition with the addition and the existing.

Lopez: mentioned that the roof may be faded, and painting it would not be a good idea, so the applicant should take notice of trying to match the existing red mansard standing seam roof. He also noted that the scale seems right for the neighborhood as across the street on Bank, there is multi-story building in close proximity. He mentioned some concern with the mesh metal balustrade screening and suggested a more solid material.

Nico, the owner: noted that they recently repaired a portion of the red roof, and the repairs portion is noticeable because the existing is faded somewhat.

Lopez: mentioned he would like to see the applicants rethink the existing front entry canopy and tie that into the proposed design.

Smeaton: inquired how the applicant is proposing to incorporate the super graphics on the mesh balustrade. Dahl noted the new cup design of the restaurant and its super graphics and how it will serve as a model for the super graphics on the facade of the restaurant and presented a revised graphic sketch and signage.

Lejeune: noted that he liked the concept of the proposed blade sign, and the idea of the super graphics. However, he also noted that he would like to see the mansard roof go away as it is an outdated design element, but he understood the cost implications.

Lopez: Inquired if there was a risk for the middle-school children throwing trash out onto the ground below from the proposed second floor.

Nico/owner: noted that he has thought of that, and that he is hoping that increased seating, will bring in increased revenues to allow him to hire full time staffing for patrolling the grounds and ensuring the grounds stay clean. He also mentioned that he is installing more cameras to monitor patron activities.

Smeaton: inquired if they were to wall off the upper floor tower with glass, would it still be considered as outdoor seating.

Ms. Viscarra (Staff): noted that an enclosure of the 2nd floor with glass would still read as an enclosure and trigger new parking requirements. She also noted that it was advised to the applicant to provide more transparency with perforated balustrade railing, and no windows in the outdoor dining areas and tower.

Lopez: noted that the brick of the addition should also match the brick of the existing.

Lejeune: noted that the existing building is rather quiet, with a subdued design, and dark windows. He noted that the proposed addition will change that quiet character to be careful of its impact

Applicant Response:

No additional response.

Public Comments:

No Public Comment

BOARD COMMENTS

5. No Board comments.

STAFF COMMENTS

6. No Staff Comments

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. Minutes for the previous DRB meeting were not reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT

8. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm to the next scheduled July 5, 2018.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton
Chair, Design Review Board

Date

03/18/2019