

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

**CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA**

**CONVENED THIS 4<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2019**

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

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting convened at: 7:04 pm  
Board Members Present: Mark Smeaton – Vice Chair, Samantha Hill, Kay Younger  
Board Member Absent: Michael Lejeune, Yael Lir  
Staff Liason: Edwar Sissi, Associate Planner

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

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

1. No Public Comment.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

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

**Project Information:**

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

**Presentation:**

Fenske: presented the project and noted the comments from the previous DRB meeting. He discussed the design iterations that he and the owner studied. They ultimately decided on a complete redesign, while retaining the existing front volume. He presented a 3D model for the board ad public and noted the nouveau Spanish revival design.

**Public Comments:**

Mellissa (owner): discussed the changes and hopes the design meets the expectation of the Board.

**Questions, Discussion of Board and Applicant Response:**

Smeaton: Inquired how much the first floor raises.

Fenske: Noted the existing first floor is existing and does not get raised, it is however about 6 feet above the side walk given the sloping front yard which will now be encased in a 3 foot wall.

Smeaton: Inquired why the front door header was so low compared to the header heights of adjoining windows, and if that can be increased to match.

Fenske: Noted, in concurrence with the owner, that the front door can be increased in height.

Hill: Noted that she viewed the streetscape and context and appreciates the architect's design as a response to the neighborhood for contextual compatibility.

Younger: Noted that she really appreciates the design.

Smeaton: Noted that this design iteration was much preferred over the previous because there are not combative elements with the old and the new.

**Decision:**

Hill: Made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted.

Younger: Seconded the motion.

**APPROVED AS SUBMITTED (3-0, Lejeune & Lir absent)**

**CEQA Categorical Exemption:**

The project is categorically exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the provisions of Section 15301, Existing Facilities, Class 1:

- (a) Interior or exterior alterations
- (e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:
  - (2) 10,000 square feet if:
    - (A) The project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and
    - (B) The area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.
- (L) Demolition and removal of individual small structures
  - (1) One single-family residence
  - (4) Accessory (appurtenant) structures including garages, carports, patios, swimming pools, and fences.

---

**3. Project Address: 1326 Fair Oaks Avenue (Hi-Life Burgers)**  
**Project Number: 2204-DRX**  
**Applicant: Steven Dahl, Architect**  
**Potential Historic District: N/A**

**Project Information:**

A proposal to add a 622 sq. ft. of outdoor dining area with a minor façade change to the existing 1,901 sq. ft. restaurant building on a 10,710 sq. ft. lot. The outdoor dining area will be located on the first floor of the front elevation and on the south side elevation of the building. A 23' 9"ht. two story outdoor dining tower is proposed on the front elevation of the building. A 53 sq. ft. addition is proposed on the south side elevation. A new "Hi Life Burger" wall sign and a blade sign are proposed. The signage is not a part of this approval and will be reviewed in another DRB meeting. The proposed exterior materials for the outdoor dining tower and the addition will match the existing. There is no change to the existing parking. The outdoor dining will be subject to the approval of an Administrative Use Permit per South Pasadena Municipal Code Section 36.350.130.

**Presentation:**

Steve Dahl: presented the project and noted the owner in the audience and reflected the design changes with a photo presentation of the previous iteration and the new iteration which now removed the second story, and will now keep the outdoor dining at ground level. He also noted the railing has been redesigned to be less heavy, and be more open and more transparent. He noted the removal of the existing monument sign, and the new open railing will facilitate viewing planes at the corner and improve safety. The blocky stair well for the original 2nd story will be removed and make the project more appealing to the neighborhood. The south rear pop out will remain and serve as a screening element for the new outdoor dining on Bank Street. He also noted the Planning Commission will hear the AUP next Tuesday.

**Public Comments:**

Christina Vogel (1618 Bank Street): She thanked the architect for the revisions to the design change and removing the second floor. She expressed concern with the design review finding for findings 2 and 3. She was concerned with the impact of absorbing all of the parking traffic impact and the addition of 50 additional seats that will impose on the neighborhood. She mentioned that bank street is a residential street and should not be allowed to have outdoor dining. She also noted that that she is not opposed to outdoor dining along Fair Oaks Avenue.

Andrew Vogel (1618 Bank Street): He noted that he supports the business and is a regular customer. He appreciated the design changes and the removal of the second floor. He had concerns with the addition of seating on Bank Street which is a residential street. He mentioned that outdoor dining on Fair Oaks is fine and there is precedent for that, but does not want to set precedent for outdoor dining on residential streets.

Gavin Wasserman: supports the comments expressed by the two other members of the public. He wanted to reiterate his concern with the wrap around seating that will extend to the residential street of Bank Street.

**Questions, Discussion of Board and Applicant Response:**

Hill: inquired how the number of outdoor dining seats was established.

Dahl: noted that there was no ideal number, rather the number was based on what can be accommodated in the new space. He also noted that many of the restaurant patrons walk to the restaurant, and don't even drive.

Smeaton: inquired how far the dining area extends along Bank Street

Dahl: it extends about 36 feet, which is shorter than length of the building and the parking lot of the commercial building across Bank Street.

Hill: inquired how patrons will access the outdoor dining area along Bank Street.

Dahl: noted that there is only one entrance through the main entry along Fair Oaks, in response from the neighbors and Board about the previous iteration to have access along Bank Street.

Smeaton: inquired how many seats were lost with the removal of the second floor.

Dahl: noted that 22 seats were lost in the tower, but more seats were allowed at grade due to the removal of the stairs, for a net loss of 10 seats.

Hill: inquired if a traffic study was conducted, even though it is not required for this particular feature.

Dahl: Noted that a formal traffic study has not been conducted.

Smeaton: inquired what the motive was for the outdoor dining.

Dahl: noted that the need came from customer demands for customers with dogs, with kids, and those that just want to be outside and eat their meal.

Dahl: read off a list of other restaurants that have outdoor dining in close proximity to residential.

Niko /owner: presented a series of photographs that indicated plenty of available parking spaces in the restaurant parking lot during the afternoon, however Bank street images he showed indicated impacted street parking. He noted that the railing above the raised concrete curb surrounding the restaurant will now be improved because skateboarders will no longer be able to utilize it for skating and jumping.

Smeaton: noted that the applicant has made a good concerted effort to respond to the neighbor concerns and board concerns and remove the tower. The new design ties into the existing structure better, and the bump out is a nice volumetric addition. He noted that the restaurant as a business has the right to pursue outdoor dining as an entitlement.

Hill: Noted she appreciates the new design and the new open mesh of the railing and its response to the neighborhood and contextual compatibility. She commended the effort to control access strictly through Fair Oaks, and not allow it along Bank Street. The controlled circulation was carefully thought out. The new roof design is well integrated and works well with the existing massing and materials.

Younger: noted that she thinks the exterior seating is a thoughtful and wise addition given the restaurant's high patronage of school students, and for Dog owners such as herself.

Hill: noted that outdoor dining, as a wrap around the corner, will help to activate the corner and be an urban improvement.

Smeaton: Agreed with Hill and noted that it is important for outdoor dining to wrap around the corner and activate the corner

**Decision:**

Hill: Made a motion to APPROVE the project as submitted.

Younger: Seconded the motion.

**APPROVED AS SUBMITTED (3-0, Lejeune & Lir absent)**

**CEQA Categorical Exemption:**

City Staff has determined that the project is Categorically Exempt under CEQA Article 19, Section 15301, Class 1 - Existing Facilities:

- (a) Interior or exterior alterations
- (e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:
  - (1) 50 percent of the floor areas of the structures before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less.

Section 15311, Class 11 – Accessory Structures

- (a) On-premise signs

**NEW ITEMS**

4. No new items.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. No discussion items.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

- 6. **Comments from the Board**  
No Board comments.

- 7. **Comments From Staff**  
No Staff comments.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 8. The Board reviewed the following minutes: August 2018, September 2018, March 2019

**Decision:**

Smeaton: Made a motion to ADOPT the minutes.

Younger: Seconded the motion

**ADOPTED (3-0, Lejeune and Lir absent)**

**ADJOURNMENT**

- 9. The meeting adjourned at 7:52 pm to the next scheduled meeting on May 2, 2019.

APPROVED,



Mark Smeaton  
Chair, Design Review Board

Date

