

CITY OF SAN MARINO

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate



www.cityofsanmarino.org

(626) 300-0711 Phone

City Hall

Council Chambers

2200 Huntington Drive

San Marino, CA 91108

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2017

7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE, SAN MARINO, CA

The City of San Marino appreciates your attendance. Citizens' interest provides the Design Review Committee with valuable information regarding issues of the community.

Regular Meetings are held on the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of every month.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office at (626) 300-0705 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: Chairman Frank Hsu, Vice-Chair William Dietrick, Kevin Cheng, John Dustin, Corinna Wong, Alternate Judy Johnson-Brody, and Alternate Chris Huang

POSTING OF AGENDA

The agenda is posted 72 hours prior to each meeting at the following locations: City Hall, 2200 Huntington Drive, the Crowell Public Library, 1890 Huntington Drive, and the Recreation Department, 1560 Pasqualito Drive. The agenda is also posted on the City's Website: <http://www.cityofsanmarino.org>

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Section 54954.3 of the Brown Act provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on any item of interest to the public, before or during the Design Review Committee's consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-51**
2793 GAINSBOROUGH DRIVE, (WONDER INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT/WU)
The applicant requests to construct a second-story addition, new 2-car garage, and make exterior modifications to the house.
(Required Action Date: 05-06-17)
2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-86**
1560 OLD MILL ROAD, (FEI TAN/CHANG)
The applicant proposes a new two-story house with basement parking and front yard walls.
(Required Action Date: 05-07-17)
3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-107**
1867 WINDSOR ROAD, (LI/XIAO)
The applicant proposes a new two-story house with a detached garage.
(Required Action Date: 04-29-17)
4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-103**
2168 ADAIR STREET, (2168 ADAIR LLC)
The applicant requests to make exterior modifications and install roofing material not found on the City's Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list to a previously approved new residence.
(Required Action Date: 05-19-17)
5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-02**
1104 LORAIN ROAD, (YAGURA/REYNOSO)
The applicant requests to install roofing material not found on the City's Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list
(Required Action Date: 05-06-17)

OTHER MATTERS

OPEN FORUM

This is an opportunity for future applicants to informally present preliminary design concepts for feedback from members of the DRC. Comments received are based on members not having visited the site and neighborhood. Therefore, positive comments should not be perceived as preliminary approval of a project but rather as a tool in facilitating a project through the Design Review process. Applications that are on this agenda, as well as those that are not, may be discussed during Open Forum. No more than two DRC members may participate in Open Forum discussions.

PUBLIC WRITINGS DISTRIBUTED

All public writings distributed by the City of San Marino to at least a majority of the Design Review Committee regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the Public Counter at City Hall located at 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California.

ADJOURNMENT

The San Marino Design Review Committee will adjourn to the next regular meeting to be held on Wednesday, May 3, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chamber, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California.

APPEALS

There is a fifteen day appeal period for all applications. All appeals should be filed with the Planning and Building Department. Please contact the Planning and Building Department for further information.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chairman

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: AMANDA MERLO, AICP
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-51**
**2793 GAINSBOROUGH DRIVE, (WONDER INVESTMENT
MANAGEMENT, INC./JWL ASSOCIATES, INC.)**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition, new two-car detached garage, and make exterior modifications to the house.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (existing facilities).

PROJECT HISTORY

An application for an addition at this property was submitted in 2015 and was ultimately denied at the City Council level.

April 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC for this application.

May 6, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 2

Object – 1

No response - 11

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

City policy requires story poles to be installed in advance of the public hearing. In this case, the story poles were not installed. Staff has still prepared an analysis of the project, but recommends the DRC continue action on this matter so that the applicant can arrange to have the story poles installed.

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the DRC shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: Staff can find that the proposed style and one-and-a-half story approach is compatible with the neighborhood. There are a mix of one and two-story houses in the neighborhood as well as a variety of architectural styles. The proposed style respects the mix of one and two-story homes in the neighborhood by not having a full two-story façade. The neighborhood has a variety of architectural styles and the Cape Cod style will be complementary to it.

Staff cannot find that the proposed materials are appropriate for the style of house and therefore, result in a structure that is not compatible with the neighborhood. The Proslat PVC wall panel, vinyl shutters, and red simulated clay tile are not typical of a traditional Cape Cod house, and also do not appear to be found elsewhere in the neighborhood.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The second-story windows that face the adjacent homes are for the entry area and a bathroom, neither of which would pose a privacy concern for the neighbors. The proposed balcony is inset in the second floor, so views to the sides would be blocked.

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The addition results in a change to the existing style of the house, but roof lines will be compatible with each other.

4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: Many of the proposed materials are not consistent with the proposed style of the structure, as discussed above.

CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) EDWARD & MARY RIEGLE am a property owner of (address)

2839 GAINSBOROUGH DR., San Marino and have been shown

the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

(address) 2793 GAINSBOROUGH DR. SAN MARINO

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.
2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.
3. I do not object and decline to state reason.
4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.
5. I object in particular to the following: ① The new roof is massive and is red tile appropriate to Cape Cod? ② Decision of planning comm last Oct 28 still holds "Due to existing substandard front yard setback the two story proposal appears too close to the street." ③ Project still call for complete reorganizing of most rooms. Careful attention needs to be paid to the project exceeding 50% of replacement value of existing house
6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.
7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

Edward R Riegle Mary Riegle
Property Owner's Signature

Oct 10, 2016
Date

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chairman

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: AMANDA MERLO, AICP
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-86**
1560 OLD MILL ROAD, (TAN/CHANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story house with subterranean parking and new front yard walls.

The applicant submitted an arborist report and tree protection plan for the trees on-site, which was reviewed by the City's arborist. If the project is approved, staff recommends the DRC require implementation of the recommendations found in the arborist's report, along with any additional recommendations set forth by the City's arborist.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (replacement or reconstruction).

PROJECT HISTORY

April 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
May 7, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 10
Object – 0
Neither object nor support - 1
No response – 1

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the DRC shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The neighborhood has a variety of architectural styles and has both one and two-story homes, including full two-story houses like the one proposed. Staff can find that the proposed style and two-story approach is compatible with the neighborhood. Upon studying the neighborhood and story poles, staff found that the proposed plate heights and tall windows and doors would make the project appear out of scale with the adjacent homes. Additionally, simplification of the entry area would enhance compatibility with the neighborhood.

The proposed front yard walls are close to the house and do not create any type of enclosure. The walls along the driveway are necessary for the subterranean garage. The landscape plan identifies a seven-foot high retaining wall adjacent to the driveway, however, a different page of the plans identifies a 12"-24" wall. The maximum allowable height of retaining walls in the front yard is four feet. This would need to be corrected on a future set of plans. The fountain with koi pond appears to be in a modern style and would not be compatible with the proposed house.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The second-story roof garden and covered terraces would negatively impact the privacy of the adjacent neighbors.

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The proposed colors and materials are consistent with each other and match the architectural style.

CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, Harriet Plunkett am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)

1505 Old Mill Rd, San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)

the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
1560 Old Mill Rd
(project address)

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I object to the project.
2. I do not object to the project.
3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments: The underground garage + rooms
thought that wasn't allowed anymore -
are there too many roof lines?
wish people would build something besides
spanish revival base

Harriet A Plunkett
Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

Mar 10, 2017
Date

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chairman

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: AMANDA MERLO, AICP
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-107**
1867 WINDSOR ROAD, (LI/XIAO)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story house and detached two-car garage.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (replacement or reconstruction).

PROJECT HISTORY

April 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

April 29, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 7

Object – 0

No response - 5

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the DRC shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

- 1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The neighborhood has a variety of architectural styles and has both one and two-story homes. Staff can find that the proposed style and massing is appropriate for the neighborhood. The proposed house will be slighter shorter than and have a similar shape to the existing two-story house.

Staff finds that there can be some revisions made to the front elevation to make the structure more compatible with the neighborhood. The elevations make it appear as though the second floor is taller than the first, which gives a top-heavy appearance. The story poles show a more proportional appearance. Changes to the tall front-facing windows on the second story may help correct this appearance. The design may also benefit from slightly reducing the size of the front columns and large, arched front window.

- 2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The second-story windows that face the adjacent homes are mostly smaller windows and are placed higher up on the wall.

- 3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

- 4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The proposed colors and materials are consistent with each other and match the architectural style.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-103**
2168 ADAIR STREET, (2168 ADAIR LLC)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests to make exterior modifications to a previously approved new residence and to install roofing material and color not found on the City's pre-approved roof materials colors and application list.

The DRC approved the new residence in June of 2014. The project is under construction and the applicant wishes to provide exterior treatments to alter the architectural style from Monterey Colonial to Spanish style. The applicant proposes to use a handmade clay tile product that will produce a blended terra cotta color.

The product is installed at the following addresses:

1. 585 Mountain Drive, Beverly Hills (Material is visible from Loma Vista Drive)
2. 2565 Benedict Canyon Drive, BH (Best viewed from Moholland Drive)
3. 1510 Gilcrest Drive, Beverly Hills
4. 1370 Los Altos Ave, Long Beach
5. 801 Paseo Del Mar, Palos Verdes Estate

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 because the project involves a replacement structure.

PROJECT HISTORY

March 20, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

May 19, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 13

Object - 0

No response - 2

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the DRC shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The massing, scale, and placement of the residence and the detached garage were previously determined to be compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed Spanish style is compatible with the legal neighborhood.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The proposed ground floor patio and a second floor balcony will not cause privacy impact to adjacent neighbors as adequate setbacks are provided. Additionally, the second floor balcony is limited in size and is accessed from the master bedroom which is not a common gathering space.

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The project retains the approved exterior color scheme with the exception of the roofing material and color. The applicant proposes to change the roofing material from natural wood shake to clay tile. The proposed clay tile product is handmade from volcanic ashes in Nicaragua. The volcanic ashes is developed into clay material through a high temperature wood fire process and handmade with mahogany molds to produce the barrel shaped tiles. As a result, the tiles have a handmade appearance and do not have a consistent red color like those produced in a controlled factory.

The proposed product is similar in appearance to the two-piece mission clay tile on the City's pre-approved materials and colors list but do not have the uniform red color that is often found on traditional Spanish homes in the City.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-02**
1104 LORAIN ROAD, (YAGURA/REYNOSO)

Frank Hsu, Chair
William Dietrick, Vice Chair
Kevin Cheng
John Dustin
Corinna Wong
Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate
Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install a composition roof material.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (existing facility).

PROJECT HISTORY

April 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

May 6, 2017 – Required action date

The property has recently implemented an addition and remodel project approved by the DRC in June of 2015. The approved roofing material was the Cedarlite product in Silverwood color, a simulated wood shake material from the City's pre-approved materials and colors list. The applicant is requesting to install a composition roofing material manufactured by CertainTeed, Presidential in Country Gray color. The proposed roofing material is on the City's pre-approved materials list however, this particular product has several requirements that include the existence of the product on the roof. The applicant did not provide a local address where this product is installed.

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 8

Object - 0

No response - 3

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

In addition to the required findings, the Code allows the DRC to consider the following items when reviewing a roof material applications: 1. Fire, wind and/or earthquake safety; 2. Structural integrity; 3.

The extent the roof is exposed to public view or view by neighbors; and 4. The ability of the proposed roofing material to successfully dispose of rainwater for the particular house.

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the DRC shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: Neighboring structures have clay tile, natural wood shake and simulated wood shake roofing materials. Staff cannot make the finding because the appearance of the proposed product will be noticeably different from the previously approved simulated wood shake product and roofing materials on neighboring properties.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comment: The proposed Country Gray color is similar to the previously approved Silverwood color by Cedarlite.