

## CITY OF SAN MARINO

# DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

*Kevin Cheng, Chair*

*Corinna Wong, Vice-Chair*

*John Dustin*

*Judy Johnson-Brody*

*Chris Huang*



[www.cityofsanmarino.org](http://www.cityofsanmarino.org)

(626) 300-0711 Phone

City Hall

Council Chambers

2200 Huntington Drive

San Marino, CA 91108

---

**WEDNESDAY, JULY 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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:** Kevin Cheng, Corinna Wong, John Dustin, Judy Johnson-Brody, and 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. DRC16-81**  
**1221 ROANOKE ROAD, (SAN ROANOKE LLC)**

*This item was continued from the May 17, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes a new two-story house with a detached 3-car garage, new side yard fence and driveway gate.  
(Required Action Date: 09-08-17)

2. **MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-21**  
**2828 FLEUR DRIVE, (MORI/NAN)**

The applicant proposes to modify the second story windows and side yard fencing adjacent to a street of a previously approved project.  
(Required Action Date: 07-28-17)

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-106**  
**1711 EUSTON ROAD, (CHEN/HAN)**

The applicant proposes a first and second story addition.  
(Required Action Date: 08-02-17)

4. **MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-25**  
**1285 SAN GABRIEL BLVD, (LI/XIAO)**

The applicant proposes to make modifications to a previously approved one-story, new single family home.  
(Required Action Date: 08-02-17)

5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-10**  
**828 SIERRA MADRE BLVD, (LI/XIAO)**

The applicant proposes to construct a new one-story single family house with a detached garage and front yard walls.  
(Required Action Date: 08-28-17)

**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, August 2, 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



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JULY 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-81**  
**1221 ROANOKE ROAD (SAN ROANOKE LLC)**

*Kevin Cheng, Chairman*  
*Corinna Wong, Vice Chair*  
*John Dustin*  
*Judy Johnson-Brody*  
*Chris Huang*

---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with a detached three-car garage and side yard fence and driveway gate.

## **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**

May 17, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC  
July 19, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC  
September 8, 2017 – Required action date

## **NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve - 1  
Object – 8  
Object – 6 (outside of legal neighborhood)  
No response – 6

## **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:* Staff can find the two-story approach and the Tudor style compatible with the legal neighborhood. The two-story portion of the structure being adjacent to the east side yard helps minimize the visual appearance of the structure from the intersection. However, there is an odd ward transition between the second-story overlapping the first-story as viewed from the west elevation. The placement of the single-story portion of the structure appears imposing and closer to the sidewalk than neighboring structures and other corner properties at that intersection. Staff finds that the entry treatment to be out of proportion with the single-story gable and that a small vent above the transom windows will enhance the front façade.

- 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

*Comment:* Window sizes and placement are respectful of the east neighbor.

- 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 materials and colors are consistently carried throughout the structure and the detached garage. The groupings of casement window, stone veneer material on the front façade and color scheme are consistent with the Tudor style.

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the *front* yard.

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a *side* yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The DRC shall approve the application for the pilasters with lighting fixtures in the front yard if it finds all of the following to be true:

- 1. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES  NO  NOT APPLICABLE

*Comments:* Staff finds the material and design of the driveway gate to be compatible with the new residence. While the proposed side yard wood fence is compatible with the residence, however staff finds that a block wall would be more suitable at the proposed location given that the north neighbor has a street-facing wall and that the block wall material would allow for landscaping to cascade over the wall or tall planting in front of the wall rather than the proposed groundcover.

- 2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES  NO  NOT APPLICABLE

The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.

*Comments:* The north neighbor is improved with a side yard wall and a driveway gate, staff can support the proposed side yard wall and driveway gate provided that they are painted in a darker color to complement the residence and the driveway gate be setback the same distance as the north neighbor.

- 3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES  NO  NOT APPLICABLE

*Comment:* Provided that the driveway gate has the same setback as the north neighbor, the proposed improvements will not create a hazardous condition to pedestrians.

## 1221 Roanoke Rd. San Marino



after



before

- \*porch at right side has been removed
- \*large gable at front elevation has been eliminated and redesigned
- \*new design is more simple with less detail and less busy
- \*the "disney" type of arch exposed wood has been removed
- \*overall mass has been reduced
- \*2nd floor width reduced substantially
- \*2nd floor mass/ area reduced from 1,240sf to 954sf
- \*one of the bedroom on 2nd floor relocated to the first floor
- \*use of stone has been revised to brick.
- \*use of brick is more subtle and less heavy in appearance
- \*some window has been revised with casing
- \*building height has been reduced from 29'-8" to 27'-6" (from F.F)
- \*Plate height of 1st floor revised from 10' to 9'-6"
- \*Plate height of 2nd floor revised from 9' to 8'-6"
- \*fencing changed from vinyl to wood

# City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JULY 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-21**  
**2828 FLEUR DRIVE (NAN/HARTMAN BALDWIN)**

*Kevin Cheng, Chairman*

*Corinna Wong, Vice-Chair*

*John Dustin*

*Judy Johnson-Brody*

*Chris Huang*

---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant is requesting permission to modify a previously approved two-story remodel and side yard gate and wall project. The current request involves changes to the window locations on the west and south elevations, front yard hardscape and side yard railing along Ramiro Road.

At the July 6, 206 meeting, the Design Review Committee approved a two-story interior remodel project with new windows, exterior modifications to the building frontage and side yard gate and wall along Ramiro Road.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION**

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 because the project involves an existing facility.

## **PROJECT HISTORY**

July 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

July 28, 2017 – Required action date

## **NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve - 1

Object – 2

No response – 12

## **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 proposed changes alter the west and south elevations but do not alter the structure's compatibility with the neighborhood. The front yard improvements will not result in an enclosure from the street.

**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

*Comment:* Changes to window size and placement are respectful of the west and south 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 windows are consistent in operation and details as those found on the existing structure.

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the *front* yard.

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a *side* yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The DRC shall approve the application for the pilasters with lighting fixtures in the front yard if it finds all of the following to be true:

**1. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

*Comments:* Staff finds the modifications to maintain an open front yard appearance and the side yard railing is architecturally consistent with the Spanish residence. Staff recommends that hedges or tall planting be provided to screen the railing and to be consistent with other side yard walls on the west side of Ramiro Road.

- 2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.

*Comments:* The south neighbor has a block wall enclosing the rear yard along Ramiro Road. Staff can find the proposed railing consistent in location with the south neighbor's block wall. The proposed railing will be minimally visible with hedges or tall planting.

- 3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.**

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

*Comment:* New side yard railing is sufficiently setback from the street corner that it will not create a hazardous condition to pedestrians or vehicles.

CITY OF SAN MARINO  
DESIGN REVIEW  
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

1. John Bilbaugh  
(neighbor's name)

am a property owner of 1750 Ramiro Road

1750 Ramiro Road  
~~2828 Flower Drive~~  
(neighbor's address)

San Marino and have been shown

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

2828 Flower Drive  
(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:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

John Bilbaugh  
Neighboring Property Owner's Signature  
1750 Ramiro Road  
San Marino, CA  
91108

5/17/2017  
Date

CITY OF SAN MARINO  
DESIGN REVIEW  
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

---

1. DeLoris M. Barker  
(neighbor's name)

am a property owner of

1780 Ramiro Rd  
(neighbor's address)

San Marino and have been shown

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

2828 Fleur Dr.  
(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:



Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

5/17/17  
Date

# City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JULY 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-106**  
**1711 EUSTON ROAD, (CHEN/HAN)**

*Kevin Cheng, Chairman*  
*Corinna Wong, Vice-Chair*  
*John Dustin*  
*Judy Johnson-Brody*  
*Chris Huang*

---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to construct a first and second story addition.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION**

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) because the project involves addition to an existing structure.

## **PROJECT HISTORY**

July 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC  
August 2, 2017 – Required action date

## **NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve - 3  
Object - 0  
No response – 9

## **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

*Comment:* The proposed addition at the rear of the existing two-story structure will not alter the appearance of the residence as viewed from the street therefore staff can find the addition compatible with 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 floor uncovered deck will not cause privacy concerns to the immediate adjacent neighbors. The west neighbor is on a higher elevation and there is a forty-foot distance between the structures. Existing heavy vegetation and a forty-foot distance alleviate privacy concerns from the east neighbor.

- 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 includes matching exterior materials, colors, eaves, and style details. For consistency with windows on the structure, new exterior doors should have grids.

- 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 materials and colors are consistent with the existing structure and with the architectural style.

# City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



*Kevin Cheng, Chair*

*Corinna Wong, Vice Chair*

*John Dustin*

*Judy Johnson-Brody*

*Chris Huang*

TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: ALEXANDRIA EN  
PROFESSIONAL INTERN

DATE: JULY 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-25**  
**1285 SOUTH SAN GABRIEL BLVD., (LI/XIAO)**

---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to modify a previously approved new house. The modifications include eliminating the subterranean garage and constructing a new, detached two-car garage.

## **PROJECT HISTORY**

August 17, 2016 –New house approved by the DRC  
July 19, 2017 – First hearing before DRC for the revised project  
August 2, 2017 – Required action date

## **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 previously approved subterranean garage will now become a detached garage. This changes the north side elevation and also causes a reduction in the size of the house to accommodate the additional lot coverage. However, the overall massing and style of the house will remain the same. Staff can find that the proposed size and scale of the home are compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed detached garage is compatible with the neighborhood, as most other homes are similarly developed.

**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 one-story house will not negatively impact the neighbors' privacy. The proposed modifications also will not have any impact on the neighbors' privacy.

**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 colors and materials are consistent throughout the house and have not changed from the original proposal. The proposed garage will match the house in terms of colors and materials.



# City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JULY 19, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-10**  
**828 SIERRA MADRE BLVD., (LI/XIAO)**

*Kevin Cheng, Chairman*  
*Corinna Wong, Vice Chair*  
*John Dustin*  
*Judy Johnson-Brody*  
*Chris Huang*

---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant proposes to construct a new one-story residence with a detached two-car garage and front yard walls.

## **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**

July 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC  
August 28, 2017 – Required action date

## **NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve - 4  
Neither Approve or Object - 1  
No response – 7

## **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:* Staff can find the one-story residence and the design approach compatible with the legal neighborhood. The proposed residence shares a similar roof form, massing and scale with neighboring single-story structures.

- 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

*Comment:* The one-story residence will not have privacy impacts on 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 stone veneer application is appropriately placed on only part of the front façade. The proposed materials and colors are consistently carried throughout the structure and the detached garage.

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the *front* yard.

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a *side* yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The DRC shall approve the application for the pilasters with lighting fixtures in the front yard if it finds all of the following to be true:

- 1. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES       NO       NOT APPLICABLE

*Comments:* The proposed front yard walls are less than three feet in height and they function as retaining walls due to the descending slope from the residence to Sierra Madre Boulevard. Staff

can find the front yard walls compatible with the residence since it has the same stone veneer material as the front of the residence.

- 2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES  NO  NOT APPLICABLE

The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.

*Comments:* The proposed project provides similar front yard landscaping improvements as neighboring properties, the south neighbor is improved with similar walls at the front of the property, and neighbors to the north have short walls and tall hedges along the front property line. Staff can support the size and location of the front yard walls. Staff recommends providing a matching step light on the north front yard wall or removing the single step light fixture proposed on the south front yard wall.

- 3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.**

Staff can make this finding:  YES  NO  NOT APPLICABLE

*Comment:* The proposed walls provide the required eighteen inches setback and it will not create a hazardous condition to pedestrians.