

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, JUNE 21, 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. DRC16-107**
1867 WINDSOR ROAD, (LI/XIAO)

This item was continued from the April 19, 2017 meeting. The applicant proposes a new two-story house with a detached garage.

(Required Action Date: 07-28-17)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-51
2793 GAINSBOROUGH DRIVE, (WONDER INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT/WU)

This item was continued from the May 17, 2017 meeting. The applicant requests to construct a second-story addition, new 2-car garage, and make exterior modifications to the house.

(Required Action Date: 08-04-17)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-44
1257 SAN MARINO AVENUE, (LO)

This item was continued from the May 3, 2017 meeting. The applicant proposes a first and second story addition.

(Required Action Date: 06-23-17)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-38
2198 ROANOKE ROAD, (NORTON/CHEN)

This item was continued from the May 3, 2017 meeting. The applicant proposes an addition and remodel of the first and second story.

(Required Action Date: 09-17-17)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC15-03
1395 BELHAVEN ROAD, (JU/TSAO)

The applicant requests a new one-story addition.

(Required Action Date: 07-21-17)

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, July 5, 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: JUNE 21, 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
June 21, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC
July 28, 2017 – Required action date

At the previous hearing, the DRC did not express concerns about the height or mass of the house. There also were not any neighbors in attendance that shared such concerns. Because of this, staff informed the applicant that the story poles could be removed since they were impeding the tenant's usage of the driveway and garage. When the story poles were removed, the public hearing notice signage was also removed. Per Code, this sign must remain in place through the 15 day appeal period after a decision is made. Since the sign was removed, the project does not meet the public hearing noticing requirements and must be continued. Staff recommends continuing the project to the meeting of July 5, 2017.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: AMANDA MERLO, AICP
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JUNE 21, 2017

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

Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chairman

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

April 19, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC; continued due to lack of story poles.

May 17, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC; continued due to lack of story poles.

June 21, 2017 – Third hearing before the DRC.

August 4, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 2

Object – 1

No response - 11

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 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. However, there are modifications that can be made to enhance compatibility with the style and with the neighborhood. The house has a wide frontage and steep roof pitch. Lowering the stepped-down portion on the right could balance the front façade, and it is a common feature in Cape Cod homes.

The proposed Hardieplank siding, wood shutters, and brick veneer are appropriate to the house and neighborhood. The proposed Eagle Bel Air roof material, which has red and purple tones, would not be appropriate to the neighborhood or house. A wood or simulated wood roof should be used on the Cape Cod style.

- 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; the addition is compatible with the proposed building style.

- 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 roof material is not consistent with the proposed style of the structure, as discussed above. Also, the brick wainscot should extend around to the sides of the house.

CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) EDWARD + MARY RIEGLER 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 Riegler Mary Riegler
Property Owner's Signature

Oct 10, 2016
Date

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JUNE 21, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-44**
1257 SAN MARINO AVE, (LI/LO)

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 construct a first and second-story addition.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

May 3, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
June 21, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC
June 23, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 7
Object - 0
No response - 8

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: There are two-story structures within the legal neighborhood. The massing and scale of the addition is compatible with neighboring two-story structures. The first and second-story addition is appropriate for the corner property.

- 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 addition provides sufficient setback from the north side yard to prevent privacy impact to the north neighbor. Existing matured hedges are located between the subject property and the north 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 is compatible with the existing structure. The revised design includes a two-foot building height reduction, removal of the front-facing chimney, and dormers evenly spread across the roof. The revised design improves the visual balance of the structure.

Submitted plans have internal inconsistencies related to the revised building height. The revised building height is 26 feet 2 inches as shown on Sheets A1.1 (Story Poles #1 and 2) and A-5 on elevation drawings, however the plate height for each floor, roof forms and slopes remained the same as the original design. Staff recommends that a condition be incorporated with the project approval to ensure the exact building height, plate height and roof slopes are implemented accurately.

- 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: Exterior wall and roofing materials are consistent and matching those found on the existing structure. Windows operation and treatments are consistent for the addition project.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JUNE 21, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-38**
2198 ROANOKE ROAD, (NORTON/NUNEZ)

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 construct a first and second-story addition.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

May 3, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
June 21, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC
September 17, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 7
Object - 0
No response - 8

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 legal neighborhood comprises of both single and two-story structures. The proposed first and second-story addition is compatible with the neighborhood in terms of visual

massing and scale. The addition is located along the interior (west) side yard and the rear yard in a manner that will not negatively alter the existing streetscape.

- 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: Staff finds the second floor balcony to be respectful of neighbors' privacy. New second floor windows along the west elevation may be intrusive to the single-story neighbor to the west and staff recommends using opaque or frosted glass for these second floor windows.

- 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

Comment: The proposed addition is well integrated with the existing structure.

- 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: Exterior colors and materials are consistent with those existing on the structure. Window material, operation and treatments are consistently carried throughout the structure. Balcony railing design matches design of an existing side yard gate on the property.

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: JUNE 21, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC15-03**
1395 BELHAVEN ROAD, (JU/TSAO)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

June 21, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
July 21, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 6
Object – 0
No response - 11

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 is comprised of one-story Ranch and Minimal Traditional style homes. The proposed one-story addition, which will maintain the architectural style of the house, is compatible with the neighborhood. The detached, two-car garage does not require DRC approval since it is less than 600 square feet in lot coverage. However, the overlapping placement of the garage and addition creates a crowded appearance. If the garage were to move closer to the rear property line, or if the addition were shortened, the addition would appear more 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 one-story addition with large setbacks will not create privacy concerns for the 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

Comments: The proposed addition will appear as a natural extension of the house.

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 original windows on the house have grids. This style should be carried around the whole house.