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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 Kevin Cheng, Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, John Dustin, Judy Johnson-Brody, Chris Huang, Frances Banerjee, and Lon Wahlberg

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. DRC17-43
   2630 LORAIN RD., (TANG/HAN)
   *This item was continued from the October 18, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story house with a basement and a detached three-car garage.
   *(Required Action Date: 2-22-18)*

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-09
   2679 E. CALIFORNIA BLVD., (GU/TSANG)
   *This item was continued from the December 6, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story house with a basement, retaining the existing two-car garage and converting the existing attached pool house into a covered patio area.
   *(Required Action Date: 1-20-18)*

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-03
   574 LOS ARBOLES LN., (TZENG)
   *This item was continued from the December 6, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a new one-story residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage.
   *(Required Action Date: 2-1-18)*

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-07
   596 SIERRA MADRE BLVD., (HSU/YANG)
   *This item was continued from the December 20, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage, and street facing gates and fencing.
   *(Required Action Date: 3-12-18)*

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-71
   1300 WAVERLY RD., (TUNG/OROZCO)
   *This item was continued from the November 15, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a street side yard driveway gate and pilasters.
   *(Required Action Date: 3-20-18)*

6. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC 17-56
   1320 OAK GROVE AVE., (CHAN)
   *This item was continued from the December 20, 2017 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a front yard gate with pilasters.
   *(Required Action Date: 1-26-18)*
7. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-67
1040 OAK GROVE AVE., (PENG/AGAIAN)
The applicant proposes to construct a front yard gate with pilasters.
(Required Action Date: 2-19-18)

OTHER MATTERS

8. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JANUARY 3, 2018.

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. No more than two DRC members may participate in Open Forum discussions. Applications that have been heard by the DRC may not be discussed during Open Forum.

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, February 7, 2018 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.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-43 2630 LORAINE ROAD, (TANG/HAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence and a detached two-car garage with a storage room.

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

October 18, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee found the design, massing, and exterior materials to be incompatible with the neighbor.
January 17, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC.
February 22, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of 10/18/2017)

Approve - 2
Object - 0
No response - 7
Neither object nor support - 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 legal neighborhood comprises of both one and two-story homes. It should be noted that majority of the single-story structures are located west of the Rubio Wash, on both side of Lorain Road. Homes located east of the Rubio Wash tend to exhibit a larger massing. The three legal neighbors abutting the rear of the subject property are developed with single-story structures similar to those located west of the Rubio Wash.

Since the first hearing, the revised design provides a lower building height at 23 feet 10 inches. The proposed Cape Cod style and plate height at 8’-6” for the first floor and 8’ for the second floor are compatible with neighboring 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

Comments: A second floor bedroom window along the west elevation is located 11 feet from the property line, staff found this distance to be respectful of the single-story neighbor to the west. A tall hedge is also proposed along the west property line to further limit impacts on the west 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 exterior materials are common for the Cape Cod style. These materials are found within the legal neighborhood. The earth tone exterior color scheme will help the new structure blends in on the block. The exterior finishes and colors are consistently carried throughout the project. In place of a wall lighting fixture, staff recommends a hanging or recessed fixture in the entry alcove.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-09
2679 CALIFORNIA BLVD., (GU/TSANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence with a basement and converting the existing pool house into a covered patio area. The existing detached two-car garage will remain at its current location and will be taller by 2 feet to accommodate a plate height increase.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

October 4, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee found the new home incompatible with the legal neighborhood in terms of architectural style, massing, and exterior materials and treatments. There were noise and privacy concerns related to the large second floor balcony.
December 6, 2017 – Second hearing. The Committee considered the re-design and was unable to make the required findings due to issues with massing, plate height, fenestrations and privacy impact from the second floor balcony.
January 17, 2018 – Third hearing before the DRC.
January 20, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of October 4, 2017)

Approve - 10
Object – 4
No response – 1
Neither – 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:* Staff found the proposed Mediterranean style, plate height, roofing materials, front entry treatment and the scale of the structure to be out of proportion with adjacent structures. The project will dramatically alter the streetscape along the north side of California Boulevard.

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 balcony’s window sizes have been reduce and the openings are above eye level. The rear yard facing portion of the balcony will have a limited view into the north neighborhood’s property since the balcony is setback 89 feet from the rear property line. Although a new planting hedge is proposed along the rear property line, staff found the new hedge to have minimal effect in mitigating the privacy concern since the second floor balcony will be 11 feet above ground level.

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 colors and materials are consistently applied throughout the project.
MATERIAL LIST
2679 CALIFORNIA BLVD., SAN MARINO, CA 91108

WINDOW/ DOOR
JELD-WEN
SITELINE WOOD CLAD
BRONZE

CEMENT PLASTER
MERLEX
SMOOTH FINISH
P-174 DESERT BEIGE

WOOD WORK
2X8 FASCIA
PAINTED
WILD MUSTANG (DUNN EDWARDS)

CLAY ROOF TILE
BORAL ROOFING
2-PIECE MISSION BOOSTED
RED

PRECAST TRIM/ MOULDING
MERLEX
PRE-CAST
P-141 BISQUE

WOOD WORK
2X8 FASCIA
PAINTED
WILD MUSTANG (DUNN EDWARDS)

EXTERNAL LIGHT
LIVEX
ARMWELL 2 LIGHT 26 INCH WALL LANTERN 2551-07
BRONZE, FROSTED GLASS

GARAGE DOOR
LOUIS DOOR INC.
HECTOR GARAGE STAIN-GRADE WOOD
STAINED WALNUT
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-03 574 LOS ARBOLES LN., (TZENG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story Minimal Traditional residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

September 20, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The project was continued due to building massing, privacy concerns and neighborhood compatibility issues.
December 6, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC. The Committee found the re-design to be compatible with the neighborhood in style, massing, scale and materials. The project was continued for clarifications on exterior material colors and internal consistency issue with plans.
January 17, 2018 – Third hearing before the DRC.
February 1, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of December 6, 2017)

Approve - 2
Object – 8
No response – 1
Neither – 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

Comment: The proposed architectural style, scale, plate height, and massing is compatible with the legal neighborhood and structures located within the cul-de-sac.

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 single-story structure provides sufficient setback and window placement are respectful of the north neighbor’s 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 revised plans and materials board provide details on exterior materials and architectural features. The solid, stained black front door and black wood shutters provide sufficient contrast against the siding and stucco colors. Rain gutters and downspouts will be painted white to blend in with the stucco color. Staff found the colors and materials displayed on the revised materials board to be compatible with the structure and are consistently carried throughout the project.
574 LOS ARBOLES LN, SAN MARINO
ILLUSTRATION & MATERIAL BOARD

CROWN MOULDING
FASCIA BOARD
WOOD COLUMN
COLOR: SWISS COFFEE DEW341
(DUNN EDWARD PAINT)

WINDOW / DOOR
WOOD CASING
L&L WOOD PRODUCTS
HOWE CASING
3.25" OVER 2" TRIM
COLOR: SWISS COFFEE DEW341
(DUNN EDWARD PAINT)

WINDOW SHUTTERS
ATLANTIC SHUTTERS
CLASSICAL COLLECTION
COLOR: BLACK

DECORATIVE SHROUD
FIREPLACE GUYS
HIP RIDGE CAP
COLOR: DARK GREY

RAIN GUTTER
DOWNSPOUT
IRONWORK BY OTHERS
COLOR: WHITE

FRONT DOOR
SIMPSON DOOR
EXTERIOR FRENCH
MODEL 77130
COLOR: STAINED BLACK
W/ SIDELIGHT 37804
COLOR: WHITE

GARAGE DOOR
AMARR CLASSICA
DOOR DESIGN: CORTANA
WINDOW: MADEIRA
PAINTED: TRUE WHITE
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-87
596 SIERRA MADRE BLVD., (HSU/YANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence with an attached two-car garage, and street facing gates and fencing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

November 1, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with overall massing, volume, plate height, privacy impact on the north neighbor, and finish details and materials. The Committee found the fencing and pilasters incompatible with the front yard development of the neighborhood.
December 20, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC. The Committee granted a continuance request.
January 17, 2018 – Third hearing before the DRC.
March 12, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of November 1, 2017)

Approve - 7
Object – 0
No response – 6

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – NEW RESIDENCE

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 contains both one and two-story homes in various styles. At the first hearing, the Committee found the massing, plate height, and volume to be incompatible with the neighborhood. The Committee further noted that the two-story front entry appearance is inappropriate and the overall structure is out of scale with itself. The current design provides minimal changes and the project remains massive and incompatible 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

   *Comment:* The proposed second-story, rear yard facing balcony provides a 26-foot setback to mitigate privacy impact on 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

   *Comment:* The colors and materials are appropriate for the Spanish style home and are consistently carried throughout the project.

**DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – GATES AND FENCING**

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 fence, gate and pilasters 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 pilasters and gate in the front yard are compatible with the style of the home. The wrought iron driveway gate should provide matching design as the second floor balcony railing and removal of the wood planks to minimize the visual impact of the gate.

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 subject property is located at the northeast corner of Sierra Madre Boulevard and California Boulevard. Neighboring properties are improved with driveway gates and staff can support the driveway gate and pilasters along California Boulevard. Staff cannot find the location of the front yard pilasters and gate consistent with front yard improvements on the Block.

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

   *Comments:* The proposed wrought iron driveway gate and side yard fence will not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The proposed front yard pilasters and gate are 3 feet 6 inches in height and substantially setback form the property line.
**South Elevation**

**Exterior plaster**
Lahabra Meadowbrook

**Amarr Garage Door**
Color: Wood Grain

**Angelus Concrete Paving**
Estate Cobble II Tuscan

**Iron Gate with Stain Wood Plank**

**Precast column**

**Stepping Stone**

**Stucco Window Grille**

**Precast Door Molding**
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-71
1300 WAVERLY RD., (TUNG/OROZCO)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street facing driveway gate (Euston Road) and pilasters along the northern property line.

At the November 15, 2017 meeting, the Committee found the proposed gate design to be incompatible with the existing residence. The Committee expressed concerns about the proposed wrought iron material, the color, and the overall compatibility with the subject block.

PROJECT HISTORY

November 15, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
January 17, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
March 20, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 4
Object - 1
No response - 6

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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 gate in the rear yard and retaining wall along the property line 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 proposed white wood driveway gate along the north side yard appropriately simple in design and compatible with the existing Minimal Traditional style house.

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:* For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, Staff observed the house directly adjacent to the rear yard of the subject property along Euston Road. Although there are no pilasters found on other properties on the subject block, the proposed gate and concrete pilasters are still compatible with the legal neighborhood due to its simplistic appearance.

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

   *Comments:* The proposed gate provides a setback of 3 feet from the property line and would not create any issues for pedestrian or oncoming vehicular traffic.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-56
1320 OAK GROVE AVE., (CHAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a front yard gate with pilasters.

At the December 20, 2017 meeting, the Committee found the proposed gate too ornate and incompatible with the existing structure.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) – Existing Structures.

PROJECT HISTORY

December 20, 2017 – First hearing before DRC
January 17, 2018 – Second hearing before DRC
January 26, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 6
Object - 0
No response - 4

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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 gate 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 can find the proposed fence and pilasters architecturally compatible as long as the color of the pilasters will match the existing 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 front yard wrought iron gate will be 6 feet tall, the proposed fencing will be 5 feet and 6 inches tall, and the pilasters will be 6 feet tall, constructed of concrete masonry material. The size, location, and height of the proposed front yard gate on the subject property are consistent with other front yard gates that are found on the subject block. For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, Staff observed houses adjacent to the subject property and others located along the same side of Oak Grove Avenue, in between Shenandoah Road and Circle Drive.

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

   *Comments:* The proposed pilasters will maintain the required setback of eighteen inches (18") from the front property line and the proposed gate and fence will maintain two feet and six inches from the front property line. The proposal will not disrupt oncoming vehicular traffic nor cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO:   CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
      DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM:  CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE:  JANUARY 17, 2018

SUBJECT:  DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-67
          1040 OAK GROVE AVE., (PENG/AGAIAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a basement addition, a first-story addition, and exterior modifications to the existing single-story residence.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) – Existing Facilities.

The existing residence was originally designed by Wallace Neff and built in 1955. The home is not currently listed in the California State Historical Resources Inventory. A previously conducted Historic Resource Assessment concluded that the structure does not meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. Staff is attaching a copy of the addendum and summary of the assessment report. The complete report is available upon request.

PROJECT HISTORY

January 17, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
February 19, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 2
Object - 0
No response - 14

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 consists of a combination of one-story Ranch homes and two-story homes in Spanish, Mediterranean, and Tudor architectural styles. The proposed one-story addition is at the rear of the property, but will be visible from Oak Grove Place as this is a corner lot. The home will remain compatible with the neighborhood as it will maintain the one-story Ranch 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 one-story addition will not negatively impact 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

Comments: Staff finds that the proposed addition retains many defining features of the existing Ranch style home including the wide overhanging eaves, low pitched roof, the U-shaped floor plan, and the asymmetrical composition.

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 addition matches the existing home with respect to using the same color palette and selecting materials from the City’s pre-approved materials lists for the windows, doors, and roof. Although there is minimal ornamentation proposed, Staff finds the glass railing to be too contemporary for this traditional Ranch home and cannot support the use of this material for the balcony.

Staff also recommends utilizing brick exterior detailing for the proposed garage addition to be consistent with the existing two-car garage.
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
JANUARY 3, 2017 - 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER  Chairman Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Kevin Cheng, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Frances Banerjee, Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg.

ABSENT: Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, Committee Member Chris Huang.

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Hsu gave an explanation of the Design Review Committee procedures and explanation of the fifteen-day appeal procedure to the members of the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-75
   1476 KENSINGTON ROAD, (KWOK)

   Associate Planner Choi presented the revised project and stated that staff was able to make the required findings.

   Joseph Kwok, property owner, presented the changes in details and answered questions.

   The following people spoke about the project:

   Dale Pederson, 2140 Lorain Road, spoke in support of the project and complemented the teamwork between the applicant and the DRC
   Andrew Wong, 1475 Kensington Road, opposed the project, stated the project remains too large
   Mrs. Park, 1464 Kensington Road, opposed the project, stated that the style is not compatible with the neighborhood

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the project is now compatible with the neighborhood and with itself as a French style home.
Committee Member Johnson-Brody stated the only issue would be that windows on the south and east elevations should be consistent in size and with muntins, if size permits.

Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg found the structure to be incompatible with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to approve the project as submitted. Second by Alternate Committee Member Banerjee. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Banerjee. NOES: Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg.

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-25
1705 DURKLYN COURT, (ZHOU)

Associate Planner Choi stated that the applicant is requesting to continue the project to the February 21, 2018 meeting for additional time to revise the project.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to continue the project to the meeting of February 21, 2018. Second by Chairman Kevin Cheng. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Banerjee, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. NOES: Committee Member Dustin.

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-84
1310 LORAIN ROAD, (SAKRANI/WEBB)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff was unable to make the required findings for the requested composition fiberglass material and color. The proposed material lacks texture and is not compatible with roofing materials in the legal neighborhood. Staff found the proposed Country Gray color to be too dark for the existing structure.

Mr. Sakhirani, property owner, presented the project.

There were no public comments.

A majority of the Committee found that the proposed material and color would be compatible with the style of house and with other roof installations in the neighborhood.

Alternate Committee Member Banerjee moved to approved the project as submitted. Second by Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Banerjee, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. NOES: Committee Member Dustin.

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-92
1942 ENDICOTT AVENUE, (LEE)
Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings for the removal of the brick chimney and the metal chimney flue.

Mary Chou, applicant representative, explained the reasons for the project.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the existing structure will remain compatible with the neighborhood and with itself without the brick chimney and the metal chimney flue.

Committee Member Dustin moved to approve the project as submitted. Second by Committee Member Johnson-Brody. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Banerjee, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. NOES: None.

OTHER MATTERS

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 5, 2017.

Committee Member Dustin moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Second by Chairman Cheng. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Banerjee, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. NOES: None.

6. DISCUSSION OF EAGLE ROOFING, LIGHTWEIGHT DOUBLE EAGLE PONDEROSA TILE PRODUCT IN BROWN GRAY RANGE COLOR FOR THE PRE-APPROVED ROOF MATERIAL LIST.

Associate Planner Choi informed the Committee that the roofing product representative is not available to discuss the product.

The following people spoke on the item:

Rich Haserot, 2365 Sherwood Road, explained the reasoning behind the requirements found on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Material List and the need to study available roofing products on the market in order to update and expand the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials, Colors and Application List.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the roofing product is not ready for consideration by the Planning Commission. The Committee had concerns with the product, the color and installation of the 90-degree edge rake. The Committee agreed that the product needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

The Committee stated that there is an urgent need to establish an ad hoc committee to study available roofing products for addition onto the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials, Colors and Application List.
ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, January 17, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER