WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2018
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: Chair Howard Brody, Vice-Chair Kevin Cheng, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang, and Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij

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. DRC18-61
   2435 ADAIR ST., (LU)
   The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing block wall.
   (Required Action Date: 12-1-18)

2. MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-83
   2735 CANTERBURY RD., (TERRA OAKS LLC/PDS STUDIO INC.)
   The applicant requests to modify the building height of the main structure and the detached garage of a previously approved project.
   (Required Action Date: 12-21-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-48
   1886 ALPINE DR., (CONZONIRE/PACA)
   The applicant proposes to construct street-facing block walls, a pedestrian gate, a trellis structure, and new window awnings on the existing two-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 12-10-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-69
   961 S. SANTA ANITA AVE., (YANG)
   The applicant proposes to construct a front yard fence and garden wall.
   (Required Action Date: 12-18-18)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-57
   2570 WETHERBY RD., (TUNG AND CHIN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition to the existing single-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 12-21-18)

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. 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 a joint meeting to be held with the City Council on Wednesday, November 14, 2018 at 5:00 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: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-61
2435 ADAIR ST., (LU)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing block wall. This application is part of an active Code Compliance violation due to unpermitted construction of a new replacement block wall.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e) because the project involves an accessory structure.

PROJECT HISTORY

October 17, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with needing clarity on the plans with respect to material and location of the proposed wall.
November 7, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
December 1, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 2
Object - 0
No response - 11

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 new replacement wall in the street-facing side 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 block wall will be replacing a previously existing block wall in the same location. The style, height, and color will match that of the previously existing wall. The previously existing wall consisted of brick material, which was painted white. The proposed block wall will consist of concrete masonry unit material and painted white. Staff finds that the proposed wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence as the color would match and be consistent with the style of the residence.

   The applicant is not replacing the existing CMU block wall that is located along the north (rear) property line. The location of the proposed replacement wall has been highlighted on the applicant’s site plan.

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 adjacent to the subject property, located along the same side of Kenilworth Avenue, in between Adair Street and Melville Drive (2424 Melville Drive). The adjacent neighbor’s house is also improved with a street-facing block wall that is consistent in size, location, and appearance as the proposed block wall on the subject property.

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 block wall will maintain a setback of 1 foot and 6 inches from the side property line, therefore it meets the minimum 18-inch setback required by City Code and will not create a hazardous condition to pedestrians or vehicular traffic.
TO:        CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
FROM:     EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER 
DATE:     NOVEMBER 7, 2018 
SUBJECT:  MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-83 2735 CANTERBURY RD., (TERRA OAKS LLC/PDS STUDIO INC.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to modify the building height of a previously approved project that involves a single-story residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage.

On September 20, 2017, the Design Review Committee approved the new residence project with conditions. The Committee also approved a modification to the roofing material on October 3, 2018.

During the roof framing stage, the applicant discovered a discrepancy on the project plans related to the datum plane, first floor finished floor and the overall building height of the main structure. City Codes dictate that the datum plane is an elevation point resulting from the average of the highest and lowest spot elevations along the former building’s frontage as shown on the topographical survey; the datum plane is the base point where building height is measured.

The approved project plans neglected to take into account of the finished floor and mistakenly labeled the finished floor and the datum plane with the same elevation. Due to this error, the actual finished floor is four inches above the datum plane. On Sheet A6.1, the previously approved front and rear elevations labeled the datum plane and the finished floor as 652.67, when in fact, as shown on the as-built elevations, the finished floor is four inches higher than the datum plans. This discrepancy does not change the previously approved building height and plate height as measured from the finished floor, at 16 feet 11 inches and 9 feet 6 inches respectively. However, City Codes state that building height shall be measured from the datum plane; therefore, the structure is now four inches taller than previously approved.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1 because the requested modification to building height is negligible and involves no expansion of the approved single-family residential use.
PROJECT HISTORY

November 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
December 21, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 11
Object – 1
No response – 3

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: Although the requested modification renders the structure four (4) inches taller, the additional height does not alter the visual massing and bulk of the structure in a manner that makes it incompatible with the legal neighborhood. The structure remains at a reasonable height for a single-story structure in the legal neighborhood and it would not alter the streetscape along Canterbury Road.

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
I, [Insert Name], am a property owner of [Insert Address], San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at [Insert Address].

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: [Insert Details]

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.
7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

[Signature]
Property Owner’s Signature

[Date]
Date
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-48 1886 ALPINE DR., (CONZONIRE/PACA)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct street-facing block walls, a pedestrian gate, a trellis structure, and new window awnings on the existing two-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.

PROJECT HISTORY

November 7, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
December 10, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 11
Object – 0
No response – 3

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 consists of both one-story and two-story structures in various traditional architectural styles. Staff finds that the proposed attached trellis would be an acceptable addition to the rear yard area of the existing two-story structure and is compatible with the neighborhood. The adjacent neighbor along Lorain Road has a covered patio area in their rear yard that is a similar and comparable feature to facilitate the use of the rear yard space. However, Staff is unable to support the addition of the new window awnings since the placement of the awnings only along the rear side of the structure creates a random appearance and is also inconsistent with the location of awnings found on other Spanish style properties within 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

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: Overall, Staff finds that the proposed trellis is compatible with the existing structure, however the applicant may want to consider a lighter shade to stain the wood, as the proposed “Cordovan Brown” color appears to be too dark to be consistent with the lighter shade of the existing structure. Staff is unable to make the finding to support the proposed window awnings, as it is not applied consistently throughout the house and the color is also not identified on the drawings.

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 new wall in the street-facing side yard and the pedestrian gate 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 block wall extension and the pedestrian gate are compatible with the existing residence. The new portion of the wall will match the existing wall in terms of color and material. The proposed pedestrian gate is composed of natural wood and would complement the style of 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: For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, staff observed the house adjacent to the subject property, located along the same side of Lorain Road, in between Alpine Drive and Carlisle Drive (1881 Carlisle Drive). The adjacent neighbor’s house is also improved with a street-facing block wall with an attached pedestrian gate that is consistent in size, location, and general appearance as the proposed project.

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 block wall will maintain a setback of 3 feet from the side property line, therefore it meets the minimum 18-inch setback required by City Code and will not create a hazardous condition to pedestrians or vehicular traffic.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-69 961 S. SANTA ANITA AVE., (YANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a front yard fence and a garden wall.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e) because the project involves an accessory structure.

PROJECT HISTORY

November 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
December 18, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 4
Object - 0
No response - 7

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 new front yard fence and garden wall 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 fence would be inconsistent in height along the north property line as City Code allows for a maximum height of six feet in the side yard, but restricts the maximum height of a front yard fence at four feet. Staff finds that the varying height of the fence would produce an inconsistent appearance in the front yard that would not be compatible with the existing wood fence along the southern property line and would not complement the existing residence.

   The proposed garden wall would be a replacement of the existing deteriorated garden wall without the red brick cap. Staff finds that a gray concrete block garden wall would look rather industrial at this site and would recommend a condition to paint and/or stucco the wall if approved by the Committee.

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 houses located along the same side of Santa Anita Avenue, in between Robles Avenue and Canterbury Road. Front yard garden walls appear to be ubiquitous on properties located along Santa Anita Avenue. However, staff did not observe any front yard fencing on other properties on this block comparable to what the applicant is proposing at the subject property.

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 fence and block wall will be located on the side yard property line and the applicant has provided a copy of the signed fence agreement with the adjacent property owner. The proposed project would not result in any hazardous conditions for pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-57 2570 WETHERBY RD., (TUNG AND CHIN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition to an existing single-story residence on a corner property.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) - Existing facilities.

PROJECT HISTORY

November 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
December 21, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 5
Object – 0
No response – 8

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 proposed addition involves enclosing part of a covered breezeway between the residence and the garage visible from Santa Anita Avenue and an extension of the existing structure into the east side yard. The neighborhood comprises of predominantly single-story
structures, the proposed addition maintains the single-story façade and orientation on Wetherby Road. The placement of the addition continues the L shape structure that is consistent with structures located on corner properties along Santa Anita Avenue. The increased massing and bulk are compatible with structures in 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 addition along the east side yard complies with the required setback and provides window sizes and placement are respectful of the east neighbor. Staff does not see any potential privacy issues or concerns associated with this project.

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 addition provides matching roof slope, roof eaves with 24 inches overhang and louver shutters. The project is well integrated with the existing structure and it will maintain the architectural characteristics of the 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 will be consistent throughout the building. Staff finds the new exterior color in Peaches and Cream to be brighter than the typical earth tone exterior colors found in the neighborhood. Staff recommends a lighter earth tone color.
CALL TO ORDER  Chairman Brody called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Howard Brody, Vice-Chair Kevin Cheng, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang, and Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij

ABSENT:  Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg

APPEALPROCEDURE

Chairman Brody 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. DRC18-38
    730 CHESTER AVE., (SUN/GENNARO)

    Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that the project plans lack sufficient details for her to make the required findings for the project. Staff recommended denial of the project as presented.

    Mark Gennaro, landscape architect, explained the design and reasons for the project.

    There were no public comments.

    It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was not compatible with existing front yard improvements found in the legal neighborhood.

    Committee Member Batnij moved to deny the project. Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Cheng, Chair Brody. NOES: None.

2.  MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-107
    1867 WINDSOR RD., (JC NEW HOME LLC/HASLOCK)

    Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff was able to make the required findings.
Chris Haslock, applicant, displayed a sample window product, explained the window performance and product warranty. Mr. Haslock shown two different shades of green, the Mallard Green and Forrest Green, for consideration.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the window manufacturer change would not alter the compatibility of the project. The Committee can make the required findings because the new windows and doors will be consistent in grid patterns and styles with the previously approved windows and doors.

Committee Member Batnij stated that she is not familiar with the product and visited two of the homes with the product installed and found the product to be incompatible on a traditional style home.

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to approve the project with the following condition:

1. Windows and doors shall be in the Mallard Green color.

Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Vice-Chair Cheng, Chair Brody. NOES: Committee Member Batnij.

3. MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-17
2258 S. OAK KNOLL AVE., (HAN/HASLOCK)

Associate Planner Choi stated that the noticing was provided in error. The modification request will be directed to the Planning Commission because it was the body that approved the original project.

OTHER MATTERS

4. DISCUSSION OF MARVIN INTEGRITY WOOD-ULTREX WINDOWS FOR THE PRE-APPROVED WINDOW MATERIAL LIST

Associate Planner Choi stated that the window representative is requesting that the Committee consider the Marvin Integrity Wood-Ultrex window product for the City’s Pre-Appproved Window Material List.

Richard De La Hoya, Window manufacturer representative, provided a presentation on the composition of the wood-ultrex material, its performance and warranty. He also displayed a double hung and a casement window material sample. Mr. De La Hoya clarified that the written specifications for the performance, appearance and warranty of the product would be the same regardless of the window operation.

There were no public comments.
Chair Brody stated that it is difficult to review a full line of product and that it would be helpful for the window representative to provide specific models such as double hung or casement for consideration, instead of a full line of product that involves different window types.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody stated that she would like to see a true wood window product compares to the wood-ultrex product.

Chair Brody invited the window representative to return with additional information and to provide product material booklet with specific pages identified for review.

5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 1, 2018.**

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Chair Brody, Vice-Chair Cheng, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Batnij. NOES: None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 19, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

________________________
EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER
CALL TO ORDER  Chairman Brody called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Howard Brody, Vice-Chair Kevin Cheng, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang, and Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij

ABSENT: Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Brody 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. DRC18-62
   2963 SHAKESPEARE RD., (HUANG/HOWARD & SONS, INC.)

   Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that the project plans lack sufficient details for her to make the required findings for the project.

   There were no public comments.

   The Committee received and filed the request to withdraw the application.

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-13
   2650 CANTERBURY RD., (CHAN/LIN)

   Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff was able to make the required findings.

   Eric Lin, project designer, provided an overview of the project and reviewed the exterior materials information requested by the Committee at the previously hearing.

   There were no public comments.

   The Committee expressed concerns with the artificial appearance of the stimulated veneer stone material.
It was the consensus of the Committee that the project is compatible with itself and with the neighborhood, and the concerns with the stimulated stone veneer material can be addressed through a condition of approval.

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to approve the project with the following condition:

1. Applicant shall use Lantana Cliffstone for the front façade, as noted on the plans.

Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Huang, Vice-Chair Cheng, Chair Brody. NOES: Committee Member Johnson-Brody.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-55**
   **1155 AVONDALE RD., (FU/LEFEBvre)**

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that she is unable to make the required findings for the project for compatibility reason.

There were no public comments.

Cheryl Fields, landscape architect, explained the project.

The Committee found the proposed gates and pilasters to have Arts and Crafts elements and they are not compatible with the Tudor residence.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to deny the project. Second by Chair Brody. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Cheng, Chair Brody. NOES: None.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-45**
   **2875 DEVONPORT RD., (GUTERRES)**

Associate Planner Choi provided the report and explained that the front yard improvements are incompatible with properties on the same block as defined by the City Codes. Associate Planner Choi recommended denial of the project.

Tomas Guterres, applicant, explained the project and distributed photographs of similar front yard walls on nearby properties.

There were no public comments.

The Committee found the project to be incompatible with the residence and inconsistent with the Block, as defined by City Codes.

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to deny the project. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Cheng, Chair Brody. NOES: None.
5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-27**  
480 WINTHROP RD., (DABBS/DUBON)

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that staff is unable to make the required findings for compatibility with the legal neighborhood and with the structure itself.

Dr. Dabbs, property owner, explained the reasons for the after-the-fact request.

Julio Dubon, project designer, provided an overview of the work completed.

There were no public comments.

Majority of the Committee found the exterior modifications done on the residence has made it incompatible with itself and with the legal neighborhood.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody stated that she likes the improvements thus far; however, the modern appearance has made the residence incompatible with the neighborhood.

Chair Brody moved to deny the project. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Huang, Chair Brody. NOES: Vice-Chair Cheng, Committee Member Johnson-Brody.

**OTHER MATTERS**

6. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 15, 2018.**

Committee Member Huang moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Chair Brody, Vice-Chair Cheng, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Batnij. NOES: None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 3, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

EVA CHOI,  
ASSOCIATE PLANNER