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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 Corinma 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. DRC17-46
   1885 VIRGINIA RD., (YOUNG/CHUI)
   This item was continued from the November 1, 2017 and December 20, 2017 meetings. The applicant proposes to construct a first and second-story addition with exterior modifications to the existing two-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 3-8-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-67
   1705 DURKLYN CT., (ZHOU)
   This item was continued from the November 15, 2017 and January 3, 2018 meetings. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story house with a basement and detached three-car garage.
   (Required Action Date: 3-30-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-43
   2630 LORAIN RD., (TANG/HAN)
   This item was continued from the October 18, 2017 and January 17, 2018 meetings. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence and a detached two-car garage with a storage room.
   (Required Action Date: 2-22-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-46
   2458 S. OAK KNOLL AVE., (WANG/HAN)
   This item was continued from the December 20, 2017 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a first and second-story addition, and exterior modifications to the existing two-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 3-20-18)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-85
   2650 WALLINGFORD RD., (MA)
   This item was continued from the February 7, 2018 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a new street facing block wall and exterior modifications.
   (Required Action Date: 3-30-18)

6. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-86
   1805 EUCLID AVE., (KURERA/PARK)
   The applicant proposes to construct an addition and remodel to the existing first story, an addition of a new second story, and a new detached three-car garage.
   (Required Action Date: 4-7-18)
7. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-63
1870 CARLISLE DR., (CHANG/LIN)
The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition with exterior modifications to
the existing one-story residence
(Required Action Date: 3-18-18)

OTHER MATTERS

8. REQUEST FOR PROJECT APPROVAL EXTENSION
2763 GAINSBOROUGH DR., (CHIN)

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, March 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
FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-46 1885 VIRGINIA RD., (YOUNG/CHUI)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition and exterior modifications to 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 Structures.

PROJECT HISTORY

November 1, 2017 – First hearing before DRC. The project was continued due to issues with the color scheme and compatibility of the overall addition with the existing house and the general neighborhood.
December 20, 2017 – Second hearing before DRC. The project was continued due to design issues regarding privacy impacts and massing.
February 21, 2018 – Third hearing before DRC
March 8, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 6
Object – 1
Neither - 1
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.
Comments: The neighborhood is comprised of two-story Colonial Revival, Tudor, and Spanish style is compatible with the neighborhood. Since the last hearing, the proposed addition has been reduced from 724 square feet to 656 square feet, minimizing the size of the master bedroom addition and eliminating portions of the first floor addition. Staff can find the proposed size and scale of the structure compatible with surrounding properties.

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

Comments: At the prior hearing, the Committee identified privacy impacts to the adjacent neighbors that would result from the proposed second floor balcony and first floor addition. The project designer has revised the plan to recess the second floor balcony to eliminate any direct sight lines to the south neighbor. Additionally, the previously proposed covered patio and bathroom along the north side of the property has been eliminated. Staff finds that the proposed addition sufficiently maintains the reasonable expectation of the neighbors’ privacy.

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

Comments: At the last hearing, the Committee expressed concerns over the window shutter widths and the front entry portico. The project designer has enlarged the window shutters on the front elevation to be proportional to the size of the windows and has provided additional details of the elements of the front entry pediment and columns.

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

Comments: Staff finds that the colors and materials chosen for this project are consistent with the existing structure. The windows and roofing materials are selected from the City’s Pre-Approved Lists and will be compatible with the style of the house.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: EVA CHOI ASSOCIATE PLANNER
DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-25 1705 DURKLYN COURT, (Zhou)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303a (New construction).

PROJECT HISTORY

November 15, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with massing, exterior finishes, lack of Tudor features and the overall cohesiveness of the structures.
January 3, 2018 – The Design Review Committee granted a continuance request.
February 21, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC.
March 30, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of November 15, 2017 hearing)

Approve - 8
Object – 4
No response – 1
Neither – 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: Staff finds the proposed plate height and overall massing incompatible with the neighborhood and particularly with Ranch structures within the cul-de-sac. The concept of a Tudor structure is not appropriate for the cul-de-sac location as the Tudor style dictates a very steep roof and this would disrupt the streetscape.

The proposed structure appears busy and lacks identifiable Tudor features. The front façade has too many competing features and the entry treatment is not appropriate for the chosen style. Staff finds the wood siding application on the front elevation to be incompatible for the Tudor style. The chimney location and height seems to indicate that this is an add-on feature instead of the massive chimney traditionally associated with the Tudor 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

Comment: The proposed second floor bathroom window on the east elevation is out of proportion with the gabled dormer. Staff finds that a smaller window with less glass surface area and using opaque glass for the second floor bathroom window (Window 203 labeled on second floor plan) can effectively mitigate potential privacy impact on the single-story neighbor to the east.

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: First floor windows on the east elevation should be casement windows for consistency with the rest of the structure. Both deck areas on the second floor should have consistent railing design instead of the partial railing at the covered deck area only. The circular vents on the front elevation is out of scale and not appropriate for the Tudor structure. Staff recommends a downcast lighting fixture at the uncovered second floor deck to reduce lighting pollution to adjacent neighbors.
Feiss Cotswold Lane 23 3/4"H Black Outdoor Wall Light
- Style # 2T840

Three timeless candelabra bulbs glow behind delicate panels of beveled glass in this handsome black finish outdoor wall light. With a classic scrolled design and intricately detailed frame, it's an elegant way to illuminate a traditional style garage, entryway or porch. From the Cotswold Lane collection by Feiss.

Product Details

- Feiss brand was formerly known as Murray Feiss - Cotswold Lane collection outdoor light.
- Scroll top arm.
- Clear beveled glass.
- Black finish.
- Medium size light.
- Aluminum construction.
- Three max 60 watt or equivalent candelabra bulbs (not included).
- 23 3/4" high.
- 9 1/2" wide.
- Extends 11 3/4" from the wall.
- Backplate is 13 1/2" high, 5 1/4" wide.
- Wet location outdoor rated.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER
DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-43 2630 LORAIN 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. Massing remained incompatible with the immediate neighborhood, issues with dormer details and driveway gate design.
February 21, 2018 – Third 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 sides 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.

At the January 17th hearing, the architect presented a design with the building height at 23 feet 10 inches and plate height at 8'-6” for the first floor and 8’ for the second floor. The current design provides the same plate height, but the overall building height is reduced by another 12-inches. The height reduction is achieved by changing the roof slope to 10:12, staff finds this change acceptable since Cape Cod roofs typically have roof pitches of 8:12 or greater.

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 only second floor window located along the west elevation is adequately setback from the single-story neighbor to the west. A tall ficus 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 and color scheme are commonly found on Cape Cod structures within the legal neighborhood. The earth tone exterior color scheme will help the new structure blends in on the block. The wrought iron driveway gate design and color are common for the proposed style. Staff can make this finding provided that the front entry treatment be modified for consistency with neighboring structures and this includes removal of the sidelite and provision of a solid door.
Changes are made from previous plans shown on 1/17/2018 DRC meeting.

1. Reduce total building area 90 sf (from 3108 sf to 3018 sf)

2. Reduce total building height 12” (from 23’-10” to 22’-10”), (pitch from 10.5 to 10:12)

3. 485 sf have been removed from 2nd floor to 1st floor for reducing mass
   (Now, it is 1 suite and sitting area on 2nd floor)

4. Reduce dormers size and similar design with dormers @ 2660 Lorain Rd.

5. Reduce front façade windows size and brick wainscot height

6. Modify front driveway gate, see \( \frac{6}{A4} \)

7. Modify front entry door, see \( \frac{8}{A4} \)

8. Called out wood shutter width = \( \frac{1}{2} \) of window width

9. No more interior circular stairway, instead of traditional shape

10. Re-design 1st floor pop-out side yard bathroom which toward west
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-55
2458 S. OAK KNOLL AVENUE, (WANG/HAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a first and second-story addition, and exterior modifications to the existing two-story structure.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

December 20, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee was concerned with the unbalanced shed dormer. Majority of the members found the front porch design compatible.
February 21, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
March 20, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (AS OF 12/15/2017)

Approve - 9
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 addition will not alter the building height, visual massing, scale, and the overall appearance of the structure as viewed from the street. The visible new features include a covered front porch and dormers on the north and south elevations. The structure will remain compatible with the legal neighborhood. The addition alters the east elevation (facing rear yard) of the structure; it introduces a shed dormer at the center of the second floor, a covered patio and extension of the two gable roof on first floor.

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 addition facing the rear yard is well over 100 feet from the east neighbor. The second floor side dormers are located in bathrooms, given the limited floor area in the near the dormers, staff finds that the project will not have privacy impacts on adjacent neighbors.

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

Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The architect revised the shed dormer to provide a better integration with the second floor and the first floor covered patio. The revised shed dormer appears balanced and has a more gentle slope as viewed from the side elevations.

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 addition provides matching stucco, roofing material and window treatments as those found on the existing structure. The new columns will be off-white in color to match existing trims on the structure. First floor patio doors are provided with consistent simulated divided lites as those found on existing windows.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-85 2650 WALLINGFORD RD., (MA)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new street facing block wall and exterior modifications.

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

February 7, 2018 – First hearing before DRC. The Committee identified design issues with the window design, landscaping, block wall details, and front entry.
February 21, 2018 – Second hearing before DRC
March 30, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 11
Object - 0
No response - 2

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.
Staff can make this finding: ☑YES ☐NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: The neighborhood consists of one-story Ranch and Minimal Traditional style houses. The house 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 interior remodeling and exterior modifications to the one-story house 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

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: Most of the material and color choices will match the existing structure. Previous Committee comments included concerns about the front entry. The project designer has changed the front door selection to a more suitable solid wood door and reduced the width of the sidelites to be proportional to the front door.

At the previous hearing, the Committee also expressed concerns with the window treatment color choices and the front entry details. Staff is unable to clearly identify the window color selection and the door material as there are inconsistencies between the plans and the photo material board provided in the application submittal. Thus, Staff is unable to thoroughly make the finding for this aspect of the project.

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 can find the proposed concrete block masonry wall architecturally compatible with the materials and colors 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 houses adjacent to the subject property and others located along Shakespeare Drive, ending at Palomar Road, focusing on corner properties for a more effective comparison. The proposed street facing side yard wall will be 4 feet tall. The size, location, and height of the proposed wall can be found consistent with other side yard walls found on the subject block. Several houses on the block exhibit side yard block walls and the corner property located at 2915 Shakespeare Drive maintains a street facing side yard block wall screened with landscaping, comparable to what the subject property is proposing. Therefore, Staff finds that the proposed side yard wall is consistent with those found on the block on which the property is located.

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 street facing side yard walls will maintain a setback of 24 inches from the side property line and will not disrupt oncoming vehicular traffic nor cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic. The proposed wall will be entirely on the property owner’s lot.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-86
1805 EUCLID AVENUE, (KURERA/PARK)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new three-car garage, first and second-story addition to an existing single-story residence.

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

PROJECT HISTORY
February 21, 2018– First hearing before the DRC
April 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 6
Object - 1
No response - 0

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 concept of a Spanish style structure will seamlessly integrate with adjacent structures within the legal neighborhood. While two-story structures exist within the legal
neighborhood, the proposed massing, building volume and plate height (10-foot for the first floor and 9-foot for the second floor) are out of scale and incompatible with neighboring structures. The second story addition along the south side yard spans the entire length of the structure, this condition may appear overbearing and dwarfs over the single-story south neighbor. Staff finds that a decorative Juliet balcony to be better suited for the front elevation than the proposed balcony with a 2-foot 6-inches projection.

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 balcony will overlook the rear yard of the single-story neighbor to the north.

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 north elevation is unbalanced and needs to be better integrated with the existing structure. Window sizes and locations appear random which result in large areas of blank wall on the north and south elevations. For consistency in window operation and appearance, the double hung windows (W6 and W7) listed on the Window Schedule on Sheet A-1.1 should be replaced by casement windows.

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 finishes and roofing materials are consistently carried throughout the project. Staff finds that a clay tile roof in a single red color rather than the proposed black and red multicolor would be more in keeping with other Spanish style structures the neighborhood.
I, [PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME], am a property owner of [PROPERTY ADDRESS], San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at [NEIGHBOR'S ADDRESS].

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

1. [PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME] OBJECT TO THE PROJECT.

2. [PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME] DO NOT OBJECT TO THE PROJECT.

3. [PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME] NEITHER OBJECT NOR SUPPORT THE PROJECT.

4. COMMENTS: PRINCIPALLY A SINGLE STRUCTURE NEIGHBORHOOD, WOULD LIKE TO KEEP THE EXISTING ESTABLISHED LOOK OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

[PROPERTY OWNER'S SIGNATURE]  [DATE]

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature  Date
SPANISH ROSETTE MOSAIC TILE

Material: Ceramic tile
Brand: Rock Mill tile & stone
Model: Spanish Brisa Collection (Style decided by owner)

FRONT DOOR

Material: Walnut wood/ Wrought Iron
Brand: Glass Craft Door Company
Model: Arch top plank with privacy glass option.
Color: Dark walnut

Architects
746 S. Los Angeles Street
Suite 1104
Los Angeles, CA 90014
213.623.2810

arqstone@att.net
STUCCO

Material: Stucco  
Brand: Omega  
Model: ColorTek  
Texture: Sand Finish 30/30  
Color: Coconut (Wall)/Spiced Cognac (Window moulding)

427 Spiced Cognac  18 Coconut

ROOF

Material: Clay Tile  
Brand: Boral Roofing  
Model: 2-Piece Mission  
Color: Black, Red Multicolor

HARDSCAPE STEP LIGHTING

Material: Zinc - Aluminum Alloy  
Brand: Hinkley Lighting  
Model: 58508BZ-Luna  
Standard Weight: 4w  
Bulb Type: LED  
Color: Bronze (Bronze finish)  
ADA: Yes

CUSTOM GUARDRAIL AND HANDRAILS

Material: Wrought Iron  
Color: to match window finish.

WINDOWS

Material: Aluminum Clad  
Brand: Marvin Windows & Doors  
Model: Marvin Ultimate  
Color: Billiard Green  
Operation: Casement, Fixed, Double hung, Slider Windows
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-63 1870 CARLISLE DR., (CHANG/LIN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition with exterior modifications and a significant remodel of the existing one-story house.

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

February 21, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
March 18, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 5
Object – 0
Neither - 1
No response – 5

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

   Staff can make this finding: ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: The neighborhood consists of a mix of one-story and two-story structures in Cape Cod, French, Colonial, and Minimal Traditional styles. Staff finds that the current iteration of the proposed French Revival style structure is not compatible with the neighborhood as it is too embellished in design with the excessive application of stone veneer. Most of the structures on this street are more understated and traditional in design.

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 second-story addition proposes a reasonable number of windows on the north and south elevations. Staff finds that the remodel and addition would balance the reasonable expectation of privacy of the two adjacent two-story structures.

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 second-story addition includes a complete remodel of the style of the existing building. Staff finds that the proposal contains several inconsistencies and incompatible components in the overall design. The front elevation has an unbalanced appearance and the front facing gable is too tall in comparison to the top of the roofline. The louvered vent is oversized and should be redesigned to be more in scale with the front elevation. Additionally, the dormer windows are not true dormers and produce an awkward appearance with disproportionate window surrounds. Staff also finds the shutters on the front bay window to be inappropriately placed and suggests they be removed. Lastly, the placement of the proposed Juliette balcony on the west elevation appears random and results in an unrefined design. Staff recommends redesigning the west elevation to add articulation and detail with an alternative approach.

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 window and roofing materials are selected from the City’s Pre-Approved Lists and are acceptable. However, Staff would prefer to see a natural material used on the structure rather than the proposed stone veneer. While stone detailing is certainly encouraged, the application of the stone veneer along the entire front façade of the structure is too exaggerated and overwhelms the front elevation.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

SUBJECT: PROJECT EXTENSION REQUEST
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-95
2763 GAINSBOROUGH DR., (CHIN, HANSON)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

On February 15, 2017, the DRC approved a second-story addition at the property known as 2763 Gainsborough Drive. Pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.08(C), the DRC approval is valid for one year and building permit must be obtained within one year of the approval date. The DRC may grant an approval extension for up to one year from the original approval date.

The project is currently going through the Building Plan Check process, but has experienced some delays as the owner has been addressing Code violation issues on the property concurrently. Should the DRC decide to grant the project extension approval, the new approval expiration date would be February 15, 2019.
February 6, 2018

Dear Design Review Committee,

My project, DRC 16-95 for a second floor addition at 2763 Gainsborough Dr. was approved on Feb. 15, 2017. I am writing to request a 1-year extension on my project so I can proceed with the building permit process.

Thank you for your consideration

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Owner

[Signature]
February 22, 2017

Lars Hanson
2763 Gainsborough Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

SUBJECT: DECISION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AT A MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 15, 2017 FOR
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. DRC16-95
2763 GAINSBOROUGH DRIVE, SAN MARINO, CA

Dear Mr. Hanson:

The Design Review Committee thanks you for participating in the Design Review Process regarding a second story addition at the property known as 2763 Gainsborough Drive. The City of San Marino encourages and appreciates efforts to upgrade and improve property insofar as such improvements are aesthetically complementary as well as compatible with neighboring buildings. After a full review and consideration of your application and after an open, public hearing held February 15, 2017, the Design Review Committee approved your application for a second story addition subject to the following condition:

1. The south-facing second story bathroom window shall have a top-down operation and frosted glass.

The Design Review Committee’s decision is final unless appealed to the Planning Commission within fifteen (15) days from the date of their action. This action is valid for a period of one year from the date of the meeting. Please place this approval letter on the plans submitted for plan check. The approved plans are legal documents and the project must be constructed exactly per the approved plans. Any modifications to these plans must be presented to the City, prior to construction, for determination if Design Review Committee’s approval of such changes is required. Construction that is not in accordance to the approved plan is subject to a fine of 5% of the valuation of the construction or $2,500, whichever is greater. After payment of the penalty fee, the modifications would still require review and approval by the Design Review Committee. The Design Review Committee could approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed modifications.

The Design Review Committee members extend their best wishes to you for the successful completion of your improvement project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Amanda Merlo, AICP
Associate Planner
cc:

2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108-2639 • Phone: (626) 300-0711 Fax: (626) 300-0716