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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. DRC17-65
   2605 SYCAMORE DR., (WROBEL, WHITAKER)
   This item was continued from the December 20, 2017 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a first-story addition, a new detached three-car garage, and exterior modifications.
   (Required Action Date: 2-18-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-67
   1040 OAK GROVE AVE., (PENG/AGAIAN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a basement addition, a first story addition, and exterior modifications.
   (Required Action Date: 2-19-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-103
   2320 CONISTON PL., (WONG, YEOW)
   The applicant proposes to install a door material that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List.
   (Required Action Date: 2-18-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-85
   2650 WALLINGFORD RD., (MA)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new street facing block wall and exterior modifications.
   (Required Action Date: 3-30-18)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-09
   1190 OAK GROVE AVE., (BENNETT)
   The applicant proposes to construct a front yard wall.
   (Required Action Date: 3-30-18)

OTHER MATTERS


7. DISCUSSION OF LACY PARK RESTROOM.
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 21, 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: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-65
2605 SYCAMORE DR., (WROBEL, WHITAKER)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant proposes to construct a remodel and addition to the existing single-story structure, a new detached three-car garage, and exterior modifications.

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

PROJECT HISTORY
October 4, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee found the proposed design incompatible with itself and with the neighborhood due to scale, visual massing, and plate height. The Committee requested accurate renderings, identification of all exterior materials, and a color and materials board.
December 20, 2017 – The Committee granted a continuance request from the applicant.
February 7, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC.
February 18, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (AS OF 12/20/2017)

Approve - 7
Object – 2
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 proposed design will maintain the existing front setback and majority of the front façade of the structure. The design and placement of the proposed front facing bay window is similar to neighboring structures within the cul-de-sac. The overall style and visual massing of the proposed front façade is compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed addition and exterior modifications allow the structure to maintain its current building height and roofline as viewed from the street.

The new detached garage provides a ten foot one inch plate height and this would be out of scale with other accessory structures within the neighborhood. A typical garage plate height should not exceed nine feet. An aerial view of the neighborhood shows mostly standard two-car garages. Given the size of the three-car garage and its proximity to the east property line, staff can make the finding provided that the plate height and building height are reduced by one foot and one inch.

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 complies with required yard setbacks and will not result in privacy impacts on the 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

Comment: In order to accommodate the proposed addition along the west property line, with the minimum required yard setback, the resulting roof design has a disjointed appearance. Window placements are dictated by the interior floor plan thus the windows appear random as viewed from the exterior and large areas of blank walls are seen along the east and west sides 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

Comment: Although the colors and materials are consistently carried throughout the project, improvements can be made through modifying a few exterior features to enhance the project. The proposed smooth stucco provides a more modern appearance than structures within the neighborhood; staff recommends a textured stucco finish. The project can benefit from providing louvered shutters that are sized to match the windows and using down casted exterior lighting fixtures.
RE: WHITAKER-WROBEL: PROPOSED REMODELING  
DRC17-65: PROPOSED PLAN REVISION 1/23/2018

We have been listening to the DRC and working with City Building Dept.  
The Blue Print Plans submitted today are a “Single Story” design.  
We have CHANGED the remodeling design to address the issues of Neighborhood Compatibility, Mass,  
and Privacy.

1.  We are using the design of the “Existing Front” – North Elevation “as it presently exists”.  We have  
maintained the same design 360 deg.  
This should reduce the DRC concern of “Neighbor Compatibility”.  
Style: Single Story Minimal Traditional (keeping existing style).

2.  We have reduced the Proposed Plan to a “One Story” design. We are trying to improve the  
property in this design by utilizing space toward the back of the property.  This should reduce the  
neighbors and DRC concern of “Mass”.

3.  We have removed the 2nd Story and the Deck/Balcony.  
This should reduce the neighbors and DRC concern of Privacy.

4.  Please NOTE that we are living on a small Cul-De-Sac (five houses).  The property is narrow in  
front, but extends back to a large “Diamond Shaped” parcel. The property has a Swimming Pool, small  
SCE Easement, and a large “Easement” (25 ft.) on Rizzio Wash. The property is located at the apex of  
the Cul-De-Sac on Sycamore Drive. This new proposed plan (single story design) utilizes the property  
shape and space available.

a.  The lot is narrow in the front and ‘Diamond” shaped.  We are maintaining the front design as it  
presently exists.  The ‘Proposed Remodeling’ utilizes the property shape extending toward the  
back of the property.

b.  The house is located at the Center of the Cul-De-Sac.  Adjacent homes on the Cul-De-Sac are  
constructed ‘around’ the Cul-De-Sac as it expands (advances) forward. Our house has the largest  
setback of the other four homes on the cul-de-sac.

c.  The existing house was originally constructed (1941) tangentially (slightly rotated) on the cul-de-  
sac. This was necessary because the property is narrow in front. When viewing the Streetscape  
of the Remodeling from the Center of the Cul-De-Sac. A person standing in the cul-de-sac can  
view the front of the house. The small rotation of the ‘existing front of the house’ (to remain) will  
visually block the view of the majority of the proposed rear remodeling (West Side). This is a  
similar design that was utilized in the design of our adjacent neighbor’s house (2595 Sycamore).

Please see Attached Changes to Present Plans.

Samuel R Whitaker  
Bozena B Wrobel
WHITAKER-WROBEL RESIDENCE
2605 SYCAMORE DRIVE

1-31-2018: **MAJOR CHANGES TO BE NOTED ON THE PRESENT PLANS:**

1. **THE PRESENT PLANS ARE FOR REMODELING A SINGLE STORY DWELLING UTILIZING A SINGLE STORY DESIGN** [PREVIOUS PLANS WERE A 2 STORY CAPE COD]

2. FRONT OF HOUSE (VIEWED FROM CUL-DE-SAC) TO REMAIN SAME. FRONT PORCH TO REMAIN AND A BAY WINDOW IS ADDED ON THE FRONT (EAST). MINIMAL TRADITIONAL STYLE

3. ROOF HEIGHT TO **REMAIN THE SAME** AS EXISTING HOUSE (HEIGHT: 18 ft. 4in.) ALL ROOF PITCHES ARE 4:12

4. **EXISTING TWO BEDROOMS AND BATH TO REMAIN.** REMAINDER OF EXISTING HOUSE WILL BE DEMOLISHED EXCEPT for FIREPLACE.

5. SINGLE STORY DESIGN EXTENDS BACK ON THE WEST SIDE OF PROPERTY UTILIZING EXISTING AVAILABLE SPACE.  
   A. **UNABLE TO BUILD IN AREA OF EASEMENT 25 FT ALONG RIZZIO WASH**
   B. **UNABLE TO BUILD IN EASEMENT WITH SCE ALONG NORTHWEST PROPERTY LINE**
   C. **EXISTING SWIMMING POOL**
   D. **NEW 3 CAR GARAGE.**

6. **BASEMENT SIZE IS CALCULATED TO THE ALLOWABLE (230 SQ FT)** BASEMENT FOR PLACEMENT OF FORCED AIR HEATING SYSTEM and HOT WATER HEATER and LAUNDRY and STORAGE.

7. PROJECT WILL REQUIRE **REMOVAL OF ONE TREE LOCATED IN THE BACK “DRIVEWAY TURN AROUND” AREA FOR GARAGE.**

8. **ROOFING MATERIAL IS CEDAR LITE- HEARTWOOD FROM PREAPPROVED LIST.**

9. **ALL NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – FROM PREAPPROVED LIST.

10. **FINISH TEXTURE OF THE HOUSE WILL BE SMOOTH STUCCO – LA HABRA TRABUCO**

11. **TRIM and MOULDING** and **POSTS – OFF WHITE** (Swiss Coffee) – SEE Materials Board

12. **SHUTTERS AND FRONT DOORS** are **PAINTED DUNN EDWARDS - DEA186 BLACK PEARL**

13. **THERE IS A REQUIRED NEW THREE CAR GARAGE.**

14. **GARAGE DOORS ARE WOOD** FROM THE PREAPPROVED LIST PAINTED OFF WHITE (Swiss Coffee) – SEE Materials Board
Los Angeles, CA
February 1, 2018

ATTN: Eva Choi

ATTACHED is ONE (1) *.pdf File

1.) WHITAKER-WROBEL - BIOSCREEN BETWEEN HOUSES - 4 PAGES (PHOTOS).pdf

Please Review this File (4 Photos).

Please Note: Our Neighbor's House has only a 5 ft set back from our mutual property line. The height of the Wall/Bioscreen (between 6 to 7 ft) between the properties will mostly shield their view of the majority of our new addition. This includes visualization of the Kitchen driveway wall area.

Thank-You

Samuel Whitaker MD
Bozena Wrobel, MD
PICTURE FROM FRONT OF DRIVEWAY AND THE WALL/BIOSCREEN BETWEEN HOMES - EAST SIDE NOTE THE HOUSE AT 1660 SYCAMORE HAS A SMALLER "SET BACK" ON CUL-DE-SAC.

6 FT CEMENT BLOCK WALL WITH BIOSCREEN EXTENDING ABOUT 1 FT HIGHER IN AREA BETWEEN HOUSES. OVERALL HEIGHT WALL/BIOSCREEN IS ABOUT 7 FT IN THIS AREA.

PICTURE FROM MIDDLE OF DRIVEWAY - NOTE THE BIOSCREEN BETWEEN HOMES - EAST
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER  
DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 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(c)(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.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-103 2320 CONISTON PL., (WONG, YEOW)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant proposes to install a door material (Renewal by Andersen Narroline Series 200) that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List.

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 the DRC
February 18, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS
Approve - 1
Object – 0
Neither - 5
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
2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.

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

Comments: Staff finds that the proposed patio glass sliding door replacement will not have any impact on the neighbors’ privacy as it is located at the rear of the property and will not result in any additional visibility.

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: Staff cannot support the proposed door material as it is not comparable to any of those that are found on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List. The material consists of wood wrapped in a rigid vinyl frame cover and may result in an undesirable appearance with wear and tear over time. Furthermore, the City encourages the use of natural materials over synthetic window materials.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 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
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. However, while Staff finds that the window types are acceptable, the white color trim and dark bronze color windows would result in a stark contrast and be unsuitable for the exterior façade. The stone detailing around the new entryway is suitable as it matches the existing detailing along the structure and walkway, but the addition of the side lites produces a busy appearance along the front elevation.

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.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-09
1190 OAK GROVE AVENUE, (BENNETT)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests to legalize a front yard wall. The applicant provided a detailed description and reasoning for installing the wall without prior approval.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

February 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
March 30, 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 Commis-
sion can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pe-
destrian or vehicular traffic.

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

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

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

   Comments: The materials, colors and texture of the short front yard wall is architecturally com-
   patible with the home and existing front yard walls on the property. The short wall was con-
   structed in November and is now partially covered by planting material.

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 be-
   tween 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 an interior lot along the east side of Oak grove Avenue. Properties along the same side of the block are developed with similar front yard walls and land-
   scaping.

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

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

   Comment: The wall, located behind an existing front yard wall, complies with the setback and height requirement and do not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
January 26, 2018

Dear Neighbor and City of San Marino;

We live at 1190 Oak Grove Avenue, and we are making repairs to the garden wall in front of our home. Back in November of 2016, we lost one or the largest oak trees on our property. It was located at the front of our house, 7’ in from the sidewalk. When it fell, it took other trees with it, along with part of an intermediate retaining wall. It completely blocked the street. The police had us remove the tree very fast, and cutting a tree with a 4’ diameter was a challenge.

The slope, from our front hedge down to the sidewalk is very steep; as you can see it drops down 8’ (vertical drop of 8’) in as little as 12’. Shorty after the tree fell, we had another rain storm, and an enormous amount of the dirt and rock from the hill was washed onto the sidewalk, into the gutter, and down the street. It completely filled the gutter on Rosalind Road behind our house. We retrieved approximately 20 cubic yards of gravel and soil.

Along the sidewalk is a 2’ retaining wall that runs around our house, and the neighboring houses. It was likely built over 70 years ago. We found that the drain system for this wall was blocked. The lack of drainage likely contributed to the tree falling down. To fix the drains we had to remove all the planting – and much of the intermediate retaining wall – shown in the attached drawing. The intermediate retaining wall was
part of our permit from 9 years ago, when we re-located our
two driveways, and removed the central driveway, after
building the house.

We have now fixed the french drain system, replaced the
intermediate retaining wall, but have now stopped all work
until the city approves the plan. While the large oak was in
place, the entire area was landscaped with ivy and over 70
large azaleas. This covered the intermediate retaining wall.

Please note that the intermediate retaining wall only extends
up to ground level; it is as high as it needs to be to hold back
hill. See attached photo.

The remaining work is as follows:

1. Seal the intermediate retaining wall
2. Install drip irrigation system
3. Replace the soil, and plant landscaping so that the
intermediate retaining wall will no longer be visible.

Thank you for your time and consideration; please don’t
hesitate to call us if you have any questions.

Chantal Bennett (626) 824-1300
REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
JULY 19, 2017 - 7:00 P.M. 

CALL TO ORDER  Chairman Kevin 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, Committee Member Chris Huang.  

ABSENT:  Vice-Chair Corinna Wong  

APPEAL PROCEDURE  

Chairman Kevin Cheng 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  

None.  

PUBLIC HEARINGS  

1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-81  
1221 ROANOKE RD., (SAN ROANOKE LLC)  

Assistant Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff was unable to make all the required findings.  

Philip Chan, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.  

The following people spoke about the project:  

Susan Jakubowski, 1248 Roanoke Road, stated concerns about the general location of the subject lot and massing issues with the project.  
Paul C., 1259 Roanoke Road, stated concerns about the compatibility of the proposed house with the neighborhood.  
Nancy Hoffman, stated concerns about design issues, massing, and the on-site landscaping.  
Steve Garcia, 234 E. Colorado Blvd. (Pasadena), spoke in support of the project and responded to comments made by previous speakers.  
Janet Chan clarified the scope of work and details about the project.  
Gretchen Shepherd Romey, 1119 Lorain Road, stated concerns about massing and the compatibility of the project with the lot and the neighborhood.  
Crystal, 831 Winston Avenue, stated concerns about privacy impacts.
Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to continue the project to the meeting of October 3, 2017. Second by Committee Member Dustin. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Dustin. NOES: None.

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

Assistant Planner Choi presented the staff report and stated staff was able to make all the required findings.

Matt Mori, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

The following people spoke about the project:

Tori, 2835 Monterey Road, stated concerns about the swimming pool and the potential effects to her property.

John, 1750 Ramiro Road, stated concerns about potential future unexpected changes to the project.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the modification was acceptable and compatible with the structure.

Committee Member Dustin moved to approve the project subject to the following conditions:

2. Replace wall along South property line.

Second by Committee Member Johnson-Brody. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, and Committee Member Dustin. NOES: None.

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

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

Freeman Han, project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

The following people spoke about the project:

Dennis Neer, 1425 Hampton Road, spoke in support of the project.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was compatible with the existing house and the neighborhood.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to approve the project subject to the following conditions:
1. Provide exterior lighting fixtures where appropriate and remove lighting near the second floor false balcony.
2. Provide consistent grids on windows and doors.

Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: None.

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

Assistant Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings.

Feng Xiao, applicant, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project is compatible with the house and the neighborhood.

Committee Member Dustin moved to approve the project subject to the following condition:

1. Work with staff to select a driveway gate that is less ornate and compatible with the residence.
2. Provide appropriate exterior lighting fixture(s) on the garage.

Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Dustin. NOES: None.

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

Assistant Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could make all of the required findings.

Feng Xiao, architect, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project is compatible with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to approve the project subject to the following condition:

1. Work with staff to provide appropriate shutter system on the north and south elevations. Provide additional corresponding shutter sets on the north elevation and removal of shutters on the south elevation.
2. Work with staff to provide a compatible gate design that is more transparent.
3. Provide appropriate lighting fixtures near pedestrian and garage doors.
4. Provide matching French door design and material as the window system on the east elevation.
5. Provide synthetic turf material on the driveway.

Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Chairman Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: None.

OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 2, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

CHRISTINE SONG,
ASSISTANT PLANNER
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 Cheng 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, (SAKHRANI/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. Sakhrani, 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, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
MEMORANDUM

TO: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR
FROM: MICHAEL THOME, PARKS & PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER
DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2018

SUBJECT: LACY PARK RESTROOM CONCEPTUAL PLAN

The Parks and Public Works Department is conducting a community input process related to the replacement of the Lacy Park Restroom.

On November 8, 2017 the City Council directed staff to commence a process to design and build a replacement bathroom. The City conducted a qualification based selection process to solicit a qualified architect specializing in public restrooms. Crane Architecture Group, of Fullerton, CA was retained to provide the design of the project as well as assisting in conducting the public outreach. Engineering already completed for this project will be retained and any additional site/utility engineering will be performed by the City Engineer. A new restroom could be open by Fall 2018.

The goals of this project are to increase accessibility to restroom facilities in Lacy Park, to optimize the amount of restroom fixtures available for park patrons, all while attaining the best possible value.

The purpose of our attendance at tonight’s Commission meeting is to solicit your thoughts and suggestions on the current conceptual plan, and to receive any other input about design, landscape or the project in general.
DRAFT

January 31, 2017
Restroom Building Fixture Analysis
New Restroom Building
Lacy Park
City of San Marino, Ca.

The following is our basis for determining the number of restroom plumbing fixtures required for Lacy Park. Our analysis is based on the Lacy Park Attendance records for the years of 2016 and 2017 as provided to us by City staff.

Average Daily Weekend Park Attendance: 400 People Per Day
Maximum Number of People at Peak Hours: 300 People Per Hour (estimate)

Restroom Fixture Counts are based on Table 4-4 of the 2016 California Plumbing Code (CPC)
Men: 1 Toilet per each 1 to 50 Occupants (Urinals can be used in lieu of toilets up to one half)
Women: 1 Toilet per each 1 to 50 Occupants
Restroom Fixtures Required:
- Men: 2 Toilets and 2 Urinals (4 fixtures total)
- Women: 4 Toilets

Although the referenced table does not indicate a requirement for lavatories, from our experience, we recommend 2 lavatories in each restroom to accommodate the number of expected users.

Please let me know if you should have any questions.

Richard J. Crane Jr., AIA
Principal Architect
Crane Architectural Group