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. DRC17-91
   779 S. SANTA ANITA AVE., (MOROVATI)
   The applicant proposes to construct an architectural water feature in the front yard.
   (Required Action Date: 4-20-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-83
   1541 EUSTON RD., (HUANG/DIG INC.)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new one-story residence with a detached two-car garage, street facing fencing and driveway gate.
   (Required Action Date: 5-7-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-95
   2030 DEL MAR AVE., (STEIGERWALD/FENG XIAO ARCHITECT, INC.)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new one-story residence with a detached two-car garage, street facing fencing and driveway gate.
   (Required Action Date: 5-7-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-73
   2230 EL MOLINO PL., (YU/JER)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage.
   (Required Action Date: 5-7-18)

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 the next regular meeting to be held on Wednesday, April 4, 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:  MARCH 21, 2018

SUBJECT:  DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-91
           779 S. SANTA ANITA AVE., (MOROVATI)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a water fountain feature in the front yard.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e) – New construction of small facilities/equipment.

PROJECT HISTORY

March 21, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
April 20, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 7
Object – 0
No response – 9

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 that the proposed water fountain would be compatible with the neighborhood and would serve as an acceptable decorative feature in the front yard. Another property within the legal neighborhood (2575 Wetherby Road) also has a similar water fountain in their front yard area.

During a site visit, staff noticed that parts of the unassembled water fountain have already been placed at the front of the property. This may serve as a visual aid for the Committee members during their review.

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: The proposed water fountain is composed of granite while the existing structure’s front entryway exhibits a comparable stone material. Staff finds that the color and material of the proposed water fountain complements the existing structure with respect to style, material, and appearance.
PLANT LIST
1. CLEA LITICE
2. LAUANDER
3. BOXWOOD
4. CLEA MAJESTIC BEAUTY
5. TEKOMALICIA
6. PINEAPPLE GRANDIFLORA
7. FERRIS ROSEMARY
8. CAMELIA Japonica
9. TEUROCHIA CHAMAEDRUS

NOTES
1/2 TO SCALE
ROUND COVER

TOTAL Hardscape : 2,422 sq ft
TOTAL Area : 7,564 sq ft
Perimeter : 21.75'
F769GR – Grey Granite Fountain
80"H x 57" Diameter
Neighbor Letters Summary
√ Approve
X Object
O No Response

© 2018 Digital Map Products. All rights reserved.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-8
1541 EUSTON RD., (HUANG/DIG, INC.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 21, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
May 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 1
Object – 8
No response – 1

Outside of legal neighborhood
Approve – 1 (1425 Hampton Road)
Object – 2 (1505 and 1665 Euston Road)

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:* Staff can support a two-story approach at the subject site provided that the visual massing and building volume are reduced. While articulations are provided all around the structure to avoid a boxy appearance, the proposed front elevation appears busy with three recessed dormers and two gable roofs. The gable roofs on the second floor do not contribute to the architectural 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 proposed second-story, rear yard facing balcony will have a direct view into the west neighbor’s rear yard. The only second-story window on the west elevation will have a view into the west neighbor’s front yard and this will not result in privacy concern.

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 finds the application of the brick material on the structure and the garden walls, although in a light brown color called Mojave Gold rather than the traditional red brick found on adjacent structures, to be excessive for the site. The front elevation would benefit from removing the sidelites by the entry door to reduce the amount of glass surface area. Staff finds the location and materials of the driveway gate and pilasters to be compatible with the proposed structure and the neighborhood.
Neighbor Letters Summary
✓ Approve
X Object
O No Response

* 1505 and 1605 Euston Road are outside of the project's legal neighborhood

CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) am a property owner of (address)
1475 Charlton Rd., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(address) 1541 Euston Rd.

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:
   - Massing in form and height
   - No change from original plan

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

   Property Owner's Signature

   Date
I am a property owner of following address and a legal neighbor of the applicant. I have seen the plans and proposed changes to the neighboring property located at 1541 EUSTON ROAD. For the same reasons of last year’s decision, I **object** to the project (volume, setback, skyline, etc. does not comply with the city guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Park</td>
<td>1525 EUSTON RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Lao</td>
<td>1475 CHARLTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cintay Wong</td>
<td>1466 Charlton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Ling</td>
<td>1515 Euston Rd</td>
<td>Wendy Ling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>1500 Virginia Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingtian Li</td>
<td>1655 Euston rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mecon</td>
<td>1605 Euston Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Chan</td>
<td>1505 Euston Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Caten</td>
<td>1480 Virginia Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleane McNulty</td>
<td>1525 Euston Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Justin Huang 1435 Kensington rd Justin

12.
March 14, 2018

Dear Members of the Design Review Committee
and Planning Department Staff; Attn: Eva Choi

We will be in New York the next two weeks taking care of the grandchildren. Therefore, we will not be able to attend the DRC meeting on March 21, 2018, at which the above matter is scheduled to be considered. While we would like to be present to make our comments in person, please consider this communication as our submission for the official record of the DRC proceedings.

We have visited the Planning Department and reviewed the plans for the construction of a new two-story residence and a detached three-car garage at 1541 Euston Road. We have viewed the story poles erected at the site to show the profile of the proposed project. In addition, we have viewed surrounding neighborhood residences.

We realize that our residence at the corner of Euston and Hampton is not within the legal neighborhood of the proposed project; however, our home is only five houses away from the subject property. Therefore, we are very familiar with the neighborhood and we have the best interests of the neighborhood deeply at heart.

We have carefully reviewed all aspects of the proposed project and have concluded that we support the project for the following reasons:

**Compliance with Ordinances**: The project is in compliance with all building ordinances. The livable square footage is within that allowed by ordinance. The building height is within the limit set by ordinance. All setbacks (front, side and rear) meet the ordinance. Since there are no violations of laws or ordinances, there is nothing to preclude approval of the project.

**Compatibility**: The project is for a two-story residence. We note that the three homes directly to the west of the subject property are two-story. Further, in the broader neighborhood, there are at least a dozen two-story homes along the north side of Euston. In fact, the few one-story homes are in the minority. The proposed project is, without question, compatible with the neighborhood.

**Architectural Consistency**: Our study of the architectural drawings indicates the proposed home is compatible with itself. We note the use of brick facing across a good part of the front of the home. This is a pleasing architectural feature, and we note a number of the homes in the neighborhood have brick facing. The plans indicate that the materials to be used are high quality. In our opinion, the architectural plan is good.

**Privacy**: We note that the neighbors should have little or no concerns about privacy. There are no second-story windows facing the property to the west. In addition, with the driveway and setback, the distance between the properties assures privacy. Trees and other vegetation separate the subject property from the east neighbor. Due to the hill in the back there
essentially is no neighbor to the rear. We conclude that there are no privacy issues that rise to the level of concern.

**Design Guidelines:** The proposed project follows closely San Marino residential design guidelines for a two-story home. The front of the house cannot be considered massive; the roofline tapers back and represents streetscape compatibility, consistent with the examples shown on pages 16 and 26 of the residential design guidelines. The proposed home even has three dormers, as do the examples in the guidelines.

We realize that there could be some individuals who may object to this project. Some folks simply are opposed to all change, regardless of the merits of the project. In our opinion, we see only legitimate reasons why the property owners should be allowed to develop their property as proposed. In our view, it is incumbent on the DRC to respect the property rights of the owners. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the DRC approve the project at 1541 Euston Road.

We would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ The Kneiers
Dennis and Liz Kneier
1425 Hampton Road
San Marino, CA 91108
626-578-1109
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-95
2030 DEL MAR AVE., (STEIGERWALD & SHIEH/ FENG XIAO ARCHITECT, INC.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a one-story residence, a detached two-car garage, and street facing fencing, pilasters and driveway gate.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 21, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC.
May 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 7
Object – 0
No response – 7

*Applicants are only required to contact neighbors/property owners within the San Marino city boundary.

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: Majority of the structures within the legal neighborhood are single-story and Minimal Traditional in design. The proposed one-story design would blend in with the existing streetscape. The proposed style, orientation, building volume, and massing are compatible with neighboring structures.

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

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

Comments: Three bedrooms are located along the north side of the proposed structure, the bedroom windows will not impact the privacy of the north neighbor because of the existing driveway separation on the neighbor’s property. The structure is setback 35 feet from the south property line and will not cause any privacy impact on the south 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 colors and materials are appropriate for the single-story structure and the neighborhood. Materials are consistently applied throughout the project. The only concern staff has with exterior materials is the excessive amount of paving in front of the garage.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – GATES AND FENCING

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the front yard.

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a side yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
The DRC shall approve the application for the fence, gate and pilasters if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**

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

   *Comments:* The proposed fencing, pilasters and driveway gate are minimal in design and are compatible with the proposed structure.

2. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.**

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

   The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.

   *Comments:* The subject property is located on the east side of Del Mar Avenue, between Rose Avenue and Sycamore Drive. Neighboring properties are improved with fencing and driveway gates, however the locations are near the midpoint of the structure along the side yard. Staff can support the size and height of the fencing, pilasters and driveway gate, but not the location. The proposed location and the width (over 35 feet) of these features result in a cumulative visual impact that is different than fencing and gates on adjacent properties. Staff can support the proposal with the relocation of these features closer to the kitchen exterior door or the chimney.

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 proposed fencing, pilasters and driveway gate are substantially setback from the front property line, they will not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 21, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-73 2230 EL MOLINO PLACE, (YU/JER)

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

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

March 21, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC.
May 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 3
Object - 2
No response - 2

*Applicants are only required to contact neighbors/property owners within the San Marino city boundary.

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. Staff finds the style and the two-story approach compatible with the legal neighborhood. Staff finds the proposed plate height, 9’-3” for first floor and 9’ for second floor, to be out of scale with adjacent structure. The overall visual massing is not excessively large but staff believes that a height reduction would help the new structure integrate with the existing streetscape.

The proposed front-facing balcony is a feature not found within the legal neighborhood; staff finds that the size and location of the balcony would not negative impact the compatibility of the proposed structure.

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 rear-facing second floor balcony would affect the privacy of the single-story south 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 colors, materials and finishes are similar to structures within the legal neighborhood and this would help the new structure blends in on the block. Front yard paving is compatible with neighboring properties on El Molino Place. The only minor concern is the driveway gate material which staff finds wrought iron to be more suitable than the proposed tubular steel.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

1. Rochelle Medici am a property owner of
   (neighbor’s name)
   2220 Elmound Place, San Marino and have been shown
   (neighbor’s address)

   the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
   2270 El Molino Place
   (project address)

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

1. I object to the project. See Below

2. I do not object to the project.

3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments:
   THE HOUSE IN GENERAL LOOKS GREAT!! I HAVE 2 CONCERNS: 1)
   PLEASE REMOVE THE TREE-SHRUB ON YOUR NORTH/EAST FRONT CORNER.
   THE CITY HAS ALREADY COMPLAINED.
   ALSO IT SCRATCHES OUR CARS OFTEN WHEN WE EXIT THE DRIVEWAY. 2)
   PLEASE DO NOT PLANT ANY TREES IN THE BACK YARD THAT WILL BLOCK
   OUT MY NORTHERN VIEW. I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS NOW ILLEGAL. I ALREADY PAID THE
   FORMER OWNER TO REMOVE OVERGROWN

Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature: Rochelle Medici
Date: 12/3/19
TREES IN THE BACK YARD. HALF THE COST OF REMOVAL (1/2 x $1500)
THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION AND BEST OF LUCK WITH YOUR NEW HOUSE.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

1. Carmen Cheng am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)

2240 El Molino Place, San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)

the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

2730 El Molino Place
(project address)

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

1. [ ] object to the project.

2. I do not object to the project.

3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments: Please see attached email

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

Date
Dear Mr. Yu,

I am in receipt of your plans regarding the intended construction on your home located at 2230 El Molino Place, San Marino 91108. As your direct neighbor to the south of your home, you can imagine my surprise when I saw your plans contemplating a second story addition. When I purchased my home a few months after you, I had not anticipated this level of construction especially since I have a newborn baby that requires sleep at all hours of the day.

In specific regard to your plans, I noticed that you plan to build a balcony, which would directly overlook my swimming pool. This concerns me as there would be a direct loss of privacy for me and my family. As I am sure you can similarly relate, you would likely feel uncomfortable if you knew strangers could easily see into your backyard, especially if you had children. While I can see that you are proposing landscaping along the property wall, I did not see any landscaping plans attached to the plans that you did provide. In which case, I have no way of knowing what kind of plants you’re planning on placing there. If I may, I would like to offer the suggestion of placing your balcony on the north side of your building. I believe your neighbor to the north does not have a swimming pool and there would then be no loss of privacy to me or your neighbor directly to your north. In addition, there are already tall trees and other bushes that already provides privacy to your neighbor in the north. I would suspect this would be a major point of discussion when your plans are brought to Design Review. If your architect is willing to make this minor change, I would be more than happy to attend the hearing and support your project. Moreover, I would anticipate that this forethought would save you time and money prior to the hearing of your plans. Furthermore, my additional concern that I was not able to extrapolate from your plans was how the water run off would be. I’d like to ensure that the water run off flows from east to west as opposed to north to south.

Lastly, I understand that we are still planning to meet to discuss the wall between both our properties. Due to the impending Thanksgiving holiday, we can in all likelihood discuss the aforementioned issues along with the wall with your surveyor hopefully after Thanksgiving but before Christmas.

I look forward to hearing from you so that we can address the many issues and concerns on both ends. Have a wonderful Thanksgiving Holiday.

Kind Regards,

John Gao and Carmen Cheng
CALL TO ORDER  Vice-Chair Wong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang.

ABSENT:  Chairman Kevin Cheng

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Vice-Chair Wong 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. DRC16-51
   2793 GAINESBOROUGH DR., (WONDER INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT/WU)

   Associate Planner Choi stated that the applicant was requesting a continuance to allow for additional time to revise the project design. The applicant was not present.

   The following people spoke about the project:

   A resident at 2794 Gainsborough Drive expressed opposition for the project and asked the Committee to deny the continuance request.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the applicant was not showing significant efforts to move forward with the project.

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

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

   Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings.
Howard Lo, the applicant presented the project and answered questions.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody asked about the lighting plan, the material of the proposed railing along west elevation, and the changes to the proposed dormers.

There was no public comment.

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

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

1. Applicant shall work with staff to modify the second story floor plan to reduce the inset of the dormers by a minimum of 24 inches.
2. Rear porch fencing shall use wrought iron material.

Second by Committee Member Johnson-Brody. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: None.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-75**
   
   **1476 KENSINGTON RD., (KWOK)**

   Associate Planner Choi presented the project.

   Joseph Kwok, applicant and property owner, presented the project and answered questions.

   The following people spoke about the project:

   Andrew Wong, 1475 Kensington Road, stated concerns about massing and neighborhood compatibility.
   Edell Peterson, 2140 Lorain Road, stated concerns about square footage and massing changes.
   Richard, 1495 Kensington Road, stated concerns about neighborhood compatibility and conflicts with the overall design.
   Cathy Miller, 1500 Charlton Road, stated concerns about the massing and neighborhood compatibility.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was not compatible with the neighborhood. They agreed that modifications needed to be made to the design.

   Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to continue the application to the meeting of October 18, 2017. Second by Committee Member Dustin. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: None.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-39**
   
   **1805 S. EUCLID AVE., (KURERA/PARK)**
Associate Planner Choi stated that the story poles were not installed in time for the public hearing, so she recommended continuing the application to a later date.

The applicant was not present.

The following people spoke about the project:

Vince Filutze, 1821 Euclid Avenue, stated concerns about the design and the project contact person.
John Holtsnider, 1813 Euclid Avenue, spoke in support of the project.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to continue the project to the meeting of September 6, 2017. Second by Committee Member Dustin. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: None.

OTHER MATTERS

5. CONSIDERATION OF EAGLE ROOFING, DESIGNER SELECT CALIFORNIA PRODUCTS, STANDARD WEIGHT AND LIGHTWEIGHT DOUBLE EAGLE PONDEROSA TILE PRODUCTS IN BROWN GRAY RANGE COLOR FOR THE PRE-APPROVED ROOF MATERIAL LIST.

Eagle Roofing Representative, Annette Sindar presented the roofing material samples for the Committee’s consideration.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody asked about the quality and durability of the Eagle Roofing material in comparison to those found on the City’s current Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application List. Ms. Sindar responded that the Eagle Roofing material comes with a lifetime limited warranty and a class “A” fire rating, which is comparable to those materials found on the City’s current Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application List.

Ms. Sindar further elaborated on the thickness, weight, and pricing of the Eagle Roofing material.

The following people spoke on the matter:

Michael Johnson, 1300 Belhaven Road, stated concerns about the weight and safety of the material in the event of a natural disaster such as an earthquake.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to recommend to the Planning Commission the Eagle Roofing, Standard Weight and Lightweight Double Eagle Ponderosa Tile Products in Brown Gray Range color to be reviewed to be placed on the Pre-Approved Roof Material List.

Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: Committee Member Dustin.

OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT
With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 16, 2017 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 Kevin Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Kevin Chang, Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang

ABSENT:  None

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Kevin Chang 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

Committee Member Dustin referenced the previous August 2, 2017 meeting when the Committee voted to recommend the Eagle Roofing material product for Planning Commission review. For the Committee’s consideration, he clarified that the Eagle Roofing material is not similar in dimensions to other roofing materials currently on the City’s Pre-Approved Roofing Materials Color and Application List.

Chairman Cheng announced that he recently spoke with the Planning & Building Director regarding the Design Review Committee meeting procedures and story pole policy. Chairman Cheng also referenced the pending Historic Preservation Ordinance, which once approved and enacted, will not result in projects being reviewed by the Committee. He clarified that all projects at Committee meetings meet City Code and projects regarding historic significance will go before the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.  DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-04
    1701 WARWICK ROAD., (PFEIFFER, FINK)

    Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could support the project.

    Jeffrey Fink, the project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

    There was no public comment.

    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 condition:

1. Applicant shall work with staff to ensure lighting in back yard does not negatively impact the south neighbor.

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

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-83 2735 CANTERBURY RD., (KWOK/ PDS STUDIO INC.)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings provided that the project incorporates consistent roof eave lines on the north elevation and relocate downspouts away from the front façade.

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

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project required further revisions.

Vice Chair Wong moved to continue the project to the September 27, 2017 meeting.

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

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-07 1180 OAKWOOD DR., (CHIA/LAI)

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could not make all of the required findings.

Kamen Lai, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was not compatible with the existing house. They agreed that modifications needed to be made to the design.

The applicant was asked if they agreed to waive the required action date to proceed with the next available meeting date of October 4, 2017. He agreed.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to continue the application to the meeting of October 4, 2017.
Second by Committee Member Wong. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Dustin,
Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Chairman Cheng. NOES:
None.

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-22
1490 MIRASOL DR., (YOU/HAN)

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could make all the required findings
with the condition that the window shutters on the east elevation be removed.

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

There was no public comment.

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

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

1. Remove window shutters on the second story east elevation.
2. Maintain consistency of dormer installations to match the existing.
3. Work with staff to provide downcast or shielded lighting on the exterior of home.

Second by Chairman Cheng. AYES: Vice-Chair Wong, Committee Member Huang, and
Chairman Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Johnson-Brody and Committee Member Dustin.

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-51
2230 MELVILLE DR., (LIU)

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could make all the required findings
with the condition that the window grids be consistent with existing windows in terms of width
and protrusion from the glass.

The applicant was not present.

Committee Member Dustin asked for clarification regarding staff’s recommended condition of
approval. Committee Member Johnson-Brody asked about window options provided on the
City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List.

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project requires additional changes and a different
window material should be selected.

Committee Member Huang moved to continue the project to the September 27, 2017 meeting.

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

OTHER MATTERS
OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

CHRISTINE SONG,
ASSISTANT PLANNER