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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. DRC17-71**  
   1300 WAVERLY RD., (TUNG/OROZCO)  
   The applicant proposes to construct a street side yard driveway gate and pilasters.  
   *(Required Action Date: 3-20-18)*

2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-87**  
   596 SIERRA MADRE BLVD., (HSU)  
   *This item was continued from the November 1, 2017, December 20, 2017, and January 17, 2018 meetings.* The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with an attached two-car garage, and street facing gates and fencing.  
   *(Required Action Date: 3-12-18)*

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-63**  
   2895 WALLINGFORD RD., (WOO/HAN)  
   The applicant proposes to construct a new front porch and exterior modifications.  
   *(Required Action Date: 4-1-18)*

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-02**  
   1875 KENILWORTH AVE., (TANG/CHANG)  
   The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition and exterior modifications.  
   *(Required Action Date: 4-27-18)*

5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-32**  
   2159 LORAIN RD., (TIANJIN JINPIN INVESTMENT CO INC/JAMES V. COANE AND ASSOCIATES)  
   The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage.  
   *(Required Action Date: 4-27-18)*

6. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-102**  
   1555 RUBIO DR., (WADE/LANSFORD)  
   The applicant proposes to install roofing material that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Roofing Material List.  
   *(Required Action Date: 3-30-18)*
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, March 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

BY:    CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE:    MARCH 7, 2018

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

At the January 17, 2018 meeting, the Committee identified inaccuracies on the plans and requested additional information regarding the proposed construction of the pilasters and gate.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

November 15, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC
January 17, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
March 7, 2018 – Third hearing before the DRC
March 20, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 4
Object - 1
No response - 6

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the front yard.
The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a side yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The DRC shall approve the application for the gate in the rear yard and retaining wall along the property line if it finds all of the following to be true:

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

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

   Comments: Staff finds the proposed white driveway gate along the north side yard appropriately simple in design and compatible with the existing Minimal Traditional style house.

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

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

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

   Comments: For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, Staff observed the house directly adjacent to the rear yard of the subject property along Euston Road. Although there are no pilasters found on other properties on the subject block, the proposed gate and concrete pilasters are compatible with the legal neighborhood due to its simplistic appearance. There is also an existing wood fence in the rear yard of the neighboring property to the east at 1305 Bedford Road that can further support this finding for consistency.

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

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

   Comments: The proposed pilasters will provide a setback of 2 feet, 6 inches from the property line, while the proposed gate would provide a setback of 3 feet, 10 inches from the property line. This would not create any issues for pedestrian or oncoming vehicular traffic.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER
DATE: JANUARY 17, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-87
596 SIERRA MADRE BLVD., (HSU/YANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

November 1, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with overall massing, volume, plate height, privacy impact on the north neighbor, and finish details and materials. The Committee found the fencing and pilasters incompatible with the front yard development of the neighborhood.
December 20, 2017 – Second hearing before the DRC. The Committee granted a continuance request.
January 17, 2018 – Third hearing before the DRC. The Committee was concerned with massing and the front entry treatment.
March 7, 2018 – Fourth hearing before the DRC.
March 12, 2018 – Required action date

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

Approve - 7
Object – 0
No response – 6
DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – NEW RESIDENCE

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

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

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

   Comments: Staff supports the two-story Spanish style approach. The recessed front entry treatment is appropriate for the style while adding human scale to the structure. However, the second-story remains visually massive and appears top-heavy. Staff finds that redistribution of the floor area on the second floor to reduce the width of the structure as viewed from Sierra Madre Boulevard would help balance the 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 second-story, rear yard facing balcony is only 21 square feet in size and it is setback 70-feet from the rear property line to mitigate privacy impact on the east neighbor.

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

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

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

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

   Comment: The colors and materials are appropriate for the Spanish style home and are consistently carried throughout the project. The decorative wrought iron railing outside some of the windows match the railing design of the balcony and the gates. Staff recommends that the arched windows on the south elevation (Window #3 in the kitchen and the wok room) and railing be replaced with rectangular shaped windows.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – GATES AND FENCING

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the front yard.
The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a side yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The DRC shall approve the application for the fence, gate and pilasters if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☑ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   *Comments:* The proposed pilasters and gate in the front yard are compatible with the Spanish style home. The wrought iron gates are consistent in color and design with railings proposed on the home.

2. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.**
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☐ YES ☑ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.
   
   *Comments:* The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Sierra Madre Boulevard and California Boulevard. Neighboring properties are improved with driveway gates and staff can support the driveway gate and pilasters along California Boulevard. Staff cannot find the location of the front yard pilasters and gate consistent with front yard improvements on the Block.

3. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.**
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☑ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   *Comments:* The proposed wrought iron gates and side yard block wall will not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The proposed front yard pilasters and gate are 3 feet 6 inches in height and they are substantially setback form the front property line.
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-63
2895 WALLINGFORD RD., (WOO/HAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new front porch and exterior modifications to the existing single-story residence.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 7, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
April 1, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 3
Object – 0
No response – 10

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 Ranch and Minimal Traditional style homes. Staff finds that the new front porch would maintain the Ranch style appearance of the home and will remain compatible with the legal neighborhood.

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

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

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

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

Comments: The project does not include an addition, but the front elevation includes a minor alteration to the roofline as a result of the new front porch. Staff finds that the new roofline and eave overhang will be compatible with the existing home, as it simply extends the existing roofline to provide additional overhead coverage over the front entry. The home will remain true to the Ranch architectural style.

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 consistent with the existing home.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-02
1875 KENILWORTH AVE., (TANG/CHANG)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition to the existing two-story structure 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

March 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC.
April 27, 2018 – Required action date

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

Approve - 11
Object – 0
No response – 6

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 second floor master bedroom expansion is visible from the front yard (Lorain Road); the addition expands the floor area and raises the plate line of the closets to match the loft area. The project also involved the removal of three skylights just south of the addition, also a visible from Lorain Road. The cumulative exterior changes to the structure is minimal and
the structure will maintains its current architectural characters, massing, bulk, and height. Thus, the structure remains compatible with the neighborhood.

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

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

Comment: The second floor addition will not introduce new windows; therefore it will not result in 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 resulting plate line increase from the addition will be consistent with the loft area on the second floor. The addition is well integrated with the existing structure.

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

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

Comments: The colors and materials are consistently carried throughout the project to match the existing structure. The project also included replacement of the roofing material from natural wood to a composition shingle material manufactured by CertainTeed. While the proposed roofing material, CertainTeed, Landmark TL product, in Shenandoah color, is on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list, a prerequisite to using this material is that the current, existing roofing material must be a permitted composition fiberglass roofing material. Since this is not the case with the project, the existing roof material is a natural wood material, the installation of the CertainTeed, Landmark TL product requires the Committee’s approval. Staff found that a similar composition roofing material is installed on an English home across Lorain Road (2450 Lorain Road) from the subject site. The proposed Shenandoah color will closely simulate the visual appearance of wood shake, it will complement the exterior color scheme of the structure and the structure will remain compatible with the neighborhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>LD. or MODEL #</th>
<th>REQUIRES 1&quot; RANDOM STAGGER</th>
<th>REQUIRES 1/2&quot; KEYWAY SPACING</th>
<th>COMMENTS, SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Clay Tile (2-piece barrel)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Mission Tile</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Only for application on a Spanish or Mediterranean style architecture. Structural calc required if over 6 lbs per square foot. Reference page 9 of the Residential Design Guidelines. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Slate</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Must be applied with random width tiles. Only for applications on Tudor style homes as identified on page 11 of the Residential Design Guidelines. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated Wood Shake</td>
<td>Boral</td>
<td>Cedarlite</td>
<td>Silverwood</td>
<td>2CLCL5780</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ninety (90) degree edge rakes are not permitted. Only for applications on Monterey Period Revival, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Tudor, Ranch, Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional as identified on pages 9-13 of the Residential Design Guidelines. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance. Must be installed like a natural wood shake edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated Wood Shake</td>
<td>Boral</td>
<td>Monterey Shake</td>
<td>Gold River Blend</td>
<td>2IBOT3300</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ninety (90) degree edge rakes are not permitted. Only for applications on Monterey Period Revival, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Tudor, Ranch, Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional as identified on pages 9-13 of the Residential Design Guidelines. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance. Must be installed like a natural wood shake edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated Wood Shake</td>
<td>CeDUR</td>
<td>CeDUR</td>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ninety (90) degree edge rakes are not permitted. Only for applications on Monterey Period Revival, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Tudor, Ranch, Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional as identified on pages 9-13 of the Residential Design Guidelines. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance. Must be installed like a natural wood shake edge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. R-10-11
EXHIBIT "A"
PRE-APPROVED ROOF MATERIALS COLORS AND APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>L.D. or MODEL #</th>
<th>REQUIRES 1&quot; RANDOM STAGGER</th>
<th>REQUIRES 1/2&quot; KEYWAY SPACING</th>
<th>COMMENTS, SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Fiberglass</td>
<td>CertainTeed</td>
<td>Landmark TL</td>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Requirements for approval: The following conditions shall apply only to re-roofing projects. Composition materials not identified on the Pre-Approved Roof Materials List are subject to DRC approval. The composition materials identified in the Pre-Approved Roof Material List may be used provided that the following specifications and conditions are met: 1. Permitted fiberglass roofing material must currently exist on the home. 2. All valleys shall be cut, not woven, and valley flashing shall be installed. 3. High profile hip and ridge caps shall be used on all hips and ridges. 4. Gutters must be installed to screen eave edges. 5. All material packaging shall have the same run number and date. 6. Ninety degree edge rakes are not permitted. 7. The product thickness shall be between 1/4 inch to 3/8 inch. 8. The product must have the appearance of natural wood shingles, have variation in colors, depth, and width and it must also create a &quot;shadow effect.&quot; 9. Minimum 40-year warranty product. 10. Staff inspection may be required prior to permit issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition Fiberglass</td>
<td>CertainTeed</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Country Gray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Note: Color approval shall be made by the Director. If in doubt, the Director shall refer the matter to the Design Review Committee. These roofing materials are pre-approved for issuance of a building permit. Replacement with roofing materials not on this list is permitted only if approval is first obtained from the Design Review Committee or the Planning Commission. New roofing materials not found on the pre-approved list that are approved by the Design Review Committee through new construction shall not grant the roofing product approval for the pre-approved list. If a new roofing product is approved by the Design Review Committee through new construction, the manufacturers of the roofing product must present the new material to the Planning Commission for consideration on the pre-approved list. The above listed materials are not to be construed as the most durable product available on the market. These materials are considered by most in the roofing industry to be of excellent quality and durability, but the visual and aesthetic features of the materials are the primary factors when including the materials on the pre-approved list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(updated 2/28/18)
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-32 2159 LORAIN RD., (TIANJIN JINPIN INVESTMENT CO INC/JAMES V. COANE AND ASSOCIATES)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 7, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
April 27, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 0
Object – 4
No response – 8

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – NEW RESIDENCE

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

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

   Staff can make this finding: ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: The legal neighborhood contains both one and two-story homes in various styles. Staff can support the concept of a two-story, Tudor Revival style structure. However, staff cannot make the finding for compatibility for the proposed first floor plate height at 9 feet and the overall vertical massing of the structure. Additionally, the projecting balcony above the entryway is not a feature found on nearby Tudor style homes, staff recommends a decorative Juliet balcony in its place. While a front facing gable is true to the Tudor Revival style, the proposed front facing gable appears dominating at the current setback (40-foot) from the front property line, thus the structure appears out of scale with the streetscape.

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 have a direct view into adjacent rear yards.

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 recommends the addition of half-timbering, window sills on the first floor east and west elevations, and reduction of the roof vent size to enhance the aesthetic of the structure. The proposed materials and colors, including the natural slate roofing material, are appropriate for the chosen style.
I, Jordan Sullitto, am a property owner of 2150 Sherwood Rd, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at 2159 Lorne. 

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: Attachment are too small to read.

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: [Signature]

Date: 11.19.17
I, **CHRISTINE HIROSE** (name), am a property owner of

2179 LORAIN ROAD (address), San Marino and have been

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

2159 LORAIN ROAD (address).

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

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following: *(Handwritten notes: (A) It looks too massive for the site, (B) The 2nd story windows would look directly into our yard, intruding upon our privacy, (C) The size & aesthetics aren't compatible with the other houses in the neighborhood.)*

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

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

*Christine Hirose*  
Property Owner’s Signature  
11/27/17  
Date
I, _______ Don T. Hirose _______, am a property owner of 2179 Loran Rd, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at 2159 Loran 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:
   1) The design is massive and incompatible with neighboring houses.
   2) Windows mean on the north elevation look into our garden and deny our privacy.
   3) Again the size is too large for the neighborhood and it appeared will bring value down for neighboring properties close to its inconspicuousness with other houses.

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: 11/28/2017
I, **Eldon W. Swanson**, am a property owner of

**2170 Lorain Rd**, San Marino and have been

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

**2159 Lorain 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: **(1) Design of Front (2) Height of Roof (3) Replacing a One-Story with a 2-Story (4) What are the Set-Backs from Property Lines?**
6. I **object** and decline to state a reason at this time.
7. I **neither object nor support** the proposed changes at this time.

**Eldon W. Swanson**

Property Owner’s Signature

12/11/17

Date
City of San Marino
AGENDA REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 7, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-102
1555 RUBIO DR., (WADE/LANSFORD)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install the Tilcor steel shake roofing material in the Birch color. The proposed roofing material and color are not on the City’s pre-approved roof material list.

The Tilcor steel shake material in Weathered Wood is installed at 2240 Roanoke Road, 671 Winston Avenue, 1615 Waverly Road, and 2695 Devonport Road. Staff was not able to identify any properties with the Tilcor steel shake material in Birch installed on the roof.

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

March 7, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
March 30, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 0
Object – 0
Neither - 2
No response – 13

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

In addition to the required findings, the Code allows the DRC to consider the following items when reviewing a roof material applications: 1. Fire, wind and/or earthquake safety; 2. Structural integrity; 3. The extent the roof is exposed to public view or view by neighbors; and 4. The ability of the proposed roofing material to successfully dispose of rainwater for the particular house.
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 mostly consists of Tudor, Spanish, and Minimal Traditional style homes. Neighboring structures within the legal neighborhood comprise of natural wood shake and simulated wood shake roofing materials. Staff can make this finding with the condition that low profile ridge tiles be provided to mimic the natural wood shake appearance as much as possible.

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 Birch color and the use of low profile ridge tiles will provide a similar roof appearance as the existing natural wood shake roof.