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. DRC17-86**  
   **1805 EUCLID RD., (KURERA/PARK)**  
   This item was continued from the February 21, 2018 meeting.  
   The applicant proposes to construct an addition and remodel to the existing first story, an addition of a new second story, and a new detached two-car garage.  
   *(Required Action Date: 4-7-18)*

2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-12**  
   **1185 LORAIN RD., (WARD)**  
   The applicant proposes to construct pilasters in the front yard.  
   *(Required Action Date: 5-11-18)*

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-72**  
   **2960 LORAIN RD., (CHAN/FENG XIAO ARCHITECT, INC.)**  
   The applicant proposes to construct a new single-story residence with a subterranean four-car garage, and street facing driveway gate and pilasters.  
   *(Required Action Date: 5-18-18)*

OTHER MATTERS

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 6, 2017.**

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 18, 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: APRIL 4, 2018

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

February 2, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with massing, boxy appearance, plate height, entry treatment, privacy impacts from the rear balcony, exterior material selections and design not true to traditional Spanish design.

April 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of 2/21/18 meeting)

Approve - 6
Object - 1
No response - 8

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: The revised front entry design reduces the massing and provides a balanced front façade. The reduction of one-foot in plate height from each floor improves the visual balance of the structure and it is now compatible with the neighborhood. The revised two-car garage plan provides a less intense development (compared to the former three-car garage design with three-foot setback from property lines) on the site and is more in keeping with garages found in 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

Comments: Window locations and sizes are respectful of the north neighbor. There is a fifteen-foot separation between the subject structure and the south neighbor’s structure and this distance serves to buffer privacy impacts resulting from the large casement window in Bedroom #2. Staff finds privacy issues with the second floor balcony and planter deck as these features provide a direct view into the north neighbor’s backyard.

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 addition is not compatible with the existing structure. The addition appears to be driven by desired functions of the interior floor plans, thereby resulting in large blank wall areas on the north and south elevations. The west elevation has an exterior wall projection around the arched bathroom window which staff finds it uncharacteristic of Spanish homes in the City. Façade treatments are not consistently carried throughout the project, only the front façade and the rear covered patio exhibit defining features traditionally associated with Spanish homes.

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 supports the exterior stucco color and finish texture. Submitted plans have internal inconsistencies related to roofing and window materials; staff recommends using a single red color roofing tiles and aluminum clad window material from the City’s Pre-approved material lists. The garage door should be made of wood and factory painted in a color matching the muntins (grids) color on the windows. Exterior lighting should be down cast with seeded glass feature instead of clear glass and only install at locations mandated Uniform Building Codes. A hanging pendant should be provided at the entry alcove.
The following are the revision made to the 1805 Euclid Road project:

The highest ridge line height is now 23'-0" from A.D.P. Overall height has been reduced by 24". 1st floor ceiling ht. is now 9 ft and 2nd level ceiling ht is now 8 ft.

Redesign of Entryway & Front Elevation

Entry way porch for the front door is now recessed by 42", reducing 17.5 S.F. from building area. There are no longer any columns or archway at front entry. The revision takes cue from the existing house by continuing the living room roof to cover porch, a more modest entry, overall reduced by 12" height. Porch has been reduced to 6ft in depth. 2 ft shallower than existing porch. In turn we removed the unnecessary Handrail to give a more modest look to the residence.

Living room ridge has been reduced by 12". Ceiling height was 12'-4" but now reduced to 11’-0” Scaled in consideration of neighbor C & Neighbor B (north & south adjacent)

Privacy Concerns:

We pulled Master Bedroom balcony 8'-6” away from Neighbor C to the north by redesigning the roof over the area and also reduced the size by 25 sq. ft less. Balcony has been lowered 12” as well.

Addressing concerned of the neighbor west of our property, the balcony from the master bedroom is over 70+ ft away and believe their privacy concern is a non-issue. They may have thought that the story poles for the garage were for the main house.

Garage has been reduced in size to appropriate 2-car required Garage. Increased the garage setback from side & rear yard to 5’ away from property line.

Overall massing of the columns at rear deck have been redesigned to address concerns of top heavy look. Simplified the arches, Columns are now in-effect walls, proportioned wider to balance floor above.

Gusset profile details for eaves have been engineered out and simplified to give a more modest look.

Pool has been removed from Site plan, and replaced with gravel Hardscape area.

Authenticity considered heavily.

Chimney is no longer square, now redesigned in a traditional Spanish Revival style Oval shape, precast & finished with stucco to match.

Stucco option reduced to 1 color. 18 Coconut. Provides cleaner more simplified house, move away from track home criticism.

Concerns for authenticity of windows has been addressed at the Living Room. The Specialty window is now rounded at the top, no longer shallow arched. Window at Living Room authenticity remark has been addressed above. Dining room window has been simplified in shape. Color of roofing tiles has been revised to solid red color.

Regards, Jonathan Park
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct pilasters with lighting fixtures in the front yard.

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

April 4, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
May 11, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 8
Object - 0
No response - 7

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a side yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
The DRC shall approve the application for the 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 that the proposed pilasters and walkway are architecturally compatible with the existing residence. There is an existing landing at the front entry way, an existing walkway in the front yard, and a driveway which are all composed of both brick and concrete material. The proposed brick pilasters would be a suitable addition to the front yard.

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 proposed front yard pilasters will be two feet and six inches tall and of concrete and brick material. The size, location, and height of the proposed front yard pilasters on the subject property are consistent with other front yard features that are found on the subject block. For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, Staff observed houses adjacent to the subject property and others located along the same side of Lorain Road, in between Sherwood Road and St. Albans Road.

   The subject block exhibits brick walkways on several houses and pilasters of similar dimensions and material are found on the adjacent neighbor’s property to the east. Staff finds that the proposed front yard pilasters are compatible with those existing on Lorain Road and the steps with brick detailing will be consistent with the rest of 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 pilasters will maintain a setback of 3 feet and 3 inches from the front property line and will not disrupt oncoming vehicular traffic nor cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: APRIL 4, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-72 2960 LORAIN RD., (CHAN/)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story residence with a subterranean four-car garage, and street facing driveway gate, walls, and pilasters.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

April 4, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC.
May 18, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 6
Object – 1
No response – 4

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: Staff finds the proposed single-story structure to be compatible with the existing built environment in the legal neighborhood. The roofline and building orientation are similar to adjacent structures. The project will maintain the landscaped front lawn and will continue to use Rose Avenue (rear yard) to access the garage.

Staff notes that the subterranean garage and the driveway along the east side yard result in more paving area than adjacent properties with garage access from Rose Avenue. The appearance of the long driveway from Rose Avenue is a preferred alternative to a street facing garage which is discouraged by the Residential Design Guidelines. Retaining walls with planting along the east property line reduce the visual impact of the driveway.

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: A small balcony (two foot in depth) located along the east side of the structure is sixteen feet from the property line and will not cause privacy impacts 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

Comments: The exterior earth tone color scheme will complement neighboring structures with brick and natural stonework. The colors and materials are consistently applied throughout the project.

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
   
   *Comment:* The proposed fencing, pilasters and gate are compatible with the modest style of the structure. The wrought iron fencing and driveway gate share the same design as the balcony railing.

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:* Staff supports the proposed fencing, walls and pilasters as similar features are found on neighboring properties. The location of the driveway gate and the adjoining pilasters should be setback further from Rose Avenue to reduce the visual appearance of the gate since no other driveway gate exists on the north side of Rose Avenue.

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 driveway gate and adjoining pilasters will limit site lines for vehicles exiting the east neighbor’s garage. The issue can be resolved by relocating the driveway gate and adjoining pilasters as noted above.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, Ho Nai Lung, am a property owner of
2970 Lorain Rd., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
2960 Lorain Rd., San Marino.

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

1. I object to the project.

2. I do not object to the project.

3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments: The construction of the 4 cars underground garage may cause future undetectable damage of the foundation of my property.

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature: ____________________________ Date: Feb 7, 2018
WOOD STAIN GARAGE DOOR
RANCH HOUSE WOOD STAIN DOORS,
PROGRESSIVE SERIES 5HD-79B
WITH WALNUT FINISH

MAIN ENTRY DOOR
CUSTOM WOOD STAIN DOORS,
FIELD WIND MODEL 422
WITH WALNUT FINISH

MAIN ENTRY LIGHT FIXTURE
HUBBARDTON FORGE AIRS SMALL
OUTDOOR WALL SCONCE, DARK SKY,
COASTAL NATURAL IRON FINISH,
SEEDED CLEAR GLASS

ROOF TILE
CORAL ROOFING, SIMULATED WOOD SHAKE,
MADERA MOUNTAIN WOOD

ALUM. CLADDING WOOD WINDOW AND FRENCH DOORS
WITH TRUE DIVIDERS, SIERRA PACIFIC
HURD H3 WINDOWS
EXTERIOR CLADING COLOR TW BLACK

WINDOW SHUTTER
BENJAMIN MOORE COLOR
PREVIEW, HC-154, HALE NAVY

STUCCO
SMOOTH FINISH, OMEGA
COLOR 407 CORNCO BEIGE

Material Board
March 28, 2018,

To: Design Review Committee
City of San Marino

Re: 2960 Lorain Rd.

Dear Design Review Committee,

We understand a subterranean garage is uncommon on Lorain Rd. While thinking of our design approach on this project, our team has looked at the site condition.

1. The site condition creates many opportunities including: a front street entrance for pedestrian to the house and a garage entrance located on back street. We took site advantage to locate the gate to the subterranean garage on the back street.
2. Moving the existing garage condition to subterranean garage, will allow the garage doors to be hidden from the street view. The back street perspective will also improve.
3. A one story house will not intrude neighbor’s privacy and will be compatible with neighborhood.
4. Keeping integrity for neighbor’s property: one of the neighbors has concern on the vibration of the construction of underground garage, may cause damage of the foundation of his property. Our team has come up with different possible solutions.

We have consulted with our geological engineer. Our geological engineer has completed the soil report for the site and also has given the owner and contractor professional suggestions to reduce the vibration. Please see the attachment for suggestions. The owner will hire professional design consulting team and general contractor to make sure the design and construction will be based on the professional recommended method and code requirements to keep integrity of neighbor’s property.

Sincerely,

Feng Xiao, AIA, NCARB
Hi Feng:

As you know, elastic waves traveling through soil will cause ground motion and foundation/structures vibration. The subject development may utilize ground earth movement equipment and drilling of soldier piles for the basement construction. The earth movement equipment and rotating machine for the soldier piles will create steady-state vibration and cause elastic waves. The onsite near surface soils consist of silty sand with fine grained materials of more than 15 percent. In general, vibration have less or negligible effect on clay or other fine grained soils. In order to further reduce any potential ground vibration, the earth moving equipment should be kept in low moving speed and the rotary soldier pile installation machine should also be kept at slow penetration speed as determined by the machine operator.

--
Jack C. Lee PE, GE, PLS, QSD
President
Cal Land Engineering, Inc.
dba Quartech Consultants
576 E. Lambert road
Brea, CA 92821
Tel: 714-671-1050 Ex.118
Fax: 714-671-1090
email: lee@callandeng.com
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 Chris Huang, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody

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

There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

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

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

   The following people spoke about the project:

   Julie, 1635 Old Mill Road, expressed concerns about massing.

   Susan Jakubowski, 1248 Roanoke Road, commented on the massing, square footage, and potential impacts on future development in the neighborhood.

   Nancy Hoffman, 1234 Roanoke Road, spoke in opposition of the project.

   Jonathan David, 1224 Huntington Drive, spoke in opposition of the project.

   Gretchen Shepherd Romney, 1119 Lorain Road, commented on the massing and lack of neighborhood compatibility.

   Yvonne, 1635 Old Mill Road, spoke in reference to the trees being removed on the property due to the project.
It was the consensus of the Committee that the project has made significant improvements and the project was acceptable.

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

1. Eliminate two lighting fixtures on the north elevation.
2. The applicant shall work with staff to minimize the size and appearance of louvered vents on the front elevation.
3. Any existing trees on the property that are damaged or removed as a result of the project shall be replaced with a similar type with a minimum height of 48”.
4. Front entryway door shall match the rendering.

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

2. MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-18
1155 AVONDALE ROAD, (BEAUTY OCEAN INVESTMENT LTD./HASLOCK AND LIM CHANG ROHLING & ASSOCIATES)

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

Jay Baliwag, the applicant, presented the project and answered questions.

Robert Volk, 1440 Orlando Road, expressed concerns about the scope of the project and the exterior elevations.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project would maintain compatibility with the existing structure.

Committee Member Dustin moved to approve the project as submitted.

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

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-24
2430 CUMBERLAND ROAD, (FU/NGO)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could not make all of the required findings.

Christina Fu, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project required additional design revisions.
Vice-Chair Wong 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, Chairman Cheng. NOES: None.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-05**
   **1400 SAN MARINO AVENUE, (LY/NORAVIAN)**

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could support the project.

An Ly, property owner, 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 condition:

1. Low profile ridge tiles shall be used.

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

5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-27**
   **2695 DEVONPORT ROAD, (HUANG/LANSFORD)**

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could support the project.

Robert Lansford, the applicant, presented the project and answered questions.

Richard Haserot, 2365 Sherwood Road, spoke in opposition of the proposed roofing material.

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

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

1. Low profile ridge tiles shall be used.

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

The discussion of the Eagle Roofing tile product was postponed to a later date due to a sewer leakage issue at City Hall.

OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 20, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

__________________________
CHRISTINE SONG,
ASSISTANT PLANNER