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, 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](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. DRC17-38
   This item was continued from the April 18, 2018 and May 2, 2018 meetings.
   1715 WESTHAVEN RD., (ZHU/PDS STUDIO)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence with a detached two-car garage.
   (Required Action Date: 6-12-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-26
   2935 SOMERSET RD., (LAU/LANSFORD)
   The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood shake roofing material on the residence and detached garage with roofing material not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list.
   (Required Action Date: 6-29-18)

OTHER MATTERS

3. DESIGN REVIEW TRAINING

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, June 6, 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: MAY 16, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-38
1715 WESTHAVEN RD., (ZHU/PDS STUDIO)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence with 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

April 18, 2018 – The project was continued to the 5/16/18 meeting due to the lack of story poles
May 2, 2018 – Noticed for the meeting sent out by error
May 16, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
June 12, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 1
Object – 6
No response – 4

Outside of legal neighborhood: Approval for the project from 1745 Westhaven 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: The legal neighborhood contains single-story and two-story homes in traditional architectural styles. The site can handle a two-story structure with the proposed yard setbacks. However, staff finds the proposed plate height to be out of scale with adjacent structures and recommends a one-foot reduction for the first floor and a six-inch plate height reduction on the second floor. The plate height reduction will also improve the massing and help the new structure blend in 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

Comments: The proposed second floor is recessed from the north and south property lines to minimize visual impact on adjoining neighbors. While smaller awning windows are located on the second floor along north and south elevations to prevent privacy impact on adjacent structure, staff finds the square awning windows to be inconsistent with the rest of the window sizes and operation on the structure. Staff recommends providing casement windows with muntins in sizes that result in better balance with the rest of the structure and use opaque or frosted glass to address privacy concerns.

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 colors and materials are common for Spanish Colonial Revival homes and are also found on adjacent structures. Window treatments are not consistently applied on the structure. Second floor windows on the north and south elevations should have consistent window treatment as the first floor. Additionally, appropriate spacing should be provided between the roof eave and second windows on the north elevation. The precast trim below the front facing windows are too heavy for the wrought iron railing and the size of the windows. A less prominent trim treatment will provide better proportion on the front façade.
1725 Westhaven Road
San Marino, CA 91108
May 9, 2018

Design Review Committee
Planning Department
San Marino City Hall
2200 Huntington Dr.
San Marino, CA 91108

RE: DRC 17-38: 1715 Westhaven Rd DRC application

Dear Members of the Design Review Committee and to whom it may concern:

We live at 1725 Westhaven Rd, the immediate neighbor directly south of 1715 Westhaven Rd, which has an application to build a new house (DRC 17-38). We chose to live here because we loved the open, spacious look and feel of this neighborhood, and the understated beauty of the homes.

We strongly oppose the new design because it appears much too large for its location in the neighborhood, because its overall style does not match the neighborhood, and because it intrudes on our privacy. We also have other smaller concerns.

We have listed several of our concerns about this proposed design in the following pages. We deeply appreciate the time and effort you invest in reviewing applications and helping guide the designs within our community to ensure the character and compatibility of the neighborhoods. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Helen Cheng  Mike Cheng

Helen and Mike Cheng

P.S.: We invite members of the DRC and Planning Staff to view the story poles from our yards at any time before the May 16th DRC hearing.
Massiveness

The Residential Design Guidelines state that
“The size, mass, and height of a structure should be in proportion
with the size of the property and should also be in scale with
nearby structures.” (p. 18)

The size, height, and mass of the new design are out of proportion with our house and others in
the neighborhood. It belongs on a larger lot in a different neighborhood. We are concerned with
the area, height, and the resultant perceived massing, and we think this design is not
compatible.

Many of these concerns could have been prevented if the applicant had simply followed the
Residential Design Guidelines.

Main Residence Area

“The design of a new home should not maximize the allowable lot
coverage. It should provide ample open space around a structure
and incorporate a variable footprint within the required set
backs. This will result in a more interesting structure, allow for
sunlight and air, provide privacy, and preserve the character of
the neighborhood.” (p. 22)

The new design is far out of proportion with our house and the neighborhood. The application is
only 23 sq ft from the maximum allowable living space of 3600 sq ft. and is on the absolute
smallest lot in the legal neighborhood. If it were surrounded by other maximally-sized houses,
then there might be different considerations.

However, our house is a modest, low-pitched, one-story house with 2003 sq ft on a similarly
sized lot. The front of our house is a 14’ wide living room, with the rest of the house further set
back from the front of the house.

The existing house at 1715 Westhaven Rd is relatively shallow. The sky and air space between
the existing house and all of its neighbors is clearly visible. From the diagonal perspective of the
sidewalk as you walk down the street, you can see the air space of their backyard over our
house and between houses, and their house is almost hidden behind our front yard oak tree.
With the depth and height of the new design, you would see a lot more of their building.

Perhaps the house would fit in a different neighborhood, with larger neighboring houses and
larger lots, but its size does not match the scale found here.
Plate Heights

"First and second floor plate heights should be consistent with those established on other homes in the neighborhood." (p. 26)

Other plate heights in the neighborhood are probably in the range of 8' to 8 1/2'. My house has plate heights ranging from 7'3" to 8'. This design has a 10' 1st floor plate height and a 9' 2nd floor plate height. These are way out of scale with this neighborhood.

Main Residence Height

"New homes should be compatible with the height, setback, proportion, and scale of the houses in the neighborhood." (p. 22)

The very tip of the stacked tiles on the front gable of our house measures less than 12' above the ground, including the foundation. This might barely reach the horizontal part in the middle of their proposed front entrance.

Although the proposed maximum height is similar to the existing house, the current maximum height is reached at just a point of the roof, so that most of the building is shorter. In contrast, the new application has a sustained maximum height of 25'6" for 19' across the front ridge, and another ridge just 1/2' lower for 25' along the length of the structure. This is a huge volume that would appear to totally dominate over us.

The front ridge of the story poles also seems to move forward of the existing peak, so it will appear higher from the perspective of a person. This may not be obvious now, since one of the story poles fell over within a day of installation.

Westhaven Road has a very slight slope, so that my property (1725 Westhaven Rd) is about a foot lower than the applicant's. The current roof is about 1' lower on the south side of the house. This reflects the contours of the land and is a nod to the prior existence of our 1 story house. The new application ignores the natural slope. It will appear to be even higher on the south side, which directly contrasts with my house.

Again, perhaps this house would fit somewhere else. But that place wouldn't even be in Arcadia, which has a maximum building height of 25' for a lot this size, where 25'6" or 26'1" would be too tall. It is too tall to be compatible with this neighborhood.
Front Façade Size

The area of the façade is over 800 sq. ft. This is 5 times as large as ours. While the existing house has the entry/living room in front with the dining room (left/south side) set back an additional 1', this helps break up the apparent size and reduce the façade and roof height on the side closer to our house.

The proposed façade height (face of the house below the roof) is noticeably higher than on the existing house, due to increased plate heights that are significantly taller than others in this neighborhood. This façade height enhances the feeling of height of the house perhaps more than the absolute roof height.

The shallow depth of the existing house makes the overall massing proportional with the neighborhood. The new application has a taller face, along with width and depth, which all contribute to a large volume that is out of proportion with the neighborhood.

Front Entry Height

The front entry including all the foam decorations is nearly 25' high, over twice as tall as the front gable of my house. The tower behind those decorations makes the building look taller, too, and seems unnecessary. In Arcadia, the front porch including decorations for this sized lot would be capped at 14', which would still be too high for our particular neighborhood.

The front door itself is 8'6" high, which in addition to the porch step and higher building pad than my house, is even higher than my eaves.

In the drawings the ridge line is higher than the top of this entryway, but the ridge is 10' behind this entryway. Due to parallax, from the perspective of a person on the ground, the entry frame would appear to be higher than the top ridge of the house.

This front entry height is completely inappropriate here.

Mass

Besides area and height, the volume of a building should be compatible with the neighborhood. When a building is wide, deep, and tall, it has a large volume. Small indentations such as the one on the 1st floor South elevation reduce the liveable area but don't reduce the overall envelope. When covered patios and balconies are added, the enclosed volume appears even larger and heavier.
The volume and massing of this design are out of scale with the neighborhood/streetscape.

Garage

Their garage would be 31' deep, while ours is 17' deep. That would be almost long enough to park two pairs of cars in tandem (in the 4/16/18 plans). The applicant has moved the story poles for a smaller but still tall garage, but I have not seen the new plans.

The applicant’s proposed garage would have 9' high walls, plus the roof and eaves for a total height of 14', towering over even my house, which in the rear (closest to applicant’s garage) has a 7’3” plate height with a flat roof.

In comparison, my other neighbor’s garage + bonus room + covered storage space (adjacent to our South property line) has gutters around 6’ high with no side eaves. Our garage is 8’ high with no side eaves.

Since the garage location is moved much closer to the property line, it will feel like a 9' high wall (plus roof) along most of my backyard. Our backyard would feel squeezed between two garages.

We hope they can reduce the height and depth of their garage to the minimum, as well as increase the side setback, to match the neighborhood garage sizes and to reduce the impact on our backyard.

If they need the extra storage space of this huge garage, perhaps they could orient the garage so the short side is parallel to our property line.

Neighborhood Liveable Area and Lot Size Comparison

The new house would have nearly the 2nd largest liveable area in the legal neighborhood. Lots on Bedford are much larger, so this new house would be the largest by far on Westhaven Rd., from Huntington Dr. down to Lorain Rd. In contrast, our house is the smallest yet would be next door to the proposed new house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Liveable Area (Sq Ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1720 Bedford</td>
<td>7496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Bedford</td>
<td>3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed 1715 Westhaven</strong></td>
<td><strong>3577</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690 Westhaven</td>
<td>3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105 Adair</td>
<td>3184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695 Westhaven</td>
<td>2738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 Melville</td>
<td>2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Westhaven</td>
<td>2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104 Adair</td>
<td>2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Bedford</td>
<td>2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715 Westhaven</td>
<td>2204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735 Westhaven</td>
<td>2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 Westhaven</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Assessor, the applicant has the smallest lot in the legal neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Lot size (Sq Ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1720 Bedford</td>
<td>44437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Bedford</td>
<td>25230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Bedford</td>
<td>24033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690 Westhaven</td>
<td>15560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 Melville</td>
<td>13250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105 Adair</td>
<td>11620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104 Adair</td>
<td>10760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695 Westhaven</td>
<td>10680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Westhaven</td>
<td>10670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735 Westhaven</td>
<td>10502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 Westhaven</td>
<td>10499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed 1715 Westhaven</strong></td>
<td><strong>10497</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighborhood Floor-Area-Ratio comparison

The properties on Westhaven are all similar in size, but some properties in this legal neighborhood (on Bedford Rd) have much larger lots 2-4+ times larger than this one, so this chart compares FAR = liveable area / lot area.

As you can see from the chart below, the new house would have the largest FAR, significantly larger than all the rest of the neighborhood. My house, next door to the new house, has a below-median FAR, so the contrast between my house and the new house would be unpleasantly noticeable.

Although the design complies with the maximum allowable limitations, we think those limitations are an absolute upper bound applicable to the entire district to allow for all kinds of different designs. They are not an entitlement, and compatibility depends on the actual neighborhood. In this case, the design is out of scale with the rest of the neighborhood.

Legal Neighborhood Floor-Area-Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed DRC17-38</th>
<th>2105 Adair</th>
<th>1695 Westhaven</th>
<th>1705 Westhaven</th>
<th>1690 Westhaven</th>
<th>1715 Westhaven</th>
<th>2104 Adair</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>1735 Westhaven</th>
<th>1725 Westhaven</th>
<th>1735 Durklyn</th>
<th>2103 Melville</th>
<th>1720 Bedford</th>
<th>1712 Bedford</th>
<th>1708 Bedford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor-Area-Ratio
Setbacks

"New structures should observe established front and side yard setbacks in a neighborhood....
The established pattern should be followed for new house placement even if it is more restrictive than the Zoning Code. The same is true for side yard setbacks." (p.17)

The houses in this neighborhood generally have wider side setbacks, with planters on both sides of the driveway.

The existing house has a 14’ or 15’ setback to the southern property line (next to my house). The new design has a 12’ setback on this side. Combined with the extra height and depth, the spacing will feel much tighter than the existing spacing.

Style

We have concerns with the stylistic/design compatibility of this house.

Front yard design

"Open space and landscaped areas should visually blend with adjacent properties." (p. 18)

Several houses in a row currently have a large front lawn continuing between each driveway. You wouldn’t easily see where one property ends and the other begins within the lawns.

This new design with so much hardscape will clearly stick out from the rest of the neighborhood. The front yard including driveway is only 60’ wide and about 40’ deep. Having so many walkways crisscrossing this small area seems to be too busy.

Again, this landscape design seems to belong on a much larger lot, not in this neighborhood.

Front Entry Style

"New homes should be compatible with ... the existing on-site relationships of the surrounding neighborhood such as front facade orientation, scale of front entries, front porches, and front yard landscaping." (p. 22)

Quite a few homes in this neighborhood were built during the Great Depression. Because of the times, the homes were built with high quality materials and workmanship, but they exhibited a more modest design with understated details.
This new design features an ostentatious front entryway façade. Ornate designs carved from stone or marble might fit on a palace or on City Hall, but this precast version attempts to be a cheap facsimile that does not belong in this neighborhood. Also, it is neither centered nor clearly offset — not sure if it’s supposed to look like a miniature City Hall with windows instead of an old Fire Department door, but that is a much larger building.

As mentioned in an earlier section, the front entry height is also incompatible.

This design simply does not preserve the character of this neighborhood.

**Driveway Gate**

The proposed driveway gate is 6’ high, set back only 6’ from the front of the house. Most houses around ours don’t have driveway gates. If they do, they are often set back far from the front setback of the house, are 3-4’ high to match a neighbor’s gate, and/or span a narrower driveway.

Our patio has a wing wall from the house (in line with the front of the house) that meets a side property line wall. These brick walls are 33” high in front. After a few feet, the side increases to 4’ high, and finally reaches somewhere less than 5’ high. The 6’ high driveway gate, juxtaposed with our 3’ high wall when viewed head-on from the sidewalk/street, perhaps meeting the 4’ high part of the wall, does not fit here.

If their purpose is security, an intruder would simply enter from our 3’ high wall to bypass their gate, so we fail to see the purpose of so tall a gate.

On the direction of their gate -- We are concerned that if the future resident of this house leaves his gate open, such as on trash pickup days or if he finds the gate inconvenient, then we will have a 6’ gate over our 4-5’ wall. We would prefer that the hinge be on the side of their house (North side of driveway) rather than next to the property line wall. In the drawing, the hinge location appears to be floating on the property line.

Often in this city we see people park cars on driveways in front of driveway gates. Having a gate with a short setback from the front of the house encourages drivers to park more forward of the house. Setting the gate further back from the front of the house would encourage the appearance of more front yard space without parked cars. Since there is no rear entry door to the house, it would be impractical for a future resident to park in the garage and then re-open the gate in order to reach the front door to enter his house and perhaps unload groceries, making it even more likely to have parked cars in front of the gate.

The driveway gate should be shorter and set further back to reduce the perception of an enclosing feeling, and it should open away from our house so that it doesn’t overshadow our wall and courtyard when it is kept open.
Windows

The 2nd floor windows on the side elevations (both North and South Elevations) seem haphazardly placed. Perhaps they were designed for interior rooms without concern for the exterior appearance, but it seems the 2nd floor and 1st floor were designed independently of each other. The various non-aligned alcoves/cutouts in the outer envelope of the building also suggest independent floor designs.

The upstairs windows don’t line up with downstairs windows and have no clear fenestration pattern. This carelessness does not enhance its design aesthetics and would be an eyesore we’d see every day, and it would be visible from the street over our rooftops.

One page of the plans call for a Chestnut Bronze finish to the windows, and another page says white. I’m not sure which is correct, but mismatched colors are not so glaring a concern as the window placement, privacy, and overall mass of the building.

Eaves

On top of this already massive (for the neighborhood) house sits a roof with wide eaves. Like a large hat, it contributes to making the house and garage look even bigger.

It also does not match the stated style of Spanish Colonial Revival.

Houses in this neighborhood generally have much shorter eaves. These eaves need to be reduced.

Roof pitches

This design features many roof pitches, unlike the simple, clean look of the existing house. Perhaps this is to achieve the tall plate heights on a deep/wide building without making the building even taller or having a flat middle section of the roof, but it looks too busy/complicated.

Eventually, the roof valleys may catch leaves, and it’s unlikely anyone will climb up that high regularly to clean them, so it could turn into a maintenance problem clearly visible from my house or possibly even from the street.
Privacy

We are concerned with our loss of privacy from the new design, as well as for the precedent-setting intrusion of neighborhood privacy.

Windows

The existing house is shallow, so the existing upstairs windows primarily overlook our living room. The new design is much deeper and taller, and the side setback from our property line is reduced a few feet, so the windows would clearly overlook our bedrooms and main bathroom, as well as our backyard.

This would make us feel like we lived under a watchtower and would completely eliminate our privacy.

When I look out my bathroom and bedroom windows towards the sky and San Gabriel Mountains, now I see tall story poles with orange flags delineating walls that would block the sky and sunlight, and where there would be windows overlooking mine.

This design is offensive to the notion of common respect for neighbors' privacy.

Please don’t set a precedent by introducing a huge house with so many upstairs windows to this neighborhood where they do not belong.
Other concerns

2 Kitchens

The plans show two full kitchens on opposite sides of the house. With so many bathrooms and two kitchens, this proposed house could be used for multiple families. We are firmly opposed to a multi-family dwelling in our neighborhood, and are apprehensive of a design that might facilitate multi-family usage.

Drainage

The plans have a lot of impervious concrete hardscape. Because our property is slightly lower than the applicant's property, we are concerned with where the water would drain. It ought to drain toward the street instead of toward our house, but we can't tell from the design if proper drainage was actually considered.

Trees

"A building should be designed to be compatible with the natural slope of the land, adapting to the land and reflecting its contours, while respecting all significant, existing trees and vegetation and any other natural site attributes." (p. 18)

The application includes development (house foundation and digging a pool) well within the dripline of a large Olive tree. This specimen is tall enough that you can see it from several houses away. I hope that care can be taken to minimize digging underneath the tree, so that the tree survives, but otherwise the new design and the tree seem to be incompatible with each other.

The plans include a grove of Avocado trees the applicant removed last year in preparation for this DRC application. The drawings are also missing an Oak tree near the rear/West property line.

Also, the plans depict a block wall that would go directly through a Palm tree on the Southern property line. This does not make any sense; the applicant's proposed wall should accommodate the existing tree.
Materials

"Natural materials are preferred. Synthetic materials for the building made to simulate natural wood and masonry are discouraged" (p.33)

The Residential Design Guidelines suggest using natural materials. This design uses foam and precast trim on the exterior, as well as strips of artificial grass in the driveway. These might not be as durable or look as good in 10-20 years as real wood or stone, or real plants. Also, I don't think foam trims are typically found in the neighborhood.

Comparison with Prior Application (DRC 14-66)

This applicant previously applied for a similarly sized new house and had six DRC hearings until it was ultimately denied. Dates: 12/17/2014, 1/7/2015, 2/4/2015, 3/4/2015, 3/18/2015, 4/1/2015.

During the process, the applicant made a few small changes, but ultimately the massing was still out of scale and the design was still incompatible with this neighborhood. The applicant was inflexible on the major incompatibilities such as the overall area and massing.

This application feels like a great leap backwards. All those hearings failed to impress on the applicant the need to consider fitting in the neighborhood. Comments on massing and scale were completely ignored.

This new design is bigger, taller, and more massive than the last design.

Perhaps they hope to offer minor concessions to match the old design when they present another iteration for the next hearing. We hope they save everybody's time and make meaningful, substantial improvements instead of minor adjustments of a few inches here or there, and we hope they can come up with something that would harmonize with the neighborhood, that would look like it belonged, and which would enhance the neighborhood. Thank you for your attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRC 14-66 Denied</th>
<th>DRC 17-38 New Design 4/16/2018</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livable area (sq ft)</td>
<td>3573</td>
<td>3577</td>
<td>Still too massive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>25'6&quot;</td>
<td>Taller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st floor plate height</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>Taller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd floor height</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>Taller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage (sq ft)</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>50% Larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage size (sq ft)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>50% Larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered patios/porches (sq ft)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>Adds Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway gate</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 30 April 2018

TO: Members of the San Marino Design Review Committee
Kevin Cheng, Corinna Wong, John Dustin, Christopher Huang, Judy Johnson-Brody, Frances Banerjee and Lon Wahlberg

RE: DRC 17-38 Proposed New Residence at 1715 Westhaven Road

My husband Vittorio Maccaferri, who passed away 4 months ago and I purchased 1695 Westhaven Road in 1977 (41 years ago). Residing in this part of San Marino has been a pleasure living along side neighbors who respect the character of the smaller size homes and are proud to keep San Marino green.

Early 2015, a man came to my front door stating he was the architect for our new neighbors at 1715 Westhaven and asked me to sign a petition for remodeling that structure. I asked what the current square footage was and what the proposed square footage would be and he said he did not know those figures. I also asked to see the plans for the project and he said he did not have them. Finally, I asked for his business card and he said he did not have one with him. I told him I would not sign his petition.

Since 2015, at least three large trees have disappeared from the property. I now live with a view from my upstairs bedroom, bathroom and dressing room and my back yard garden of very tall wood poles with carnival colored flags delineating what appears will be a structure dwarfing my neighbors at 1705 Westhaven and take away all MY privacy in MY home!

I am asking you to go to the City of SAN MARINO California website and under Design Review Committee read About the Committee and Duties. Please remember your duty to *Foster new development that is aesthetically compatible with existing building and infrastructure. [I have attached a copy of the website page].

I am unable to attend the meeting at City Hall on Wednesday, May 2nd but I authorize Thomas Ott to present my objections to the Committee.

Respectfully,

Margaret B. Maccaferri

/m
Dear Design Review Committee,

This email is forwarded to you in an effort to address concerns regarding the application for a new two-story residence and garage construction (DRC Case No. 17-38) at 1715 Westhaven Road, San Marino.

The proposed construction includes an extraordinarily large house and garage extending in some areas to only 4 feet from the neighboring property line. Not only does this infringe on the privacy of those neighbors, but sets a precarious precedent for the city of San Marino. In light of the previously denied smaller-scaled plans from several years ago, the current proposal is entirely incompatible with the lot size and also with the community.

Where gardens and trees once provided privacy and green space in neighborhoods with appropriately dimensioned buildings to lots, if approved, these kinds of oversized and out of place residences, stretching from one edge of the property line to the next, could become the norm. This is not the precedent the community of San Marino wants to set.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

The Esseln Family
1712 Bedford Road, San Marino
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) ___________________________ am a property owner of (address)

_________________________________, San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(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: 
   
   Why is this construction even being reconsidered?
   
   It was already turned down several years ago.

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

______________________________
April 15, 2018
Date
Design Review Committee Hearing April 18, 2018
San Marino City Hall
Dated: April 10, 2018
Re: Proposed New Residence at 1715 Westhaven Road, DRC 17-38

We have resided at 1705 Westhaven Road since 1986. Our property is adjacent to 1715 Westhaven on its North side. We opposed a prior application by the same owner in early 2015 (DRC 14-66) which was denied in early April of 2015 on a five to one vote of the Committee. The current application and plan is opposed for many of the same reasons as the prior one, summarized below.

1. There is an existing ambiance and neighborhood character on Westhaven, where we have lived since 1986. This character will be harmed by the proposed project.

2. Like others in adjacent cities, we are concerned about “mansionization” and its effect on traditional neighborhoods and communities.

3. Box like construction is antithetical to traditional San Marino design elements.

4. San Marino’s Residential Design Guidelines preclude the proposed project:
   
   A. P.16. Scale and Mass. “The mass and height of a new building should blend well with neighboring structures and not overwhelm them with disproportionate size or design that is out of character.”
   
   B. P.22. New Homes. “The design of a new home should not maximize the allowable lot coverage. It should provide ample open space around a structure and incorporate a variable format within the required setbacks. This will result in a more interesting structure, allow for sunlight and air, provide privacy, and preserve the character of the neighborhood.”

5. The current plan, like the prior one, is incompatible with the nature and character of our neighborhood. The proposed structure is so large that it would compromise our access to light and air, creating a tunnel effect between our properties.

6. The plan maximizes allowable living area at 3,599 square feet on an allowable base of only 3,600 square feet.

7. We have privacy concerns with overlooking window locations and a second level rear balcony.

Thank you,

Thomas Ott
Maria Ott
CITY OF SAN MARINO  
DESIGN REVIEW  
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, [Neighbor's Name], am a property owner of  
1705 Westhaven Rd., San Marino and have been shown  
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at  
1715 Westhaven Rd. (South Side Neighbor)  
(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:
   1. Site plan & survey are out of date
   2. Second story deck needs wall on N side for privacy
   3. Is a 2 car garage adequate?
   4. Mediterranean street side elevation doesn't carry through.
   5. North side: do windows with 6 ft. sill really protect privacy?
   6. North side: cook cooking area needs exhaust filtering and venting to prevent buildup of cooking odors.
   7. Question if site line is being adhered to (30' site line from top of 6 ft. wall)
   8. Perhaps more upon architectural review

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 1/28/2018
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, J. Dunne, am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)
1690 Westlake, San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
1715 Westhaven
(project address)

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: do not want a tear down

__________________________
Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

__________________________
Date

12/7/17
Dear Planning Department and members of the Design Review Committee:

The owners of 1715 Westhaven Rd have another application (DRC 17-38) for a new house and garage, with a new hearing scheduled for April 18th.

The city requires the applicant to install at least 10 days before the hearing a public notice sign in front of the house and story poles. This helps to inform the public and to give nearby residents time to react.

Today is 8 days before the hearing, and no pole or sign has been installed. Does the city/DRC enforce this requirement anymore?

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Helen Cheng
Design Review Committee
Planning Department
San Marino City Hall
2200 Huntington Dr.
San Marino, CA 91108

March 26, 2018

RE: Objection to 1715 Westhaven Rd DRC application

Dear Members of the Design Review Committee:

We are immediate neighbors of 1715 Westhaven Rd, which has an application to build a new house. When one of the owners showed us their plans, we expressed our objections both verbally and in writing on the neighbor approval/objection letter he provided us. When approached by their architect, Philip Chan, we also expressed some of our objections directly to him.

It has recently come to our attention that the applicants replaced the objection letter we gave them with a "no response" letter.

We are disturbed at their dishonesty in misrepresenting our opinions to the city and DRC.

Attached is a copy of the objection letter that we gave to the applicants two months ago in response to the plans they showed us, highlighting our view that their design is incompatible with the neighborhood, intrude on neighbors’ privacy, and in particular is disproportionate with our house (a low, one story house right next door) and diminishes the enjoyment of our property.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Helen and Mike Cheng
I, Helen Cheng, am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)
1725 Westhaven Rd., San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
1715 Westhaven Rd., San Marino
(project address)

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: Please see attached comments.

Helen Cheng
Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

2-4-2018
Date
After briefly reviewing the plans of the proposed changes,
1. We object to the project.

Comments

1. Style does not match neighborhood. Please see San Marino Residential Design Guidelines.

2. Scale and Massing highly disproportionate with entire neighborhood, especially with two immediate neighbors to the South. Project is over twice as tall as our house, and also is wider and bigger and heavier.

3. Plan pushes the maximum allowable living space and other limits. It does not allow even a 1/4" margin for construction error.

4. Rear covered patio/balcony adds to the perceived massing. Rear balconies do not belong in this neighborhood with 60-foot-wide lots.


6. Garage is much longer, as well as taller, wider, and much closer to us than existing 2-car garage, walling-in our property. Since it is so long and has so much extra interior space, it should have a greater setback to avoid suffocating our backyard

7. Pool lacks safety enclosure.

8. Privacy concerns from 2nd floor windows overlooking us, especially all of our bedrooms.

9. Two A/C units will have twice the noise and are proposed to be much nearer to our bedrooms. Should have greater setback because multiple noise sources.

10. Driveway gate too far forward for the neighborhood, too prominent and industrial-looking. Also appears to be floating from property line. If motorized, motor should be installed on house side, away from our property.

11. Complicated roof design is out of place with neighborhood.

12. Left-side windows in front façade look out of place with neighborhood.

13. Plan drawings/application inconsistent with themselves -- conflicting measurements. Information sheet lacks info on existing house. Style not as stated -- says Spanish Colonial Revival style, but drawings don't have elements of that style.

14. Plan drawings use many different scales to try to cram multiple drawings in fewer pages. Would be more readable if the drawings used more consistent scales.

15. Possibly other concerns as they arise.
Dear Ms. Choi and Ms. Song,

I would like to go on record as still being opposed to the proposed tear down and subsequent rebuild of the property at 1715 Westhaven Rd. The proposed design is not in keeping with the neighborhood and would set an unacceptable precedent.

In addition, they have already destroyed and removed perfectly healthy trees. These trees were NOT in the proposed construction area, but did provide some privacy from my vantage point.

I will be at the meeting on the 16th, assuming this item will still be on the agenda.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jocelyn Katz

1708 Bedford Rd.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: MAY 16, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-26 2935 SOMERSET RD., (LAU/LANSDORD)

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

May 16, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
June 29, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 4
Object – 0
No response – 8

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 legal neighborhood predominantly consists of Minimal Traditional style homes with low roof pitches. The main type of roofing material found in the legal neighborhood are natural wood shake and simulated wood shake concrete tiles. Staff finds that the proposed roofing material would be 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

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.