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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: Chair Howard Brody, Vice-Chair Kevin Cheng, Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, 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
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. DRC18-06
   1270 MESA RD., (GU/SUEN)
   This item was continued from the June 20, 2018 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate and perimeter fencing.
   (Required Action Date: 8-4-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-100
   605 CHAUCER RD., (HUANG/HAN)
   This item was continued from the July 5, 2018 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard fence and pedestrian gate.
   (Required Action Date: 8-6-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-34
   1240 GARFIELD AVE., (HE/TSAI)
   The applicant proposes to modify previously approved windows.
   (Required Action Date: 9-7-18)

OTHER MATTERS


OPEN FORUM

This is an opportunity for future applicants to informally present preliminary design concepts for feedback from members of the DRC. Comments received are based on members not having visited the site and neighborhood. Therefore, positive comments should not be perceived as preliminary approval of a project but rather as a tool in facilitating a project through the Design Review process. No more than two DRC members may participate in Open Forum discussions. Applications that have been heard by the DRC may not be discussed during Open Forum.
PUBLIC WRITINGS DISTRIBUTED

All public writings distributed by the City of San Marino to at least a majority of the Design Review Committee regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the Public Counter at City Hall located at 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California.

ADJOURNMENT

The San Marino Design Review Committee will adjourn to the next meeting to be held on Wednesday, August 15, 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: AUGUST 1, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-06
1270 MESA RD., (GU/SUEN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate and perimeter fencing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

June 20, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with the overall ornate design of the proposed gate.
August 1, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
August 4, 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

   *Comment:* The proposed driveway gate can be found compatible with the existing residence as there are other existing wrought iron details around the front entry way of 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 size, location, and height of the proposed street facing driveway gate and fencing on the subject property are consistent with other wrought iron front yard fences 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 Mesa Road, in between Virginia Road and Oak Grove 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 fencing will maintain a setback of 35 feet and 6 inches from the side 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

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: AUGUST 1, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-100
605 CHAUCER RD., (HUANG/HAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard fence and pedestrian gate.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

July 5, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC. The project was continued due to design issues regarding the proposed use of the concrete block material for the wall.
August 1, 2018 – Second hearing before the DRC
August 6, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 4
Object – 2
Neither – 1
No response – 8

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 fence and pedestrian gate can be found architecturally compatible with the existing residence and would result in a less heavy appearance than the previously proposed concrete block wall.

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:* At the prior hearing, the Committee expressed concerns about the compatibility of a concrete block wall on the subject street. Staff finds that the revised proposal for a wrought iron fence is more consistent with the location and height of the adjacent property’s (610 Canterbury Rd.) existing wrought iron fence.

3. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.**
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   *Comment:* The proposed fence will maintain a setback of 20 inches from the property line and will not disrupt oncoming vehicular traffic nor cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to modify previously approved windows on an existing one-story residence. The applicant is seeking approval for a modification that has already been completed in the field.

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

August 1, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
September 7, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 7
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 legal neighborhood consists of both one-story and two-story structures in various traditional architectural styles. The applicant has installed windows that are not consistent with previously approved plans. Staff finds that although no major design changes were made to the existing Minimal Traditional Style home, the style of the windows that were installed impacts the overall appearance of the home and its compatibility with the legal neighborhood. The other homes within the legal neighborhood have windows that are consistent in terms of grid system, style, and operation.

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: Only existing windows were replaced.

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 involve a building addition, however the proposed window modification is not compatible with the existing structure as the fenestrations and window operations are not consistent throughout the house. The difference in window styles result in architecturally inconsistent building facades and a very arbitrary appearance.

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: Although the window material and manufacturer are on the City’s Pre-Approved Material list, the various styles and operations of the windows used are not compatible with the existing structure.
CALL TO ORDER: Chair Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Chair Cheng led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Chris Huang, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg, Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, Chair Kevin Cheng.

ABSENT: None

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chair Cheng gave an explanation of the Design Review Committee procedures and explanation of the fifteen-day appeal procedure to the members of the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Helen Cheng, 1725 Westhaven Road.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-72 2960 LORAIN ROAD, (CHAN)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated the various changes that the architect had incorporated in the redesign of the project. One major change is the placement of the garage, which is now on grade, accessed from Rose Avenue and is compatible with rear development of adjacent neighbors. Staff was able to make the required findings for the project.

The following person(s) spoke:
Feng Xiao, project architect, presented the project.

Hearing no further public comments, Chair Cheng closed the public hearing.

Committee Members Dustin and Johnson-Brody expressed concerns with the exterior lighting design and that leader heads are not appropriate for a single-story structure.

Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg was concerned with the use of artificial turf grass and stated that he would prefer natural grass.

A majority of the Committee was able to make the findings for the proposed residence and block walls adjacent to Rose Avenue.
Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to approve the project as presented. Second by Committee Member Dustin. AYES: Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Wong, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-06**  
   **1270 MESA ROAD, (GU/SUEN)**

   Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that staff found the ornate design of the gate to be architecturally incompatible with the existing residence.

   The following person spoke:
   Janet Suen, Project architect.

   Hearing no further public comments, Chair Cheng closed the public hearing.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed design is too ornate for the design of the existing residence.

   Committee Member Dustin moved to continue the project to the August 1, 2018 meeting. Second by Committee Member Johnson-Brody. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Wong, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-30**  
   **1280 SHENANDOAH ROAD, (YOUNG/KAZANJIAN)**

   Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff was able to make all of the required findings for the modification project.

   The following person spoke:
   Natalie Kazajian, project architect.

   Hearing no further public comments, Chair Cheng closed the public hearing.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the modification project is well balanced and integrated with the existing design of the structure.

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

   1. Exterior lighting fixture OA-25 model (10” wide, 25.5” long) shall be used at the front entry.

   Second by Vice-Chair Wong. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Wong, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-25**  
   **1735 S. LOS ROBLES AVENUE, (LOPEZ/JOHNSON)**
Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings for the first and second story addition project.

The following person spoke:
Mr. Campos, representative from the architect’s office

Hearing no further public comments, Chair Cheng closed the public hearing.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the addition project is compatible with the existing structure and with the neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Wong moved to approve the project as submitted. Second by Committee Member Huang. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Vice-Chair Wong, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

OTHER MATTERS

5. DISCUSSION OF TILCOR STEEL SHAKE ROOF PRODUCT FOR THE PRE-APPROVED ROOF MATERIAL LIST.

Associate Planner Choi advised that the DRC had previously approved this roofing material for installation in the City and the applicant is requesting the Committee to consider recommending the product to the Planning Commission for placement on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application List.

Robert Lansford, roofing contractor, presented the product.

The Committee Members viewed the sample and discussed the request with Mr. Lansford.

The Committee stated that they would like to see the product from older installations and on structures with different roof pitches in order to evaluate the performance and appearance of the product.

The Committee directed Mr. Lansford to return with a list of additional installations in the San Gabriel Valley area.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Thursday, July 5, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

________________________
EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER
CALL TO ORDER: Committee Member Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Committee Member Cheng led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, Committee Member Howard Brody, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Kevin Cheng, Committee Member Chris Huang, Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg

ABSENT: None

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Committee Member Cheng gave an explanation of the Design Review Committee procedures and explanation of the fifteen-day appeal procedure to the members of the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

1. OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

2. REORGANIZATION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

   Committee Member Batnij motioned to appoint Committee Member Brody as Chair of the Design Review Committee. Second by Committee Member Cheng. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Huang. NOES: None.

   Chair Brody motioned to appoint Committee Member Cheng as Vice-Chair of the Design Review Committee. Second by Committee Member Batnij. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Vice-Chair Cheng, and Chair Brody. NOES: None.

   Chair Brody provided a brief explanation of his approach as Chairman for future applications to be presented before the Committee.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-100
   605 CHAUCER ROAD, (HUANG/HAN)
Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that staff was unable to make the required findings for the proposed block wall.

The following persons spoke:
Freeman Han, project architect, presented the project.
Harry Surmenian, 575 Sierra Vista Avenue.

Hearing no further public comments, Chair Brody closed the public hearing.

Chair Brody stated that the concept of a block wall at this corner property is incompatible with the legal neighborhood. A majority of the Committee found the proposed block wall material to be incompatible with the residence and the legal neighborhood.

Chair Brody moved to deny the project. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to continue the project to the August 1, 2018 meeting. Second by Committee Member Johnson-Brody. AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, and Vice-Chair Cheng. NOES: Chair Brody.

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-03
1640 EUCLID AVENUE, (XIA/AND STUDIO)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings for the first and second story addition project.

The following person spoke:
Won Cho, project architect.

Hearing no further public comments, Chair Brody closed the public hearing.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the addition project is compatible with the existing structure and with the neighborhood, provided that conditions related to exterior materials and oak tree protection are implemented.

Committee Member Johnson-Brody moved to approve the project with the following conditions.

1. Provide wood siding on the top half east elevation to match existing siding on the structure.
2. New patio doors shall have grid system to match existing windows on the structure.
3. Applicant to provide sample material for rear yard decking and proposed exterior lighting fixtures for staff approval.
4. Provide a tree protection plan to preserve and protect the oak tree during construction.

Second by Chair Brody. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Vice-Chair Cheng, and Chair Brody. NOES: None.

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-74
1346 WILBURY ROAD, (WANG/KIYOHARA MOFFIT)

Assistant Planner Song presented the project, stated that staff was unable to make all of the required findings for the project and recommended denial of the project.

The following person(s) spoke:
Gina Moffit, project architect.
Paige Parnish, attorney representing the property owners at 1345 Winston Avenue.
Jack Wu, 1355 Winston Avenue.
Christa Lakon, 2340 Coniston Place.

Hearing no further public comments, Chair Brody closed the public hearing.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed project is poorly integrated with the existing structure, it is also incompatible with the neighborhood, and that it poses privacy impacts on adjacent neighbors.

Chair Brody moved to deny the project as submitted. Second by Committee Member Huang. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Vice-Chair Cheng, and Chair Brody. NOES: None.

OTHER MATTERS

6. REQUEST FOR PROJECT APPROVAL EXTENSION
1560 OLD MILL ROAD, (DESIGN INSPIRATION GROUP, INC.)

Associate Planner Choi presented the staff report.

The following persons spoke:
Jeff Tan, son of the property owner.
Alex Chang, project architect.

Vice-Chair Cheng moved to approve the extension request with a new approval expiration date of July 5, 2019. Second by Committee Member Huang. The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: AYES: Committee Member Batnij, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Huang, Vice Chair Cheng, and Chair Brody. NOES: None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, July 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER