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, Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang, Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, and Alternate Committee Member 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. DRC18-62
   2963 SHAKESPEARE RD., (HUANG/HOWARD & SONS, INC.)
   The applicant proposes to install composition fiberglass roofing material manufactured by CertainTeed (Presidential) in the color Country Gray to an existing one-story residence and detached garage.
   (Required Action Date: 11-3-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-13
   2650 CANTERBURY RD., (CHAN/LIN)
   This item was continued from the August 15, 2018 meeting. The applicant proposes to construct exterior modifications to an existing one-story residence
   (Required Action Date: 9-23-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-55
   1155 AVONDALE RD., (FU/LEFEBVRE)
   The applicant proposes to construct a driveway gate, a pedestrian gate, and new pilasters in the front yard.
   (Required Action Date: 11-5-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-45
   2875 DEVONPORT RD., (GUTERRES)
   The applicant proposes to construct front yard walls with lighting fixtures.
   (Required Action Date: 10-21-18)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-27
   480 WINTHROP RD., (DABBS/DUBON)
   The applicant proposes to construct a front yard driveway gate, install a window material and manufacturer not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List and exterior modifications to an existing one-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 10-29-18)

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, October 3, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chamber, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California.

**APPEALS**

There is a fifteen day appeal period for all applications. All appeals should be filed with the Planning and Building Department. Please contact the Planning and Building Department for further information.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-62
2963 SHAKESPEARE RD., (HUANG/HOWARD & SONS INC)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install composition fiberglass roofing material manufactured by CertainTeed (Presidential) in the color Country Gray to an existing one-story residence and detached garage.

The applicant has requested a withdrawal of the application as they have decided to select another material from the City’s Pre-Approved Roofing Material List.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-13
2650 CANTERBURY RD., (CHAN/LIN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct exterior modifications to an existing one-story residence. The proposed one-story addition at the rear of the existing residence is not visible from public view and therefore is not subject to Design Review.

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 15, 2018 – First hearing before DRC. The project was continued due to lack of details regarding the windows.
September 19, 2018 – Second hearing before DRC
September 23, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 8
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.
Comments: The legal neighborhood consists of one-story structures in mostly Ranch and Minimal traditional architectural styles. Staff finds that the proposed changes to the front elevation are minimal and the overall structure still maintains compatibility with the legal neighborhood.

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

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

Comment: The proposed addition at the rear is not subject to Design Review.

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

Comment: The proposed addition at the rear is not subject to Design Review.

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: At the previous hearing, the Committee noted some inconsistencies in the plans with respect to the window and door details. The project designer has included the window specifications on both the elevation drawings and the window and door schedules. Staff finds that the proposed colors and materials are acceptable.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-55 1155 AVONDALE RD., (FU/LEFEVBRE)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a driveway gate, wrought iron fencing, a pedestrian gate, and new pilasters in the front yard.

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

September 19, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
November 5, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 3
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 driveway gates, wrought iron fencing, pedestrian gate, and pilasters in the front yard 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 wood driveway gates and pedestrian gate are architecturally compatible with the existing residence. The wood material and wrought iron detailing would complement the existing stone exterior along the structure and provide a harmonious balance with the proposed stone pilasters. Staff has reservations about the proposed black wrought iron fencing that would span across the entire front yard. This may result in an excessively enclosed appearance if the existing hedges were ever to be removed. Staff would recommend striking the wrought iron fencing from the plans.

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: Based on the definition of a block, staff observed houses adjacent to the subject property and others located along the same side of Avondale Road, winding around and ending before the intersection at Orlando Road. However, for the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing properties and the overall streetscape, staff focused on the houses along Avondale Road ending at 1111 Avondale Road. Staff finds that there are gates and pilasters of similar size, height, and location along Avondale Road, however, no other property exhibits the same amount of wrought iron fencing across the front yard in the same location.

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 driveway gates and pilasters will maintain a minimum setback of 26 feet and 8 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

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-45 2875 DEVONPORT RD., (GUTERRES)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicants are seeking after-the-fact permission to construct front yard walls with lighting fixtures.

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

September 19, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
October 21, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 6
Object – 0
No response – 2

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 walls with lighting fixtures are architecturally compatible with the existing residence. The proposed walls will provide matching stucco color as the residence and the dark brown lighting fixtures will complement the trims on the residence.

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

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

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

Comments: For the purpose of analyzing compatibility based on the definition of Block, Staff observed properties located along the north side of Devonport Road between San Gabriel Boulevard and Paloma Road and noted that the entire block consists of open green lawns. Although the front yard walls do not wrap around the entire corner property, it does provide a different visual appearance as compared to the rest of the properties on the Block. The proposed front yard walls with lighting fixtures are not consistent with the front yard development pattern existing on the block.

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

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

Comment: The proposed walls provide sufficient setback from the curb that they will not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic.
September 14, 2018

Design Review Committee
2200 Huntington Dr.
San Marino, CA 91108

Dear Chairman Brody and members of the Design Review Committee,

I would like to submit my opposition to DRC18-45, the proposal to construct a front yard wall with lighting at 2875 Devonport Road. The Residential Design Guidelines strongly encourage front yard landscape to be free of perimeter fences, walls and hedges (RDGs p41). This proposal strongly contradicts that guidance.

There are no other front yard wall structures of this type on the block. The proposed wall is not consistent with the existing properties on the block which consist entirely of visually open front yards. In addition, the proposed craftsman style light fixtures are not compatible with the minimal traditional style of the home.

The recent drought with its accompanying water restrictions has many residents looking to revise their landscaping in a drought tolerant manner. This is to be encouraged, but not at the expense of losing the open park like character encouraged by the Residential Design Guidelines, and is an established character of the existing streetscape on Devonport. I would not like to see this proposal establish a precedent that could allow other properties on the block to similarly visually close off their front yards.

It is unfortunate that the applicant has already initiated construction and assumed the associated costs; however, this fact should not be a factor in deciding compatibility. The applicant has the responsibility to conduct due diligence prior to initiating construction. I would ask that you deny this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration,

John Dustin
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-27 480 WINTHROP RD., (DABBS/DUBON)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install a window material and manufacturer not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List and exterior modifications to an existing one-story residence.

The applicant is seeking an after-the-fact approval for the above unpermitted modifications that have already been completed. The proposed driveway gate and side yard fencing exceeds the City Code maximum height allowance of 4 feet and is therefore subject to Planning Commission approval. They are shown on the plans for reference only.

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

September 19, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
October 29, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 10
Object – 0
No response – 5

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 traditional styles of architecture with mostly conservative design elements. Staff finds that the removal of several architectural elements (lattice posts, stone details along front façade planter, front door replacement) from the structure results in a modern appearance, which is inconsistent with the look of the other homes within the neighborhood. Additionally, the extensive removal of previously existing plants and shrubbery has left the property devoid of landscaping, resulting in a bare front yard, which further exacerbates the incompatibility issue along this street.

Please refer to attached photos showing the original condition of the home prior to the requested modifications.

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 applicant has installed aluminum windows manufactured by Fleetwood Windows & Doors. Staff is unable to support the use of this window material throughout the house as it appears thin and unsubstantial, compounding the inappropriate modern appearance of the traditional Ranch style house. Furthermore, the combination of monochromatic colors results in a cool-toned palette that is not typically seen on traditional Ranch homes. The application of smooth stucco and stripping of the brick material along the front façade further creates a design inconsistency.

Staff has included specification sheets and a brochure for the Fleetwood windows and doors. Additional information can be accessed at: http://www1.fleetwoodusa.com/.
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 15, 2018 - 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER   Chairman Brody called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Howard Brody, Committee Member Chris Huang, Committee Member Joyce Gatsoulis Batnj and Alternate Committee Member Lon Wahlberg.

ABSENT: Vice-Chair Kevin Cheng, Committee Member Judy Johnson Brody.

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Brody 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. MODIFICATION TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-74
   677 S. SANTA ANITA AVE., (YAN)

   Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that the project was revised to address the Committee’s previous comments at the June 20, 2018 meeting.

   John Wiley, property owner, and Jeff Roberts, project designer, explained the reason for the entry porch addition.

   There were no public comments.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the front porch addition is not compatible with the design of the existing two-story residence.

   Committee Member Huang moved to deny the project. Second by Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg. AYES: Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Batnj, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg, Chair Brody. NOES: None.

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-36
   1635 RUBIO DR., (RITTICHAI/CARTER DESIGN)

   Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated staff was able to make the required findings.
There were no public comments.

Freeman Han, the project architect, provided a short overview of the project.

Majority of the Committee stated that the brick details is an integral element on the building façade and removing it would negatively alter the visual quality of the structure.

Committee Member Huang found the brick removal to be an improvement and he would be able to make the findings.

Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg moved to deny the project. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Batnij, Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg, Chair Brody. NOES: None.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-42**
   **2540 E. CALIFORNIA BLVD., (SHEU)**

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that staff was able to make the required findings for the single-story addition request.

Mr. Sheu, property owner, provided a brief overview of the project.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed addition is seamless and would not significantly affect the compatibility of the structure with the legal neighborhood.

Committee Member Huang moved to approve the project as submitted. Second by Committee Member Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Batnij, Chair Brody. NOES: Alternate Committee Member Wahlberg.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-13**
   **2650 CANTERBURY RD., (CHAN/LIN)**

Assistant Planner Song presented the project and stated that staff was not able to make the required findings for the proposed exterior materials.

Eric Lin, project designer, provided a brief overview of the project.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed veneer material is compatible with the structure, however, the project elevation drawings are inconsistent and the plans lack window details.
Committee Member Batnij moved to continue the project to the September 15, 2018 hearing. Second by Committee Member Huang. AYES: Committee Member Huang, Committee Member Johnson-Brody, Committee Member Batnij, Chair Brody NOES: None.

OTHER MATTERS

ADJOURNMENT

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

EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER