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 Kevin Cheng, Vice-Chair Joyce Gatsoulis-Batnij, Committee Member Howard Brody, Committee Member Christa Lakon, Committee Member Peter Wong, and Alternate Committee Member Rick Chou

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 CASE NO. DRC19-51**  
811 SANTA ANITA AVE., (LU/HAN)  
*This item was continued from the February 5, 2020 meeting.* The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications.  
(Required Action Date: 3-22-2020)

2. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC20-11**  
521 PLYMOUTH RD., (SMITH)  
The applicant proposes to install a roofing material not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Roofing Material List.  
(Required Action Date: 4-21-2020)

3. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-73**  
2330 BRENTFORD RD., (FLACH)  
The applicant proposes to install a window material not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List.  
(Required Action Date: 4-15-2020)

4. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-90**  
1778 OAK GROVE AVE., (BROGAN)  
The applicant proposes to construct a front yard wall with a sculpture and a pedestrian gate.  
(Required Action Date: 4-12-2020)

5. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-66**  
2240 LORAIN RD., (YANG)  
The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing block wall and a driveway gate.  
(Required Action Date: 4-15-2020)

6. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-96**  
615 LA MIRADA AVE., (CHU)  
The applicant proposes to construct a first and second story addition and remodel to an existing two-story residence.  
(Required Action Date: 4-15-2020)

OTHER MATTERS

7. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 5, 2020.**

OPEN FORUM

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

The San Marino Design Review Committee will adjourn to the next regular meeting to be held on Wednesday, March 18, 2020 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: Chair Cheng and Members of the Design Review Committee
FROM: Marlon Cervantes, Assistant Planner
DATE: March 4, 2020
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-51
811 S SANTA ANITA AVE. (LU)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and make exterior modifications to an existing two-story home.

The project also includes the removal of one of two existing two-car garages and construction of a new two-car garage. The proposed garage is under 600 square feet and is not subject to this review.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees.

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

February 5, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee continued the project citing concerns over the inappropriate color scheme for a Cape Cod style home, the relocation of the front walkway, lack of landscaping adjacent to the driveway and the covered patio in the rear.
March 4, 2020 – Second hearing before the DRC.
March 22, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of 2/5/20 hearing)

Approve – 8
DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

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

   *Comments:* The legal neighborhood is made up of both single and two-story homes in a variety of architectural styles. The proposed addition would not be visible from the street and would not detract from the existing structure’s compatibility 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

   *Comments:* The proposed addition includes four new windows along the north elevation facing the neighboring property. Staff finds that these windows do not provide any direct sightlines into the neighbor’s home, are setback a significant distance from the neighbor’s home and would not impact any reasonable expectation of privacy.

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:* Staff finds that the addition is compatible and consistent with the existing building; rooflines will match the existing home with respect to slope and materials used.

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 existing wood shake seen on the east elevation of the home is being replaced with wood siding to match the siding used along the north and south elevations. The change in material will create greater consistency with the rest of the home and is consistent with other Cape Cod style homes seen throughout San Marino.
Existing windows throughout the home will be replaced with Jeld-Wen windows from the City’s Pre-Approved Materials List in the Bone White color. The shutters and bay window roofs will be a dark brown color to complement the roofing material. The roofing material for the proposed addition will be Boral Cedarlite in the Ironwood color to match the existing roof.

The exterior of the addition will be stucco with a sand finish in a Pure Ivory color (by La Habra) to match the color and texture of the remaining garage.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install CertainTeed Landmark TL composition fiberglass shake in the Shenandoah color, a color found on the City’s Pre-Approved Roofing Material List.

While the CertainTeed Landmark TL product line is on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Material List in the Shenandoah color, the request does not meet the prerequisite of having permitted composition fiberglass roofing material currently existing on the home.

Currently, the home has asphalt composition shingles installed on the roof, however permit records show the roofing permit to be for installation of cedar shake. Because the existing composition shingle roof was installed without a permit, this request is subject to Design Review Committee approval.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 4, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC.
April 21, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 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 is made up of homes in a variety of architectural styles and varying roofing materials, both natural and synthetic. Staff observed clay tile, simulated wood shake, natural wood shake roofs and three examples of composition shingles including 555 Plymouth Rd., 548 Plymouth Rd. and 505 Plymouth Rd. within the legal neighborhood. Staff finds that the installation of CertainTeed Landmark TL composition shingles would maintain 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

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 CertainTeed Landmark TL composition shingle roofing material in the Shenandoah color would be consistent with the color and style of the existing home.
TO: Chair Cheng and Members of the Design Review Committee
FROM: Eva Choi, Associate Planner
DATE: March 4, 2020
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-73
2330 BRENTFORD RD. (FLACH)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to install a window manufacturer that is not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List. The proposed garden window is aluminum clad wood material, locally manufactured by JT Windows.

The applicant’s garden window along the east side yard was damaged by the waste hauler’s truck and it is beyond repair. The applicant was unable to find a garden window product from manufacturers listed on the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 4, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC.
April 15, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 9
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
   
   Comment: The replacement of a garden window at the same location and size as the former window would not impact the structure’s overall 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

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 garden window comes in a standard white color which is consistent with the former garden window. However, the unit also has optional snap-out grill intending to mimic true divided lites. Since snap on/out grills are not allowed in the City, staff recommends that true (permanent, protruding) divided lites be provided.
JT Windows, Inc.
First in Quality Crafted
Windows and Doors

Product Features:

**Exterior**
- Rugged .0625" T6 aluminum exterior
- All exterior surfaces are powder coated.
- Concealed three-point locking system creates ultra security and peace of mind
- Standard color is white. Custom color brown available at additional charge. Please consult your local dealer.
- Drip rail moulding across top directs water or moisture to run off without getting the front glass dirty.
- Side casement drip rails prevent water from penetrating casement openings, and eliminates possible leakage or casement freeze-up during harsh winter conditions.
- Upper and lower threaded rods through sashes allow for unprecedented strength against sagging. Lower supports required on all projection windows.

**Optional Glass**
- Tempered
- Low-E²
- Obscure
- V-Groove
- Light or dark tints
  (Ask your dealer for entire list of JT glass options)
- 13/16" insulated glass package standard on front panel and glass roof.
- 5/8" insulated glass package standard on casement flaps.
- Removable screens standard.
- Easy glass replacement.

**Interior**
- All interiors are made of solid Douglas Fir, select Northern Red Oak or Eastern Hard Rock White Maple.
- Our exclusively designed optional JT Snap-Out Grill gives your window French window look of True Divided Lites (TDL), yet easily pops out for simple glass cleaning or to give your window a different look.
- JT Snap-Out grill is available in custom divided break-ups.
- All Clad Plus Garden Windows are available in standard even- and half-foot sizes.
- Available with or without jambs.
- Floor comes standard with birch or oak plywood.
- 1¾" Standard Clearance for granite, tile, cement or any counter top possibility (Please specify).
- Standard interior wood species subject to change upon market conditions.

Made in USA
Chatsworth, CA 91311

www.jtwindows.com
JT Windows, Inc.

First in Quality Crafted Windows and Doors

JT Windows is proud to release our Classic Flat Garden Window. This window is the only window on the market today with a unique, 100% T6 aluminum interior and solid wood-frame center. It is the most perfect window on the market today.

From the casement percentage size to the balance of sight, the proper window requires virtually no maintenance. At the same time, your home will maintain a positive appearance for a lifetime. Our cantilevered three-point locking system on each of our full-glazing sashes provides you with security, while rotating garden windows allow enhanced, unobstructed views.

JT Windows has been building garden windows for over 20 years. We have more experience in building garden windows - large, small, and perfect windows - than most companies starting in the industry today. For a complete overview of our line, contact your local, full-service aluminum window contractor, or call us toll-free at 1-800-JT WINDOWS.

Take a look at our modern day Aluminum Garden Window. We're sharing your home with JT Windows. The Best Garden Window Ever Built.

3 Points of Weatherproofing

1. Top drip molding diverts water away from red lead to keep glass clean.
2. Double drip molding eliminates water from stabilizing window.
3. Bottom drip molding adds beauty and attention to detail.

Weather-Tight Seals

Durable weather stripping keeps moisture and air from entering your home.

JT Snap-Out Grill (optional)

Give your windows the finish of the finest French filtered (F720) polycarbonate panes for simple, glass cleaning or to give your windows more of a European look.

Aluminum Cladding

Aluminum clad loft provides aluminum cladding with steel wall interior.
JT Windows, Inc.
First in Quality Crafted Windows and Doors

The Clad Plus Collection™

JT Aluminum Clad Garden Window - shown with optional snap-out grill. Creates a new dimension of light, size and beauty in a simple one-step installation with virtually no maintenance...install it and enjoy it a lifetime.

Chatsworth, CA 91311
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a front yard garden wall with a sculpture and a pedestrian gate along with a partial replacement of a pool.

The proposed garden wall will be 14” high constructed using concrete masonry units and limestone veneer with a split-face finish. The proposed sculpture will be a maximum of 2’ high installed on a 2’ pedestal. The wood pool gate will be painted a dark grey color (Down Pipe No. 26 by Farrow and Ball) and 5’6” at its highest point. The iron pool fence will replace an existing brick wall and will match the existing fence in material and height.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e) – Accessory Structures.

PROJECT HISTORY

March 4, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC.
April 12, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 3
Object – 0
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 installation of the 14" high garden wall and the wood pool gate are compatible with the neighborhood. Due to the unique orientation and topography of the property, the visibility of the low retaining wall and gate will be limited; however, staff finds that the installation of the sculpture and pedestal in the front yard are not compatible with the neighborhood as similar features are not found throughout the legal neighborhood and recommends the elimination of the sculpture from the project.

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: Staff takes concern with the limestone veneer being proposed along the retaining wall and recommends natural limestone to match existing natural materials seen throughout the property.

   The iron pool fence will replace an existing brick wall and will match the remainder of the existing pool fence, creating consistency in height and materials.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard block wall and a driveway gate.

The project site is a reverse corner lot where the rear yard of this property abuts the front yard of another property (1945 Lorain Road). Thus, the maximum allowed wall height along the side yard is four (4) feet.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees. However, the proposed wall is within the canopy of three established trees and staff is recommending that the project be conditioned to follow construction guidelines listed in the Tree Protection Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e) because the project involves accessory structures (block wall and gate).

PROJECT HISTORY

March 4, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC
April 15, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 7
Object – 0
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. 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 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 side yard wall adjacent to a street if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comments: The proposed block wall is compatible with the existing residence and is located behind the existing hedge along the side yard. Staff found the driveway gate appearance to be heavy due to the solid panels between the frame which effectively create an enclosure along the side yard.

2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   The Municipal Code defines Block as the property abutting on one side of a street and lying between the two (2) nearest intersecting or intercepting streets or between the termination of such street and the nearest intersecting or intercepting street.
   
   Comments: The property is located at the beginning of the last city block in San Marino. The opposite end of the subject block is in the City of San Gabriel (401 Coolidge Drive) and it is the only property on the same block that has a side yard wall adjacent to the street. The remainder of the block are properties with front yards facing San Marino Avenue, and they do not have fencing or walls in the front yard. Under the definition of Block, the subject property would be the only one to have a side yard block wall. Staff noted that the three corner properties at the Lorain Road and San Marino Avenue intersection are improved with some type of perimeter fencing or wall. The proposed side yard block wall and driveway gate are similar to existing features found on adjacent corner properties.

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: With the setback of three (3) feet eight (8) inches and the height of four (4) feet, the block wall and gate will not create hazardous conditions to drivers and pedestrians provided that planting material are maintained at the allowed four (4) feet height.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a first and second story addition and remodel an existing two-story residence.

TREE PRESERVATION

This project will not remove or relocate any trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

March 4, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC.
April 15, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 9
Object – 0
No response – 2
Neither Approve or Object – 1

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 is made up of both single and two-story homes in a variety of architectural styles. The proposed addition would be in keeping with the bulk, visual massing, and the scale of other Tudor homes within the legal neighborhood. The project will improve the structure’s compatibility 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

Comments: The addition includes dormer windows along the east side yard, these new windows will provide a view over the east neighbor’s roof and side yard area but it will not provide any direct sightlines into the neighbor’s home.

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: Staff finds the new dormers to be out of scale for the overall roof size and the existing dormers have shed roof over them. As shown on the South Elevation, the new dormer appears to overpower the only prominent gable on the front façade. Staff recommends the new dormers to have shed roof and are reduced in size to be proportional with the overall structure. Staff also finds that the new street-facing window (Window #21) to be out of scale for the Tudor structure, typically a decorative window or a rectangular-shaped vent are found under the steeply- pitched front facing gable roof.

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 exterior colors provide sufficient contrast between the smooth stucco finish and the decorative half-timbering. New wood casement windows are proposed for the structure which are consistent with the style of the structure. However, Windows #12 and 13 should have small diamond pattern since this feature is a character defining element of a Tudor structure.
Chi Residence
615 La Mirada Avenue
San Marino, California 91108

Design Review Hearing
March 4, 2020

Proposed Paint Colors

WOOD TRIM, Including Windows and Doors
Benjamin Moore 987, "Buckhorn"

STUCCO - BODY
Benjamin Moore 983, "Smokey Taupe"

STUCCO - BASE
Benjamin Moore 985, "Indian River"
CALL TO ORDER  Chair Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair Kevin Cheng, Vice-Chair Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, Committee Member Christa Lakon, Committee Member Howard Brody, Alternate Committee Member Rick Chou

ABSENT: Committee Member Peter Wong

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

There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NOs. DRC19-80 and DRC 19-81**

   3325 MONTEREY RD., (YANG/DESIGN INSPIRATION GROUP INC.)

   Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff can support the project.

   Alex Chang, project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

   Margarita Jarrabek, Architectural Historian, provided detail explanation of restoration process and answered questions regarding aspects of the project.

   The following person(s) spoke on the project: 
   Ms. Mary, 1714 Hilliard Dr.

   Alternate Committee Member Chou expressed appreciation for the project and felt it provided a much needed face lift.

   Committee Member Brody felt it was necessary to incorporate the two documents distributed by historic consultant as part of project file and expressed support for the project.

   Committee Member Lakon had concerns over the privacy and massing along the neighbor’s side to the west and would like to see it pulled away from the side property line. Also had
concerns regarding excessive light and removal of the guest house which would result in an opening along the shared property line adjacent to Lacy Park.

Vice-Chair Batnij believed the changes made to be insignificant, that the massing issue had not been resolved and that the addition may impact the oak tree.

Chair Cheng felt that the applicant had made changes as deemed fit for the project.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

Second by Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Chou, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Vice-Chair Batnij and Committee Member Lakon.

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-61
1380 BELHAVEN RD., (LAW/LOUIE)

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

Ron Louie, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

The following person(s) spoke on the project:
Ms. Kathy Martinson, 1370 Belhaven.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was compatible with the neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Batnij moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Transom windows on the east elevation shall be removed.
2. Continuation of the six-foot wall.
3. The project shall provide screening vegetation/planting and working with staff and the north neighbor on privacy concerns.

Second by Committee Member Brody. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-19
2200 EL MOLINO PL., (CHEN)

Assistant Planner Cervantes presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

Tracy Gao, project designer, provided a brief overview of the project and answered questions.
Chair Cheng moved to approve the project with a condition added to require wrought iron fencing throughout.

Lacking a second, the motion failed.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed fence created a fortress-like enclosure of the yard.

Committee Member Brody moved to deny the project.

Second by Vice-Chair Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Vice-Chair Batnij, Committee Member Brody, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-60
   2180 LORAIN RD., (CABOT/PACA)

Vice-Chair Batnij recused herself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could not support the project.

Virginia Paca, project architect, presented the project and answered questions and recommended flexibility of survey requirement.

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

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

Second by Chair Cheng. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

Vice-Chair Batnij returned to the dais.

5. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-96
   2851 SHAKESPEARE DR., (NGUYEN)

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

Michael Chen, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Lakon expressed support for the project and noted the 12 support letters received for the project.
Vice-Chair Batnij noted that the family room addition was compatible, however she also felt the extension in the back disrupted the development pattern of the neighborhood, recommended reducing the side wing or shifting the massing.

Committee Member Brody expressed support for the project and noted that the custom nature of the homes allowed for variation.

Alternate Committee Member Chou agreed with Vice-Chair Batnij’s comments regarding the massing of the addition.

Chair Cheng was able to support the project as proposed.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

Second by Chair Cheng. AYES: Committee Member Brody and Chair Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Vice-Chair Batnij

Motion failed.

Vice-Chair Batnij moved to continue the project.

Second by Alternate Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Brody.

6. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC20-03
2133 ROANOKE RD., (AGAJANIAN/DEYOUNG)

Vice-Chair Batnij recused herself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Assistant Planner Cervantes presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

John DeYoung, project contractor, spoke and provided a sample of wrought iron material and ¾" tongue and groove for the proposed gate.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the gate was compatible with the home and the neighborhood.

Committee Member Lakon moved to approve the project.

Second by Committee Member Brody. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

Vice-Chair Batnij returned to the dais.
6. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-89**  
1650 LAS FLORES AVE., (CHANG/PAN)

Assistant Planner Cervantes presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

George Chang and Catherine Pan, property owners, presented the project and answered questions.

The following person(s) spoke on the project:  
Ms. Hoda Rad, 1640 Las Flores Ave.

Committee Member Lakon and Alternate Committee Member Chou could not support the request due to failure to meet prerequisite.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

Second by Vice-Chair Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou.

7. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-51**  
811 SANTA ANITA AVE., (LU/HAN)

Assistant Planner Cervantes presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

Freeman Han, project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

Tom and Carolyn Lu, property owners, answered questions regarding the project.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed changes and the color scheme were inappropriate for a Cape Cod style home and also expressed concerns over the relocation of the front yard walkway and the rear yard patio cover.

Vice-Chair Batnij Chou moved to continue the project.

Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.
MARLON CERVANTES,
ASSISTANT PLANNER