

CITY OF SAN MARINO

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate



www.cityofsanmarino.org

(626) 300-0711 Phone

City Hall

Council Chambers

2200 Huntington Drive

San Marino, CA 91108

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2017

7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE, SAN MARINO, CA

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 Frank Hsu, Vice-Chair William Dietrick, Kevin Cheng, John Dustin, Corinna Wong, Alternate Judy Johnson-Brody, and Alternate Chris Huang

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. DRC16-80**
1865 ROSE AVENUE, (MA/SGS INTERNATIONAL INC.)
This item was continued from the December 21, 2016 meeting. The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence with a detached two-car garage.
(Required Action Date: 02-07-17)
2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-87**
1450 WESTHAVEN ROAD, (KWONG/HAN)
The applicant requests to construct a first and second story addition, side yard wall and driveway gate.
(Required Action Date: 02-05-17)
3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-93**
2920 LORAIN ROAD, (XU/LOUIE)
The applicant requests to construct a first and second story addition, a detached two-car garage, and exterior modifications.
(Required Action Date: 02-12-17)
4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-54**
2151 LORAIN ROAD, (WANG/JAMES COANE & ASSOCIATES)
The applicant requests to construct a two-story residence with a detached two-car garage.
(Required Action Date: 02-18-17)
5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-50**
2159 LORAIN ROAD, (YUAN/JAMES COANE & ASSOCIATES)
The applicant requests to construct a two-story residence with a detached two-car garage.
(Required Action Date: 02-17-17)

OTHER MATTERS

6. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 2, 2016 AND JANUARY 4, 2017.**

OPEN FORUM

This is an opportunity for future applicants to informally present preliminary design concepts for feedback from members of the DRC. Comments received are based on members not

having visited the site and neighborhood. Therefore, positive comments should not be perceived as preliminary approval of a project but rather as a tool in facilitating a project through the Design Review process. Applications that are on this agenda, as well as those that are not, may be discussed during Open Forum. No more than two DRC members may participate in Open Forum discussions.

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, February 1, 2017 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.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-43**
1865 ROSE AVENUE, (MA/SGS INTERNATIONAL INC.)

Frank Hsu, Chairman
William Dietrick, Vice-Chair
Kevin Cheng
John Dustin
Corinna Wong
Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate
Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence and a detached two-car garage.

PROJECT HISTORY

September 21, 2016 – First hearing before the DRC. The Committee cited issues with massing and the large amount of roof area, and treatment of finish details and materials.

November 2, 2016 – Second hearing before the DRC.

December 21, 2016 – Third hearing before the DRC. The Committee granted a continuance request.

January 18, 2017 – Fourth hearing before the DRC.

February 7, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 5

Object – 1

No response - 5

An objection letter was submitted via email from a resident outside of the legal neighborhood.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comments: Staff can find the proposed two-story massing and design to be compatible with the legal neighborhood. The design team has revised the north (rear) elevation of the structure to reduce the massing and streamline the roof form.

- 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: Proposed window on the east and west elevations of the second floor are located in the bathrooms which are not high traffic areas. A previously proposed rear yard-facing balcony has been removed from the project.

- 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

Comment: The proposed exterior finishes, color schemes, window treatment and details are compatible with the proposed style. Staff recommends additional shutters along the east and west elevations.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chairman

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

TO: CHAIRMAN HSU AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: AMANDA MERLO, AICP
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-87**
1450 WESTHAVEN ROAD, (KWONG/HAN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a first and second story addition and side yard wall and driveway gate.

PROJECT HISTORY

January 18, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

February 5, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 5

Object -0

No response – 3

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 contains both one and two-story homes, and a variety of architectural styles. The proposed Cape Cod style, which utilizes both one and two-story massing, will be compatible with the neighborhood. There are varying roof slopes used on this project, but the Cape Cod house located across the street from the subject property also uses a variety of roof slopes.

- 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 second story windows are sensitively designed to protect the neighbors' 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: The addition of wood corbels on the front facing gable is not consistent with the style or with the rest of the house. The placement of window molding is also not consistent throughout the house.

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 materials include a solid used brick wainscot, wood shutters and siding, and a simulated wood roof. These materials and colors are consistent with the architectural style and with the neighborhood. The proposed colors and materials are also consistent throughout the structure.

Side yard wall and gate

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 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 wall will match the house stucco color and will be finished with brick. The simple details on the proposed gate are compatible with the main house.

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

Comments: The subject property's side yard is along the alley and the proposed wall will be used to enclose the driveway area. The placement is similar to the other alley wall.

3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves sight 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: Given the wall's location in the alley, which is used by slow-moving traffic to access a limited number of properties, staff finds that the wall and gate will not create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: EVA CHOI
ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-93**
2920 LORAIN ROAD, (XU/LOUIE)

Frank Hsu, Chair

William Dietrick, Vice Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construction first and second floor addition, detached two-car garage, and exterior modifications.

PROJECT HISTORY

January 18, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC

February 12, 2017 – Required action date

The City's story pole policy does not require story poles for every second story addition project. Staff and the DRC have the discretion to determine if the story poles should be required based on potential concerns regarding the mass of the project. Staff did not find the proposed addition on the existing two-story structure warranted the need for story poles. However, the DRC does have the discretion to request story poles be installed if the Committee has concerns regarding the mass of the proposed project.

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 11

Object - 0

No response - 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 legal neighborhood comprises of one and two-story structures. Staff can find the proposed addition and exterior modifications to be compatible with the neighborhood as there are similar two-story massing, design, materials, and color scheme on nearby structures.

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: Staff does not anticipate privacy and noise impacts to the surrounding neighbors. Due to the limited size of the second floor-standing balcony, staff does not anticipate privacy impact to adjacent neighbors. Matured landscaping along the east property line helps to reduce privacy concerns from the east neighbor.

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.

Staff can make this finding: YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

Comment: The addition to the rear of the structure appears seamless and is compatible with the existing structure.

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 brick material and exterior colors are compatible with the structure; they are also found within the neighborhood. Window treatments and exterior materials are consistently carried throughout the structure.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-54**
2151 LORAIN ROAD, (WANG/JAMES COANE & ASSOC.)

Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence and a detached two-car garage.

PROJECT HISTORY

January 18, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC.

February 18, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 1

Object – 1

No response – 9

Neither object nor approve - 1

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The City's staking plan policy requires the installation of story poles at least ten-days prior to the public hearing date, and this project did not comply with this requirement. Therefore, staff is recommending continuance of the project to the February 1, 2017 meeting.

City of San Marino AGENDA REPORT



TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-50**
2159 LORAIN ROAD, (YUAN/JAMES COANE & ASSOC.)

Frank Hsu, Chairman

William Dietrick, Vice-Chair

Kevin Cheng

John Dustin

Corinna Wong

Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate

Chris Huang, Alternate

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story residence and a detached two-car garage.

PROJECT HISTORY

January 18, 2017 – First hearing before the DRC.

February 17, 2017 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 3

Object – 1

No response – 8

Neither object nor approve - 1

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The City's public notice procedures and staking plan policy for new homes require that story poles and project notice poster be installed at the project site at least ten-days prior to the public hearing date. This project did not comply with these requirements. Therefore, staff is recommending continuance of the project to the February 1, 2017 meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 2, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Frank Hsu, Vice-Chairman William Dietrick, Committee Member Kevin Cheng, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Corinna Wong, Alternate Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Chris Huang.

ABSENT: None.

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Frank Hsu gave an explanation of the Design Review Committee procedures and explanation of the fifteen-day appeal procedure to the member of the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-43
1865 ROSE AVENUE, (MA/SGS INTERNATIONAL INC.)**

Assistant Planner Choi presented the staff report for this item and stated that the project was continued from the September 21, 2016 meeting. Staff had reservations with the revised design and found the massing to be incompatible with neighboring structures and the large front windows appeared imbalanced.

Ting Ting Liu, project designer, presented the revised design and answered questions related to material finishes and window treatment.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project remains incompatible with itself and with the neighborhood. The Committee expressed that there is a disconnect between the front and rear elevations of the structure. The Committee found the massing and scale issues unresolved since the last hearing.

Vice-Chair Dietrick moved to continue the project to the meeting of December 21, 2016 and to extend the required action to February 7, 2017. Second by Committee Member Cheng.

AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chair Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Wong. NOES: None.

**2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-33
2900 SHEFFIELD ROAD, (NORTHCOTT/CIRRITO)**

Assistant Planner Choi presented the staff report for this item. She stated that staff was in support of the project with the recommendation that a uniform roofing material color be provided for the clay tile roof.

Steve Eide, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the revised design is balanced and proportion with itself, and compatible with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Dustin had questions regarding exterior stucco color, and exterior lighting design adjacent to the garage door and over the entry alcove.

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

1. The exterior stucco color of the structure shall be Dunn Edwards DEW 309 "Ajo Lily" LRV 79 (Sand Finish).
2. The single wall sconce light next to entryway shall be moved and modified to be a hanging fixture of a similar type on the interior of the entry alcove.

Second by Vice-Chair Dietrick. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chair Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Wong. NOES: None.

**3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-61
2325 MELVILLE DRIVE, (LAI/KAJER)**

Committee Member Cheng recused himself from deliberation of this item and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Assistant Planner Choi presented the staff report for this item and stated that staff was not able to make the required findings due to the proposed driveway gate location and that the gate opens into the front yard, which is inconsistent with most driveway gates in the neighborhood that open into the side and rear yards.

Georgie Kajer, project architect, explained that the driveway width is only eight feet six inches and the proposed driveway gate design allows the entire driveway width for use, whereas a gate that swing inward will reduce the driveway clearance up to six inches. Ms.

Kajer presented a driveway gate design that comprise of an in-ground gate operator and a rectangular control box that will be mounted on the building. She stated that the control box will be the only visible feature and will be fully screened with shrubbery.

Roger Lai, property owner, answered questions from the Committee.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Dustin stated that he cannot support the elevated patio with the short wall and pilaster in the front yard, he found these entry features appear odd ward and these features are not found elsewhere within the legal neighborhood. He found the in-ground gate operator and the wall mounted control box acceptable with landscaping to fully screen the control box.

Majority of the committee members agreed that the in ground gate motor is the preferred design and found it acceptable if the mechanism is fully screened with shrubbery.

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

1. The in-ground gate motor shall be fully screened by landscaping.

Second by Chair Hsu. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chair Dietrick, Committee Member Wong, Alternate Committee Member Johnson-Brody. NOES: Committee Member Dustin.

Committee Member Cheng entered the Council Chamber and returned to the dais.

**4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-69
2225 ROBLES AVENUE, (CRAWFORD)**

Planning Intern San presented the staff report for this item and stated that staff was in support of the project as the proposed front yard walls are compatible with existing front yard development in the neighborhood.

Susan Crawford, property owner, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

Majority of the Committee found the front yard walls compatible with the neighborhood and liked the proposed low hedges in front of the walls.

Committee Member Dustin cautioned that the myrtle hedges may grow thick and may encroach into the sidewalk.

Committee Member Cheng stated that the proposed walls will create an enclose appearance as the east and west neighbors both have front yard walls.

Committee Member Wong moved to approve the project as submitted. Second by Vice-Chair Dietrick.

AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chair Dietrick, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Wong. NOES: Committee Member Cheng.

**5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-73
1766 WINDSOR ROAD, (WU/HAN)**

Assistant Planner Choi presented the staff report for this item and stated that staff was in support of the new three-car garage.

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

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Dustin expressed concern with lighting pollution affecting the south neighbor if the exterior light is 45 watts.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed new garage is compatible with other garage structures within the neighborhood.

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

1. Roof tiles on the new garage shall match roof tiles found on the main residence.

Second by Committee Member Wong. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chair Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Committee Member Wong. NOES: None.

OTHER ITEM

OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

AMANDA MERLO,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
JANUARY 4, 2017 - 7:00 P.M.**

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Frank Hsu, Vice-Chairman William Dietrick, Committee Member John Dustin, Committee Member Kevin Cheng, Alternate Committee Member Judy Johnson-Brody, Alternate Committee Member Chris Huang.

ABSENT: Committee Member Corinna Wong

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chairman Frank Hsu 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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC15-74
35 KEWEN PLACE, (CHEN/TSOI)**

Alternate Committee Member Johnson-Brody recused herself from this item due to living within 500' of the subject property.

Associate Planner Merlo presented the project and stated staff was in support of the project subject to the planting of additional landscaping.

Paula Tsukamoto, applicant, presented the project and was available for questions.

There was no public comment.

The majority of the Committee felt the project could meet all required findings as it was not visible from public view, compatible with the existing house, followed the slope of the land and adequately addressed the privacy concerns.

Committee Member Dustin felt that the project did not adequately address the privacy concerns.

Vice-Chairman Dietrick moved to approve the project subject to the following condition:

1. Additional landscaping shall be provided along the east property line, between the first and second cluster of trees. Final landscaping type shall be approved by staff.

Second by Committee Member Cheng. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chairman Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Alternate Committee Member Huang. NOES: Committee Member Dustin.

**2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-80
648 WINSTON AVENUE, (SHAO/FENG XIAO ARCHITECT, INC.)**

Associate Planner Merlo presented the report and stated that staff could make all of the required findings.

Feng Xiao, architect, presented the project and was available for questions.

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed new house was compatible with the neighborhood, considerate of the neighbors' privacy, and used materials that were compatible with the style and neighborhood.

Vice-Chairman Dietrick moved to approve the project with the following condition:

1. The side yard gates shall be wrought iron and the fencing on either side shall be wood.

Second by Committee Member Cheng. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chairman Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Alternate Committee Member Huang. NOES: None.

**3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-99
1615 WAVERLY ROAD, (WELLS/LANSFORD)**

Associate Planner Merlo presented the project and stated staff could make all of the required findings.

Robert Lansford, contractor, presented the project.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed material was compatible with both the house and neighborhood.

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

1. Low profile ridge caps shall be used.

Second by Vice-Chairman Dietrick. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chairman Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Alternate Committee Member Huang. NOES: None.

**4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC16-82
2260 LORAIN ROAD, (YANG/RAMOS)**

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

Ms. Yang, owner, ~~presented the project.~~

The following person spoke about the project:

Dale Pederson, 2140 Lorain Road

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed gate was not compatible with the house and therefore the project was not yet ready for approval.

Alternate Committee Member Huang moved to continue the project to the meeting of February 1, 2017. Second by Committee Member Cheng. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chairman Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Alternate Committee Member Huang. NOES: None.

OTHER ITEMS

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 2, 2016 AND NOVEMBER 16, 2016.

The November 2, 2016 meeting minutes were not included in the DRC packet and were not voted on by the DRC.

Vice-Chairman Dietrick moved to approve the November 16, 2016 minutes as corrected. Second by Committee Member Dustin. AYES: Chairman Hsu, Vice-Chairman Dietrick, Committee Member Cheng, Committee Member Dustin, Alternate Committee Member Huang. NOES: None.

OPEN FORUM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, January 18, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

AMANDA MERLO,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER