The City of San Marino appreciates your attendance. Citizens’ interest provides the Design Review Committee with valuable information regarding issues of the community.

Regular Meetings are held on the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of every month.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should contact the City Clerk’s Office at (626) 300-0705 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: Chairman Kevin Cheng, Vice-Chair Corinna Wong, John Dustin, Judy Johnson-Brody, Chris Huang, and Lon Wahlberg

POSTING OF AGENDA

The agenda is posted 72 hours prior to each meeting at the following locations: City Hall, 2200 Huntington Drive, the Crowell Public Library, 1890 Huntington Drive, and the Recreation Department, 1560 Pasqualito Drive. The agenda is also posted on the City’s Website: http://www.cityofsanmarino.org

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Section 54954.3 of the Brown Act provides an opportunity for members of the public to address
the Design Review Committee on any item of interest to the public, before or during the Design Review Committee’s consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-63
   This item was continued from the February 21, 2018 and April 4, 2018 meetings.
   1870 CARLISLE DR., (CHANG/LIN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition with exterior modifications to the existing one-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 6-16-18)

2. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-19
   1225 MESA RD., (JASPER/LUNDGREN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a motorized driveway gate, a pedestrian gate, brick pilasters with lighting fixtures and fencing in the front yard.
   (Required Action Date: 6-15-18)

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-11
   1635 ROSE AVE., (JEON)
   The applicant proposes to construct an addition and remodel to the existing first story, an addition of a new second story, exterior modifications, and a new detached two-car garage.
   (Required Action Date: 6-15-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-96
   1380 WILBURY RD., (LI/HOHMANN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence, a detached two-car garage and street facing side yard fencing.
   (Required Action Date: 6-15-18)

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 regular meeting to be held on Wednesday, May 16, 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: MAY 2, 2018
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-63 1870 CARLISLE DR., (CHANG/LIN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition with exterior modifications and a significant remodel of the existing one-story house.

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 21, 2018 – First hearing before DRC. The project was continued due to several design issues regarding the front elevation, the proposed flat roof, window treatments, contemporary building materials, and second floor privacy issues.
April 4, 2018 – Second hearing before DRC. The project was continued without a hearing due to the applicant requesting additional time to revise the plans to address an oak tree dripline issue.
May 2, 2018 – Third hearing before DRC.
June 16, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS
(As of 2/21/18)
Approve - 5
Object – 0
Neither - 1
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 neighborhood consists of a mix of one-story and two-story structures in Cape Cod, French, Colonial, and Minimal Traditional architectural styles. Staff finds that the proposed addition of a second story is acceptable, however the French Revival style is not an appropriate style selection for 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

   *Comments:* The previously proposed Juliette balcony on the second floor has been removed from the plans. The proposed second-story addition does not propose any unreasonable privacy impacts to adjacent neighbors.

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:* At the prior hearing, the Committee expressed concerns about the height of the front facing gable, the proposed flat roof, lack of window details, and overall inconsistencies in the design of the project. Staff finds that previous staff and Committee comments have not been sufficiently addressed. Although the stone veneer application has been significantly reduced down to a wainscot, the overall front elevation still appears awkward with a single dormer and lack of design details that clearly distinguish the structure as a French Revival home. Furthermore, the flat roof and hollowed well are poorly designed and should not have any bearing on future plans for solar panels and/or placement of air conditioning units. Lastly, staff has previously informed the applicant that the French Revival style may not be a suitable selection for the subject property, as it is often seen on larger estate properties and is not compatible with this area district.

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 window and roofing materials are selected from the City’s Pre-Approved Lists and are acceptable. However, staff finds that the proposed stone veneer material is not compatible with the proposed structure and may appear too synthetic as well as too contemporary for the chosen architectural style.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MAY 2, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC18-19
1225 MESA RD., (JASPER/LUNDGREN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a motorized driveway gate, a pedestrian gate, brick plasters with lightings and fencing in the front yard.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

May 2, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
June 15, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 10
Object – 1 (owner of 1224 Rosalind Rd.)
No response – 4

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 Commis-
sion 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 pilasters with lighting fixtures 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:* The materials and colors of the gates and fencing are architecturally compatible with the home. The side yard fencing will be partially covered by an existing hedge.

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 subject property is an interior lot along the north side of Mesa Road. Properties near the east end (cross street Circle Drive) of the block are improved with gates and pilasters.

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 improvements will not cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The driveway gate is setback approximately 22 feet from the curb.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, Charlie Ho., am a property owner of
1224 Rosalind Rd., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

1225 Mesa Rd.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I object to the project. [ ]

2. I do not object to the project. [ ]

3. I neither object nor support the project. [ ]

4. Comments:

[Blank lines for comments]

[Blank lines for comments]

[Blank lines for comments]

[Blank lines for comments]

[Neighboring Property Owner's Signature] [Mar. 24, 2018]
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MAY 2, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-11
1635 ROSE AVE., (JEON)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct an addition and remodel to the existing first story, an addition of a new second story, exterior modifications, and a new detached two-car garage.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(2) – Existing Facilities.

PROJECT HISTORY

May 2, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
June 15, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 11
Object – 2
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 proposed second story addition is compatible with the massing and scale of development within the legal neighborhood. The new detached garage is consistent with other detached garages in the vicinity; the only attached garage in the neighborhood is located at 1660 Rose Avenue, a triangular shaped lot that proved challenging to provide a conforming detached garage. The project introduces new exterior colors, materials, and roofing materials that are similar to those found on neighboring structures; this helps the project blend in with the existing streetscape.

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

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

Comment: Second floor windows are setback sufficiently to avoid a direct sightline into adjacent structures.

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 provides articulation and minimally increases the massing and bulk of the existing structure. However, staff recommends a consistent roof slope for the addition portion and the detached garage to improve compatibility 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: New exterior colors and materials are introduced for the project and are consistently carried throughout the project. Staff recommends the use of a single door with sidelites and true brick for wainscoting application.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTIONS LETTER

I, (name) Joseph Vuolamatti am a property owner of (address) 2000 Lucan Rd., San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 1635 Rose Ave.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following:
   Old matured trees have been cut in their back yard. Building a second floor on this property will expose our back yard and adversely affect our privacy. I will agree if this issue can be addressed.

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

Property Owner's Signature ____________________________ Date 9/30/2017
6/8/2017

Jenny Wong & Hilda Deng
Owners of 1655 Rose Ave.
1655 Rose Ave. San Marino, CA 91108

Planning & Building, San Marino City Hall
2200 Huntington Dr. San Marino, CA 91108

Subject: Privacy concerns of our neighbor 1635 Rose Ave new construction

To Whom It May Concern:

We knew our neighbor: 1635 Rose Ave. has submitted a plan for new construction to the city hall. We are very concerned about our privacy been compromised. Because their second floor will view all our backyard (with swimming pool) as well as the bedroom upstairs and family room on the first floor. As the pictures attached, our East side wall does not have any window opening to view their property. If they contract a second-floor building, even there are low trees in between, they still can view all our backyard and all the glass doors/windows facing the North.

Based on this privacy concerns, we request that their West side wall of the second floor shall not have any window opening just as our East side wall. If the city construction code requires window opening, it shall be high small window that only view upward. Further, if they have balcony facing the North, also a wall be installed on the East side so no view access to our backyard.

Any questions please call Jack Jeng, our relative at 626-260-2852 (cellphone) shall

Sincerely Yours

Jenny Wong & Hilda Deng
Owner and Resident
Owners of 1655 Rose Ave.
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MAY 2, 2018

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-96
1380 WILBURY RD., (LI/HOHMANN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story residence, a detached two-car garage and street facing side yard fencing and walls.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (replacement or reconstruction).

PROJECT HISTORY

May 2, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
June 15, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 2
Object – 6
Object (not in the legal neighborhood) - 2
No response – 5

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – NEW RESIDENCE

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

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

   Staff can make this finding: □ YES ☒ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: The legal neighborhood contains both one and two-story homes in various traditional styles. Staff can support the proposed style, the concept of a two-story residence and a detached garage at this corner location. However, staff finds the vertical massing, entry treatment and the south side yard covered patio incompatible with the legal neighborhood. Entry treatments on adjacent structures are reserved and minimally noticeable, the proposed entry alcove contributes to the overbearing appearance of the structure. While the side yard covered patio provides a transition from the sidewalk to the two-story massing, this covered patio feature is not found in 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: Large second story windows on the north elevation may cause a privacy impact to the north neighbor, planting a tall hedge or providing additional side yard setback will reduce the privacy impact.

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 materials and colors, including the barrel red tiles roofing material and architectural details, are appropriate for the chosen style and consistently applied throughout the project.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – SIDE YARD FENCING

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 street facing side yard fencing and walls 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 materials and colors of the walls and fencing are architecturally compatible with 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 subject property is one of two corner lots between Winston Avenue and Wilbury Road along the north side of Cumberland Road. The proposed fencing and walls are not consistent with the limited side yard wall existing on the adjoining corner lot at 1375 Winston Avenue.

It should be noted that similar street facing walls and fencing are found on corner properties across Wilbury Road from the subject site, but these locations are outside of 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

*Comments:* The side yard wall is setback sufficiently from the sidewalk, however staff finds that the visual clearance for pedestrians traveling east on Cumberland Road can be improved if the 45 degree corner of the wall at the termination of the driveway is replaced with a curved wall much like the west end of the wall.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

We are property owners of (address)
1375 Winston Ave., San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 1380 Wilbury Road.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following: see attached pages

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

Property Owner's Signature

Date

(new owners per family trust, see last paragraph of attached)
We, the new owners by family trust of the house at 1375 Winston Ave., object strongly to the proposed “renovation” of the house just to the west of us, 1380 Wilbury Road, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed house and entertainment area are much too large for the small lot and will come much too close to the property lines. In addition, the proposed configuration of the second floor will interfere with the normal use of our house and yard by intruding on the privacy of our house and yard and causing a great deal of noise and light pollution to our property. Our house has no windows on the west side of the second floor so does not allow us any view of neighbors’ backyards or windows. However, the proposed new house has not only windows but balconies that will overlook our yard and allow the occupants to peer into the west facing windows of our house. The entertainment area (barbecue and pool) no doubt will have extensive lighting and be the focus for inevitably noisy and probably sometimes late-night entertaining. Alice Salisbury owns a house in the Seven Oaks area of Bakersfield. A neighbor’s balcony with floodlight and second story overlook her master suite and pool. She knows how unpleasant and intrusive this can be. Such situations were banned for all new construction in the development after the house’s first owner pointed out the issue to the developers. The house to the north of 1375 Winston was enlarged to within about 5 feet (a driveway’s width) of ours at about the time our father died (we are not sure if Mother agreed to this or just let it slide by). The outdoor flood lights shine into the windows of 3 of the 4 bedrooms and we can hear far too much of what occurs in that house and, even more, outside that house. The bedroom Mother used was one adjacent to the house next door and the noise and light caused her great distress from that time onward. The house does not need the same type of problem on a second side.

2. We have already several times had to prevent interference with or use of the piece of ground between the 2 houses’ driveways which is part of 1375 Winston’s lot. New neighbors have parked cars there, made plans to pave the area to expand their driveway and had their gardeners start to remove trees and bushes to facilitate their use of the area. If new owners were confused, it is likely that a constantly changing stream of contractors and workers will try to damage or make use of that area, also believing that it is part of the 1380 Wilbury property.

3. Even before the new house is completed, the demolition and construction noise, the large amount of heavy equipment coming and going, and the construction supplies being piled around the tiny lot (and maybe on ours) will interfere with our privacy and lifestyle.

4. The new construction may interfere with the SCE power line right-of-way which runs between 1375 Winton and 1380 Wilbury. The electrical lines have arced (a very dangerous occurrence) at least twice because of high winds. If the construction damages the trees and kills all or part of them, that will provide ready fuel for a fire if the lines arc again. The new house and entertainment area may interfere with access to the lines and appear to be close enough to the right-of-way to be vulnerable as well to fires caused by the lines arcing. (Alice Salisbury worked for SCE for 5 years as an engineer and safety manager and has a healthy respect for electricity and what it can do.)

5. The driveway and detached garage for 1380 Wilbury sit on the property line between that house and 1375 Winston. It will be difficult to demolish the driveway and garage without doing damage to 1375 Winston’s property. In a large demolition/construction project, attention to careful execution of that small part of the work may be lacking.
6. Besides, creating fuel for a possible electrical fire, killing or damaging the trees along the property line will eliminate any privacy screen between the two houses and be unsightly.

7. We will be selling this house as soon as we have it ready to do so (probably in several months). Construction of a monster house right next door will lower the value of our property and make it difficult to sell. Who wants a house with no privacy and a great deal of light and noise from next door? Who wants a house with dead trees and damage all along the property line? In the immediate future, who wants a house with a large construction project right next door?

8. In the course of selling this house (and the Bakersfield house as well) and buying another in another city, we might not always be present to protect the property either from issues arising out of the construction (intrusion of the actual construction onto our property, supplies piled on our property, equipment parked on our property, etc.) or from damage to or theft from the house and property by construction-related persons who see no one is home.

Margaret Coffee Salisbury, the previous owner of this property, died March 10, 2018. We will be glad to provide a death certificate and proof that ownership of the house passes by the terms of the family trust to her children, James Powers Salisbury and Alice Coffee Salisbury.
CITY OF SAN MARINO  
DESIGN REVIEW  
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER 

I, Jianhua Zhang & Yu Wan, am a property owner of  
1368 Wilbury Road, San Marino and have been shown  
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at  
1380 Wilbury Rd.  
(neighbor's name) 
(address) 
(project address) 

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):  

1. I object to the project.  
2. I do not object to the project.  
3. I neither object nor support the project.  
4. Comments: 

   1. It will tremendously invade/break the privacy of my back yard 
   2. It will bring unacceptable noise disturbance for my family's life 
   3. Huge damage to San Marino's ancient antique buildings, not aesthetically compatible with current San Marino character of house 
   4. There are a lot of trees along the boundary, this construction will inevitably cut the trees, has detrimental impact on the trees and resident amenities. 
   5. Foundation of this house is too high, 3 feet higher than sidewalk. 

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature: Jianhua Zhang & Yu Wan  
Date: 1/17/2018  

Updated on 4/6/18
Dear all respectable committee members

We strongly object to the new construction plan on 1380 Wilbury Road.

Reasons for objection:

1. It will tremendously invade/break the privacy of my back yard, the designed house extends so long (around 24 feet longer than my house) to the back, there are also windows on the 2nd floor facing directly to my backyard, all my back yard will be under monitor of this house. And please note there is no driveway between this house and my house, it will be so close to peer/peep at us, and their 2nd floor windows will be too close to ours. It will bring so harmful damage to our psychological/mental health, especially for my two young kids. It will be a nightmare for us. The privacy is also human rights, we can’t allow the building of this house to take away our privacy and human rights. Accordingly, it will bring down the value of my house sharply because nobody wants to live in such a house with back yard watched by other people all the time.

2. The foundation of this house is so high at about 3 feet higher than the sidewalk, the planned building of two story house will be super higher than other houses in this area, especially than those houses on the south side of Cumberland, make it so abrupt, not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

3. It is a huge damage to Sam Marino’s ancient antique building style, it is not aesthetically compatible with current San Marino character of building style, We don’t need such big modern mansion in San Marino. It is not compatible with the visual character of the neighborhoods.

4. There are a lot of trees in the front and in the back alongside the boundary, this planned construction will inevitably cut the roots, will have damaging impact on these trees.

5. This construction will bring us unacceptable loud noise and disturb our family’s normal life for very very long time. It is also not safe for us.

It is totally unacceptable.
From owner of 1368 Wilbury Road, San Marino.
Dear all respectable committee members

We strongly object to the new construction plan on 1380 Wilbury Road.

Reasons for objection:

1. It will significantly invade the privacy of my back yard, the designed 2 story house extends so long (around 25 feet longer/deeper than my house) to the back, there are two windows on the 2nd floor master bedroom facing directly to my backyard. And there are another two windows facing my back yard in their so close garage, the fence is only a little more than 5 feet, any average height adult standing inside their windows of the garage can peep on my back yard. So all my back yard will be under monitor of this house. It will bring so harmful damage to our psychological/mental health, especially for my two young kids. It will be a nightmare for us. The privacy is also human rights, we can’t allow the building of this house to take away our privacy and human rights. The increased height of two story house than current one story house will also bring us serious visual pressure.

2. Their planned garage is too close to the boundary line, less than 4 feet as measured from the story pole to the boundary line. There is a big tree on the boundary line close to the planned garage, this planned construction will inevitably cut the roots, damage this big tree. Another concern is the garage is much higher than current garage, it is 9 feet to the top of plate, much higher than regular garage in San Marino, giving serious visual pressure to us.

As a result, it will bring down the value of my house sharply because nobody wants to live in such a house with back yard watched by other people all the time.

3. Please note there is no driveway between this house and my house, the planned two story house will be so close to us, their building will block the sunlight to our windows in the first floor and 2nd floor. And their extended 25 feet house will block the sunlight to my garden and my living room.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, [BRIAN & SHARON MEQUET], am a property owner of
(neighbor’s name)
[2490 CONISTON PLACE], San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor’s address)
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
[1380 WILBURY ROAD, SAN MARINO]
(project address)

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I object to the project.
2. I do not object to the project.
3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments: [UNTIL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS PROVIDED, I CANNOT SUPPORT THE PROJECT. NO SQUARE FOOTAGE IS INCLUDED (FOR THE HOUSE). THE MATERIALS TO BE USED MUST BE IDENTIFIED. THE HOUSE MUST CONFORM TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD. WILL THE LOT BE GRADED?]

[Signature]
Neighbor Property Owner's Signature

[Date]
Date
I, **DHRUBA ROY**, am a property owner of 2530 CUMBERLAND, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at 1480 WILBURY RD.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I **object** to the project.
2. I do not object to the project.
3. I **neither object nor support** the project.
   - Proposed plan of the
4. Comments: This house does not match the neighboring houses. It is a two storyed house on a raised lot. I am opposite to this house. It will ruin my view. I looked on this plan and I will have a view of solid wall your roof etc. This is totally unmatched with neighborhood. If a one storyed house is built I will agree to that plan. Thank you.

_DHRUBA ROY_

**Neighboring Property Owner's Signature**

_DHRUBA ROY_

**Date**
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name)  Ivan Ho  am a property owner of (address)
2520 Cumberland Rd , San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(address) 1380 Wilbur Road  .

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my
   property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my
   property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present
   form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following:
   
   
   
   
   
   

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

[Signature]  4/16/18

Property Owner’s Signature  Date
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Hung Poel, Mei Poel, am a property owner of (address)
2485 Cumberland Rd, C.M., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(address) 1380 Wilbur Road.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following: We would like to keep
   with the city’s old and unique style of
   housing that distinguishes our city as
   the most prominent community. We would
   approve 1 floor, however, we object building
   2 floors.

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

[Signature]
Property Owner’s Signature

4-15-2018
Date
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Jack Wu am a property owner of (address) 1355 Winston Ave, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 1380 Wilbury Rd.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.

2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.

3. I do not object and decline to state reason.

4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.

5. I object in particular to the following:

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.

7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

Property Owner's Signature

Date 4-4-18
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Yan Ding am a property owner of (address) 1346 Wilbury Rd., San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 1380 Wilbury Road.

After reviewing the plans of the proposed changes (circle applicable response):

1. I do not object because I do not believe that the proposed changes will impact my property.
2. I do not object because the proposed changes are aesthetically compatible with my property.
3. I do not object and decline to state reason.
4. I object because the proposed changes are not aesthetically compatible in their present form with my property.
5. I object in particular to the following: not compatible with other traditional houses in the neighborhood.

6. I object and decline to state a reason at this time.
7. I neither object nor support the proposed changes at this time.

Property Owner’s Signature

Date