THURSDAY, JULY 5, 2018
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: Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, Howard Brody, Judy Johnson-Brody, Kevin Cheng, 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.

1. OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

2. REORGANIZATION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-100
   605 CHAUCER RD., (HUANG/HAN)
   The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard block wall and pedestrian gate.
   (Required Action Date: 8-6-18)

4. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC18-03
   1640 EUCLID AVE., (XIA/AND STUDIO)
   The applicant proposes to construct a first and second-story addition to an existing two-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 8-10-18)

5. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC17-74
   1346 WILBURY RD., (WANG/KIYOHARA MOFFIT)
   The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition to an existing one-story residence.
   (Required Action Date: 8-3-18)

OTHER MATTERS

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

OPEN FORUM

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

The San Marino Design Review Committee will adjourn to the next meeting to be held on Wednesday, July 18, 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.
ITEM 1

OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS
ITEM 2

REORGANIZATION OF
THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: JULY 5, 2018

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

PROJECT HISTORY

July 5, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
August 6, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

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

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. It also states that the Design Review Committee may reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback and decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall located in the front yard.

The Design Review Committee may not reduce the maximum permitted height, increase the minimum required setback or decrease the maximum permitted opacity of any fence, gate, yard wall or retaining wall located in a side yard adjacent to a street; except, that the Design Review Committee or Commission can increase the minimum setback for a gate providing access to a driveway in order to protect pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
The DRC shall approve the application for the gate in the rear yard and retaining wall along the property line if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. **That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.**

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

   *Comments:* Staff finds that the proposed block wall, pilasters, and pedestrian gate are architecturally compatible with the existing residence as well as the existing block wall along the west property line. The existing residence exhibits a large amount of brick detailing that will be complemented by the proposed brick pilasters. The proposed gate will match the existing gate that is adjacent to the existing garage.

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

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

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

   *Comments:* For the purpose of analyzing compatibility with existing residences, Staff observed one other house adjacent to the subject property located along the same side of California Blvd., in between Chaucer Road and Canterbury Road.

   The proposed street facing pilasters will be six feet tall and the proposed block wall will be five feet and six inches tall. Although the location and height of the proposed block wall is consistent with the location and height of the adjacent property’s (610 Canterbury Rd.) existing wrought iron fencing and gate, the appearance and type of structure are not consistent—a block wall versus wrought iron fencing. Since size can be measured by thickness, opacity, and mass, Staff finds that the proposed block wall is not consistent or compatible with the fencing found on the adjacent property on the subject 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 proposed pilasters will maintain a setback of two feet from the property line and the proposed block wall will maintain a setback of two feet and six inches from the property line. Neither will disrupt oncoming vehicular traffic nor cause a hazardous condition to pedestrian traffic.
June 21, 2018

RE: NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE THE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
DRC CASE NO. 17-100
605 CHAUCER RD., SAN MARINO

The Design Review Committee will review the application submitted by Mr. Freeman Han to construct a street-facing side yard block wall and pedestrian gate on the property known as 605 Chaucer Road, San Marino. Please be advised that the date, time and place of the hearing is as follows:

DATE: JULY 5, 2018
TIME: 7:00 P.M.
PLACE: SAN MARINO CITY HALL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CALIFORNIA 91108

The application being considered by the Design Review Committee and any subsequent modifications, additions, or deletions, may potentially affect your property and neighborhood. Consequently, you are encouraged to attend and participate at said hearing. If you cannot personally attend the Design Review Committee meeting, you may choose to review the application at City Hall, and submit a letter of support or objection to the Design Review Committee before the meeting date.

Sincerely,

Christine Song
Assistant Planner

NOTICE #N-18-55

OWNERS OF
642 CHAUCER ROAD

6.25.18

WE ARE AGAINST THE CONCRETE BLOCK WALL UNLESS IT IS COVERED WITH STUCCO OR BRICK. CONCRETE WILL LOOK LIKE A PRISON.

K. Harakembo
I, [Name], am a property owner of

[Address], San Marino and have been

shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

[Address]

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: I object to the concrete block wall. The planting will take years to cover to block wall. I would approve if the wall is completely brick, as compatible with the existing structure, or if the block was covered with stucco.

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

[Date]

1.29.18
1. **Harry Surmenian** am a property owner of
   
   (neighbor’s name)

   575 Sierra Vista Ave, San Marino and have been shown
   
   (neighbor’s address)

   the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

   605 Chaucer Rd
   
   (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: I will not object to lower height (up to 4'-0") decorative fences. The 5'-6" high concrete fences, regardless if they are obscured behind the same height rows of trees, will change the entire main street view.

H. Surmenian

Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature 01-22-2018

Date
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION
The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (existing facility).

PROJECT HISTORY

July 5, 2018 – First hearing before the DRC
August 10, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve - 12
Object - 0
No response – 2

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 addition occurs on the south and east elevations of the structure, the project will not alter the appearance of the Tudor structure as viewed from the street. The project will
maintain its current visual massing from street view and overall building height. The structure remains compatible with the legal neighborhood and adjacent Tudor structures on the block.

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:* Window locations and sizes are respectful of adjacent neighbors. New casement windows on the south elevation (along driveway) are smaller in size than current windows. There is a large second floor casement window in Bedroom #2; staff finds the window setback, at 41 feet from the rear property line, to be sufficient in preventing privacy impact on the east neighbor. This second floor casement window will not provide a direct view into the east neighbor’s structure.

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 is compatible and well integrated with the existing structure. The project provides consistent plate height, roof slope, window treatments, and exterior materials and finishes to ensure that the addition areas match 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 façade treatment and finished materials are consistent with the existing structure. To provide texture and to break up a flat stucco wall on the east elevation, staff recommends providing wood siding on the second floor addition area in a manner that is similar to the wood siding applied on the second floor north elevation (next to the chimney) as shown on Sheet A-510 Proposed Rear Side View.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
RESIDENTIAL PLAN INFORMATION SHEET
R - I DISTRICTS V, VI, VII

Property Address: 1640 Euclid Ave.
Contact Person: Won Cho (AND Studio)
Owner's Name: Xing Xia
Area District: VII
Proposed Building Height: 23' 9" (No Change)

Date: 6/27/2018
Phone: (213) 417-3223
Phone: (773) 280-0234

1. Actual Parcel Area:
2. Statutory Parcel Area (See Exhibit "A"):
3. 40% of Actual Parcel Area (Line 1 x 40%):
4. 30% of Statutory Parcel Area:
   (See Exhibit "B")
5. Smaller of Lines 3 or 4:
6. If the Actual Parcel Area (Line 1) is larger than
   the Statutory Parcel Area (Line 2), enter 10% of
   the difference: (Line 1-Line2) x 10%:
7. Maximum Livable Area and Ground Coverage:
   (Line 5 + Line 6)
8. If the property is a corner lot enter 90% of the amount of Line 7.
9. Existing Ground Coverage:
   (gross sq.ft. of 1st floor including garage)
10. Proposed Additional Ground Coverage:
    (gross sq.ft. of 1st floor including new garage sq.ft.)
11. Total Proposed Ground Coverage: (Line 9 + Line 10)
12. Existing Livable Area:
13. Proposed Additional Livable Area:
    • Include all interior ceiling areas over 15 feet in height:
14. Total Proposed Livable Area (Line 12 + Line 13)
15. Garage Size: 11' - 3" ft. x 19' - 1" ft.
    Right Side: 23' 6'' Left Side: 20' 25''
17. Number of existing bedrooms*: 4
    Total proposed number of bedrooms*: 4

*Bedroom – Any room which is not a kitchen, dining room, living room, family room or bathroom and which is designated as a bedroom or
is capable of being used for sleeping quarters, which contains a closet, or to which a closet could be added, which has a nearby or adjacent
bathroom, and which meets the requirements contained in section 23.02.10 of this chapter. Final determination of the identification of any
room shall rest with the City Manager or his/her designated representative.

I certify that I have read this application and state that the information is true and correct. Any falsification of this application will be
sufficient cause to revoke any permits or approvals that are granted based on this information.

XING XIA
Property Owner and/or Authorized Agent
TO:  CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM:  CHRISTINE SONG, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE:  JULY 5, 2018
SUBJECT:  DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-74
1346 WILBURY RD., (WANG/KIYOHARA MOFFIT)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant proposes to construct a second-story addition to an existing one-story residence.

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
July 5, 2018 – First hearing before DRC
August 3, 2018 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS
Approve – 5
Object – 1
Neither – 4
No response – 2

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

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

   Staff can make this finding:  ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: The legal neighborhood consists of both one-story and two-story structures in various traditional architectural styles. Staff finds that although the legal neighborhood could sustain an additional two-story structure, the proposed second-story addition produces a “top-heavy” appearance that is incompatible in massing and design with the rest of 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: Staff finds that the proposed second-story addition compromises the expectation of privacy for the east and north neighbors. The front facing second floor balcony wraps around to the north elevation and would obstruct the north neighbor’s privacy. The second floor rear elevation (east) provides a sightline directly into the east neighbor’s backyard.

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 proposed second floor addition is not well integrated with the existing building and produces a “pop-up” appearance with uneven rooflines. Additionally, the proposed second floor should be set back further than the first floor, per the Residential Design Guidelines. The second floor exterior wall projection along the north elevation extends past the first floor by 2 feet and 1 inch, thereby creating an imbalanced appearance that is not seen elsewhere in the project.

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 on the City’s Pre-Approved Lists and are acceptable as they will match what is currently on the existing structure. All other colors and materials for the proposed addition will also match existing.

The applicant has indicated that they would like to replace the proposed ‘solar tube’ skylight shown on the plans with the Velux brand ‘Sun Tunnel’ skylight (detail/specification sheet attached).
June 20, 2018

Jack Wu
1355 Winston Ave
San Marino, CA 91108

To whom it may concern:

This letter is to inform the Planning Commission that the address 1346 Wilbury Road's plans to build a second story would negatively affect my own residence, 1355 Winston Avenues, in terms of both privacy and how unsettling the structure is in terms of both size of the structure and distance from my residence. I would also like to request for a member of the Planning Commission to spare some time to investigate how severe this addition would damage the privacy of my backyard before the hearing date. I would also like to request that I be informed before your arrival to my residence so I may explain my concerns face to face. Please contact me at the phone number disclosed: 626-592-1479.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely,

Jack Wu
Jack Wu
(name)
1355 Winston Ave
(address)
San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property, located at 1346 Wilbury Rd (DRC 17-74).

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: The two story house against my privacy for all my backyard, I am strongly disagree the new contraction on the 1346 Wilbury Rd. Please see attached letter and photos for detail.

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: 5-30-2018
Jack Wu  
1355 Winston Ave  
San Marino, CA. 91108  
(H) 626-765-3078  
(C)626-592-1479

Re: 1346 Wibury Rd. new addition construction  
( DRC17-74)

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to inform you that I am the owner at 1355 Winston Ave, the neighboring property located at 1346 Wilbury proposed the addition of a second story, this new construction will cause privacy issues to my bedroom, restroom, and back yard. Thus, I cannot open my curtain or windows once the new story has been build. Therefore I am strongly opposed to the new construction plan on 1346 Wibury.

Thank you for your consideration and support.

Best Regards,  

Jack Wu
To whom it may concern,

This letter is to inform you that I am the owner at 1355 Winston Ave, the neighboring property located at 1346 Wilbury has proposed the addition of a second story, this new construction will cause privacy issues to my bedroom, restroom, and back yard (see photo #1) Thus, I cannot open my curtain or windows once the construction has started. Therefore I am strongly opposed to the new construction plan on 1346 Wilbury. Please see below a detailed communication agenda with 1346's neighbor during past two months.

March 30, 2018 The neighbor brought the approve/object letter to sign at the night, the explanation given to me by said neighbor was unclear thus I signed “I neither object nor support the project” on the letter.

May 02, 2018 I met the owner at city hall after the other Wilbury hearing meeting and told them I would be objecting the project due to privacy issues (See photo #01, #02, #03 and #04)

May 03, 2018 The neighbor came to my house to inform us that they would plant several trees to rectify the issue of privacy and I told them the tree height should be like their neighbor next door, the neighbor told me they did not have the space to plant the trees and wanted to plant on my property but then I suggested for the neighbor to have a retaining wall planter fence that would elevate trees up to around 3 to 4 feet and then plant trees that need extend 8 feet above the top of the current wall dividing our properties. This would have solved 80% of my general complains on privacy. (see photo #6 for an example of a retaining wall planter fence)

May 8, 2018 Due to the neighbor's ground level being about 3 to 4 feet higher than my property, I called the neighbor to refuse tree planting on my own property site, as it would take longer time for the trees planted to grow.
May 15, 2018  The neighbor put the four trees that stretched just over the fence but the amount of privacy given by the trees was negligible and did not solve any of the current privacy issues.

May 30, 2018  I went to City Hall to request the objection form.

June 6, 2018  The objection letter was returned to city hall with a detail explanation.

June 18, 2018  The neighbor had workers put up steel bar guide lines (the wire with flags attached) which referenced the height of renovation. My family noticed this and spoke to me about how insecure they felt about the renovation when it came to our privacy (see photo #5), and this insecurity will most definitely be amplified if construction begins.

June 21, 2018  Another objection letter along with photos was sent to the city planning commission to further explain the privacy issue.

June 22, 2018  I was took back the March 30, 2018 signed form “approval/objection letter” from city hall.

I sincerely ask the planning commission member to help to object to the 1346 Wibury renovation plan due to the privacy issues to myself and my adjacent neighbor. Therefore I would like to request that the commission members enforce the two points below if the objection fails and that the motion will be carried through before construction:

1. A retaining wall planter fence around 3 to 4 feet in height be erected and trees be planted in the retaining wall with a height that would extend over the top of the current wall by a minimum of 8 feet. The trees plant can be no more then two feet apart from each other and must be able to cover the area highlighted (see photo #3). This project will need to be enacted and finished before construction.

2. A privacy screen be set up to block the highlighted area (see photo #3) before the start of the renovation.

Thank you for your time, consideration and support.

Best Regards,

Jack Wu
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: JULY 5, 2018

SUBJECT: PROJECT EXTENSION REQUEST
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC16-86
1560 OLD MILL RD., (DESIGN INSPIRATION GROUP, INC.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

At the July 5, 2017 Design Review meeting, the Committee approved a new two-story residence with subterranean parking and front yard wall project at the subject property. Pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.08(C), the DRC approval is valid for one-year and the applicant must obtain the building permit for construction within one-year from the approval date.

The project received structural plan check approval on May 10, 2018, however the property owner is not ready to obtain the permit because he has yet to select a contractor for the project. For this reason, the property owner is requesting an extension of the DRC approval. Should the DRC approve the extension request, the new DRC approval expiration date will be July 5, 2019.
DEAR MR. CERVANTES:

ON BEHALF OF MY CLIENT, THE PROPERTY OWNER, I AM WRITING THIS LETTER TO REQUEST A **12-MONTH EXTENSION** FOR OUR PROJECT, AS REFERENCED ABOVE. THE PLANS WERE APPROVED BY DRC ON JULY 5, 2017 AND WILL EXPIRE IN A FEW DAYS.

THE OWNER IS CURRENTLY REVIEWING BIDS FROM VARIOUS CONTRACTORS AND IT IS TAKING LONGER THAN HE ANTICIPATED. WE ARE REQUESTING THIS EXTENSION, SO HE WILL HAVE MORE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS TASK.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION ON THIS MATTER. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO GIVE ME A CALL AT (626)287-1859.

SINCERELY YOURS,

ALEX W. CHANG
July 10, 2017

Long Fei Tan
1560 Old Mill Road
San Marino, CA 91108

SUBJECT: DECISION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AT A MEETING HELD ON JULY 5, 2017 FOR
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. DRC#16-86
1560 OLD MILL ROAD, SAN MARINO, CA

Dear Long Fei Tan:

The Design Review Committee thanks you for participating in the Design Review Process regarding a new two-story residence with subterranean parking and new front yard walls at the property known as 1560 Old Mill Road. The City of San Marino encourages and appreciates efforts to upgrade and improve property insofar as such improvements are aesthetically complementary as well as compatible with neighboring buildings. After a full review and consideration of your application and after an open, public hearing held July 5, 2017, the Design Review Committee approved your application as submitted.

The Design Review Committee’s decision is final unless appealed to the Planning Commission within fifteen (15) days from the date of their action. This action is valid for a period of one year from the date of the meeting. Please place this approval letter on the plans submitted for plan check. The approved plans are legal documents and the project must be constructed exactly per the approved plans. Any modifications to these plans must be presented to the City, prior to construction, for determination if Design Review Committee’s approval of such changes is required. Construction that is not in accordance to the approved plan is subject to a fine of 5% of the valuation of the construction or $2,500, whichever is greater. After payment of the penalty fee, the modifications would still require review and approval by the Design Review Committee. The Design Review Committee could approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed modifications.

The Design Review Committee members extend their best wishes to you for the successful completion of your improvement project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Alexandria En
Professional Intern

Cc: digarchac@sbcglobal.net