WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 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 Planning Commission with valuable information regarding issues of the community.

Regular Meetings are held on the 4th 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: Se-Yao Hsu, Marcos Velayos, Jeri Wright, James Okazaki, and Vice-Chair Raymond Cheng, Chair Howard Brody.

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 Planning Commission on any item of interest to the public, before or during the Planning Commission’s consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NOS. CUP17-31, CUP18-01, DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-98, AND MASTER SIGN PROGRAM NO. MSP18-01
PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 5324-027-036, VACANT LOT LOCATED BETWEEN 2459 AND 2481 MISSION STREET, (KHERADMANDAN/DAHL)
The applicant requests permission to construct a new two-story structure containing two commercial units on the ground floor and one residential unit on the second floor. The applicant also proposes a new master sign program for the property. The project requires two conditional use permits and two design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.03.01C, 23.03.04E1, 23.15.03B, and 23.12.04D.
(Required Action Date: 5/4/18)

2. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NOS. CUP17-33, CUP17-37, DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC17-110, DRC17-111, AND DRC17-112
2395 ADAIR STREET, (WONG/TAM STUDIO ARCHITECTS)
The applicant requests permission to construct an addition and remodel of an existing single-story residence, a new detached three-car garage and a street-facing side yard gate. The addition will exceed the maximum lot coverage and livable area allowance. The accessory structure exceeds six hundred square feet in total lot coverage and is visible from public view. This requires two conditional use permits and three design review actions pursuant to City Code sections 23.02.20B, 23.15.03A1, 23.15.03C and 23.15.03F.
(Required Action Date: 5/11/18)

3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP17-32
2549 HUNTINGTON DRIVE, (YANG/LEW LIVING TRUST)
The applicant requests permission to operate a dental clinic within an existing commercial building. This requires a conditional use permit pursuant to City Code Section 23.03.01C.
(Required Action Date: 4/21/18)

OTHER MATTERS

4. RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS FOR DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-08
1400 CIRCLE DRIVE, (HE/JAMES V. COANE AND ASSOCIATES)
5. **RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NOS. CUP17-23 AND CUP17-34, DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-104**
1230 WINSTON AVENUE, (MARRONE)

6. **RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP17-18, AND DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-57**
1942 WELLESLEY ROAD, (CHU/OVERHAUL ARCHITECTURE)

**ORAL PUBLIC APPEARANCES**

This is the time set aside for any person who desires to be heard on any matters not covered on this agenda. No action is to be permitted except:

1. Catastrophic Emergency as is described by majority vote; or
2. The need for action arose within the last 72 hours as determined by a 4/5 vote.

**PUBLIC WRITINGS DISTRIBUTED**

All public writings distributed by the City of San Marino to at least a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the public counter at the San Marino Center located at 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, April 25, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

**APPEALS**

There is a fifteen day appeal period for all applications. All appeals should be filed with the City Clerk. Please contact the City Clerk for further information.
TO: CHAIRMAN BRODY AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR

BY: EVA CHOI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 28, 2018

SUBJECT: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NOS. CUP17-31, CUP18-01, DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-98, AND MASTER SIGN PROGRAM NO MSP18-01

PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 5324-027-036, VACANT LOT LOCATED BETWEEN 2459 AND 2481 MISSION STREET, (KHERADMANDAN/DAHL)

PROPOSAL:

The applicant requests permission to construct a new two-story structure containing two commercial units on the ground floor and one residential unit on the second floor. The applicant also proposes a new master sign program for the property. The project requires two conditional use permits and two design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.03.01C, 23.03.04E1, 23.15.03B, and 23.12.04D.

REQUIRED ACTIONS:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP17-31 – NEW COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP18-01 – RESIDENTIAL USE IN COMMERCIAL ZONE
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC17-98 - NEW COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE
MASTER SIGN PROGRAM MSP18-01 – SIGN PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE

BACKGROUND:

General Plan: General Commercial
Zoning: C-1, General Commercial
Location: The subject property is located on the north side of Mission Street, between Las Flores Avenue and Euclid Avenue
Surrounding Uses: The site is bordered by general commercial uses to the east, west and south with residential use located to the north
Proposed Use: General Commercial on ground floor, Residential Use above
Total Building Size: 5,279 square feet indoor area, 1,223 square feet balcony area
Commercial Unit Size: 1,248 square feet each unit
Residential Unit Size: 2,783 square feet with 4 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms
Environmental Determination: A negative declaration of environmental impact was prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROVIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING: C-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Site Area per Family in C-1 Zone (per Section 23.03.03)</td>
<td>5,000 square feet</td>
<td>6,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>29 feet 11 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Zero setback, Second floor balconies project beyond front property line by 2 feet (Projection requires an aerial encroachment permit and subject to City Council approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>East Side: Zero setback, West Side: 7 inches setback due to west neighbor’s encroachment (as shown on Sheet A-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>Minimum 20 feet</td>
<td>Ground floor: 55 feet 6 inches, Second floor: 37 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Style</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:**

**Conditional Use Permits – New Commercial Structure and Residential Use in Commercial Zone**

The project site is currently vacant and the applicant proposes to construct a new structure comprising of two commercial units on the ground floor and one residential unit on the second floor. On-site parking for the units are located behind the structure and accessible through the alleyway.

The commercial component of the project includes two commercial units on the ground floor, separated by a covered breezeway, each unit contains an open floor area, an office and a restroom. Two dedicated entrances are provided to access each unit, one entrance from the rear parking lot and one through the breezeway. The building frontage is improved with glass panel doors for the commercial units with a decorative wrought iron gate at the center of the structure.

The residential unit comprises of 2,750 square feet with four bedrooms and four bathrooms. A large, uncovered balcony is located at the rear of the unit, facing the alleyway. Three balconies are located along the building frontage, two of which are Juliet balcony with limited space and decorative in nature. The center balcony facing Mission Street is accessible from the living room and the overall size makes it more...
functional. All three balconies along the building frontage extend beyond the property line. This design feature requires an aerial encroachment permit subject to City Council’s approval.

The project also includes re-striping the twelve public parking stalls on the subject block, north side of Mission Street, between Euclid Avenue and Las Flores Avenue. The re-striping will provide three additional parking stalls, two of which are handicap stalls.

City Codes specify commercial parking requirement based on the use. The proposed project provides eleven parking spaces for both commercial and residential units. In designing the surface parking area, the applicant used the formula of 1 parking stall for each 250 square feet of commercial floor area. This parking ratio yielded 10 parking stalls for the proposed 2,496 square feet of commercial floor area in the new structure. The issue with using the above parking ratio is that it inherently limits future uses to those with the lowest parking requirement in the City. These uses are administrative offices, retail service, retail sales, and veterinary offices and clinics. Other commercial uses with a higher parking ratio such as restaurants, convenience markets, and personal care would not be able to operate in this structure and would require a parking variance.

Adjacent businesses on the subject block includes a fitness center, a dry cleaner, a retail shop, a photography studio, and administrative offices. The nature of the nearby businesses have a high customer turnover rate and these businesses access their parking through the same 16-foot wide alleyway as the proposed project. The project, being a new structure on a vacant parcel and not a replacement structure, will increase traffic in the alleyway and will likely increase public parking demand on nearby streets. Without a traffic analysis to evaluate the degree of traffic impact base on possible commercial uses in the new structure, staff is unable to support the size of the proposed structure with the proposed amount of on-site parking.

With ten of the eleven on-site parking stalls dedicated to the commercial units, the residential unit is limited to one parking stall. Although City Code does not specify required parking for residential use in the commercial zone and that one parking stall is dedicated to the residential unit, staff would argue that one parking stall is insufficient for a four bedroom unit. In the residential zone, a four bedroom structure is required to provide a two-car garage. Provision of on-site visitor parking and bicycle parking would help to relieve parking impact on adjacent streets.

In examining a conditional use permit, the Planning Commission must ensure that the conditions are consistent with the required legal findings for the request.

1. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the area of such proposed use nor be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

Staff finds that the establishment and operation of the proposed structure will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the vicinity due to limited on-site parking for the size of the project. Additionally, the residential unit will likely cause parking impact to adjacent uses when visitors to the unit are not able to park on-site. The size of the rear-facing balcony will cause noise impact to adjacent residential uses.

2. That the site for the proposed conditional use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the
yards, walls and fences, parking and loading, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Chapter or required by the Commission in order to integrate said conditional use with the land and uses in the neighborhood.

The project is poorly integrated with the adjacent uses. The size of the project and the parking lot design force the trash enclosure and driveway sliding gate in very close proximity to residential uses across the alleyway. The driveway gate along the rear property line would limit the back-up area for the residential garage to the immediate north (1735 Euclid Avenue). Additionally, the project lacks landscaping to screen the appearance of the surface parking area.

3. That the proposed conditional use will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition and development of nearby uses and buildings.

The proposed use will have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition and development of nearby residents and businesses due to the traffic increase in the alleyway. The residential unit without on-site visitor parking will increase public parking demand on nearby streets and the large uncovered balcony will generate noise impact.

4. That the site for the proposed conditional use will relate to streets and highways adequate in width and pavement to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.

The site is currently vacant and the establishment of a new structure with 2,496 square feet of commercial space and a 2,783 square feet residential unit will certainly increase traffic in the area. Although nearby streets are wide enough to handle the anticipated traffic generated from the project, the amount of increased traffic may cause congestion in the 16-foot alleyway that is currently use by adjacent businesses on the block and the residential garages across the alleyway.

Design Review for the New Structure

In examining the design review requests, the Planning Commission must make sure that the conditions will be consistent with the required findings for compatibility. Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the reviewing body shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood, and
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,
3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines,
4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

The project site is an interior lot, at the center of the block with two single-story commercial structures on each side. Directly across the street from the project site, on the south side of Mission Street, is an L-shape two-story with a single-story side wing commercial structure and its associated surface parking lot. Single-story residences are located to the southwest, these are nonconforming residential uses in the commercial zone. Properties to the north, across the alleyway, are residentially zoned and are developed with residential uses.
Staff finds the proposed two-story structure to be out of character with the existing village-like streetscape on Mission Street. The proposed height and building volume are incompatible with adjacent commercial structures. The proposed structure will be the tallest structure on the north side of Mission Street, west of Los Robles Avenue. The zero front setback across the entire width of the lot contributes to the visual massing of the structure, particularly when it is located in between modest and non-descript single-story structures. The Commercial Design Guidelines emphasizes that commercial projects should be sensitive to, and in scale with, the adjacent residential neighborhood. Staff finds the proposed project incompatible with the immediate commercial structures and the adjacent residential neighborhood.

While the proposed Mediterranean style is in keep with the Mission Street District’s architectural influence, the proposed design is different from similarly designed structures in the District, in that the proposed design does not contribute to a pedestrian-friendly environment. For instance, the San Marino Café and Marketplace at 2570 Mission Street and the Julienne Restaurant at 2649 Mission Street have deep recessed building frontages, planters and street furniture near the sidewalk which make for a pedestrian-friendly environment. The proposed structure provides a zero front setback and offers projecting balconies to break up the two-story façade.

The proposed 1,035 square feet second-story, uncovered balcony will have privacy impact on residential structures across the alley. No other commercial structure in the Mission Street Commercial District is improved with a large balcony.

Exterior materials and color scheme are consistently applied throughout the project and are compatible with nearby structures. The wrought iron gate fronting Mission Street should be simplify and without spears at the top.

**Master Sign Program for the New Structure**

The proposed awning and blade signs are similar to signage on adjacent businesses on Mission Street. Staff finds the size, color, design and placement of the proposed signage appropriate for the structure.

Due to the inability to satisfy required findings for the new commercial structure and residential use in the commercial zone, staff cannot support the request for conditional use permits and design review action.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permits CUP17-31, CUP18-01, Design Review DRC17-98, and Master Sign Program MSP18-01 to a future meeting in order to provide the applicant an opportunity to redesign the project.

**Attachments:**
- Application
- Location/Radius Map
- Neighbors’ Letters
Calculation of Planning and Design Review Fees

For up to three conditional use permit, variance and/or design review applications for a single project to be processed concurrently, the fee collected shall be the fee required for the single highest application. For more than three such applications, the fee collected shall be the cost as provided, plus the cost for each additional individual application.

Please complete the following:

1. Date:  **NOV. 29, 2017**

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   
   24601 MISSION ST.

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   
   **5324-027-036**
   
   (legal description may be attached separately if necessary)
   
   **LOT 9 AND THE WESTERLY 15 FEET LOT 10,**
   
   **TRACT 9657, MB 106/26-27. APN: 5324-027-036**

4. State in your own words:
   
   a. The use (or improvement) you intend to make to the above described property:
      
      NEW MIXED USE BUILDING 2 COMMERCIAL UNITS ON GROUND FLOOR AT 1,248 SQ FT. EACH AND RESIDENTIAL ON SECOND FLOOR AT 2,703 SQ FT.
   
   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      
      NEW BUILDING

5. I (we) certify or declare under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

   I (we) also understand that in submitting this application that I (we) am (are) to expect City officials to conduct exterior inspections of my (our) property.

   **Signature of all owners of record of the property herein described:**

   **Kheradmandan Family Trust**

Mailing Address:  
P. O. BOX 49657, L.A., CA 90049

Owner’s Phone Number (Home):  **(310) 721-2083**

Owner’s Phone Number (Work):  **(_____)**

Agent’s Name and Address:  
**DAHL ARCHITECTS, INC.**

1134 EL CENTRO ST. SOUTHERN PASADENA, CA 91030

Agent’s Phone Number:  **(626) 564-0211**

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.*
Item 1

Three-Dimensional Renderings of the Proposed New Structure between 2459 and 2481 Mission Street
From: Isaac Hung <ihung1026@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 3:47 PM
To: Eva Choi
Subject: CUP 17-31, CUP 18-01, DRC 17-98

Dear Ms. Eva Choi,
I am writing in support of the this project. Mission District Commercial area needs revitalization. This project will enhance the neighborhood appeal and will create more of the pride of ownership in the area. I will be out of town on March 28. Therefore, I wish to express my voice via this email. Thank you for your attention.
Regards,
Isaac Hung
1057 Old Mill Road
San Marino, CA 91108
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, [Neighbor’s Name] am a property owner of
(neighbor’s name)

2510 Mission St. San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor’s address)

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

2461 Mission St.
(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: Not consistent with the aesthetics and character of the district.

[Additional comments]

[Signature]
Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature

[Date]

12/19/17
Date
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, Miriam Bermudez am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)

2459 Mission St. San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)

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

2461 Mission St.
(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: See Attachment


Neighboring Property Owner's Signature  7/3/18

Date
Unfortunately, construction next door to us would be a huge issue for or therapy practice. We are two licensed Marriage and Family Therapist who provide psychotherapy sessions (Miriam Bermudez & Susie Icaza). We work with clients who experience issues like PTSD and Anxiety and I can assure you that loud construction next door would have an impact on them and our ability to conduct sessions. For example, I can share with you that when the nursery was being cleared out a few months ago just the dragging of the pots could be heard so loudly inside and scared the client I was seeing at the moment. It was distracting and it didn’t allow us to have a calm, quiet session like we normally do. Please feel free to contact me if you need for information or would like to discuss these issues.

Thank you in advance for your understanding,

Miriam Bermudez, LMFT

2459 Mission St

San Marino, CA 91010

mbermudezlmft@gmail.com

(626) 252-7964
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

RENTER

1. Suzanne Icaza am a property owner of
   (neighbor's name)

2459 Mission St. San Marino and have been shown
   (neighbor's address)

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

2461 Mission St.
   (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 strongly object to the proposed development of 2461 Mission St. as a multi-use building. I operate a
   marriage & family therapy practice at 2459 Mission St. Any development at
   2461 will put me out of business as a result of construction noise, etc. In any case,
   a multi-use structure should not be allowed.

   [Signature]
   Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

   1/2/18
   Date

as it will completely change the nature of development in the area. I would request that

dirt & noise abatement procedures be mandated as well as when construction of any sort begins.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, David Baffour am a property owner of
2460 2481 Mission St. (next door), San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's name) (neighbor's address)
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at

2461 Mission St.
(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: Not to keen on having an apartment next door.

[Signature]
Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature

1/11/18
Date
The Planning Commission cannot legally grant any kind of permission to build the proposed structure at PARCEL NUMBER 5324-027-036 on Mission Street.

There is no such thing as mixed use in the San Marino zoning code, only R-1 and C-1. Planning Commission cannot approve of this because it's not allowed at all, and never has been. If a city wants to approve mixed use, it has to be a special ZONE established and defined in the code. "Residential" does not mean anything, and a fundamental requirement in both California zoning codes and the state building code is a complete structural separation of those zones under specified conditions, which is called "mixed use" and fully defined and regulated for public safety.

So this proposal is completely illegal. You cannot legally treat a "zone" like an "occupancy" as was done previously (now discarded) where an OWNER could OCCUPY a portion of his/her C-1 zoned structure. That was an old-school giveaway that's no longer in use.

San Marino City Code:

No definition of "mixed use"
No specification of construction type
No site criteria
No specification of residential use or limitations (density) No allowable land uses and permit requirements No mention of mixed use in any necessary contingent sections

For example, in South Pasadena's code, the allowed mixed use is defined in the terminology, and stated as allowed in General C-1, along with all the other required citations:

36.350.120 Mixed Use Projects.

A. Applicability. The following provisions apply to commercial projects that integrate retail and/or office uses with residential uses on the same parcel.

B. Density. The maximum allowable density for the residential component of a mixed use project shall be 24 dwelling units per acre.

C. Location of uses. Commercial and residential uses within a mixed-use project shall be fully separated, with residential units limited to the rear portion of the first story, and/or on the second and higher stories.

The other issue that violates fire and life safety in this project is the lack of two separate stair exits from the second floor directly to the outside, as well as the first. That's what "fully separated" in a zoning code means, and it triggers many building code requirements.

Otherwise you have a death trap if there's a fire in the commercial area at night and the building is locked. It's not built correctly without complete fire separation between the ground floor and the upper floor, along with a separate structural platform that blocks fire from burning up through the wall as it will do in the cheaper balloon framing.
And as you know, all structures in the C-1 zone that have more than one level, with a retail use, are required to have an elevator for public access. The ADA exception for that is very specific.

Laurie Barlow
2434 Sherwood Road, San Marino
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Michelle Hickey</td>
<td>J. Michelle Hickey</td>
<td>1655 Euclid Ave San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hickey</td>
<td>David Hickey</td>
<td>1655 E. 11th Ave, SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Newell</td>
<td>Judith A. Newell</td>
<td>16415 Euclid Ave SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Newell</td>
<td>Robert M. Newell</td>
<td>16415 Euclid Ave S.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ro-Yin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1690 S. Euclid Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yim</td>
<td></td>
<td>1690 S. Euclid Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Blaylock</td>
<td>Michael Blaylock</td>
<td>1685 Euclid Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Miera</td>
<td>Paul Miera</td>
<td>1620 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Mar</td>
<td>Harry Mar</td>
<td>1615 Las Flores Ave. S.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is a one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

Name    Signature      Address
---    ------------    ------------
Connie Knott    Dates    1665 S. Euclid Ave
Charlene Seley    Charlene Seley    1675 S. Euclid Ave
ELEANOR W.    Eleanor    1725 S. Euclid Ave
Pamela Smith    Dates    1740 S. Euclid Ave
John Smith    Dates    1740 S. Euclid Ave
Robert Moore    Dates    1705 S. Euclid Ave
William Boye    Dates    1650 S. Euclid Ave
Michael Neugard    Dates    1615 Euclid
Julie McCabe    Dates    1735 S. Euclid Ave
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

Name                Signature               Address
Jeanne Yuter        [Signature]           1635 S. Euclid Ave
Sanny Luk           [Signature]           1700 Las Flores Ave
Glenn Davis         Glenn Davis           1655 Euclid Ave
Patricia Mar        [Signature]           1615 Las Flores Ave
Will Troy            [Signature]           1720 Euclid Ave
Richard Chang       Richard Chang         1720 Las Flores Ave
Myron Cherico       [Signature]           1715 S. Euclid Ave
Carolyn Cherico     [Signature]           1715 S. Euclid Ave
Wesley Fong         [Signature]           1610 S. Euclid Ave.
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is a one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

Name
Andrea Greene Willard

Signature
 Андреа Грин Виллард

Address
 775 Buena Vista

Name
D. Willard

Signature
Д. Виллард

Address
475 Buena Vista St SM

Name
DAVID HART

Signature
Дэвид Харт

Address
495 Buena Vista St SM

Name
CRAIG HART

Signature
Крейг Харт

Address
495 Buena Vista St SM

Name
Claire M Hart

Signature
Клер М. Харт

Address
495 Buena Vista St, SM 91103

Name
Brodie Sadohiro

Signature
Броди Садохиро

Address
455 Buena Vista St, SM 91103

Name
Karen Sadohiro

Signature
Карен Садохиро

Address
455 Buena Vista St, SM 91103
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is a one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we’re worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carla Sue</td>
<td></td>
<td>1685 Los Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS BRADY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1685 Los Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td>1691 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Taboro</td>
<td></td>
<td>1610 Las Flores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it’s right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is a one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that’s what we’re worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Sos</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1685 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mar</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2997 Somerset Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>2946 Somerset Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Mar</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>1615 Los Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Mar</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>2998 Somerset Pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is a one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zillah Tobian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1610 Las Flores Ave, SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td>1635 Las Flores Ave, SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1645 Las Flores Ave, SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Zhang</td>
<td></td>
<td>1665 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Barker, Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1670 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianzhong Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1690 Las Flores Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

The residences in the Mission Area do not need the second story residential building at 2459 & 2481 Mission Street, for the following reasons:

- Incompatible with the neighborhood
- Incompatible mass of a structure
- Incompatible height
- We have privacy issues (it's right next-door to a one story building)
- The house behind it is one story behind the alley
- Those houses are very modest
- It will negatively impact our property value
- Negatively impact the segment of our community on Mission District
- We are setting a precedent if we let them build a two-story and that's what we're worried about in our Mission Area.
- Traffic congestion with 11 parking spots on the plans.

Name       Signature       Address

Lynn Dentler  Lynn Dentler  1605 Las Flores Ave, San Marino
I, (name) ELEANOR WU am a property owner of (address) 1725 S. EUCLID AVENUE, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 2459 & 2481 MISSION STREET.

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: **INCOMPATIBLE HEIGHT, SIZE/MASS, PRIVACY ISSUES, ISSUE WITH PARKING & ACCESS IN ALLEY.**
   **I DON'T WANT THIS "LOFT" TO TURN INTO AN APARTMENT BUILDING WITH A LOT OF TRANSIENTS COMING & GOING. THIS WOULD AFFECT THE SAFETY OF MY YOUNG CHILDREN.**
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  

3/25/2018  

Date
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Zillah Tobiano am a property owner of (address) 1610 Las Flores Ave, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 2459 Mission Street.

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: 
   - Structure is way too big for our neighborhood's quaint leisure aesthetic.
   - We do not want a precedent on two story mix used structure. This poses a threat to unassessed effects on security and traffic congestion.
   - Privacy issues may arise that could cause us to lose our precious residents that have been with us and supporting our neighborhood in multitude of ways.

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

3-28-18 Date
Dear Ms. Eva Choi,
I am writing to support the commercial building project on a empty lot on Mission District, finally someone trying to replace this eyesore of the lot with a beautiful building. I cannot attend this meeting tonight and I hope you would count this email as a YES VOTE for this project.

Sincerely,
Teddy Basseri
1819 El Molino Ave.
San Marino
I, (name) Julie McCabe, am a property owner of (address) 1735 Euclid Avenue, San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 2461 Mission Street, San Marino.

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 height of the structure and the living space (Condominium) above the first floor, the ingress and egress from the parking onto the alley and the danger it proposes for cross traffic and the entrance to my garage directly north of the...?

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 3/25/18
March 27, 2018

Planning Commission
Re: Notice of Public Hearing

I will not be able to attend Public Hearing but would like to submit this Letter of Objection to proposed project:

I am a Marriage and Family Therapist who practices in the building adjacent to the proposed construction plan. I have been here for 7 years. Due to the nature of the work that I do I would not be able to practice with construction noise of that magnitude right next to my office. I provide psychotherapy (talk therapy) and the noise of construction would not allow this to work. Additionally I see patients with PTSD (Post traumatic Stress Disorder) and Anxiety disorders, these types of clients can have very negative responses to loud noises during therapy. As an example some time back the cleaning out of the nursery for the preparation of the land caused one my sessions to be very difficult to hear each other. This was due to just the dragging of pots next door so I can’t imagine what it would be like for the construction of a 2 story building! I don’t know what kind of other options can be negotiated but I want to emphasize that this project would cause a serious impact on my business and the well being of my patients.

Thank you for your consideration and hope that this project is not allowed to move forward without some considerations or remedies in place for the issue of sound.

Miriam Bermudez 626-252-7964
mbermudez@mft@gmail.com
2459 Mission St
San Marino CA 91108
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Patricia Mac am a property owner of (address)
1415 Las Flores Ave., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(address) 2459 Mission Street.

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 w/ my neighborhood
   - Too big of a structure!
   - This is setting a precedent if we allow Kheradmandan to build a two-story
     building w/ residence. We do not want mixed use in our neighborhood
   - Traffic congestion w/ 11 parking spots, per plans
   - Privacy issues. Our houses are very modest and will negatively impact
     our property value!

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

3/27/2018
Date
Hello Ms. Choi,

I may not be able to attend the hearing for the proposed building 2459 & 2491 Mission Street. I am sending support for this intended building as it will only improve the retail strip of Mission Street. I have had a business on this street for over 10 years and can see this as a suitable addition in driving more money into our local economy.

Thank you for your time,
Michelle Round

Heatherbloom
626-403-2144

https://www.instagram.com/heatherbloom/
https://www.facebook.com/ShopHeatherbloom/
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) KAREN CHIU SADAFIRO am a property owner of (address)
455 BUENA VISTA ST, San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
(address) 2461 MISSION ST APN 5329-027-036

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: Introduction of live/work apartment living in Mission District contradicts
with the value and vision of our neighborhood. This project's aggressive nature in scale, parking, traffic plan and balcony encroachment are all
detrimental to our Mission District 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.

[Signature]
Property Owner's Signature

3/24/2018
Date
City of San Marino Design Review Objection Letter

I, Ann Boutin, am the property owner of 2745 Ardmore Road, San Marino, and have reviewed the pertinent documents regarding the project on the vacant lot between 2451 and 2481 Mission Street.

After reviewing said documents, I object to this project because it is not compatible with the neighborhood, it encroaches on the neighboring properties, it changes the character of the neighborhood in an adverse manner. It is my opinion the City should act now to implement code to ensure further requests for mixed use projects are discouraged or denied outright.

Ann Simmons Boutin

Dated: March 25, 2018
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, [Neighbor's Name], am a property owner of
1735 Euclid Avenue, San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
2461 Mission St.

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: This area has always had a parking problem, based on commercial businesses and the employee parking. We as residents have fought this successfully for over 20 years. This project has a problem. San Marino will never approve a residence above a commercial business. The express Egress to and from the alley is not feasible because the alley is too narrow. This project relates to building height of surrounding area is out of

Neighboring Property Owner's Signature: [Signature]
Date: 12/15/17

Conformity: Overall, this will in its current plan not be approved & the residents will fight this until it is resolved.
I, (name) Weilin Ji, am a property owner of (address) 1625 S Euclid Ave., San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) 2461 Mission Street.

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: [Signature]

Date: 3/28/18
I, (name) Connie Knott, am a property owner of (address) 1665 S. Euclid Ave., San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address) Vacant lot located between 2459 and 2481 Mission St.

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: Please see attached.


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

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

Connie Knott
Property Owner's Signature

3/27/18
Date
Connie Knott – Objection attachment

5. I object in particular to the following: This proposed structure would be the only building on the north side of Mission, with a full 2nd story, which would change the quaint quality of the Mission Shopping District. (This full 2nd story is much different than the “bell tower” above the San Marino Café or the attic space/dormer area above Mission Fitness.)

Also, parking for the proposed 2nd floor residential unit along with business parking would be too great a change. The alleyway behind the proposed structure is very narrow. The additional proposed parking spots with its consequential increased traffic in the alleyway could be potentially dangerous at the corner of Euclid and Mission. Because the corner of Las Flores and Mission is hard to cross, many Las Flores and Buena Vista residents choose to drive down Euclid to use the four-way Stop at Euclid and Mission. (Euclid is not as quiet as it appears.) Additional parking in this alleyway would further increase traffic at the corner of Euclid and Mission – and frankly it is a bit hard to see traffic coming down Euclid with its slight curve in the road.

Another concern is that allowing this first 2nd story structure on the north side of Mission would set a harmful precedent. If additional 2nd story units are approved going forward, residential or business, traffic and congestion will increase on Mission significantly. Parking and traffic along Mission has been an ongoing problem. (The street outside of Julienne’s is currently hazardous with constant jaywalkers.)

A final concern is that by allowing condo/apartment housing in our community, property values could be affected. (If residential units were tied to a store, and not separate units altogether, it may help remedy possible decreased property values - somewhat.)

San Marino is unique in that we do not have apartments. Not only do I believe this helps us to prove that we are a “family focused” community, I also believe it helps us to maintain our city as such. We focus on our schools, family/community activities, and safety. If we begin to allow condos/apartments along all of our main streets, does it stop there? Or will we slowly chip away at our quiet, safe, and family oriented community?
Dear Ms. Eva Choi:
I am a San Marino resident since 1997. I am writing to support the above referenced project. I note that under the prior ownership, that property had been neglected for years and was an eyesore in great need of attention. I was always surprised that the city allowed the deterioration, piling of debris and overgrown bushes and plants on this lot, in our well-manicured City of San Marino. The new owner has promptly cleaned up the lot and already improved the area, showing pride of ownership. The proposed development is a welcome addition that will enhance the Mission district commercial area and improve the neighborhood making it more desirable for both residents and other nearby commerce. I am not able to attend the meeting tomorrow but wanted to express my support to this project via this email.
Sincerely,
Frederique Merhaut
1753 Oak Grove Avenue
San Marino CA 91108
TO: CHAIR BRODY AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR

BY: CHRISTINE SONG ASSISTANT PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 28, 2018

SUBJECT: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NOS. CUP17-33, CUP17-37 AND DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC17-110, DRC17-111, & DRC17-112 2395 ADAIR ST., (WONG/TAM STUDIO ARCHITECTS)

PROPOSAL:

The applicant requests permission to construct an addition and remodel of an existing single-story residence, a new detached three-car garage, and a street-facing side yard pedestrian gate. The addition will exceed the maximum lot coverage and livable area allowance. The accessory structure exceeds six hundred square feet in total lot coverage and is visible from public view. This requires two conditional use permits and three design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.02.20(B), 23.15.03(A)(1), 23.15.03(C) and 23.15.03(F).

REQUIRED ACTIONS:


BACKGROUND:

General Plan: Low Density Residential (4-6 dwelling unit per acre of land area)
Zoning: R-1, Area District V
Location: The subject property is located on the north side of Adair Street, west of Kenilworth Avenue.
Lot Size: 16,617 square feet
Existing Use: Single-story residence with an attached three-car garage
Surrounding Uses: The site is bordered in all directions by single family homes in Area Districts V and VI.

Proposed Square-Footage: Total Livable Area: 3,892 square feet/ 5 Bedrooms
Total Lot Coverage: 4,609 square feet

Parking Required/Proposed: Three-car garage / Three-car garage

Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) – Existing Structures.

ANALYSIS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROVIDED/PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Existing: 17’-2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: 15’-3” (addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Existing: 42’-0” (no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>Existing: 5’-0” and 8’-4” (west)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: 8’-4” (west)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing: 15’-0” (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: 15’-0” (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Existing: 70’-9”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: 67’-3”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Style</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional (Existing)</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – Exceeding Maximum Livable Area and Lot Coverage

The subject property is a corner lot currently improved with a one-story 2,774 square foot Minimal Traditional style house and an attached 612 square foot three-car garage. The applicant is requesting to remodel the existing house and construct a 1,118 square foot one-story addition with a new detached 713 square foot three-car garage. This will result in a total lot coverage of 4,609 square feet, which exceeds the maximum allowed lot coverage by 953 square feet. The project would also exceed the maximum livable area by 236 square feet. Since the property is a corner parcel, the maximum allowed livable area and lot coverage are reduced by 10%. A neighborhood survey created by staff indicates that this would not be the only property exceeding its maximum lot coverage and livable area within a 300-foot radius of the project site, if the project is approved. In fact, this would not be the largest house in the area, even though it is the second largest lot in the neighborhood. The average home is 2,847 square feet and the largest home is 4,217 square feet. Additionally, several other corner lots within a 300-foot radius exceed their maximum allowed livable area and/or lot coverage by greater amounts.

In examining a conditional use permit, the Planning Commission must make sure that all of the following legal findings can be met:
That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the area of such proposed use nor be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

Several properties in the neighborhood exceed their maximum lot coverage and livable area allowances and Staff observed that a majority of them are corner properties. In fact, most of the corner properties that currently exceed their maximum buildable allowances are smaller in size than the subject property. Since this development pattern already exists in the area, the project would not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, or general welfare of the community or the City.

That the site for the proposed conditional use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls and fences, parking and loading, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Chapter or required by the Commission in order to integrate said conditional use with the land and uses in the neighborhood.

The project site is larger than the average lot in the neighborhood and is sufficient in size to accommodate the proposed addition, providing more than the minimum setback requirement for both the house and the new garage.

That the proposed conditional use will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition and development of nearby uses and buildings.

As a corner lot, the property owner is allowed 10% less building square footage than an interior lot, which sometimes tends to reduce the owner’s ability to achieve the fullest utilization of a property. Several other corner properties within a 300-foot radius also exceed their maximum livable area and lot coverage allowances. Staff finds that the request to exceed the maximum lot coverage and livable area will not have a detrimental effect on nearby properties since they are already improved in a similar arrangement and the current proposal will maintain compatibility with the neighborhood.

That the site for the proposed conditional use will relate to streets and highways adequate in width and pavement to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.

The proposed addition would not generate any additional traffic than what is typical for the existing residential use. It will not affect the amount of traffic along Adair Street or Kenilworth Avenue.

Staff is able to make all the required findings for the conditional use permits.

**DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS - One-Story Addition, New Three-Car Garage, and New Gate**

That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

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

Comments: The legal neighborhood is comprised of one-story and two-story structures in French and Minimal Traditional styles. Staff finds that the proposed addition and remodel of the overall structure will be compatible with the immediate neighborhood in terms of architectural style, mass, and scale. By relocating the front entry to face Adair Street, this improves streetscape compatibility and creates a more
attractive front elevation. However, Staff would recommend reducing the brick application to a half-wall wainscot, as there are no other homes in the legal neighborhood that exhibit similarly installed brick detailing. The ‘neighborhood reference’ image that the applicant has provided is a photo of a home that is not within the legal neighborhood.

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 project balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of adjacent properties and would not result in any major visibility issues.

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 remodel and proposed addition maintains many existing architectural features and preserves the overall style of the existing structure. The project introduces a relocated and updated front entry, bordered by brick detailing. Staff finds that this adds visual interest to the building and serves as an appropriate focal point of the front elevation. Additionally, the north (rear) elevation has been improved with an addition that creates a balanced roofline with two proportional gables.

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 selections for the project. However, the proposed application of the brick material is rather excessive and arbitrarily placed. Staff finds that a half wainscot of the brick along the east, west, and north elevation would be more suitable than the proposed installation which covers entire walls.

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 solid metal material of the proposed pedestrian gate along Kenilworth Avenue is too contemporary and is not architecturally compatible with the existing Minimal Traditional style home. A wood gate to match the existing wood driveway gate may be a more proper alternative.

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 the houses along Adair Street, between Ridgeway Road and Kenilworth Avenue as well as houses along Kenilworth Avenue between Melville Drive and Adair Street. There are several properties on the subject block that exhibit side yard gates of similar location and height. Staff is able to make the finding that the size and location of the proposed gate would be compatible with the neighborhood.

*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 pedestrian gate provides a setback of nine feet from the property line and would not create any issues for pedestrian or oncoming vehicular traffic.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit CUP17-33, CUP17-37 and Design Review Case Nos. DRC17-110, DRC17-111, DRC17-112, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The brick application shall be reduced to a wainscot along the walls of the house and the garage, on all elevations.
2. The proposed pedestrian gate along Kenilworth Avenue shall be constructed of natural wood material.
3. Prior to the issuance of Building permits, the applicant shall provide a valuation to replace the existing house and garage, demonstrating that the project will not exceed 50% of its replacement value. This shall be subject to approval by the City Plan Checker. If the project exceeds the 50% threshold, all existing legal nonconformities on the property will need to be corrected.

Attachments: Application
Location/Radius Map
Neighborhood Survey
Neighbor Letter
# 300-foot Radius Study

* - exceeds maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
<th>Livable Area</th>
<th>Maximum Allowance</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>AREA DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2355 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>12051</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2385 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11100</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2365 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>10315</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11027</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11110</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3476</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11622</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11830</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>12107</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2370 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>12690</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2380 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>3626</td>
<td>12261</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2394 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>15342</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2460 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>8828</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2424 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>12063</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>3038</td>
<td>10384</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>4170</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>23714</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2455 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9521</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9293</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2465 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2345 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11716</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395 MELVILLE DR</td>
<td>4217</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>14116</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2365 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>3639</td>
<td>12399</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2385 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>3671</td>
<td>12718</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>12722</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>10864</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2370 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>11611</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>3336</td>
<td>13072</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>10795</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>3079</td>
<td>10793</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2464 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>10586</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2478 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>3106</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>10183</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2424 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>12664</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2434 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9808</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2445 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9531</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2455 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>9309</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2465 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>2305</td>
<td>3008</td>
<td>10083</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340 ADAIR ST</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>10820</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>2176</td>
<td>3787</td>
<td>13875</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2423 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>8526</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>3208</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>10213</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE:** 2847.65 11538.925
Calculation of Planning and Design Review Fees

For up to three conditional use permit, variance and/or design review applications for a single project to be processed concurrently, the fee collected shall be the fee required for the single highest application. For more than three such applications, the fee collected shall be the cost as provided, plus the cost for each additional individual application.

Please complete the following:

1. Date: 12/15/17

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2395 ADAIR ST.

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   TRACT # 8700, LOT 124
   (legal description may be attached separately if necessary)

4. State in your own words:

   a. The use (or improvement) you intend to make to the above described property:
      THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE MAIN RESIDENCE TO CREATE AN ACCESSIBLE BED/BATH AREA, AN ENLARGED KITCHEN AND A NEW DINING AREA WHICH WILL TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE REAR YARD VIEW.

   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      ZONING CODE 23.02.20 (A) - REQUEST FOR LOT COVERAGE DEVIATION

5. I (we) certify or declare under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct*. I (we) also understand that in submitting this application that I (we) am (are) to expect City officials to conduct exterior inspections of my (our) property.

Signatures of all owners of record of the property herein described: [Signature]

Mailing Address: 1495 RUBIO DRIVE, SAN MARINO CA 91108

Owner's Phone Number (Home): (626) 390-7359

Owner's Phone Number (Work): (____) 

Agent's Name and Address: TAMSTUDIO ARCHITECTS
   ANTHONY TAM 107 S. FAIR OAKS AVE. STE 213
   PASADENA CA 91107

Agent's Phone Number: (626) 398-7302, ANTHONY@TAMSTUDIO.COM

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, Jon Kmett, am a property owner of
(neighbor's name)
2394 Melville Dr., San Marino and have been shown
(neighbor's address)
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
2395 Adair St.
(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 object to the location of the new
proposed 3-car garage. I fear such a large
structure built so close to my property line
will visually impact my yard, potentially causing
a decrease in value of my home.
I have no objections to the proposed changes
to the house structure.

[Signature]
Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature

2/12/18
Date
TO: San Marino Planning Commission
SUBJECT: 2395 Adair Street – Hearing

Dear Commissioners,

Please be sure due diligence is thorough on the remodel request for the above property.

By way of background, 2395 Adair St. was formerly a single-family residence. However, on or about 9 years ago the property was converted to a business property and neighbors were not properly notified of the change. After many discussions and correspondence, the property was approved by the city to be a business. The property owners leased the property to Climb Industries (sp?) – the business was providing services in house for severely disabled men. Reportedly, the lease was for approximately 8 years at approximately $8,000 per month. The city expended approximately $60,000-70,000 to install sprinklers and the owners were required to add a garage and make other business changes in the property.

The State of California also participated in the transaction wherein Climb Industries became the manager of the leased property.

Please be certain the property is properly coded. Also, if the property is going to continue to be owned as a business, all citizens in the city should be properly notified.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Signed,
Concerned Neighbors
**PROJECT ADDRESS:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2395 ADAIR ST (Existing)</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>3892</td>
<td>3656</td>
<td>16617</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: CHAIR BRODY AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDO CERVANTES
PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR

DATE: MARCH 28, 2018

SUBJECT: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP17-32
2549 HUNTINGTON DRIVE STE 101, (YANG)

PROPOSAL:

This is an application to operate a dental practice within an existing commercial space. This requires a conditional use permit (CUP) pursuant to Sections 23.03.01(C).

BACKGROUND:

This proposal is to occupy the vacant unit within a three tenant building with a dental practice. The subject property is located on the north side of Huntington Drive, west of Winston Avenue. It is a multi-tenant, one-story commercial building with 6,318 square feet of floor area. It is located on a 14,827 square foot lot and has 23 parking spaces in the rear. The dental use will require seven (7) parking spaces. Twelve (12) spaces are required for the remaining businesses. Pursuant to Code, the required parking for the building will be 19 parking spaces.

The applicant would like the operating hours of 10:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays with additional hours on Fridays and Saturdays from 10:00am – 7:00pm. The applicant is also anticipating a maximum of seven (7) full-time employees which include dentists and office personnel.

ANALYSIS:

Conditional Use Permit – Request to operate a dental use

- That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the area of such proposed use nor be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City. The residential properties that share an alley with the subject property should experience no detrimental effects from the change since the rear lot has adequate parking for clients and employees. The potential
for spillover parking into residential areas will be minimal or nonexistent. It is unlikely for customers to park in residential areas because of the closer parking opportunities on and off-site.

- *That the site for the proposed conditional use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls and fences, parking and loading, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Chapter or required by the Commission in order to integrate said conditional use with the land and uses in the neighborhood.* There are 23 spaces behind the building and on-street parking spaces directly in front of the proposed new use and building. The Code requires only 19 parking spaces. In addition to the parking, the site is sufficient in size and shape to accommodate other development features necessary for a dental use.

- *That proposed conditional use will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition and development of nearby uses and buildings.* The proposed use will not have a detrimental effect upon nearby uses and buildings. Regarding parking, the available on and off-street parking would be more than sufficient to accommodate the additional customers and employees of the dental practice. As stated above, there are 23 parking spaces on site and the Code only requires 19 spaces.

- *That the site for the proposed conditional use will relate to streets and highways adequate in width and pavement to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.* The surrounding streets are physically adequate to support the traffic generated by the proposed use. The change in use should not create a greater amount of traffic especially due to the fact that there is ample parking on and off the street.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. CUP17-32 as submitted.

Attachments: Application
Location/Radius Map
Calculation of Planning and Design Review Fees

For up to three conditional use permit, variance and/or design review applications for a single project to be processed concurrently, the fee collected shall be the fee required for the single highest application. For more than three such applications, the fee collected shall be the cost as provided, plus the cost for each additional individual application.

Please complete the following:

1. Date: 11/15/17

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2549 Huntington Drive #101

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   (legal description may be attached separately if necessary)

4. State in your own words:
   a. The use (or improvement) you intend to make to the above described property:
      Remodeling/Construction for Dental Practice
   
   
   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      Property change of zone/use for medical/dental practice

5. I (we) certify or declare under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct*.
I (we) also understand that in submitting this application that I (we) am (are) to expect City officials to conduct exterior inspections of my (our) property.

Signatures of all owners of record of the property herein described: Wai-Ling Lew Living Trust

Mailing Address: 407 West Valley Blvd. Unit 4, Alhambra, CA 91803

Owner's Phone Number (Home): (626) 458-9000

Owner's Phone Number (Work): (___)

Agent's Name and Address: GE Properties
   407 West Valley Blvd. Unit 4, Alhambra, CA 91803

Agent's Phone Number: (626) 458-9000

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
Business Plan of Elysian Dental

David C. Yang, DDS MS

Elysian Dental
2549 Huntington Drive #101
San Marino, CA 91108
Tel: 626.689.0159
General Company Description

Elysian dental is a small, privately owned, dental practice that focuses on providing high quality dental care and education to the community of San Marino. We provide dental services in the areas of invisalign, cosmetic and general dentistry.

Mission Statement: Our mission is to provide quality care and education to improve the dental and oral health of community members in the City of San Marino.

Company Goals and Objectives: Our goal is to build a long lasting relationship with our patients through trust and quality care.

Business Philosophy: Our business follows the ethical principle of Beneficence (looking out for best possible interest and well-being of our patients) and Autonomy (giving our patients the best possible options and allowing them to make the best decisions for themselves.

Products and Services
- Adult & child prophylaxis ("cleanings")
- Scaling & root planing
- Composite resin restorations ("fillings")
- Extractions
- Root Canal Therapy
- Endodontic retreatment
- Post & core build up
- Cast post & core
- Nitrous oxide sedation
- Sealants
- Desensitizing agents
- Teeth whitening
- Invisalign braces
- Veneers/laminates
- Ceramic crowns
- Implant crowns
- Removable partial dentures
- Complete dentures
- Overdentures
Marketing Plan

Economics
- Potential percent share of the market:
  - 15 dental practices in the City of San Marino listed on internet search (google, yellowpages, yelp)
  - 11 general dental practices
  - 4 specialty practices (2 oral surgery, orthodontic, endodontist)
  - In 2016 Census, the residential population in city of San Marino was approximately 13,365 people. As the 12th general dental practice in San Marino, this will give us an approximate and ratio of one dental practice to every 1,113 residents of San Marino.
    - 3.9% under age of 5
    - 26% under age of 18
    - 56.4% between ages of 18 and 65.
    - 17.9% over age of 65
    - 52% female
    - 94.5% high school graduate or higher, in population 25yrs or older.
    - 71.1% bachelor's degree or higher, in population 25yrs or older.

- Current demand in target market.
  - Target population between the ages of 18-65 (56.4% population), seek the "perfect smile." Our practice emphasizes quality dental care, Invisalign therapy, and cosmetic dentistry to attain this ideal smile that our patients seek.

Patients/Customers:
- With a highly educated population, such as residents of San Marino (94.5% high school graduate or higher, 71.1% bachelor's degree or higher), patients have been noted to be better informed and take better care of dental and oral health. Therefore, the demand for implant dentistry to correct premature loss of dentition due to neglect is much lower than most other regions of the United States. Should the need for implant dentistry be necessary by our target population, referrals will be made to a trusted oral surgeon for implant placement. Our office is fully equipped to restore implant crowns.

Competition:
- Dental Practices in the City of San Marino -
  1. 825 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
     - Larry L Goodreau, DDS
     - Krikor Simonian, DDS
     - Fary Yassamy, DDS
  
  2. 835 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
     - Robert Stanley, McNamara, DDS (oral surgeon)
  
  3. 1311 Vandyke Rd, San Marino, CA 91108
     - Christine Do, DDS
  
  4. 1344 Granada Ave, San Marino, CA 91108
5. 1477 San Marino Ave Ste 1, San Marino CA 91108
   • Don H Anderson, DDS
   • Roger Anderson, DDS

6. 1477 San Marino Ave Ste 2, San Marino CA 91108
   • David Sun, DDS
   • Yi Jian Yang
   • Linus Chong, DDS (periodontist)

7. 1477 San Marino Ave Ste 3, San Marino CA 91108
   • Jack Hamilton, DDS
   • Ronald P Estrada, DDS
   • Kathleen Conley
   • Peter Lam (oral surgeon)

8. 2002 S. Oak Knoll Ave, San Marino, CA 91108
   • Adishin, DDS

9. 2315 Brentford Rd, San Marino, CA 91108
   • Richard Fuentes, DDS

10. 2326 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
    • B Barsoum, DDS

11. 2384 Huntington Dr, San Marino 91108
    • Cuccia Brandon, DDS
    • Brian C Cogbill, DDS

12. 2437 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
    • Kenneth R Stroud, DDS

13. 2453 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
    • Peter Lam (oral surgeon)

14. 2595 Huntington Dr, San Marino, CA 91108
    • Tina M Siu, DDS (orthodontist)

15. 2920 Huntington Dr Ste 328, San Marino, CA 91108
    • Tin-Hoang Nguyen, DDS
    • Cynthia Diep, DDS
Operational Plan

Location
- 2549 Huntington Drive #101, San Marino, CA 91108. The location is on large primary roads, close to San Marino high school, and surrounded by residential area.

Physical requirements:
- Office space is 1843 sq. feet - allowing for 5 operatories, sterilization room, laboratory, mechanical room, consultation room, doctor's office, staff lounge, and handicap-accessible restroom. (Office layout included in the Appendix section)
- The building has 3 units - One west bank, Davita, and Elysian Dental.
- Parking is located in the rear of the building with twenty-one parking spaces. Eight parking spaces are designated for Elysian dental use.
- Power, plumbing and other utilities

Access: Located between major cross roads, Huntington Drive and Del Mar Boulevard, allow patients to quickly and easily locate the office. There are 21 parking spaces in the rear (8 reserved for Elysian dental) and 6 unreserved public parking spaces in the front of the dental practice.

Construction: Estimated construction cost approximately $100-150/sq. feet. Construction duration approximately 3-4 months.

Cost: Estimate your occupation expenses, including rent, but also including maintenance, utilities, insurance, and initial remodeling costs to make the space suit your needs. These numbers will become part of your financial plan.

Hours of Operation:
- Mondays & Wednesdays: 10:00am - 7:00pm.
- Tentatively starting 2019, additional hours Fridays and Saturdays: 10:00am - 7:00pm.

Personnel:
- Number of employees: one dentist (owner), two registered dental assistants, one office manager. Tentatively starting 2019, additional associate dentist, assistant, and front desk staff.
- Staff and assistants are selected, hired, and trained by office manager. Job descriptions are listed in hiring form and job advertisement listing (on indeed.com, monster.com, and ziprecruiter.com). Wages and hours are in accordance with the state Employment Development Department guidelines as provided by the [http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/](http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/).

Equipment and Supplies:
- Large equipment will be purchased from either Pearson Dental or Patterson Dental supply. Items selected with assistance from representatives Vahan Ambartsumyan (Pearson) and Thai Johns (Patterson).
- Prices have been quoted for:
  - Dental chair, delivery system, and lighting:
    - Pearson - Belmont brand approx. $13,500 (discounts included)
    - Patterson - Pelton & Crane brand approx. $12,600 (discounts included)
- Air compressor:
  - Airstar AS30 approx. $5500
- Vacuum:
  - VacStar 50H approx. $4500
  - Mojave V5 approx. $8700
- Other potential suppliers/vendors: Henry Schein, Star Dental, Darby Dental.

**Patient Payment Collection Policies:**
- We are a fee-for-service practice, but we also accept PPO and HMO dental plans.
- For fee-for-service patients, we accept all major credit cards and offer financing options from Care Credit and the Lending tree.
- Discounts and charitable/donated treatment will be on a patient to patient basis and will be determined by both the doctor and office manager.

**Startup Expenses and Capitalization:**
- Pending approval for startup dental practice loan from Bank of America (via David Kearns & Blake Vargo) for approximately $500,000 and Small Business (SBA) loan from JP Morgan Chase (via Vicky Lee) for approximately $300,000. Final decision on lender will be determined based on annual percentage of interest rates.
- In addition to bank loans, the owner/primary dentist will also be contributing to the capitalization of the dental practice with the income generated from working as an independent contractor. The bank loans will be primarily for the construction and remodeling of the dental office and large equipment purchases. Office lease/rent, office expenses, employee salary, market research and advertising will be paid with capital contributions made by the owner.
- Construction cost is approximated at $250,000. Large equipment purchases is approximated at $80,000. The remaining $170,000 unused bank loan will be on reserve as contingencies.

**Management and Organization**
- In the event that the owner/primary dentist should become incapacitated, the continuation of the business will hence forth be led by the office manager, Griselda Montes, and assigned associate dentist, Michael Yang DDS.

**Professional and Advisory Support**
- **Attorney:** Joshua Driskell, JD
- **Accountant:** Cuong Le, CPA
- **Insurance agent:** Mark Spring (Treloar & Heisel)
- **Banker:** Blake Vargo (Bank of America), David Kearns (Bank of America), Vicky Lee (J.P. Morgan Chase).
- **Consultant:** Vahan AmbFO(UMNY), Thai Johns (Patterson Dental Supplies)
- **Mentors and key advisors:** Robert S. Gureasko, DDS MPH (Professor of Endodontics, NYU), John Rathbauer, DDS (Professor of General Dentistry, NYU).
RESOLUTION NO. PCR18-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING THEIR DECISION TO APPROVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NUMBER DRC17-08, A REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1400 CIRCLE DRIVE.

THE SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION DOES HEREBY FIND, ORDER, AND RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. An appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve DRC17-08 was submitted to the City Clerk on March 6, 2018. The property owner proposes to demolish an existing single-family residence and attached garage and construct a new single-family residence and an attached four-car garage on property located at 1400 Circle Drive. This requires one design review action pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.03B.

SECTION 2. A legally noticed public hearing was conducted on February 28, 2018. Both oral and written testimony was presented to the Planning Commission.

SECTION 3. The following facts were presented to the Planning Commission:

A. The subject property is located on the north side of Circle Drive between Rosalind Road and the Circle Drive bridge. The adjacent land uses include single family homes in R-1, Area Districts 1.

B. The property contains 29,257 square feet of land and is improved with a 6,806 square-foot two-story residence with an attached three-car garage. The proposed project was found to satisfy all zoning requirements in the San Marino City Code.

C. The applicant proposes a new 6,531 square-foot two-story house with an attached four-car garage.

D. The proposed architectural style is “Italianate.” This is characterized as having the two-story volume, smooth stucco finish, balconies with balustrades, quoins along the edges of the structure, exterior molding around the windows and doors and a two-piece mission clay roof.

E. A historic assessment was provided to the Planning Commission by Tim Gregory. The property was evaluated using the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources and the City of San Marino criteria. Page 11 of the Historic Assessment finds that Robert Finkelhor is not a notable architect. According to the report, Robert Finkelhor “remains almost completely undocumented in architectural research sources and index.”
“Finkelhor did not have a significant style that would make his houses easily identifiable visually, unlike those by such top-tier architects as Wallace Neff and Paul Williams whose works are recognizably consistent quality. In addition, “It should be mentioned that Finkelhor concentrated his work in the west side of Los Angeles Basin and had little impact on the local scene, with 1400 Circle Drive being his only design documented in San Marino thus far.”

SECTION 4. Pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.08, The Planning Commission shall approve the application if it finds all of the following to be true:

A. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood, and

B. 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,

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

D. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.

SECTION 5. In regards to the design review action, the Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:

A. The proposed house is presented as an Italianate architectural style. Since previous hearings, the architect has made significant modifications to the home. The front entry way, which was once grand, has been reduced in size and mass, the front door has been reduced from a double door to a single door and the quoins that once lined the edges of the structure have been removed. These changes help simply the design of the house in a manner consistent and compatible with the homes in the neighborhood, especially the existing Italianate designed homes. The home includes red tile roofing, a smooth stucco finish, balconies, and arches. These elements are described to be appropriate for this style of home within the Residential Design Guidelines.

B. The neighborhood consists of a variety of different architectural styles. In fact, the neighborhood includes several Italianate designs. A combination of the subtle changes made to the design to help reduce visual mass, simplifying the design to be more consistent and compatible with the neighboring homes, and designing the home to be consistent in height, mass and scale with the neighborhood all lend to the home meeting the required findings described in Section 4.
SECTION 6. Based upon the aforementioned findings in Section 5, the Planning Commission hereby approves DRC17-08.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on this 28th day of March, 2018.

________________________
RAYMOND CHENG, VICE-CHAIR

ATTEST:

________________________
ALDO CERVANTES
SECRETARY
RESOLUTION NO. PCR18-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBERS CUP17-23, CUP17-34 AND DESIGN REVIEW CASE NUMBER DRC17-104, A REQUEST TO ADD A BATHROOM AND STORAGE AREA TO AN EXISTING DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE (FOUR-CAR GARAGE) AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1230 WINSTON AVENUE, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS TRACT NO. 7758, LOTS 74 AND 75, CITY OF SAN MARINO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

THE SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION DOES HEREBY FIND, ORDER, AND RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. On August 21, 2017, an application for a Conditional Use Permit and a Design Review action was submitted to the City of San Marino by Frank R. Marrone. The applicant requests to construct a 124-square foot bathroom and storage area addition at the rear of an existing four-car garage on the property located at 1230 Winston Avenue. This requires two conditional use permits and one design review action in accordance with Sections 23.06.05(H)(2), 23.06.05(I), and 23.15.03(C) of the San Marino City Code.

Section 2. The Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the application on February 28, 2018.

Section 3. The Planning Commission received and considered both oral and written testimony during the public hearing and considered all the evidence in the record of the City’s proceedings on the application as well as the evidence received and presented at the hearings. The following facts were presented to the Planning Commission:

A. The property is zoned R-1 Single-Family Residential, Area District V. The property is located on the east side of Winston Avenue, north of Huntington Drive. The site is bordered on all sides by properties zoned R-1, Area District V that are improved with single-family homes, with San Marino High School to the east.

B. The property contains 24,846 square feet of land and is improved with a two-story residence and a detached four-car garage constructed in 1941.

C. The applicant submitted an application for Conditional Use Permits CUP17-23, CUP17-34 and Design Review Case No. DRC17-104 on August 21, 2017. The application was deemed complete on January 31, 2018.

D. The proposed 124 square foot bathroom and storage addition to an existing detached accessory structure provides the required side and rear yard setbacks.
**Section 4.** The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the application for Conditional Use Permit Case Nos. CUP 17-23 and CUP17-34:

A. Pursuant to San Marino City Code Sections 23.06.05(H)(2) and 23.06.05I, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed accessory structure will not have a detrimental effect on the general welfare of the City. The proposed addition to the existing accessory structure should fully comply with development standards consistent with requirements imposed on other development projects.

B. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate development features typically associated with an accessory structure with a bathroom and storage area. The project provides side and rear yard setbacks that meet and exceed the minimum code requirement.

C. The request to modify the orientation of the new accessory structure will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition, and development of nearby uses.

D. The proposed accessory structure will not generate any additional traffic than what is typical for a residential use.

**Section 5.** The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the application for Design Review Case No. DRC17-104:

A. Pursuant to San Marino City Code 23.15.03(C), the Planning Commission finds that the proposed bathroom and storage addition is compatible with the neighborhood as there are several other properties with similarly sized accessory structures containing bathrooms and/or storage areas.

B. The proposed project would not impact the privacy of neighboring properties as it maintains and exceeds the minimum required setbacks from the property lines.

C. The proposed project is compatible with both the existing house and the existing garage. The addition will match the existing garage and complement the current architectural style.

D. The color and style of the proposed addition is compatible with the existing Colonial style house.

E. The proposed project is found to be exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1), because the project is a small addition to an existing structure.
Section 6. Based upon the foregoing findings in Sections 4 and 5, the Planning Commission hereby approves Conditional Use Permit Nos. CUP17-23, CUP17-34 and Design Review Case No. DRC17-104.

Section 7. Pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6, any legal challenge to the decision of the Planning Commission, after a formal appeal to the City Council, must be made within 90 days after the final decision by the City Council.

VOTE: AYES: NOES: ABSTAIN: ABSENT:

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing Resolution No. PCR18-01 is a true and complete record of the action taken by the Planning Commission of the City of San Marino, California at its regular meeting of February 28, 2018.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED on this 28th day of March, 2018.

_________________________ 
HOWARD BRODY, 
Chairman, San Marino Planning Commission

ATTEST:

_________________________ 
ALDO CERVANTES, 
Secretary, San Marino Planning Commission
RESOLUTION NO. PCR18-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBER CUP17-18 AND DESIGN REVIEW CASE NUMBER DRC17-57, A REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE WITH A BASEMENT AND A DETACHED TWO-CAR GARAGE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE WITH A STORAGE AREA, A BATHROOM AND A CABANA AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1942 WELLESLEY ROAD, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS TRACT NO. 12918, LOT 20, CITY OF SAN MARINO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

THE SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION DOES HEREBY FIND, ORDER, AND RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. On July 3, 2017, an application for Conditional Use Permit and Design Review action was submitted to the City of San Marino by Herrick and Angell Chu. The applicants request to construct a new two-story residence with a basement and a detached two-car garage accessory structure exceeds six hundred square feet in total lot coverage and contains a storage area, a bathroom, and a cabana. This requires two conditional use permits and two design review action in accordance with Sections 23.06.05(I) and 23.15.03(B) of the San Marino City Code.


Section 3. The Planning Commission received and considered both oral and written testimony during the public hearings and considered all the evidence in the record of the City’s proceedings on the application as well as the evidence received and presented at the hearings. The following facts were presented to the Planning Commission:

A. The property is zoned R-1 Single-Family Residential, Area District VII. The property is located on the east side of Wellesley Road, between Sheffield Road and Somerset Place. The site is bordered on all sides by properties zoned R-1, Area District VII that are improved with single-family homes.

B. The applicant requested to demolish an existing 2,043 square feet single-story residence and the detached two-car garage constructed in 1942, and construct the proposed project involving a two-story with basement residence and a detached accessory structure.

C. The applicant submitted an application for Conditional Use Permits CUP17-17, CUP17-18 and Design Review Case Nos. DRC17-57, and DRC17-58 on July 3, 2017. The application was deemed complete on October 10, 2017.
D. The applicant reduced the size of the detached garage structure to less than six hundred square feet after the November 21, 2017 hearing. The project no longer requires Conditional Use Permit CUP17-17 and Design Review Case No. DRC17-58.

E. At the February 28, 2018 hearing, the architect presented a two-story with basement Colonial Revival design encompassing 2,655 square feet of livable area, and a detached accessory structure containing a two-car garage with a storage area and a 50 square feet bathroom. The residence and the detached accessory structure provide the required side and rear yard setbacks.

**Section 4.** The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the application for Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP17-18:

A. Pursuant to San Marino City Code Section 23.06.05(I), the Planning Commission finds that the proposed size and location of the accessory structure will not have a detrimental effect on the general welfare of the City. Two-car garages with storage area are commonly found in the neighborhood and the provision of a fifty square feet three-quarter bathroom will not affect the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort or general welfare of neighboring properties as this feature will not intensify the occupancy on the property. The project complies with development standards consistent with requirements imposed on other development projects.

B. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate development features typically associated with an accessory structure with a bathroom and storage area. The project provides additional recreational amenities, site walls, and landscaping similar to adjacent properties. The project provides side and rear yard setbacks that meet and exceed the minimum code requirement.

C. The location and function of the three-quarter bathroom within the detached accessory structure will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition, and development of nearby uses.

D. The proposed accessory structure will not generate any additional traffic that are not typically associated with a residential use.

**Section 5.** The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the application for Design Review Case No. DRC17-57:

A. Pursuant to San Marino City Code 23.15.03(B), the Planning Commission finds that the proposed residence and detached accessory structure are compatible with the neighborhood in terms of design, size, massing, and front entry treatment. The structures are compatible with itself with a balanced and proportional front gable, the bay window and dormers are appropriate in size. The shed dormer on the rear elevation is well integrated with the roof design.
B. The proposed project would not impact the privacy of neighboring properties as smaller windows are located on the second floor to limit a direct sightline into adjacent properties. The project exceeds the minimum required setbacks from the property lines.

C. The exterior colors and materials are consistently applied throughout the project. The exterior materials and finishes are similar to those found on neighboring structures.

D. The proposed project is found to be exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a), because the project is a new single-family residence in an urbanized area with available utility services.

Section 6. Based upon the foregoing findings in Sections 4 and 5, the Planning Commission hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. CUP17-18 and Design Review Case No. DRC17-57 subject to the following condition:

1. Exterior lighting fixtures shall be down cast.

Section 7. Pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6, any legal challenge to the decision of the Planning Commission, after a formal appeal to the City Council, must be made within 90 days after the final decision by the City Council.

VOTE: AYES: CHAIR BRODY, VICE-CHAIR CHENG, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER OKAZAKI
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER WRIGHT
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER VELAYOS, COMMISSIONER HSU

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing Resolution No. PCR18-03 is a true and complete record of the action taken by the Planning Commission of the City of San Marino, California at its regular meeting of February 28, 2018.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED on this 28th day of March, 2018.

_________________________ 
HOWARD BRODY,
Chairman, San Marino Planning Commission

ATTEST: 
ALDO CERVANTES,
Secretary, San Marino Planning Commission