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, Vice-Chair Raymond Cheng, and 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. **ZONE CHANGE NO. ZC17-01**
   375 HUNTINGTON DRIVE, (HUNTINGTON LP)
   The applicant requests to change the zoning designation of the subject property from R-1, Area District VII to C-1 Commercial to achieve consistency with the General Plan Land Use designation of the property.

OTHER MATTERS

2. **REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP16-30**
   1151 OXFORD ROAD

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, May 23, 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.
PROPOSAL:

The applicant requests to change the zoning designation of the subject property from R-1, Area District VII to C-1 Commercial to achieve consistency with the General Plan Land Use designation of the property.

REQUIRED ACTION:

ZONE CHANGE – FROM R-1, AREA DISTRICT VII TO C-1 COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION

BACKGROUND:

General Plan: Commercial
Zoning: R-1, District VII
Location: The subject property is located on the north side of Huntington Drive, between S. Los Robles Ave. and Garfield Ave. The property borders City of Alhambra to the south and City of South Pasadena to the west
Property Size: 39,047 square feet (0.9 acre)
Existing Use: Professional/Medical Offices and Pharmacy
Surrounding Uses: North – Residential, South (Alhambra) – Commercial, East – Commercial, West – (South Pasadena) Commercial, Residential
Environmental Determination: A negative declaration of environmental impact was prepared

The subject site is developed with a professional services building fronting Huntington Drive, the building is single-story with underground parking and surface level parking located north of the building. In 1958, the Planning Commission granted two variances for the construction of the building and the medical office use. Designed by Norwood and De Longe Architectural firm and constructed in 1959; the building was known as the Estes Professional Building. The property has been used as a
commercial property since 1959. Medical offices and a pharmacy currently occupy the building. There is no proposal to change the existing use, nor construct new structures on the subject site. The zone change request, if approved, will not alter the current professional office use and site development.

At the September 14, 2016 City Council meeting, the City Council considered a General Plan Amendment involving the subject properties along with other Huntington Drive properties that are zoned residential but have been developed commercially with variances granted by the City between 1940 and 1960. By a three to two vote, the Council decided to take no action to change the zoning designation for these nonconforming use properties from R-1 (residential use) to C-1 (commercial use). The Council’s decision was to allow these Huntington Drive properties to continue to operate commercially pursuant to the variances granted to each property.

**ANALYSIS:**

The subject site is identified as part of the Huntington Drive West commercial area in the 2003 General Plan, Land Use Chapter, Economic Development section, where the property was described as “there is also one property for commercial use at the five-point intersection of Garfield, Los Robles and Huntington.” The General Plan Land Use Map identifies the property for General Commercial use. However, the Zoning Map designates the property for residential use, R-1 zone, Area District VII. The requested zone change from residential use to commercial use is consistent with the Land Use element of the General Plan, which stated that the zoning ordinance and map must be consistent with the General Plan. Additionally, the zone change will maintain a commercial land use pattern as it reflects the current and historical use of the site.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Negative Declaration finding the project will not have potentially significant impacts on the environment, and recommend approval of ZC17-01 to the City Council.

Attachments: Application
Site Photographs
Location/Radius Map
Negative Declaration
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: 3/24/17

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

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:

   RE-ZONE AS COMMERCIAL TO MATCH CITY GENERAL PLAN

   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:

   PROPERTY IS A COMMERCIAL BUILDING IN A COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ON CITY GENERAL PLAN, BUT ZONED RESIDENTIAL

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: 1624 W. OLIVE AVE, #A, BURBANK 91506

Owner’s Phone Number (Home): (818) 843 3641

Owner’s Phone Number (Work): (818) 843 1744

Agent’s Name and Address:

Agent’s Phone Number: (____)
INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR 375 HUNTINGTON DRIVE

The City of San Marino has analyzed and completed an initial study for the following project:

ZONE CHANGE ZC17-01
375 HUNTINGTON DRIVE, (HUNTINGTON LP)

The applicant requests to change the zone of the subject property from R-1 District VII to C-1 Commercial so that it is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation for the subject property pursuant to City of San Marino Code 23.01.06.

Based on the attached initial study, the City has determined that there is no potential for the project to have a significant effect on the environment. The notice of intent to adopt the negative declaration was published in the San Marino Tribune on April 5, 2018.
ATTACHMENT B - EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATION

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. There will be no impact on a scenic vista. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. There are no State scenic highways within the City or in close proximity to the Project site. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to substantially damage scenic resources along a state scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact. There will be no degrading of existing visual character; the project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact. There will be no new lighting source associated with the project.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest...
Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

**No Impact.** The project site does not include farmland and has not been identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the California Resources Agency.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

**No Impact.** There is no farmland or designated agricultural use in the City. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

**No Impact.** The project site is located within an urban area. The City of San Marino has no designated forest land or timberland.¹

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** As described in Response II.c, no impact would occur on forest land.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** As described in Response II.c, no farmland or forest land is located within the City limit. Therefore, no impact on farmland or forest land would occur.

¹ *City of San Marino Final Draft General Plan, October 2003, page 74.*
III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The project will not conflict with the applicable air quality plan. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot, and the proposed use will not generate odor, dust, or impact air quality in the City.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No Impact. As discussed in Response III.a, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to a violation as the proposed zone change will not generate air quality impact.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No Impact. As discussed in Responses III.a and III.b, the proposed project involves no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot and the proposed zone change would not result in a considerable net increase of pollutants.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No Impact. As discussed in Responses III.a, III.b and III.c, the proposed project will not generate emissions and does not have the potential to affect nearby sensitive receptors, including single family uses located north of the project site, through substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact. The proposed project will not generate or emit objectionable odors as the proposed zone change involves zoning designation and no physical change to the structure or introduce a use that would generate objectionable odors.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The proposed project involves no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot and the zone change would not have an adverse impact on wildlife or their habitats.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. As indicated above, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in City or regional plans, policies, or regulations administered by the CDFG or USFWS.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. There are no federally protected wetlands in the City.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native nursery sites?

No Impact. The project involves a zone change from residential use to commercial use for an existing single-story commercial building along an established commercial corridor within the City. The project would not interfere substantially or impact established native wildlife corridors.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot and would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources.
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan in place in the City.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

No Impact. There would be no impact on historical resources. The property does not contain a historic resource and the project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot. The 1959 Norwood and De Longe building has not been recognized or designated as a historic resource under national, state, and local registers.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No Impact. No part of the City is known to have archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact. No part of the City is known to have paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Impact. No known traditional burial sites or other type of cemetery use has been identified within the Project site. The site has been previously disturbed and is presently developed as a single-story commercial structure along an established commercial corridor in the City.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zone and therefore would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects resulting from seismic ground shaking.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot and the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects during a seismic event.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. According to the City of San Marino General Plan Hazards Map, the project site is not located within a designated Liquefaction Zone.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The topography of the project site is relatively level and the site is not located within an area identified as having the potential for earthquake-induced landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot therefore will not cause soil to become unstable.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact. The project site will not disturb soil and the project site is not located on expansive soils.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. The project site would be served by existing sewer infrastructure and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

No Impact. The proposed zone change involves an existing single-story commercial structure built in 1959, the project use will not generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions which have the potential to either individually or cumulatively result in a significant impact on the environment.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the use of hazardous materials.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the use of hazardous materials.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve the use of hazardous materials and will not emit hazardous emissions.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**No Impact.** Staff has reviewed the hazardous sites listed under Government Code Section 65962.5 and has found that none exist within the City.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There are no airport land use plans within the City.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There are no private airstrips in the City.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**No Impact.** The project involves a zone change of an existing commercial structure and the project will not interfere with emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**No Impact.** There are no wildland in the City.
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior physical changes to the structure or lot. The existing commercial structure is currently subject to all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact. The project would not interfere with groundwater supplies.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

No Impact. The project site is an existing commercial structure and the proposed zone change involves no alteration or physical change to the structure and the lot; therefore, the project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

No Impact. The project site is an existing commercial structure and the proposed zone change would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

No Impact. The project would not generate or contribute to runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No Impact. The project would have no impact on the water quality.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. As designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) the City of San Marino is located within Zone X, an area of minimal flood risk.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. As stated above, the Project site is not located within a FEMA designated 100-year flood hazard area.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No Impact. No sources of flood hazard have been identified within the City of San Marino. The project will not result in people being exposed to risks associated with flooding.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The project site is located approximately 23 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean and does not lie in close proximity to an enclosed body of water. Therefore, the potential for exposure of people to a seiche or tsunami would be low. As the project site and surrounding area are relatively flat, the potential for mudflows to occur on site is also low. No impacts associated with the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflows would occur. Therefore, no further evaluation is necessary.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site contains an existing commercial structure along an established commercial corridor, no physical change is proposed for the site, the project would not have the potential to physically divide an existing community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan,
local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The project would not conflict with any established land use plans and policies designed to avoid an environmental effect. The proposed zone change, if approved, would achieve consistency between the adopted general plan and the zoning map.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. As described in Response IV.f, there is no adopted HCP or NCCP that includes the project site.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The project site is located within an urbanized area. No mineral resources are known to exist within the City.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. As described in Response XI.a, no mineral resources are known to existing within the City.

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

No Impact. The project would not increase existing noise levels associated with the exiting single-story commercial structure with a pharmacy and professional medical offices.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No Impact. The project proposes no exterior changes to the structure or lot and would not generate excessive groundborne noise and vibration.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. The project involves a zone change, no change to the existing commercial structure and site, therefore the project would not permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. As discussed above, the project involves no physical change to the structure and the site there will be no change to the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public or public-use airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. The propose project does not include the development of new residential units.
b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

*No Impact.* The project does not involve any property acquisition and would not otherwise displace housing.

c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

*No Impact.* The project would not displace any people.

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

*Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:***

a) **Fire protection?**

*No Impact.* The project site is an existing commercial structure, the project would not increase fire protection services.

b) **Police protection?**

*No Impact.* The project site is an existing commercial structure, the project would not increase fire protection services.

c) **Schools?**

*No Impact.* The proposed project would not increase residential population, and as such would not directly generate new students to the project area and within the San Marino Unified School District boundaries.

d) **Other Public Facilities?**

*No Impact.* The project site is an existing commercial structure, the proposed zone change would not increase the demand on public services.
XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. The proposed zone change from residential use to commercial use would not increase the use of existing public parks and public recreational facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. The project would not increase demand for new or expanded public recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

No Impact. The project is located along an established commercial corridor; the proposed zone change on a property developed with an existing commercial structure would not alter the demand on the circulation system to the extent of exceeding its capacity.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No Impact. The project would not conflict with Congestion Management Program (CMP) guidelines.
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private airport. Furthermore, the project does not involve new uses that would change air traffic patterns, generate air traffic, or interfere with existing air traffic.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact. The project does not involve physical changes to nearby public streets.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The project does not involve physical changes to public streets and the project site would remain accessible for emergency vehicles and personnel.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. The project would have no conflict with alternative transportation policies.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact. The proposed zone change for a property with an existing single-story commercial structure would have no impact on the amount of wastewater generated and the project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements set forth by regional regulations.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. The project involves no physical change to the existing commercial structure and the site, therefore the project would not result in the need to construct a new water or wastewater treatment facility.
c) **Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**No Impact.** The project proposes no exterior changes to the structure or lot and would not alter storm water runoff.

d) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**No Impact.** The project site contains an existing commercial structure, the proposed zone change will not increase density on site therefore the project would not increase demand on water supply for the site. Water supply would continue to be provided to the project site.

e) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

**No Impact.** No physical change is proposed for the project site, therefore no change to wastewater treatment service.

f) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**No Impact.** The project would not change solid waste disposal needs at the property.

g) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** The project site will continue to comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste, including those pertaining to waste reduction and recycling.

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or**
animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No Impact. The project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment and the project site is not a historic resource.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

No Impact. The project would not have cumulative impacts on the environment. The project site has been developed as a commercial use since 1959 and no physical is proposed for the project site at this time. If the proposed zone change is approved, future projects are subject to development standards mandated for all commercially zoned properties along the Huntington corridor and will be subject to applicable environmental review.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No Impact. The project would not cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings because the project involves no change in function of the site, no physical and exterior changes to the existing commercial structure and the site.
The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens
1151 Oxford Road
San Marino, CA 91108

February 28, 2018

City of San Marino, Planning Commission
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

Subject: Request for Extension of Conditional Use Permit NO.CUP16-30

Dear Planning Commission Members,

The Huntington Library submitted an application for approval in December 2016, for a single-family residence to be located at 1151 Oxford Road; the application was also for authorization to demolish the existing residence at that same location. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved the project during the February 22, 2017 meeting, and no subsequent comments were received from the public in March 2017.

The Huntington Library had every intention of submitting design drawings in September 2017, but with the institutional changes in presidential leadership, the Board of Trustees requested that the project be put on hold for further review. The Board of Trustees reevaluated the project and in December 2017, authorized the project to proceed.

Currently, The Huntington is in the design phase, with the intention to submit construction drawings into Plan Check in July 2018. At this time, we request for a twelve-month extension of the approved CUP.

Thank you for your consideration.

Larry Burik,
Vice President of Facilities