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: Shelley Boyle, Raymond Cheng, Se-Yao Hsu, Alternate James Okazaki, Alternate Monte Ross, Vice-Chair John Dustin, and Chair Jeri Wright.

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.
1. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-74HP**  
   **1625 OLD MILL RD., (WONG/PDS STUDIO INC.)**  
   This item was continued from the meeting of January 22, 2020. The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence. This requires one design review action pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.03(B).  
   *(Required Action Date: 3/2/2020)*

2. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP19-22**  
   **2000-2006 HUNTINGTON DR., (LA CIENEGA COMPANY LLC)**  
   The applicant requests to provide on-site sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages as an ancillary use to a restaurant that serves complete meals. This requires one conditional use permit pursuant to City Code Section 23.03.01C.  
   *(Required Action Date: 4/10/2020)*

3. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP19-23**  
   **2507 MISSION ST., (SAN MARINO WINDSOR LLC)**  
   The applicant requests to provide on-site sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages as an ancillary use to a restaurant that serves complete meals. This requires one conditional use permit pursuant to City Code Section 23.03.01C.  
   *(Required Action Date: 3/10/2020)*

4. **APPEAL FOR DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-93**  
   **2299 ASHBOURNE DR., (KHAN)**  
   The Planning Commission will consider the appeal of Design Review Committee’s decision to deny a request to change the appearance of an existing structure as viewed from a public street.

5. **TEMPORARY USE PERMIT**  
   **2375 HUNTINGTON DR., (WELLS FARGO BANK)**  
   The Planning Commission will consider a request for temporary use for Grad Night preparation at the Wells Fargo Bank Parking Lot pursuant to City Code Section 23.09.08.

6. **APPEAL OF DETERMINATION OF DAMAGED TREES**  
   **975 ORLANDO RD., (975 ORLANDO LLC)**  
   The Planning Commission will consider the appeal of determination of a damaged tree pursuant to City Code Section 23.06.15(E).

7. **RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP19-6 AND DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-13**  
   **1100 AVONDALE RD., (YEH/JAMES V. COANE & ASSOCIATES)**
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, March 25, 2020 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.
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

- Engaged and Connected Residents
- Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services
- Beautiful, Preserved, Single-Family Residential Neighborhood

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence. This requires one design review action pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.03(B).

The existing detached two-car garage will remain at its current location and continue to provide the required parking for the residence. The existing circular driveway will also remain but re-paved with concrete material to complement the residence. The total front yard paving is less than 45%, City Codes permit the continue use of the existing circular driveway that otherwise would not be permitted in Area District V.

REQUIRED ACTION

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-74HP – NEW RESIDENCE

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

Pursuant to Code, upon receipt of a complete application the director or his/her designee shall meet with the applicant or the applicant’s representative to explain to the applicant the applicable design guidelines, findings, and procedures that will apply to the project, and to informally discuss compliance
of the project with the design guidelines and applicable regulations. None of the director’s comments or suggestions shall constitute an actual or implied approval of the application.

October 4, 2019 – Staff provided written comments on project plan completeness and requested the applicant to simplify the roof plan and to reconsider the project design to eliminate the Variance requests (deficiencies in front yard setback and interior garage dimensions).

HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT

A historic resources assessment report prepared by Sapphos Environmnetal, Inc. found that the Ranch structure built in 1951 is not a historic resource and demolition of the structure would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The City is conducting a comprehensive citywide survey and the initial reconnaissance survey identified the subject property as a contributor to a potential historic district. Further research by Sapphos Environmnetal, Inc. concluded that the construction year and architectural style were not matching up with the 1920’s and 1930’s Period Revival-styled structures that define the potential historic district. Thus, the existing structure is not a contributor to the potential historic district.

BACKGROUND

General Plan: Very Low Density Residential (2-4 dwelling unit per acre)
Zoning: R-1, Area District V
Location: The subject property is located on the west side of Old Mill Road and one property south of Huntington Drive
Lot Size: 15,596 square feet
Existing Use: On-story residence with a detached two-car garage
Surrounding Uses: The site is bordered in by single family homes (Area District V) to the north, east and south, and commercial uses to the west across the service alley.
Proposed Square-Footage: Livable Area 3,825 sq. ft / Lot Coverage 3,954 sq. ft.
Parking Required/Proposed: 2 garage spaces for a 4 bedrooms project/2 garage spaces
The project will retain the existing detached garage. The existing garage complies with setbacks and interior parking stall dimensions requirements.
Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects)

At the January 15, 2020 meeting, the Commission found the proposed residence to be compatible in style, bulk, and height with structures within the legal neighborhood. The Commission was concerned with the design details, lack of a detailed landscape plan, excessive paving in the rear yard, front door lacks human scale, placement of leader head is unnecessary
on a single-story residence, patio doors lack divided lites, and preservation of the existing Olive tree in the front yard. The Commission also noted the existing hedge exceeding the maximum allowed four (4) height.

In respond to the Commission’s concerns, the project plans incorporated the following changes
- Shutters are sized to match the opening of the windows and they are clearly labeled to have raised panels
- Solar panel location is shown on the roof plan and a single module is proposed on the south facing elevation
- Leader heads have been removed and only showing gutters
- Window surrounds have been simplified
- The entire roof is provided with consistent slope design at 4.5:12

The revised landscape plan provides additional planting materials in the rear yard along with a brief statement for the provision of an evaluation and health recovery plans for the olive tree in the front yard. Staff found this statement to be an inadequate response thus included a condition of approval to require the submittal of a tree protection plan for the olive tree, to the satisfaction of the City’s Urban Forester, prior to filing the building permit for the new residence.

Additional conditions are included to address the size of the front door, divided lites on the patio doors and the on-going maintenance of the existing front yard hedge.

**ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR MAIN DWELLING</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSAL JAN. 2020</th>
<th>PROPOSAL FEB. 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/Lot Coverage</td>
<td>3,959 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Livable area:</strong> 3,875 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Livable area:</strong> 3,825 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lot coverage:</strong> 3,954 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Lot coverage:</strong> No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEIGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>21’-10”</td>
<td>21’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YARDS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>8’-7” South</td>
<td>8’-3” South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13’-8” North/Driveway</td>
<td>No Change on North/Driveway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new residence consists of four bedrooms, four bathrooms, a powder room and a loft/den. The existing detached two-car garage conforms with setback and interior parking stall dimension requirements; the applicant intends retain the garage at its current location to minimize earthwork and excavation needed for a new garage. New exterior materials are proposed on the garage to provide consistency with the new residence. These new materials include new roofing material, fascia boards, garage door, smooth stucco with matching color as the new residence.

The new residence has a one-story appearance from street view. The interior layout provides primary living areas on the first floor and a loft area on the second floor. The second floor is hidden below the sloped roof structure that it is not visible from the street. Natural light for the loft area is provided through three skylights.

DESIGN REVIEW ACTION

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of January 22, 2020 meeting)

Approve – 10
Object – 0
No response – 2

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS - NEW RESIDENCE

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 legal neighborhood comprises of one and two-story structures in various traditional architectural styles. The proposed one-story residence is in keeping with the scale of development, height, bulk and massing in the legal neighborhood.

The immediate neighboring structures to the north and south of the project are single-story with low-pitches roof, moderate eaves overhang and features horizontal lines. The proposed residence shares similar design characteristics as neighboring structures and will blends in with the existing streetscape. Further, the proposed design is effective in screening the appearance of the second floor, the resulting roof design is consistent throughout the structure and the garage.

Given the existing matured landscaping that the applicant intends to keep along with the window locations and the proposed building height, staff does not anticipate privacy impacts resulting from the project.

The proposed exterior colors and materials are consistently carried throughout the residence and the existing garage. The roofing and window materials are selected from the City’s Pre-Approved material lists.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-74HP. If the Planning Commission concurs with this recommendation then, following the public hearing, the actions would be:

1. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and State CEQA Guidelines, the Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment finds that DRC19-74HP is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15303 Class 3(a).
2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment hereby makes the findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for DRC19-74HP, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

3. The Planning Commission approves DRC19-74HP, subject to the attached Conditions on Data Sheet No. 2, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. DRC Neighborhood Map
4. Historic Assessment Report
5. Data Sheet 1 – Findings
6. Data Sheet 2 – Conditions of Approval
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: 9/11/2019

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   1625 Old Mill Rd, San Marino

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   5338-005-015
   (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:
      Project is proposing a remodel and addition for the Wong family resulting in a new residence. We wish to keep the existing detached two-car garage.
   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      The remodel of the home will require more than 50% of the existing structure to be removed, which triggers requirement for a planning commission approval.

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:

Mailing Address: 1906 Montrobes Pl, San Marino
Owner’s Phone Number (Home): (626) 403-0008
Owner’s Phone Number (Work): (____)  
Agent’s Name and Address: 711 S. First Ave, Arcadia CA 91006. Philip Chan
Agent’s Phone Number: (626) 524-2901

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
January 16, 2020

The Planning Commission
City of San Marino

Re: 1625 Old Mill Road, San Marino, CA 91108

Dear Chairman and Planning Commissioners:

We are writing to you in support of the application for the subject property.

We have resided in San Marino for over 35 years. Our three children grew up here in San Marino, and have received the best education from our schools. We have actively participated in our community and treasured the family friendly atmosphere of our city which cannot be found elsewhere.

It is of no surprise that San Marino attracts many residents, old and new. Our eldest daughter, Wendy Wong Cheng and her husband, Derek Cheng, have decided to move their family of five, from Beverly Hills to come back and make San Marino their permanent home. Wendy and Derek want to raise their 3 children (age 9, 7, and 5) in San Marino, and since June, 2018, have rented a house at 2525 Monterey Road. Our grand children really love the school, like their mom did.

The above property is designed and will be built for their permanent residence. The house, although is categorized as two-storied, is a one-story house with a loft for the children to study and play.

We are hopeful that you will give this application your favorable consideration.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph and Cecilia Wong
HISTORICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR
1625 OLD MILL ROAD
SAN MARINO, CALIFORNIA 91108

Prepared for:
JOSEPH WONG

Prepared by:
SAPPHOS ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
430 North Halstead Street
Pasadena, California 91107

AUGUST 22, 2019
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SECTION 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a Historic Resources Assessment Report for the building located 1625 Old Mill Road (APN 5335-005-015), City of San Marino (City), Los Angeles County, California. The purpose of the report is to determine if the building, individually or collectively, constitutes a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This determination will be used by the City to determine the appropriate level of environmental review for consideration of the requested partial demolition and renovation of the existing building. Sapphos Environmental, Inc. architectural historians (Ms. Kasey Conley and Ms. Carrie Chasteen) were retained to serve as the principal investigator to complete the Historic Resource Assessment Report. Ms. Conley and Ms. Chasteen meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in the fields of History and Architectural History.

The property is located on a residential street in San Marino with one 2,549-square-foot building located at 1625 Old Mill Road.

Architectural Resources Group (ARG) completed the first citywide survey of San Marino in 2019 and the draft context statement and historical resource map was published in July 2019 for public comment.1 In the ARG report, the subject property was identified as a contributor to a potential historic district of Period Revival-style residential buildings constructed primarily in the 1920s and 1930s. This potential historic district was identified as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or for designation as a City Historic Landmark. The subject property was not identified as an individual resource eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation as a City Historic Landmark.

After careful research and evaluation, Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (Ms. Kasey Conley; Attachment A, Resume of Key Personnel) concluded that the building does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark; and would not contribute to a potential historic district. The subject property’s architectural style and year built are not consistent with the Period Revival architecture of the surrounding parcels and therefore, it does not meet the criteria to be considered a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

---

SECTION 2
PROJECT SUMMARY

2.1 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project would demolish a majority of the building for renovation and would be replaced with a single-family residence.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND CURRENT SETTING

The subject property consists of one parcel located at 1625 Old Mill Road (APN 5335-005-015), in the City of San Marino (City), Los Angeles County, California. The property is located on a residential street with primarily single-family housing.
The assessment methodology consisted of research and field assessment of the structures and buildings.

RESEARCH CONDUCTED

1. Obtained and reviewed the building permits for the parcel from the City Department of Building and Safety. Dates of construction and subsequent alterations were determined by the building permit record, as well as additional resources, such as the field inspection, and historic aerial photographs.

2. Researched the project site and surrounding area at local libraries and archives to establish the general history and context of the project site, including a review of the Historic Property Data File for Los Angeles County, newspapers, City directories, books, and articles.

3. Consulted the Context/Theme/Property Type (CTP) eligibility standards formulated for the San Marino Historic Context Statement to identify the appropriate CTP under which to evaluate the buildings on the project site.

4. Reviewed and analyzed ordinances, statues, regulations, bulletins, and technical materials relating to federal, state, and local historic preservation assessment processes and programs to evaluate the significance and integrity of the buildings on the project site.

FIELD METHODS

5. Conducted a field inspection of the project site on July 29, 2019, to ascertain the general condition and physical integrity of the building thereon. Digital photographs were taken during the site inspections, which included only the exterior of the building. Field notes were made.

6. It was concluded during the field inspection that the residential building located at 1625 Old Mill Road is located within a potential historic district because the buildings reflect a cohesive pattern of Period Revival design and 1920s and 1930s development, yet the subject property's architectural style and year built falls outside these features resulting in it being a non-contributor to the district. Accordingly, the parcel was evaluated individually as a potential historical resource under federal, state, and local eligibility criteria according to the National Park Service, California Office of Historic Preservation, and San Marino Historic Ordinance standards.
SECTION 4

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/DESIGNATIONS

4.1 RECORD SEARCH

In lieu of conducting a cultural resource record search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton, the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) for Los Angeles County, available from the California Office of Historic Preservation, historic U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series topographic maps, and aerial photographs were reviewed for the project site and adjacent properties. In addition to official maps and records, and published registers and reports for the geographic area were reviewed:

- National Register of Historic Places – Listed (2019);
- California Register of Historical Resources – Listed (2019);
- California State Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates);
- California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates); and
- City of San Marino Citywide Historic Survey – Draft Results

4.2 PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/DESIGNATIONS SUMMARY

The subject property was identified as a contributor to a potential historic district of Period Revival residential buildings dating primarily to the 1920s and 1930s. The potential historic district was found to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or for designation as a City of San Marino Historic Landmark in the initial reconnaissance survey completed for the Citywide Historic Resource Survey by Architectural Resource Group in 2019. The subject property was not identified as an individual resource and does not appear to have been previously surveyed.
SECTION 5
HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

This report employs the historic contexts, themes, and criteria considerations set forth in the initial City San Marino Historic Context statement completed by Architectural Resources Group in 2019.²

Residential Development, 1913–1930

San Marino’s residential development did not commence immediately upon incorporation in 1913 or for the next few years, but during this time the Board of Trustees (Board) laid the groundwork that would guide all development to come. On a municipal level, the Board planned and improved the street grid, passed ordinances controlling all facets of construction, and established city services like a fire department and school district. On a personal business level, they and other locals bought, sold, and prepared to develop residential subdivisions, irrevocably shaping the city as it exists today. When the economic boom of the 1920s hit Southern California, San Marino was more than ready.

Residential subdivision began in earnest around 1923, with the establishment of tracts like the Huntington Land & Improvement Company’s Oak Knoll (an extension of its earlier Oak Knoll tracts in the City of Pasadena). Oriented toward the Pacific Electric’s Oak Knoll line, this tract saw addition after addition over the next few years.³ Real estate companies representing the Huntington Co. and other owners began to advertise heavily in the Los Angeles Times for tracts like San Marino Manor (1923), Huntington Hill (1925), and Oak Knoll Marino (1923). Most of the advertisements touted the proximity to Huntington’s famed estate, and some, like Huntington Hill, were in fact directly adjacent to the property. The new tracts typically boasted wide paved streets, concrete curbs and sidewalks, streetlamps, street trees, and sizable lots.

There were far too many tracts developed during the 1920s to address each in turn, but Oak Knoll Marino typifies the development of a residential subdivision in San Marino during this boom period and is a useful representative example. In 1923, the Huntington Land & Improvement Co. subdivided Tract 6012, located west of the Huntington estate and south of the well-known Pasadena neighborhood of Oak Knoll.⁴ The land was prepared with grading, addition of drainage features, placement of underground utilities, and routing of new roads complete with street trees.⁵ It was soon ready for lot sales, with the new name of Oak Knoll Marino.

---
³ Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Tract Maps; Oak Knoll unit maps in the Patton Family Papers. 1856–1934. The Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.
⁴ Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. 1923. Tract Maps for Tract 6012; Oak Knoll maps in Patton Family Papers.
⁵ Historic (ca. 1923) photos in the Huntington Land & Improvement Company Collection. The Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.
The Frank Meline Realty Company heavily marketed the Oak Knoll Marino subdivision in newspaper advertisements starting in 1923 and continuing through the early 1930s as additional phases opened. The first unit was bounded by Huntington Drive to the south, Virginia Road to the east, the open space and lake that would become Lacy Park to the north, and Oak Knoll Avenue to the west. The realty company maintained a tract office at the corner of Huntington Drive and St. Albans Road, easily accessible from the Pacific Electric line; as new phases opened to the south and east, it opened a second office at Huntington and San Marino Avenue. Oak Knoll Marino was touted as a graceful neighborhood of wide curving streets, large lots, and expansive views perfectly suited to the high quality owners who surely wished to build there. As the Los Angeles Times reported in 1926, the development boasted “the very finest improvements...including sewers, cement curbs, cement sidewalks, splendidly paved streets and ornamental lighting.” The subdivision was meant for custom-built, architect-designed houses rather than typical tract homes built on speculation; advertisements shouted “Strictly for Homebuilders not Speculators” and depicted homes designed by notables like Paul R. Williams and Garrett Van Pelt.

To ensure high property values, Oak Knoll Marino required that houses cost $7,500-$15,000 to build and enforced strict ownership and design guidelines, noting that “Racial and artistic restrictions further enhance the value of the lots.” Racially restrictive covenants, built into the deeds of sale and more informally enforced by realtors, were a common feature of 1920s subdivisions in Southern California, especially those marketed to the rich. They ensured that people of color (and in some cases Jewish people and first-generation European immigrants) would be unable to purchase property outside of carefully circumscribed neighborhoods.

San Marino’s proximity to Los Angeles and many transportation options made commuting a major part of advertising for the city’s subdivisions. In a transparent attempt to prove Oak Knoll Marino superior to the tracts in the burgeoning Wilshire district west of downtown Los Angeles, the Frank Meline Co. bragged that San Marino-residing businessmen driving to and from work always had the sun at their backs: “Relieved from the eye-strain caused by its glare when driving toward it, they reach the office unirritated, the morning’s freshness retained. Driving home to San Marino in the evening, tired eyes are saved, the drive being both restful and refreshing.”

While other tracts may have diverged somewhat from Oak Knoll Marino in terms of size, layout, or advertising, this subdivision does seem to have been typical of most in the city during the 1920s: spacious lots (increasing in size as elevation increased to the north); wide streets, picturesque tract features (streetlamps etc.); design and price requirements to ensure consistent setbacks and appropriate architectural styles; and racial requirements to ensure neighborhoods remained white. Known named

---

6 Oak Knoll Marino display ad. 9 December 1928. Los Angeles Times.
8 Display ad. 7 June 1924. Los Angeles Times.
10 Display ad. 20 November 1925. Los Angeles Times.
developments included Gainsborough Heath, Huntington Hill, multiple Oak Knoll units, San Marino Vista, and San Marino Manor.\textsuperscript{11} Subdivision continued at this breakneck pace for the next decade, producing numerous named and unnamed tracts with lots of various sizes offered for sale. In 1925, the city established the Office of Building Inspector to keep up with rapid development.\textsuperscript{12} San Marino reached the zenith of its residential construction in 1927, when 212 new buildings were completed, at an estimated value of over $3 million.\textsuperscript{13}

The overwhelming majority of single-family residences built in San Marino during this period reflected Period Revival designs. Nearly every style within this romantic, historicist idiom appeared in the city, though Tudor Revival, Mediterranean Revival, and Spanish Colonial revival seemed to be particularly common. These styles not only lent themselves to construction on a large scale (appropriate for some of the massive houses built on large lots) but could reflect high levels of articulation on houses of a much more modest size – like the cluster of charming Storybook houses on Coniston Place. Most of these houses were custom designed by architects, including many of the region’s master practitioners. Architects known to have designed San Marino houses in the 1920s include Wallace Neff, Marston & Maybury, Marston, Van Pelt & Maybury, Harold J. Bissner, Carleton Monroe Winslow, Roland E. Coate, Frank D. Hudson, Paul R. Williams, and Gordon Kaufmann. Even “tract houses,” like the exquisite Spanish Colonial Revival homes on Berkeley Street and Fleur Drive, were designed by master architects (in these cases, Wallace Neff and Harold J. Bissner, respectively).\textsuperscript{14} Neff even built his own home in San Marino – a Spanish Colonial Revival house located at 1883 Orlando Road (1928).

Much of the City was subdivided by 1930, though some of the lots did not see actual sale and construction for some time. In fact, some of the advertised tracts existed more on paper than in reality. The developers of the 297-acre Gainsborough Heath began advertising in 1927 and planned a thousand houses, but only about 70 were built by the end of World War II – and of those, only two were completed before 1930.\textsuperscript{15} The visible street and lot pattern of other 1920s developments is evident across the City today, though many of the lots contain houses from the 1940s-1950s rather than the 1920s. In 1929, Gainsborough Heath’s sales manager noted that “with a few exceptions, one of which is Gainsborough Heath, the city has no further room for expansion.”\textsuperscript{16}


\textsuperscript{16} “San Marino Growth Told.” 3 November 1929. \textit{Los Angeles Times}.
In October 1929, the crash of the stock market sent a chill to growing cities across the country. The growth of Gainsborough Heath and other developed-but-unbuilt subdivisions stalled in 1930-1931, when the effects of the crash sank in and it became clear the Depression would be lasting. One of the last major developments to proceed for the next few years was a roughly 50-acre portion of the Patton estate’s Lake Vineyard, subdivided by the Hugh Evans Company into 90 large residential lots in 1929. The Patton-San Marino Estates/San Marino-Patton Estates subdivision was bounded by Huntington Drive on the south, San Marino Avenue on the east, Euston Road (boundary of Huntington estate) on the north, and Virginia Road on the west. Thanks to the economic upheaval of the Great Depression, only a handful of houses were constructed there at the time; the rest of the tract was built out between the 1940s and 1950s, after the Huntington Land & Improvement Company purchased it and re-divided it into smaller lots.

Less than three weeks after the stock market crash, several San Marino real estate companies placed an ad in the San Marino News urging people to invest in property in the city – no doubt an attempt to assuage some of their own financial losses by helping anyone who had any savings left find their way to the subdivisions of San Marino. They asked, “Why not make safe and sane investments in real properties?” Indeed, after New Deal bills aiming to increase home ownership passed in 1933-1934, people would invest in San Marino real estate again. But in the meantime, purchases and construction slowed dramatically, marking the end of San Marino’s first great residential boom.

Residential Development 1946-1980

Residential development resumed in San Marino immediately after war’s end, although eager new homeowners were temporarily stymied by the lack of building materials and available labor; in January 1947, the San Marino Tribune reported “An unprecedented situation exists in the city today...with a total of 128 uncompleted residences...All of these half finished projects are due to lack of materials and labor, and is a situation prevailing throughout the country and not confined only to this area, according to the building inspector.” The situation soon improved, as evidenced by the near-total filling of vacant lots in existing small-lot, FHA-compliant subdivisions like San Marino Highlands, San Marino Oaks, Gainsborough Heath, and San Marino-Patton Estates by 1949. The houses built in these subdivisions between 1946 and 1949 were nearly identical to those built right before the war, designed in Ranch and Minimal Traditional styles with low-slung profiles and built by developers. The few remaining lots in those subdivisions were filled in the 1950s, again with houses in the same styles. Thanks to federal programs like the FHA and HOLC, during the postwar period the national home ownership rate jumped from 17


18 Both names appear in newspaper articles.

19 “Huge Sale of San Marino Properties.” 11 November 1932. San Marino Tribune (San Marino, CA); Construction dates in tract derived from Los Angeles County Assessor data.

20 Display ad. 13 November 1929. San Marino News (San Marino, CA).

21 “Building Permits Show Big Gain Over Last Year.” 2 January 1947. San Marino Tribune (San Marino, CA).
under 50 percent to almost 70 percent of all households – and the rate was surely much higher in San Marino, with its utter lack of rentable units.\textsuperscript{22} The availability of VA loans after the war helped returning veterans purchase homes as well. But as elsewhere in the country, home ownership was mostly restricted to whites, with FHA and HOLC standards resulting in less than 2 percent of new FHA-insured housing being sold to minorities by the late 1950s.\textsuperscript{23}

New homes were built in existing earlier tracts as well as the 1930s-1940s FHA developments, including those of large estates in the Oak Knoll area at the north side of town – these grander homes tended to be designed by notable architects just as they had in the 1920s, though now they were names like Smith & Williams, Buff, Straub & Hensman, and Edward Fickett. These custom-built houses exhibited Mid-Century Modern, Contemporary Ranch, and Late Modern styles. For the rest of the 1950s and through the early 1970s, any remaining residential construction was demolition and replacement of existing buildings, substantial additions and alterations to existing buildings, or establishment of very small new subdivisions. All work was guided by San Marino’s new planning commission, established in 1952 to ensure the City stayed residential.\textsuperscript{24}

The new subdivisions created during the later postwar period typically featured 25 or fewer lots arrayed around cul-de-sacs branching off of existing roads, representing the dividing up of larger parcels. In some cases, like the six-lot subdivision at La Cala Place, an older house was demolished to make way for the new homes.\textsuperscript{25} The largest cohesive subdivision of this time was also the latest: the Lake Vineyard Patton Estates development in the early 1970s, which created new lots on two new cul-de-sacs and along Euston Road in the former Lake Vineyard area.\textsuperscript{26} The 1910 Patton residence remained as an island of an earlier time surrounded by 1970s houses on the new Patton Way cul-de-sac.

\textsuperscript{22} "National Housing Act (1934)." Living New Deal. Accessed March 2019. Available at: https://livingnewdeal.org/glossary/national-housing-act-1934/


\textsuperscript{25} "New Subdivision Gets Approval." 11 April 1962. San Marino Tribune (San Marino, CA).

\textsuperscript{26} "Former Patton Home Sold." 13 January 1974. Los Angeles Times.
6.1 CURRENT SETTING

The setting surrounding the parcel is single-family residential. The parcel is located off Huntington Drive in the Oak Knoll area of San Marino. The buildings surrounding the parcel portray a cohesive Period Revival design with architectural styles ranging from Tudor, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Colonial Revival (Figure 1, View facing Northeast of Setting, Old Mill Road; Figure 2, View facing Southeast of Setting, Old Mill Road; Figure 3, Sketch Map, 1625 Old Mill Road; Figure 4, Project Location Map, 1625 Old Mill Road).

Figure 1. View facing Northeast of Setting, Old Mill Road  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Figure 2. View facing Southeast of Setting, Old Mill Road  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019
Figure 3. Sketch Map, 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, 2019
Figure 4. Project Location Map, 1625 Old Mill Road
6.2 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

6.2.1 1625 Old Mill Road

The subject property includes a single-family residence constructed in 1951. The single-story Ranch-style residence faces Old Mill Road, measures 2,549 square feet, and features an irregular 'U'-shaped footprint. The building has a medium pitched, multi-hipped roof clad in composition shingles. There are two brick chimneys visible from the primary façade (Figure 5, View of Primary [Eastern] Façade, [view facing Southwest], 1625 Old Mill Road). The exterior is clad in stucco and brick. The building is in good condition.

![Image of 1625 Old Mill Road](image)

**Figure 5. View of Primary (Eastern) Façade (view facing southwest), 1625 Old Mill Road**

SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

**Primary Façade**

The primary façade is asymmetrical with three bays. The entrance is recessed, located off center in the middle bay, and accessed via a raised porch. The entrance porch is brick with one wood square column to the north. There is a small patio on the northern bay with a low brick wall around the perimeter. The fenestration pattern consists of a slightly protruding bay window and steel-framed casement windows (Figure 6A–B, View of Primary Façade, 1625 Old Mill Road).
Figure 6A. View of Primary Façade (view facing southwest), 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Figure 6B. View of Primary Façade (view facing west), 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019
**Entrance Detail**

The entrance is recessed into the primary façade of the building and two decorative wood doors allow access (Figure 7, Entrance Detail, 1625 Old Mill Road).

![Figure 7. Entrance Detail (view facing West), 1625 Old Mill Road](image)

*SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019*

**Northern Façade**

The northern façade of the building is clad in stucco. There are three sets of double steel-framed casement windows and one single casement window on the western end. A driveway leading from the street to the detached garage runs along this façade (Figure 8, Northern Façade [view facing southwest], 1625 Old Mill Road).
Western Façade

The western façade of the building is clad in stucco. The ‘U’-shaped footprint of the building can be seen from the western façade, and the center bay sits recessed from the side bays. Steel-framed casement windows can be seen on the northern and center bays. There is an entrance set into the northern bay which allows access to the kitchen. The southern bay has steel sliding doors which allow access to the house and four sets of double, steel-framed casement windows (Figure 9, Western Façade [view facing east], 1625 Old Mill Road).
Southern Façade

The southern façade is clad in stucco. There are two sets of narrow steel-framed casement windows near the roofline. Bushes and a tree cover a portion of the façade (Figure 10, Southern Façade [view facing northwest], 1625 Old Mill Road).

![Southern Façade](image)

Figure 10. Southern Façade (view facing northwest), 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Detached Garage and Pool

The detached garage sits in the northwest potion of the parcel. It is clad in stucco, has a square footprint, and a hipped-roof clad in composition shingles. It has a roll up door on the eastern façade and a brick staircase leading to the pool abuts its southern façade. A steel-framed casement window is located on the southern façade (Figure 11, Detached Garage [view facing northwest], 1625 Old Mill Road). The brick staircase leading to the pool runs the entire length of the property. It has a metal security fence along its entirety and the pool is accessed via a gate. The pool is inground and sits behind the garage in the far northwest portion of the parcel. It is surrounded by a concrete deck (Figure 12, Pool [view facing east], 1625 Old Mill Road).
Figure 11. Detached Garage (view facing northwest), 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Figure 12. Pool (view facing east), 1625 Old Mill Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019
6.3 BUILDING HISTORY

6.3.1 Construction History

The subject property is located in Tract 9178 of San Marino, which was subdivided in 1925 as a possible extension of the Oak Knoll Marino Tract. The land was owned by the Huntington Land and Improvement Company from 1925 to 1951. The Huntington Land and Improvement Company was founded by Henry Edwards Huntington in 1902 to purchase, subdivide, and re-sell land surrounding the Pacific Electric and Los Angeles railways. The land was improved in 1951 by Roy Breitweiser, the owner and builder. Based upon a review of historic issues of the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Sentinel, Roy Breitweiser does not appear to be a significant real estate developer in the history of the City based upon the lack of press coverage. Additionally, the subject property was developed 26 years after the establishment of this tract.

6.3.2 1625 Old Mill Road

The original building permits for the construction of the building were provided by the City. The land was improved in 1951 with no listed architect and Roy Breitweiser identified as the owner and contractor. The pool was added in 1965 and in 1975, a permit was issued to enclose the existing rear patio, leaving the sliding doors and casement windows in place. Multiple permits for reroofing and painting of both the residence and the garage have been issued over the years.

6.4 OWNERSHIP/OCCUPANT HISTORY

6.4.1 1625 Old Mill Road

Based upon a review of the Los Angeles County Assessor’s parcel data, the property changed ownership multiple times between 1926 and 2019 (Table 1, Assessor Data, 1625 Old Mill Road).

---

28 Huntington Library. “Huntington Land and Improvement Company Collection of Photographs and Negatives.” Online Archive of California. Available at: https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt4v19r0cw/
29 All permits supplied by Eva Choi from the City of San Marino Planning Department in PDF format, July 2019.
30 City of San Marino. 9 February 1951. Building Permit #7636.
31 City of San Marino. 15 October 1965. Building Permit #0952, #1394, #1717; Permit #24548, 1975.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>12,40,79,87</td>
<td>1926–1927</td>
<td>Huntington Land and Improvement Co. Laura Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1926–1937</td>
<td>Huntington Land and Improvement Co. Laura Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1945–1950</td>
<td>Huntington Land and Improvement Co. John Klenke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1951–1955</td>
<td>John Klenke, Roy Breitbart, Dorothy Breitbart, W.J. Settle, Otto A. Schirmer, Gertrude Schirmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980–2019* Chi H. and Yuk Y. Chuang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019** Joseph Wong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * denotes information obtained from the Los Angeles County Assessor public counter

The Huntington Land and Improvement Company was founded by Henry Edwards Huntington in 1902 to purchase, subdivide, and re-sell land surrounding the Pacific Electric and Los Angeles railways. Gertrude and Otto Schirmer were married, and Otto worked as a sausage manufacture. Roy and Dorothy Breitbart were married and Roy was an assistant cashier at Bank of America. Roy was also a builder who had built two homes in Arcadia by 1951. Dante G. Carnessale was a physician and Faye was his wife. No information pertaining to the life and career was available in the historic issues of Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Sentinel, City directories, or census record for John Klenke or W.J. Settle. The current owner is Joseph Wong.

6.5 USE HISTORY

6.5.1 1625 Old Mill Road

The property was built as a single-family residence and is currently vacant.
The building, associated with the subject property, was evaluated to determine if it constitutes a historical resource as defined by the CEQA, using the eligibility criteria for listing in applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations.

7.1 FEDERAL

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, defines the criteria to be considered eligible for listing in the National Register:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. that embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section part 63).

According to National Register Bulletin No. 15, “to be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must not only be shown to be significant under National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity.” Integrity is defined in National Register Bulletin No. 15 as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” Within the concept of integrity, the National Register recognizes the following seven aspects or qualities that in various combinations define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

7.2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Section 5024.1(c), Title 14 CCR, Section 4852 of the California Public Resources Code defines the criteria to be considered eligible for listing in the California Register:

A resource may be listed as an historical resource in the California Register if it meets any of the following [National Register] criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 4852(C) of the California Code of Regulations\(^{39}\) defines integrity as follows:

Integrity is the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described in section 4852(b) of this chapter and retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. Historical resources that have been rehabilitated or restored may be evaluated for listing.

Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility. Alterations over time to a resource or historic changes in its use may themselves have historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

7.3 CITY OF SAN MARINO

Section 23.18.030 of Article 18 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance No. 0-18-1336 defined the designation criteria for Historic Landmarks:\(^{40}\)

A. The Council may designate a historic resource a Historic Landmark if it meets the requirements of both paragraphs B and C of this section.

B. Historic landmarks must meet at least one of the following criteria:

3. It is or was once associated or identified with important events or broad patterns of development that have made a significant contribution to the cultural, architectural, historical, and political heritage of the City, region, state, or nation; or

4. It is or was associated with an important person or persons who made a significant contribution to the history, development, or culture of the City, region, state, or nation; or

5. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of


\(^{40}\) City of San Marino. 11 April 2018. City Council Agenda. Accessed May 16, 2018. Available at: http://www.ci.san-marino.ca.us/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_04112018-1034
construction; exemplifies the work of a well-recognized architect or builder or possesses high artistic or aesthetic values; or it represents one of the last, best remaining examples of an architectural type or style in a neighborhood or the City that was once common but is now increasingly rare.

C. Historic landmarks must retain integrity from their period of significance with respect to its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, or any combination of these factors. A proposed landmark need not retain all such original aspects, but must retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic, cultural, or architectural significance. Neither the deferred maintenance of a proposed landmark nor its dilapidated condition shall, on its own, be equated with a loss of integrity. Integrity shall be judged with reference to the particular characteristics that support the property's eligibility.
SECTION 8
HISTORIC CONTEXT

The property was evaluated using the Citywide Historic Context Statement developed by Architectural Resources Group for the City; specifically, the Residential Development, 1913–1930 and Residential Development, 1946–1980 themes.43

8.1 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 1913–1930

Context: San Marino Becomes a City, 1913–1930

Theme: Residential Development, 1913–1930

Property Type: Single-Family Residences, Ancillary Buildings, Subdivision Planning Features, Vernacular Landscapes, Designed Landscapes, Historic Districts

Geographic Location: Numerous residential subdivisions were established in San Marino at this time, with most actual development work taking place between 1923 and 1930; this activity took place in every part of the City and varied somewhat in terms of lot size, tract layout, street patterns, and topography. Curvilinear streets are more common than regular gridded streets in subdivisions from this period. Generally speaking, lots on the north side of town surrounding the Huntington estate tended to be larger, reflecting development of more expensive areas at higher elevations.

Area of Significance: As the site of a significant historic event from this period; for its association with patterns of residential development in San Marino; as the site of a significant historic event from this period; for its association with a person (or persons) significant in the history of San Marino.

Criteria: A/B 1/2 1/2

Period of Significance: 1913–1930

Eligibility Standards:
- Date to the period of significance (1913–1930), and
- Retain the essential aspects of integrity, and
  - Retain enough of its essential physical features to sufficiently convey its association with the historic context.
  - Retain the majority (60 percent or more) of the contributors dating to the period of significance. Retain enough of its essential physical features to sufficiently convey its association with the historic context, and
- Be directly associated with the notable person's productive period – the time during which she or he attained significance

Integrity Considerations: A property that is significant as the site of a significant historic event is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that comprised its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event. A residential property from this period should

---

retain integrity of location, feeling, and association, at a minimum, in order to convey the important association with the City's development during this period. A property that has lost integrity of setting may still be eligible. A property that has lost some historic materials or details may still be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its original style and appearance in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, and fenestration pattern. A property is not eligible if it retains some basic features conveying form and massing but has lost the majority of features that characterized its appearance during its historical period.

In order for a historic district to be eligible for designation, the majority of the components within the district boundary must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole. Integrity of design, setting, and feeling must be strongly present in the district overall, and it should convey a strong sense of time and place. A contributing building must retain integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, and association to adequately convey the significance of the historic district. In general, minor or reversible alterations or in-kind replacement of original features and finishes are acceptable within historic districts. Significant alterations that change the massing, form, roofline, or fenestration patterns of an individual building, alter the original design intent, or that are not reversible may result in non-contributing status for an individual building. In order for a historic district to retain integrity, the majority (60 percent or more) of its component parts should contribute to its historic significance.

A property that is significant for its association with a significant person should retain integrity of location, design, feeling, and association, at a minimum, in order to convey its historic association with a significant individual.

8.2 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 1946–1980


Theme: Residential Development, 1946–1980

Property Type: Single-Family Residences, Ancillary Buildings, Subdivision Planning Features, Vernacular Landscapes, Designed Residential properties constructed in the City at this time typically filled in existing tracts as already subdivided, or were built on very small (less than 25 lots) new tracts oriented toward cul-de-sacs branching off existing roads. Both development types are located across the City.

Area of Significance: As the site of a significant historic event from this period; for its association with patterns of residential development in the City; as the site of a significant historic event from this period; for its association with a person (or persons) significant in the history of the City.

Criteria: A/B 1/2 1/2

Period of Significance: 1946–1980

Eligibility Standards:

- Date to the period of significance (1946–1980)
- Retain the essential aspects of integrity
  - Retain enough of its essential physical features to sufficiently convey its association with the historic context.
  - Retain the majority (60 percent or more) of the contributors dating to the period of significance.
• Retain enough of its essential physical features to sufficiently convey its association with the historic context

• Be directly associated with the notable person’s productive period – the time during which she or he attained significance

**Integrity Considerations:** A property that is significant as the site of a significant historic event is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that comprised its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event. A residential property from this period should retain integrity of location, feeling, and association, at a minimum, in order to convey the important association with the city’s development during this period. A property that has lost integrity of setting may still be eligible. A property that has lost some historic materials or details may still be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its original style and appearance in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, and fenestration pattern. A property is not eligible if it retains some basic features conveying form and massing but has lost the majority of features that characterized its appearance during its historical period.

In order for a historic district to be eligible for designation, the majority of the components within the district boundary must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole. Integrity of design, setting, and feeling must be strongly present in the district overall, and it should convey a strong sense of time and place. A contributing building must retain integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, and association to adequately convey the significance of the historic district. In general, minor or reversible alterations or in-kind replacement of original features and finishes are acceptable within historic districts. Significant alterations that change the massing, form, roofline, or fenestration patterns of an individual building, alter the original design intent, or that are not reversible may result in non-contributing status for an individual building. In order for a historic district to retain integrity, the majority (60 percent or more) of its component parts should contribute to its historic significance.

A property that is significant for its association with a significant person should retain integrity of location, design, feeling, and association, at a minimum, in order to convey its historic association with a significant individual.
SECTION 9
EVALUATION OF ELIGIBILITY

9.1 1625 OLD MILL ROAD

9.1.1 National Register of Historic Places

National Register Criterion A

Based upon a review of the “San Marino Becomes a City, 1913–1930” and “Postwar Development” contexts of the initial Citywide Historic Context Statement, previous ownership records, and the construction history of the property; the property was developed as part of a residential tract that was recorded in 1925. A high volume of residential tracts was established throughout the City in the early 1900s as suburban development increased with the blooming streetcar system. Many of these residential tracts were plotted in the 1920s, but not developed until the postwar years. The subject property is part of Tract No. 9178 which was plotted in 1925 by owner Seymour E. Bisbee Jr. The subject property was built 26 years after the initial development of the tract. Most of the properties located within the tract were built during the 1920s and 1930s when the tract was subdivided, and a small portion of infill occurred during postwar development in the late 1940s and 1950s. The tract itself is an example of residential development from 1913 to 1930, yet the subject property was not built during this period of significance. Likewise, though the year built falls within the period of significance for postwar residential development 1946–1980, the tract where the subject property is located is not significant in that period of growth. Also, postwar residential development is ubiquitous throughout Los Angeles County. The subject property does not adequately convey significance for early residential development or postwar development because development of the subject property does not convey an association with a significant pattern of events or trends that made a significant contribution to the development of the nation, state, or region. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A.

National Register Criterion B

No information was found to suggest that any of the previous owners or residents were historic personages that made demonstrably significant contributions to the history of the nation, state, or region, or that any other individuals of historical significance were associated with the property. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion B.

National Register Criterion C

The subject property is a common and low-style example of Ranch style single-family residence with no high-style characteristics. The property was not designed by a master architect and was not built by a master contractor. The property is not an excellent example of a type of architecture in San Marino. The subject property does not possess high artistic value and does not embody the distinctive characteristics of this style of architecture. Furthermore, the subject property’s architectural style and year built fall outside the potential historic district justification for the eligibility: Revival Architecture primarily constructed in the 1920s and 1930s. Therefore, the subject property is a non-contributor to the potential historic district. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C.
National Register Criterion D

Criterion D was not considered in this report as it generally applies to archaeological resources. Additionally, there is no reason to believe the property has the potential to yield important information regarding prehistory or history.

9.1.2 California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register eligibility criteria mirror those of the National Register. Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register for the same reasons outlined above.

9.1.3 City of San Marino Historic Landmark

Similarly, the San Marino Historic Landmark eligibility criteria mirror those of the National Register and California Register criteria. Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for designation as an Historic Landmark for the same reasons outlined above.
Based upon research and analysis, the subject property located at 1625 Old Mill Road does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation as an Historic Landmark. The subject property is located within a tract with significance to the early development of San Marino but was built 26 years after the tract was subdivided (Attachment B, DPR 523 Series Forms). Also, the building was constructed within the period of significance for postwar development, yet the building is not located within an area that conveys that period of growth. Moreover, the property is not a contributor to a potential historic district as its architectural style and year built date do not match with the identifiable features of the eligible Period Revival historic district suggested in the initial reconnaissance survey completed for the Citywide Historic Resource Survey by Architectural Resource Group in 2019. Therefore, the property is not a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.
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ATTACHMENT A
RESUME OF KEY PERSONNEL
Ms. Kasey Viso has two years of experience in the field of cultural resources management and the built environment, including archival research, district and resource surveys, preparation of National Register of Historic Places nominations, and regulatory compliance. She meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's *Professional Qualification Standards* in the fields of History and Architectural History.

Ms. Viso has served on projects in Los Angeles County and has experience with the California Office of Historic Preservation; the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation; the City of Los Angeles; and various other state, county, and local government agencies.

Ms. Viso has prepared National Register nomination forms for historic districts such as Leimert Park in South Los Angeles and the Descanso Gardens Historic District in Pasadena and individual resources such as Engine Co. 54 in Hyde Park. Ms. Viso has also worked with the city of Long Beach in assisting in the evaluation of their Preservation Ordinance for the Drake Park Historic District.
P1. Other Identifier: None

P2. Location: [ ] Not for Publication  [ ] Unrestricted
   *a. County: Los Angeles and *(P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)*
   *b. USGS 7.5' Quad: El Monte  Date: 1994  T1S; R12W; __of__ of Sec: __B.M.*
   c. Address: 1625 Old Mill Road  City: San Marino  Zip: 90057
   d. UTM (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources)  Zone: ___________mE/_________mN
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate): APN 5335-005-015

P3a. Description (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries): The subject property includes a single-family residence constructed in 1951. The single-story Ranch-style residence faces Old Mill Road, measures 2,549 square feet, and features an irregular ‘U’-shaped footprint. The building has a medium pitched, multi-hipped roof clad in composition shingles. There are two brick chimneys visible from the primary façade. The exterior is clad in stucco and brick. The building is in good condition. The primary façade is asymmetrical with three bays. The entrance is recessed, located off center in the middle bay, and accessed via a raised porch. The entrance porch is brick with one wood square column to the north. There is a small patio on the northern bay with a low brick wall around the perimeter. The fenestration pattern consists of a slightly protruding bay window and steel-framed casement windows.

P3b. Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): HP3 Multi-Family Property

P4. Resources Present: [ ] Building  [ ] Structure  [ ] Object  [ ] Site  [ ] District  [ ] Element of District  [ ] Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photo or Drawing (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo (view, date, accession #): Primary Façade, view facing West  July 29, 2019

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:
   [ ] Historic  [ ] Prehistoric  [ ] Both

P7. Owner and Address:
   Joseph Wong

P8. Recorded by (Name, affiliation, and address):
   Kasey Conley
   Sapphos Environmental, Inc.
   430 N. Halstead Street
   Pasadena, CA  91107

P9. Date Recorded: August 21, 2019

P10. Survey Type (Describe): Intensive

P11. Report Citation (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none"): Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 2019. Historic Resource Assessment Report for 2310 Ocean View Avenue.

Attachments: [ ] NONE  [ ] Location Map  [ ] Sketch Map  [ ] Continuation Sheet  [ ] Building, Structure, and Object Record  [ ] Archaeological Record  [ ] District Record  [ ] Linear Feature Record  [ ] Milling Station Record  [ ] Rock Art Record  [ ] Artifact Record  [ ] Photograph Record  [ ] Other (List):
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): 2310 Ocean View Avenue
*NRHP Status Code: 6Z
Page 2 of 4

B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Private use for personal owner
B4. Present Use: Private use for personal owner

*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

The subject property is located in Tract 9178 of San Marino, which was subdivided in 1925 as a possible extension of the Oak Knoll Marino Tract. The land was owned by the Huntington Land and Improvement Company from 1925 to 1951. The Huntington Land and Improvement Company was founded by Henry Edwards Huntington in 1902 to purchase, subdivide, and re-sell land surrounding the Pacific Electric and Los Angeles railways. The land was improved in 1951 by Roy Breitweiser, the owner and builder. The original building permits for the construction of the building were provided by the City. The land was improved in 1951 with no listed architect and Roy Breitweiser identified as the owner and contractor. The pool was added in 1965 and in 1975, a permit was issued to enclose the existing rear patio, leaving the sliding doors and casement windows in place. Multiple permits for reroofing and painting of both the residence and the garage have been issued over the years.

*B7. Moved? □ No □ Yes □ Unknown
Date: N/A
Original Location: N/A

*B8. Related Features: N/A

B9a. Architect: N/A
b. Builder:

*B10. Significance: Theme: N/A Area: San Marino
Period of Significance: N/A Property Type: Building Applicable Criteria: N/A
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Based upon a review of the "San Marino Becomes a City, 1913-1930" and "Postwar Development" contexts of the initial Citywide Historic Context Statement, previous ownership records, and the construction history of the property; the property was developed as part of a residential tract that was recorded in 1925. A high volume of residential tracts was established throughout the City in the early 1900s as suburban development increased with the blooming streetcar system. Many of these residential tracts were plotted in the 1920s, but not developed until the postwar years. (See Continuation Sheet page 4)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): N/A


*B13. Remarks: N/A

*B14. Evaluator:
Kasey Conley
Sapphos Environmental, Inc.
430 N. Halstead Street
Pasadena, CA 91107

*Date of Evaluation: July 26, 2019

(This space reserved for official comments.)

DPR 523B (9/2013) *Required Information
*B10. Significance: (Continued from Building, Structure, and Object Record page 2)

The subject property is part of Tract No. 9178 which was plotted in 1925 by owner Seymour E. Bisbee Jr. The subject property was built 26 years after the initial development of the tract. Most of the properties located within the tract were built during the 1920s and 1930s when the tract was subdivided, and a small portion of infill occurred during postwar development in the late 1940s and 1950s. The tract itself is an example of residential development from 1913 to 1930, yet the subject property was not built during this period of significance. Likewise, though the year built falls within the period of significance for postwar residential development 1946-1980, the tract where the subject property is located is not significant in that period of growth. Also, postwar residential development is ubiquitous throughout Los Angeles County. The subject property does not adequately convey significance for early residential development or postwar development because development of the subject property does not convey an association with a significant pattern of events or trends that made a significant contribution to the development of the nation, state, or region. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A.

No information was found to suggest that any of the previous owners or residents were historic personages that made demonstrably significant contributions to the history of the nation, state, or region, or that any other individuals of historical significance were associated with the property. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion B.

The subject property is a common and low-style example of Ranch style single-family residence with no high-style characteristics. The property was not designed by a master architect and was not built by a master contractor. The property is not an excellent example of a type of architecture in San Marino. The subject property does not possess high artistic value and does not embody the distinctive characteristics of this style of architecture. Furthermore, the subject property’s architectural style and year built fall outside the potential historic district justification for the eligibility: Revival Architecture primarily constructed in the 1920s and 1930s. Therefore, the subject property is a non-contributor to the potential historic district. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C.

Criterion D was not considered in this report as it generally applies to archaeological resources. Additionally, there is no reason to believe the property has the potential to yield important information regarding prehistory or history.

*B12. References: (Continued from Building, Structure, and Object Record page 2)

City of San Marino. 9 February 1951. Building Permit #7636.

City of San Marino. 15 October 1965. Building Permit #0952, #1394, #1717; Permit #24548, 1975.

Huntington Library. "Huntington Land and Improvement Company Collection of Photographs and Negatives." Online Archive of California. Available at: https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt4v19z0cw/

DATA SHEET I - FINDINGS

Design Review Case No. DRC19-74HP

That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood, and

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,

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

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

PROJECT #: Design Review No. DRC19-74HP

SUBJECT: Construction of a new two-story residence.

APPLICANT: Wong/PDS Studio Inc.

LOCATION: 1625 Old Mill Road

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0710, FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

A. General Requirements

1. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, protect and hold harmless city, its elected and appointed council members, boards, commissions, officers, officials, agents, consultants, employees, and volunteers from and against any and all claims, actions, or proceeding against the city and its elected and appointed council members, boards, commissions, officers, officials, agents, consultants, employees and volunteers to attack, set aside, void or annul, an approval of the city, Planning Commission or City Council concerning this permit and the project. Such indemnification shall include damages, judgments, settlements, penalties, fines, defensive costs or expenses, including, but not limited to, interest, attorneys’ fees and expert witness fees, or liability of any kind related to or arising from such claim, action, or proceeding. The city shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding. The city shall have the option of coordinating the defense, including, but not limited to, choosing counsel for the defense at applicant’s expense.

2. Copies of the signed Planning Commission Resolution of Approval or Approval Letter, Standard Conditions, and all environmental mitigations shall be included on the plans (full size). The sheet(s) are for information only to all parties involved in the construction/grading activities and are not required to be wet sealed/stamped by a licensed Engineer/Architect.

B. Time Limits

1. Any approval shall expire if Building Permits are not issued or approved use has not commenced within 1 year from the date of approval or a time extension has been granted.
C. Site Development

1. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans which include site plans, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, sign program, and grading on file in the Planning and Building Department, the conditions contained herein, and the Zoning Code regulations. ___/___/___

2. Prior to any use of the project site being commenced thereon, all Conditions of Approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director. ___/___/___

3. Occupancy of the structure shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to commencement of occupancy, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The structure shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to start of occupancy. ___/___/___

4. The applicant shall provide divided lites on patio doors consistent with divided lites on windows. ___/___/___

5. The applicant shall provide a front entry door no higher than seven feet six inches in height. ___/___/___

6. The applicant shall provide regular maintenance on the existing front yard hedge to ensure that it remains no higher than four (4) in height. ___/___/___

7. Prior to submitting the project for Building Permit, the applicant shall submit a tree protection report and a recovery plan for the olive tree in the front yard. Said report and plan are subject to the satisfaction of the City’s Urban Forester. ___/___/___

___/___/___

___/___/___
STRAEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

• Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services
• Attractive, Complementary Business District

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests to provide on-site sales and consumption of alcoholic beverages as an ancillary use to an existing restaurant that serves complete meals. This requires one conditional use permit pursuant to City Code Section 23.03.01C.

REQUIRED ACTION

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. CUP19-22 — ALCOHOL USE FOR RESTAURANTS

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION AND PROJECT HISTORY

Pursuant to Code, upon receipt of a complete application the director or his/her designee shall meet with the applicant or the applicant’s representative to explain to the applicant the applicable design guidelines, findings, and procedures that will apply to the project, and to informally discuss compliance of the project with the design guidelines and applicable regulations. None of the director’s comments or suggestions shall constitute an actual or implied approval of the application.

November 2019 – The applicant consulted with staff on the ability on allowing beer and wine in the commercial units previously approved as restaurants. Due to the City’s proactive Economic Development Program and strategy, staff encouraged the property owner to apply for the conditional use permit only if the anticipated uses for the available commercial units were restaurants.
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: November 22, 2019

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2000-2006 Huntington Drive

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   PM 283-77-78 Ex of Alley Lot 1 San Marino Court
   (legal description may be attached separately if necessary)
   5334 010 016

4. State in your own words:
   a. The use (or improvement) you intend to make to the above described property:
      Requesting Beer and Wine Approval
      For Three Units Within the Building

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

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: LA CIENEGA COMPANY, LLC

Mailing Address: 433 N. CAMDEN DR #600 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210

Owner’s Phone Number (Home): (310) 266 6555

Owner’s Phone Number (Work): ( ) Csina1@aol.com

Agent’s Name and Address: Same as Above

Agent’s Phone Number: ( )

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
January 22, 2020

City of San Marino
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marini, CA 91108

RE: Application No. CUP19-22
2000-2006 Huntington Drive, San Marino

To Whom It May Concern:

The request for the subject application is for the sale of Beer and Wine in conjunction with sit down meal service at 2004 and 2006 Huntington Drive locations. Both locations are proposed restaurants serving lunch and dinner in a sit down setting. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the above information.

Sincerely,

La Cienega Company, LLC

[Signature]
Cameron Sinal
Data Sheet 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.

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.

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

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.
STANDARD CONDITIONS

PROJECT #: CUP19-22
SUBJECT: Beer and Wine CUP
APPLICANT: La Cienega Co.
LOCATION: 2000-2006 Huntington Drive, San Marino 91108

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0713, FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

A. General Requirements

1. The applicant shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers, or employees, because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees, for any Court costs and attorney's fees which the City, its agents, officers, or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition. ___/___/___

2. Copies of the signed Planning Commission Resolution of Approval No. or Approval Letter, Standard Conditions, and all environmental mitigations shall be included on the plans (full size). ___/___/___

3. Only restaurant uses that provide for complete meals shall be permitted to serve beer and wine. All other uses are prohibited from serving beer and wine and shall be excluded from the approval of this conditional use permit. ___/___/___

B. Time Limits

1. Any approval shall expire if Building Permits are not issued or approved use has not commenced within 1 year from the date of approval or a time extension has been granted. ___/___/___
C. Site Development

1. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans which include site plans, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, sign program, and grading on file in the Planning and Building Department, the conditions contained herein, and the Zoning Code regulations. ___/___/___

2. Prior to any use of the project site or business activity being commenced thereon, all Conditions of Approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director. ___/___/___

3. Occupancy of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to occupancy, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The buildings shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to occupancy. ___/___/___

4. Approval of this request shall not waive compliance with all sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Community, Specific Plans and/or Master Plans in effect at the time of Building Permit issuance. ___/___/___

5. All building numbers and individual units shall be identified in a clear and concise manner, including proper illumination and in conformance with Building Department standards, the Municipal Code and the San Marino Fire Department (SMFD) Standards. ___/___/___

6. All parkways, open areas, and landscaping shall be permanently maintained by the property owner, or other means acceptable to the City. ___/___/___
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

- Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services
- Attractive, Complementary Business District

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests to provide on-site sales and consumption of alcoholic beverages as an ancillary use to an existing restaurant that serves complete meals. This requires one conditional use permit pursuant to City Code Section 23.03.01C.

REQUIRED ACTION

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. CUP19-23 – ALCOHOL USE FOR RESTAURANTS

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION AND PROJECT HISTORY

Pursuant to Code, upon receipt of a complete application the director or his/her designee shall meet with the applicant or the applicant’s representative to explain to the applicant the applicable design guidelines, findings, and procedures that will apply to the project, and to informally discuss compliance of the project with the design guidelines and applicable regulations. None of the director’s comments or suggestions shall constitute an actual or implied approval of the application.

December 2019 – The applicant consulted with staff on the ability on allowing beer and wine for an existing restaurant use known as San Marino Cafe. Due to the City’s proactive Economic Development Program and strategy, staff encouraged the property owner to apply for the conditional use permit.
**BACKGROUND**

General Plan: Commercial Use  
Zoning: C-1, General Commercial  
Location: The subject property is located at the north west corner of Mission Street and Euclid Avenue  
Lot Size: 10,546 square feet  
Existing Use: Single-story commercial building with four leasable tenant spaces  
Surrounding Uses: The subject site is surrounded to the east and west by lots located in the General Commercial Zone developed with commercial buildings. To the north of the subject site are lots located in the Residential Zone developed with single-family homes.  
Proposed Square-Footage: N/A  
Parking Required: N/A  
Parking Provided: 16 spaces  
Environmental Determination: Sections 15301 Class I Existing Facilities.

The current Zoning Code limits the sale and consumption of alcohol to beer and wine. The sale and consumption of beer and wine must also be accompanied by a complete meal. “Hard liquor” is not allowed to be sold or consumed in the City under the current code.

**ANALYSIS**

The property owner is requesting a conditional use permit to allow for beer and wine sales and consumption for an existing restaurant use known as San Marino Cafe. As stated above, the current Zoning Code limits the sale and consumption of alcohol to beer and wine. The sale and consumption of beer and wine must also be accompanied by a complete meal. As an existing restaurant that services complete meals, such a request is permissible by the Code.

According to the business model, San Marino Café serves breakfast, brunch and lunch. The café is open from 9:00am to 3:00pm and employees 12 full-time and part-time staff. The business is also open 7 days a week.

In examining a conditional use permit, the Planning Commission must make sure that the conditions will be consistent with the required findings for a conditional use permit.

*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 abut the existing commercial parking lot should experience no detrimental effects from the change since the rear lot is used exclusively for parking associates with commercial activity. This will not change because of this request. The restaurant use will not amend their operations with respect to the menu, number of staff, nor the hours of operation. This request is to allow the restaurant the ability to serve beer and wine as an accessory to the restaurant use, which serves full meals.

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 16 spaces behind the building and 11 on-street parking spaces directly in front of the commercial building. According to staff's parking survey, the off-street parking experiences constant turnover. Staff found that there is enough parking spaces throughout the day to accommodate the uses of the building. In addition to the parking, the site is sufficient in size and shape to accommodate other development features necessary for the restaurant.

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 restaurant since it consistently has several spaces open during breakfast and lunch times. Staff considered lunchtime the busiest time for this building since all stores and offices would be in operation. Parking demand decreases later in the day when the office uses close for the day.

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 but rather customers will likely have longer visits. Mission Street and the alley provide for the adequate circulation and traffic for the proposed use.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends APPROVAL of CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. DRC19-23. If the Planning Commission concurs with staff's recommendation, then, following the public hearing, the actions would be:

1. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines, the Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment finds that CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. CUP19-23 is categorically exempt under Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities).
2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment hereby makes the findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. CUP19-23, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

3. The Planning Commission approves CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. CUP19-23, subject to the attached Conditions on Data Sheet No. 2, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. Data Sheet I – Findings
4. Data Sheet II – Conditions of Approval
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: 12/23/19

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2501 MISSION ST. SAN MARINO, CA 91108

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:
      SAN MARINO CAFE AND MARKETPLACE IS APPLING FOR A CUP FOR THE SALE AND SERVING OF WINE AND BEER.
   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:

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: 

HARRY ZAROUSHIAN

Mailing Address: 4647 W. AVE 41 LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

Owner’s Phone Number (Home): (626) 644-5561

Owner’s Phone Number (Work): (____ )

Agent’s Name and Address: 

Agent’s Phone Number: (____ )

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
San Marino Café and Marketplace

CUP Business Detail

Established in 2017, San Marino Café and Marketplace is a quaint counter service café with Mediterranean inspired fare, serving breakfast, brunch and lunch in the Mission District in San Marino, CA. San Marino Café also offers corporate and residential catering. Currently the café has a staff of 12 full-time and part-time employees. Hours of operation are 9:00am-3:00pm, 7 days a week. San Marino Café has become a place to gather in the community where patrons enjoy outdoor seating and a friendly ambiance. We are seeking a Conditional Use Permit at the café site at 2507 Mission St. to obtain the required permits and licensing to provide the on-site sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages during hours of operation.

Thank you.

Linda Zadoian, Proprietor

San Marino Café and Marketplace
Data Sheet 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.

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.

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

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.
STANDARD CONDITIONS

PROJECT #: CUP19-23

SUBJECT: Beer and Wine CUP

APPLICANT: Linda Zadoian

LOCATION: 2507 Mission Street, San Marino 91108

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0713, FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

A. General Requirements

1. The applicant shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers, or employees, because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees, for any Court costs and attorney's fees which the City, its agents, officers, or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition. ___/___/___

2. Copies of the signed Planning Commission Resolution of Approval No. or Approval Letter, Standard Conditions, and all environmental mitigations shall be included on the plans (full size). ___/___/___

3. Only restaurant uses that provide for complete meals shall be permitted to serve beer and wine. All other uses are prohibited from serving beer and wine and shall be excluded from the approval of this conditional use permit. ___/___/___

4. The sale and consumption of beer and wine shall be limited to the interior of the building. The sale and consumption of beer and wine on the exterior of the building shall not be permitted. ___/___/___
B. Time Limits

1. Any approval shall expire if Building Permits are not issued or approved use has not commenced within 1 year from the date of approval or a time extension has been granted. ___/___/___

C. Site Development

1. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans which include site plans, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, sign program, and grading on file in the Planning and Building Department, the conditions contained herein, and the Zoning Code regulations. ___/___/___

2. Prior to any use of the project site or business activity being commenced thereon, all Conditions of Approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director. ___/___/___

3. Occupancy of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to occupancy, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The buildings shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to occupancy. ___/___/___

4. Approval of this request shall not waive compliance with all sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Community, Specific Plans and/or Master Plans in effect at the time of Building Permit issuance. ___/___/___

5. All building numbers and individual units shall be identified in a clear and concise manner, including proper illumination and in conformance with Building Department standards, the Municipal Code and the San Marino Fire Department (SMFD) Standards. ___/___/___

6. All parkways, open areas, and landscaping shall be permanently maintained by the property owner, or other means acceptable to the City. ___/___/___
TO: CHAIR WRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR  
BY: MARLON CERVANTES, ASSISTANT PLANNER  
DATE: FEBRUARY 26, 2020  
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-93  
2299 ASHBOURNE DR., (KHAN)  

STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS  

• Engaged and Connected Residents  
• Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services  
• Beautiful, Preserved, Single-Family Residential Neighborhood  

PROPOSAL  
The applicant requests the Commission to consider the Design Review Committee's denial to install windows with grids wider than what is typically allowed for a permit with staff level review.

REQUIRED ACTION  
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-93 – CHANGE APPEARANCE OF AN EXISTING STRUCTURE AS VIEWED FROM PUBLIC STREET  

BACKGROUND  
The property was previously approved for an addition and remodel project by the Planning Commission in February, 2019 including a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the allowed lot coverage by an additional 371 square feet.  

In December, 2019, it was disclosed by the applicant to staff that all windows and doors were being replaced, however the original scope of work listed on the building permit for construction included only work in the addition and remodel areas, not a whole house
windows and doors replacement. Once inspected, Staff found that the wood windows which had been installed contained grids that were wider than what is typically allowed for permit under staff level review. Staff was unable to issue an after-the-fact permit.

On December 23, 2019, the applicant submitted an application to the Design Review Committee to review and consider the window grid width. At the January 15, 2020 meeting, the DRC denied the request citing concerns regarding deviation from approved locations and sizes of certain windows which ultimately resulted in a negative change in appearance.

On January 27, 2020, the applicant submitted an appeal application citing their desire to maintain the historic nature of the wood windows and advised staff that the street facing windows had been removed.

**DESIGN REVIEW ACTION**

**NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of January, 15, 2020)**

Approve – 11  
Object – 0  
No response – 4

**ANALYSIS**

Section 23.15.08 of the San Marino City Code states that the PC 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 proposed wood windows are compatible with window materials found throughout the neighborhood however, the grid size are wider than those seen throughout the legal neighborhood with the only exception being at 2145 Urmston Place.

The proposed windows and doors will have consistent treatment and details throughout the existing structure.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission uphold the Design Review Committee’s decision to deny DRC 19-93.
ATTACHMENTS
1. Design Review Committee Appeal Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. DRC Neighborhood Map
4. DRC Staff Report
5. DRC January 15, 2020 meeting minutes
Pursuant to City Code, the Planning Commission shall hear any and all appeals "de novo". The Planning Commission shall consider the matter pursuant to the same notice, procedure and standards applicable to proceedings before the DRC.

A complete application, a non-refundable appeal fee (Council Resolution R17-15), and eight (8) sets of drawings (if applicable) are due at the time the appeal is filed.

Date of Design Review Committee Meeting  January 15th 2020
Date of Appeal (within 15 days)  January 27th 2020
Regarding: 19-93 (DRC No.) at 2299 Ashbourne Dr, San Marino, 91108 (Address)

APPELLANT INFORMATION:
Name: Shazia Khan
Address: 2405 Roanoke Road, San Marino, 91108
Phone Number: 323-454-9535 Email Address: shazia.sk@usc.edu

The undersigned hereby appeals the decision of the Design Review Committee, referenced above, upon the following grounds: (state reasons why you think the Planning Commission should render a different decision than that rendered by the Design Review Committee. Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Please see attached letter.

Appellant Signature  1/27/2020 Date
January 27th, 2020,

To the Planning Commission

Dear Members of the commission,

I and my husband come to you to appeal the decision that was reached on January 15th at the Design Review Meeting. We think that the question that was asked regarding the size of the grids was completely derailed by the assumption that we had done something illegal.

Dear Sir/Madam, I want to insist that there was never our intention to undermine any one's authority or do anything that was not permissible. The project that we had presented and had been working with the city staff had 8 different permits that were issued in the whole renovation of the house. Our mistake as novices doing this project could be that we did not know that the windows require a separate permit. But that does not mean to brand us "Rogues" or Criminals who are doing something illegal.

The missed permit was correctable with city's staff guidance by applying for one and then asking the esteemed members of the DRC the question, that for the wood windows that need to be compatible with Title 24 it would need a 3/8th inch bigger grid then was on the previous windows? Is it not something reasonable to ask when there are similar windows in the legal neighborhood?

The verbal flogging that we received from each DRC member and the embarrassment we faced in front of neighbors and members of the community was a punishment enough for our unintentional mistake. We have already suffered insurmountable emotional and financial loss while undergoing this project that was supposed to be our dream to build our home. We have at all the steps followed by the city's rules including installing fire sprinklers and safety alarm. We have built the sidewalk to make that corner more appealing and cleaner of Los Robles. We did all of this because we love this city and want to maintain the beauty and historical architecture.

The customized wooden windows with double pane windows will require a 3/8th inch bigger size grid. The simulated grids are not an option that anyone would prefer as that was not how the old wooden windows were made and it also reduces the longevity of the window. In a time that more people are already opting for casement windows, we decided to maintain the historical character of this city by deciding on wood windows.

We hope that you will review this matter with compassion and justice.

Sincerely,

Drs. Shazia and Salman Khan.
TO: Chair Cheng and Members of the Design Review Committee  
FROM: Eva Choi, Associate Planner  
DATE: January 15, 2020  
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-93  
2299 ASHBOURNE DR., (KHAN)  

PROJECT DESCRIPTION  
The applicant proposes to change the appearance of an existing structure as viewed from a public street.  
The property is currently under construction for an addition and remodel project previously approved by the Planning Commission. During a discussion with staff in December 2019, the applicant disclosed to staff that all of the windows and doors on the structure have been replaced without permit. Upon further review of the installed window material, staff found the installed wood windows to be generally in compliance with City guidelines, but the grid size was found to be wider than what is typically allowed for a permit with only staff level review. Thus, the Committee is requested to review the window grid width. The Residential Design Guidelines encourages the window grid width to be in scale with the window and complement the character of the home’s style. New windows should appear seamless as viewed from a public street. Please refer to page 4 of the City’s Pre-Approved Window Material List for guidelines on window replacement projects.  

TREE PRESERVATION  
This project will not remove or relocate any trees.  

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION  
The project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1) – Existing Facilities.  

PROJECT HISTORY  
January 15, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC  
March 2, 2020 – Required action date
NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 11
Object – 0
No response – 4

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.
   
   Staff can make this finding: □ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comments: While the wood windows are appropriate for the structure and compatible with window materials found in the legal neighborhood; the grid size are wider than those found on traditional homes within the legal neighborhood. The only exception would be 2145 Urmston Place, where the applicant was able to confirm the window grid width being the same size as his proposal.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.
   
   Staff can make this finding: □ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.
   
   Staff can make this finding: □ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE

4. That the colors and materials are consistent and match the existing building or structure.
   
   Staff can make this finding: □ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comment: All windows and doors will have consistent treatments and details throughout the structure.
GENERAL:

- Proposals must be in compliance with the “Window Replacement Procedures” document. The proposed windows must match the shape, size, style and operation as the original windows on the home. The original windows on the home will be used to guide staff-level window replacement approvals.
- Proposals which deviate from the original style of windows shall be referred to the DRC. If the existing windows do not appear to be original to the home or if they are inconsistent with the “City of San Marino Residential Design Guidelines”, staff may refer the application to the DRC.

GRIDS (MUNTINS):

- Grids may be simulated or true divided but the width must match the existing windows.
- Grids must protrude from the exterior of the glass. No grids in between panes of glass will be accepted; no flat grids will be accepted. “Plant-on” grids are not allowed.
- Grids shall have a depth of between 3/8" - 1" and shall match the depth of the sash.
- Exterior and interior grids must be permanently affixed.
- The placement and appearance of grids should mimic the appearance of true divided lites as found on an original wood window.

OTHER:

- Windows must appear seamless as viewed from the public right-of-way; cladding or other exterior finishes must lie flat and have inconspicuous seams and joints.
- A color must be selected that is compatible with the existing color scheme of the home. The color must be specified prior to permit issuance.
- Metallic or pearized finishes are not allowed.
- Sills should be installed to match the size and design of the original window sill.
- Plant-on trim or moulding detail around the window shall be prohibited. All trim or edge detail must match the existing windows.
- Screens may be on the inside or outside.
- Dual pane windows shall have a spacer between the glass.
- Glass may not be tinted beyond what is required for energy efficiency.
- Between-the-glass window shades are not allowed.
- Side and rear doors may be the same material and manufacturer as the approved windows.
- At least one (1) window in every bedroom must meet the minimum emergency egress requirements.
- Windows must meet all applicable energy efficiency requirements. Leave the labels on windows for the building inspection.

Please read and sign below if you are submitting a window replacement application:

I have reviewed and applied the criteria set forth in the “Window Replacement Procedures and Pre-Approved Window List Document” to my window replacement project.

__________________________________________________________________________
Signature of property owner or window contractor

__________________________________________________________________________
Date
Side View with New Window

Side View with Old Window
Front view with new window

Front view with new door and window
Front view with new door & window.

New sliding door towards backyard.
City Hall

[Image of a building labeled "City Hall"]

[Image of a stained glass window]
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
JANUARY 15, 2020 - 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER Chair Cheng called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair Kevin Cheng, Vice-Chair Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij, Committee Member Christa Lakon, Committee Member Howard Brody, Alternate Committee Member Rick Chou

ABSENT: Committee Member Peter Wong

APPEAL PROCEDURE

Chair Cheng gave an explanation of the Design Review Committee procedures and explanation of the fifteen-day appeal procedure to the members of the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-17
1706 HILLIARD DR., (KY/LIN)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff can support the project with a condition of approval to re-purpose existing roofing material for installation on the new front porch.

Eric Lin, project designer, presented the project, and answered questions.

The following person(s) spoke on the project:
Ms. Mary, 1714 Hilliard Dr.

It was the consensus of the Committee that design concerns remain at this fourth hearing. The Committee was concern with the compatibility of the proposed DaVinci simulated slate material in single width with the roofing material on the existing structure.

Committee Member Brody moved to deny the project.

Second by Vice-Chair Batnij. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Chou.
2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-59**
   **2105 SHERWOOD RD., (LIU)**

Vice-Chair Batnij recused herself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could support the project with a condition that landscaping be provided in the setback area between the subject fence and the sidewalk.

Liangan Liu, property owner, explained to the Committee his experience in obtaining a property survey.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the project was compatible with the neighborhood.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. The fence shall be cedar or redwood material.
2. The fence shall be painted in a color as the residence.

Second by Alternate Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

Vice-Chair Batnij returned to the dais.

3. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-82**
   **1735 BANNING WAY, (SI)**

Committee Member Brody recused himself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Assistant Planner Cervantes presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

Mike Morita, Pella window representative, provided a brief overview of the project and answered questions.

Howard Brody, Banning Way resident, spoke in support of the project.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the new windows will be compatible with the style of the residence.

Chair Cheng moved to approve the project with the following condition:
1. Each window unit shall have three columns of equal width as depicted in the colored rendering.

Second by Alternate Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Vice-Chair Batnij.

Committee Member Brody returned to the dais.

4. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-93**
   **2299 ASHBOURNE DR., (KHAN)**

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could not support the project.

Salman Khan, property owner, explained the background, presented the project and answered questions.

The following person(s) spoke in support of the project:  
James Fu, 2265 Ashbourne Dr.  
Vahan Karaooghlanian, Burbank address

It was the consensus of the Committee that the new window muntins or grids are not consistent with the residence itself. The Committee was concerned with deviations from original approved window locations and sizes of certain windows.

Committee Member Brody moved to deny the project.

Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

5. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-34**
   **1430 BELLWOOD RD., (EAR)**

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could support the project.

Nick Wang, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the single-story addition project compatible with the existing structure and the neighborhood.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Provide a new 30” wide by 42” high window in the Kitchen facing Bellwood Road; window shall be consistent with remainder windows on the structure.
2. All new windows and doors must be a product from the City's Pre-Approved Window Material List.
3. Applicant shall coordinate with staff on the appropriate shutter color prior to installation.

Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

6. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-69
2520 RIDGEWAY RD., (TSE)

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could not support the project.

Elise Tse, Property owner, and Warren Cross, project contractor, presented the project and answered questions.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed metal roofing material would be highly visible on the corner property and incompatible with the materials found in the neighborhood.

Committee Member Brody moved to deny the project.

Second by Alternate Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

7. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-38
2920 MONTEREY RD., (GOEI/HA)

Committee Member Brody recused himself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Associate Planner Choi presented the project and stated that staff could not support the project due to design compatibility issues with the existing residence and the legal neighborhood.

Stephen Goei, property owner, presented the project and answered questions.

Herbert Krimmel, 2930 Monterey Road, spoke in opposition of the project.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed project is incompatible with the legal neighborhood and the proposed design features are incompatible with the Spanish Colonial style residence. The design is massive and disrupts the existing streetscape.

Alternate Committee Member Chou moved to deny the project.
Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

Committee Member Brody returned to the dais.

8. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-19
2200 EL MOLINO PL., (CHEN)

Associate Planner Choi stated that the project was noticed by error. The project designer had requested to be scheduled for the February 5, 2020 hearing.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Brody moved to continue the project to the February 5, 2020 meeting.

Second by Chair Cheng. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

9. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-60
2180 LORAIN RD., (CABOT/PACA)

Vice-Chair Batnij recused herself and stepped out of the Council Chamber.

Associate Planner Choi stated that the project architect has requested a continuance to the February 5, 2020 meeting.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Brody moved to continue the project to the February 5, 2020 meeting.

Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Brody, Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further items to consider, the DRC adjourned to the next regular Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, February 5, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.

EVA CHOI,
ASSOCIATE PLANNER
TO: CHAIR WRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR
DATE: FEBRUARY 26, 2020
SUBJECT: TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
2375 HUNTINGTON DRIVE (GRAD NIGHT/WELLS FARGO)

STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

- Engaged and Connected Residents
- Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests a 90-day temporary use permit to use the parking lot of the Wells Fargo parking structure to assemble and prepare the staging items for the annual Grad Night Event. This requires a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) pursuant to City Code Sections 23.09.08.

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

Pursuant to Code, upon receipt of a complete application the director or his/her designee shall meet with the applicant or the applicant's representative to explain to the applicant the applicable design guidelines, findings, and procedures that will apply to the project, and to informally discuss compliance of the project with the design guidelines and applicable regulations. None of the director's comments or suggestions shall constitute an actual or implied approval of the application.

For the past two years, the City and the Grad Night Group have discussed the requirement to secure a temporary use permit to operate the activities in the Wells Fargo parking structure.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to the Code, a “Temporary uses not complying with the provisions of this Chapter may be authorized by the Planning and Building Director if such temporary use does not exceed thirty (30) days’ duration and if the Planning and Building Director finds that such temporary
use will not be detrimental to the neighboring properties. Such temporary use in excess of thirty (30) days but not to exceed ninety (90) days shall be reviewed by the Commission.”

On January 29, 2020, staff approved the TUP for the initial 30-day period. Subsequent to this approval, the applicant submitted their request for a 90-day TUP.

For well over 25 years, the Grad Night Team has utilized the Wells Fargo parking lot for the purposes of assembling the various structures, stages and other materials necessary for the Grad Night Event, which is held at San Marino High School. During this time, the event has grown to not only include numerous themes, but a variety of different types of unique, custom built structures. Most importantly, the Grad Night event has fostered a level of volunteerism that rivals any other event in the City.

As the program grew and became more elaborate, it became necessary for the City to provide some oversight. The last two years, the event has required inspections from both the City Building Inspector and the Fire Chief. The inspections were necessary to inspect the structures integrity, the electrical systems and fire safety elements. In addition to the inspections, the City felt it necessary to require the TUP.

Noise Mitigation

The Grad Night Team has done a great job in noise mitigation over the last few years. To reduce any noise impacts, the Grad Night Team has done the following:

- Installed new walls to close the openings along the north face of the parking structure, which faces the alley.
- The new walls are constructed in a manner that ensures that any noise from the activities are kept inside the structure.
- All the heavy equipment and power tools are located in a manner to also reduce any noise impacts.
- Recently, the Team has provide noise mitigation over the parking structures driveway approach that is off the alley. Additional openings of the parking structure have also been secured with sound walls.

With the measures performed by the Team, staff felt comfortable approving the 30-day TUP and recommends the Planning Commission approve the 90-day TUP. The Planning Commission has the ability to include conditions of approval to help reduce any additional impacts. If the 90-day TUP is approved, the permit will expire on May 27, 2020.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the 90-day Temporary Use Permit to operate the Grad Night activities in the Wells Fargo Parking lot.

ATTACHMENT

1. Application
Calculation of Planning and Design Review Fees

See attached email.

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: January 30, 2020

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2355 HUNTINGTON DR SAN MARINO CA 91108-2642

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   TRACT NO 7486 NE 25 FT OF LOT 8 AND ALL OF LOTS 9,10,11 AND LOT 12; The third floor covered parking garage, accessed from the rear alley.
   (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:
      This use is for San Marino High School PTSA to build and prepare stage items for their plays and graduation props and store them for a certain term, January 5, 2020 - January 4, 2023.

      
   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      SMCC §23.03.01 C – The requested use is unique and special in nature and therefore subject to a conditional use permit: Temporary Use Permit.

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:
Laura Wulf, VP Wells Fargo Bank, N/A

Mailing Address: 333 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 800, LA, CA 90071

Owner’s Phone Number (Home): ( ) N/A

Owner’s Phone Number (Work): ( ) 249-7195

Agent’s Name and Address: Beth Davis, San Marino High School PTSA, 4th Chair
1341 Oxford Rd, San Marino, CA 91108

Agent’s Phone Number: ( ) 277-7743

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

• Engaged and Connected Residents
• Beautiful, Preserved, Single-Family Neighborhoods
• Efficient, Responsive, and Effective City Services

BACKGROUND

On November 20, 2018, it was observed by City staff that fourteen (14) established trees (greater than 11” DBH) along the street side of the property known as 975 Orlando Road, were damaged and removed without a tree removal permit. Due to the violation and pursuant to City Code Section 23.06.15G.2, a fine of $125,000 was issued to the owner of the property on November 7, 2019. Due to the severity of the tree violation, the City Arborist could not determine the type of trees that were removed. It was later determined by the property owner that the trees were comprised of Pittosporum unduatum, Prunus carolniana, Larual nobils, Ligustrum japonicum, Syzygium paniculatum and Ficus arica.

The tree violation was in adherence to the Tree Moratorium that was adopted during the time of the tree removal. Under the tree moratorium, the size thresholds were reduced from the prior ordinance from 36 inches in diameter to 6 inches in diameter for established trees. On February 9, 2020, the permanent Tree Preservation Ordinance took affect with the new size thresholds, which are 4 inches for Heritage trees and 6 inches for established trees.

Subsequent to the observance of the tree violation, staff was advised by the City Prosecutor to research the property and determine if the area in which the trees were located was City owner property or property owned by the adjacent property owner. If the property is
recorded as a City easement, its determined that the area is owned and maintained by the City. Under this case, the City may file a civil suit to remedy this issue. If an easement was not recorded for the area, its determined that the area is owned and maintained by adjacent property owner, which the City may utilize the Tree Preservation Ordinance to handle the violation. In this case, an easement for the area was not found and the direction of staff was to pursue this case as a violation of the Tree Preservation Ordinance. It is also worth noting that during this time, staff was in contact with the contractor who had removed the trees. The contractor was informed on the violation and the pending letter and fine.

ANALYSIS

The work performed was the complete removal of fourteen (14) established trees in the variety of species described above. In the “Tree and Hedge Removal” document provided by the appellant, it is described that the trees were removed to promote the health and longevity of the existing Oak Trees and to manage a future planned landscape renovation project. If this was the case at the time, staff should have been consulted to determine the best course of actions for said trees.

Due to the fact that fourteen (14) established (trees greater than 6 inches DBH) trees were removed without a permit it was determined that the trees were illegally removed and or damaged. Attached to the report are images taken by staff that show the true diameter of the trees. This evidence shows that all established trees were greater than the 6-inch threshold established by the Tree Moratorium at the time and the subsequent Tree Preservation Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the staff’s assessment of the removed trees and the lack of verifiable evidence to confirm the actual condition of the trees, staff recommends the Planning Commission uphold the decision of the City Arborist and find that fourteen (14) established trees were removed/damaged with a tree removal permit.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Appeal letter from property owner
2. Notice of Violation and Staff Photos
3. Tree Details provided by the Owner
November 20, 2019

To: Aldo Cervanties, Director of Planning and Building

FROM: Tim Lindsay, as agent to the owner of 975 Orlando, San Marino

REASON: Filling an Appeal for Illegal Tree Damage/Removals at 975 Orlando Road, San Marino, CA

In October 2018, my client and I identified trees and shrubs for removal, along the street side of said property. The plant types were comprised of Pittosporum undatum, Prunus caroliniana, Larual nobils, Ligustrum japonicum, Syzygium paniculatum and Ficus arica. Presumably planted in the 1950's, to serve as a privacy hedge, once they matured. Over the ensuing decades, they had been neglected and were over grown and reached senescent. Many of them were also adversely impacting the growth of heritage oaks growing in the street side location. They provided little privacy for the estate and physically impeded the growth and further development of the many heritage oaks growing in the same area.

Decisions to remove the plants were based on one or more of the following criteria:

1. Poor health of the plant (leaf chlorosis, reduced leaf density of canopy, signs of root disease/canker)

2. proximity of plants (competition) to the roots, trunks and canopies of existing heritage oak trees. And the nuisance or hazard they presented to people or property.

3. function and appropriateness of the plant in the landscape when compared to the future landscape plans for restoration of the historic estate.

The overall premise for the rehabilitation of the landscape, was to selectively remove overgrown vegetation to provide opportunity to replant, with sustainable plantings, that would function to re-establish privacy for the residence and improve the character of the property, as it related to the surrounding properties and the architecture of the home, built by notable architect, Wallace Neff in 1928.

My client hired me to head up the restoration of his landscape, due to my specialization in historic landscape restoration and design. Horticulture Consulting Services is the name of my city registered business. My credentials include B.S. Plant and Soil Science, M.S. Forestry, prior Assistant Superintendent of the L.A. County Arboretum, Superintendent of the Virginia Robinson Gardens, previous Board member of the L.A. County Regional Planning Commission.

Rasmussen Tree Care was hired to perform the work and to obtain necessary city permits. Rasmussen Tree Service was selected because its owner, Charlie Rasmussen, is well established in the city. He was born and raised in the city and he is used extensively by residence in the community with a very good reputation.

We are appealing these violations, in large part, because the work was done in good faith. The owner’s intent was to strictly adhere to the city ordinance regulating tree removal. We deferred to the expertise of Rasmussen Tree Trimming to acquire appropriate permits. The contractor believes no permitting was
required to remove the trees/shrubs because they were less than 11” DBH. And, that any plants that were slated for removal, that were larger than 11” DBH, were left in the landscape, demonstrating he was following the ordinance of the city.

As part of the requirements for the Appeal, please find the Tree removal permits with payment, the payment for violations and the replanting plan for said property. Various plants shown on the plan were already installed since the date of the violation and many of those proposed to be replanted are listed by the city as heritage plants.

We are all very remorseful of how this situation played out. Consequently, the owner is amiable to rectify the situation with the purchase and installation of large plants to enhance the character of the property and the city of San Marino. Please review the submitted documents and let us know if we need further addendums to fully meet the requirements of the city.

Thank you.

Tim Lindsay

Cell phone: 626.808.6670
November 20, 2019

Attn: City Clerk
City of San Marino
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

RE: Appeal to Illegal Tree Damage/Removal at 975 Orlando Road, San Marino, CA 91108

Dear City Clerk of City of San Marino,

Please be advised that Mr. Goodwin Gaw is currently traveling on business and hence has designated Mr. Tim Lindsay as an agent to file the Appeal to Illegal Tree Damage/Removal on his behalf. Tim has been hired by Mr. Gaw to provide Horticultural Consulting Services on our property since July of 2018 and therefore is very knowledgeable on all our tree work.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions at 213-213-8631 or Tim can be reached at 626-808-6670.

Sincerely,

Alice Chan
Executive Assistant to Mr. Goodwin Gaw
November 7, 2019

975 Orlando LLC
818 W. 7th Street Suite 410
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Re: ILLEGAL TREE DAMAGE/REMOVALS AT 975 ORLANDO ROAD, SAN MARINO, CA

To whom it may concern:

An inspection of the above-referenced property (hereafter "premises") on November 20, 2018 revealed the following violation of the City of San Marino's Tree Ordinance:

**SMMC 23.06.15G Illegal tree removals/damage**

It was observed that fourteen (14) established trees (greater than 11" DBH) along the street side of the property known as 975 Orlando Road, were damaged/in process of being removed. In accordance with San Marino City Code Section 23.06.15G.2 a penalty fee in the amount of $125,000 is due and payable to the City at City Hall located at 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108 on or before November 22, 2019.

In addition, you must obtain a tree removal permit for the record with a condition to replant replacement trees consistent to the City’s Tree Replacement Matrix on the property. Quantity of required trees must be approved by the City Arborist.

*The appellant may appeal a decision of the Planning and Building Director under this section to the City Clerk. An appeal shall be processed as follows (highlighted in yellow):

1. **Filing an Appeal:** The appellant shall file a written notice of appeal with the City Clerk no later than fifteen (15) days after the date of decision. The notice of appeal shall be accompanied by a fee in the amount established by resolution of the Council, as well as documentation supporting the basis for the appeal, including if applicable, the tree removal permit application, tree replacement plan, a report by a Registered Consulting Arborist and any Certified Arborist report(s).
2. Scheduling: The City Clerk shall set the time, date, and location for a hearing on the appeal. The hearing shall not be set sooner than fifteen (15) calendar days from the date the appeal was received. Notice of the time and place of the hearing will be sent to the appellant. Failure to receive the notice of hearing shall not invalidate the proceedings under this section. At the hearing, the appellant shall have the right to be heard and to present testimony and other evidence in support of the appeal.

3. Determination: Upon consideration of reports, evidence, and testimony presented, the (Planning Commission) City Council shall:
   a. Affirm, modify, or reverse the action of the Planning and Building Director (or Planning Commission); or
   b. Refer the matter back to the Planning and Building Director (or Planning Commission) for further review and consideration.

4. Decision is Final: The decision of the City Council shall be final and conclusive in all respects.

**01.06.13: APPEAL OF DECISION OF HEARING OFFICER:**

Within twenty (20) days after service of the hearing officer’s decision upon the responsible person, the responsible person may seek review of the hearing officer’s decision by filing a notice of appeal with the Los Angeles superior court. The responsible person shall serve a copy of the notice of appeal upon the city clerk either in person or by first class mail within five (5) calendar days of its filing. If the responsible person fails to timely file a notice of appeal, the hearing officer’s decision shall be deemed confirmed. (Ord. 0-07-1189, 9-12-2007)

**01.06.14: FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH HEARING OFFICER'S DECISION:**

Failure to comply with the hearing officer’s decision after it becomes final is a misdemeanor. Filing a criminal misdemeanor action does not preclude the city from using any other legal remedy available to gain compliance with the decision. (Ord. 0-07-1189, 9-12-2007)

**01.06.15: ADVANCE HARDSHIP WAIVER DEPOSIT:**

A. Any responsible person who requests a hearing to contest a citation and who is financially unable to deposit the civil fine required, may file a request for an advance deposit hardship waiver. The request shall be filed with the city manager on an advance deposit hardship waiver application form, available from the city clerk, no later than ten (10) days after service of the citation. The city manager’s office’s failure to receive a completed form, with all supporting documents, within ten (10) days after service of the citation, shall constitute a waiver of the right to receive a hardship waiver.

B. The city manager or designee may issue an advance deposit hardship waiver only if the person requesting the waiver submits a sworn affidavit, together with any supporting
documents, demonstrating to the satisfaction of the city manager or designee the person’s financial inability to deposit with the city the full amount of the civil fine in advance of the hearing. The city manager or designee shall issue a written decision specifying the reasons for issuing or not issuing the waiver. The decision shall be served upon the person requesting the waiver by regular mail. If the city manager or designee determines that the waiver is not warranted the person shall remit the full amount of the civil fine to the city within ten (10) days of receipt of the written decision. The city manager or designee’s decision whether to issue a hardship waiver shall be final. (Ord. 0-08-1202, 3-19-2008)

Sincerely,

Ron Sersen, Code Enforcement Manager, City Arborist

Cc: Aldo Cervantes, Director of Planning and Building
Tree and Hedge Removal

975 Orlando Road
San Marino, CA 90017

For a retroactive Private Tree Removal Permit
Subject to an illegal tree damage/removal violation
Dated November 7, 2019

Prepared For: 975 Orlando, LLC.
818 W. 7th St., Suite 410
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Prepared By: Michael Crane
Arbor Care, Inc.
1660 E. Mountain St.
Pasadena, CA 91115
Tel: (626) 737-4007
Email: info@arborcareinc.net

February 2020
SUMMARY

Total number of Established Trees that were removed ........................................ 8
Total number of Hedge plants that were removed ............................................... 6
Total number of removed Established Trees or Hedge plants that qualify
As Protected under the tree ordinance effective prior to Oct. 26, 2018 .................. 0
Total number of removed Established Trees or Hedge plants that qualify
As Protected under the tree ordinance effective Oct. 26, 2018 ............................ 8

The 14 Trees that were removed consist of eight trees that are considered Established and six that
are Hedge plants. All removed trees and plants were less than 11 inches in diameter, which is in
accordance with the city’s tree ordinance that was in effect until October 26, 2018; and the
removals were completed prior to that date. Regardless no communication was given from the
city regarding the changes either directly to approved tree professionals holding valid business
licenses or posted to the public on the city’s website. Should a violation exist, (16) 36”? box trees
or their equivalent would be the required mitigation for the eight Established Trees (six Victorian
Box, and two Edible Fig) that were removed. All removals were done with the objectives of
promoting the health and longevity of the existing Oak Trees and the planned landscape
renovations will result in further progress of expanding the Oak Tree canopy and restoring a
functional screen in the street setback area.

BACKGROUND

Trees and hedge material located along the street side of the property were removed for the
planned landscape renovations. The work was started in September and completed by mid-
October 2018, by Rasmussen Tree Care, a licensed and city-approved tree service. The work
was done in accordance with the current ordinance as posted on the city’s website and as
communicated directly to city-approved arborists through the city Chief Forester/Arborist. A
violation was issued on November 7, 2019, over one year after the completion of the work.
The violation alleges that 14 Established Trees were removed without a permit. An assessment
of the removed trees and plant material is included to help determine the appropriate
mitigation. This report includes this assessment as accurately as possible. A site visit made on
January 9, 2020 to evaluate the site. I met with the project’s Landscape Architect, Tim
Lindsay, to discuss the removal of the vegetation and objectives for the landscape renovation.
FIELD OBSERVATIONS
Refer to Photos in Appendix A, and City Tree Ordinances in Appendix B

The street frontage consists mostly of Algerian Ivy groundcover, with several remaining mature trees that include native and naturalized Oaks, Chinese Elms, Victorian Box, and Privet. A glimpse of the new landscape design has been installed at either end of the property near the driveway entries. It is drought tolerant and consistent with the cultural requirements of the existing Oaks. The Algerian ivy that remains throughout most of the street frontage requires an unhealthy amount of summertime watering for the oaks and covers their root crowns, which is another cultural impropriety.

Stumps of the removed trees and hedge material remain. The species can be identified from sprout growth appearing at the bases. The number and approximate sizes of the removed trees and hedge material can be extrapolated from the sizes of the stumps compared with existing similar plants located on and near the property. A total of 14 tree Established Tree and Hedge plants appear to have been cut to their stumps. These are: Six Victorian Box (Pittosporum undulatum), an Established Tree; two Edible Fig (Ficus carica), an Established Tree; three Brush Cherry (Syzygium australe), a Hedge plant; and one each of Bay Laurel (Laurus nobilis), Carolina Cherry (Prunus caroliniana), and Japanese Privet (Ligustrum Japonicum), all which are Hedge plants. Larger Brush Cherry remain, which show the contiguity of the old hedge, which once served its function but lost it due to being unmaintained for many years.

ANALYSIS
Refer to Photos in Appendix A, and City Tree Ordinances in Appendix B

I had a lengthy phone discussion with Charlie Rasmussen, the owner and operator of the tree service that performed the work. He carefully described how he measured each tree and hedge plant with a diameter tape at standard height (4 ½ feet above grade) to determine its protective status. He did not exclude hedge plants from this. All trees and plants that he cut were less than 11.5 inches in diameter and all other, including a small volunteer oak, were excluded from any cutting or pruning. Rasmussen Tree Care has a long-standing reputation in the city of quality work, and in my professional opinion the sizes of the stumps correlate with Mr. Rasmussen’s measurements. The tree and plant removals were in accordance with the city’s tree ordinance that was effective until the October 26, 2018 moratorium. Mr. Rasmussen told me that the work was completed by that date and he was not made aware of the moratorium by email, text message or any other simple communication. My personal experience with the moratorium is similar. I spent several days revising Protected Tree Reports for construction projects which I had submitted after the moratorium took effect. The city’s website was not updated with the new
tree ordinance for many months and I received no notice of the changes despite there being relatively few arborists holding business licenses in San Marino.

Photos of the street frontage are available on Google Maps. The street view images were taken in December 2017. They show the removed trees and hedge plants. It appears that the Victorian Box trees were overmature and in advanced decline, similar to the remaining Victorian Box in the frontage as well as the Victorian Box located on adjacent properties that are of the same approximate ages. The Edible Fig was likely a volunteer tree seeded by a bird, as a street frontage is an unconventional location for this or most other fruit trees. The Brush Cherry, Bay Laurel, and Privet are all planted in a row resembling a hedge. The screening function of the hedge is diminished due to a lack of pruning.

DISCUSSION

**Victorian Box Decline**

Taken from Hodel and Pittenger, Univ. of California IPM. Green Bulletin. Dec. 2014

Victorian box (*Pittosporum undulatum*) is an evergreen tree native to Australia that grows moderately fast to about 50 feet high and wide. It was much planted as an ornamental landscape subject in the first half of the 20th century in coastal central and southern California, especially from Santa Barbara to San Diego, where it was used as a lawn or street tree, background, screen, or informal hedge, and prized for its dense canopy, attractive and glossy green foliage, fragrant white flowers, showy orange fruits, and ease of cultivation. Victorian box has somewhat fallen out of favor as a landscape subject in the last 40 years but is still found in nurseries and as old and young plants in the landscape. Typically, a vigorous grower, trunks can attain one to two feet in diameter; and the tree can produce copious amounts of fruits, which readily germinate and produce seedlings in irrigated landscapes.

Over the last 25 years, arborists, horticulturists, landscape managers, and others have frequently noticed a widespread decline of older, established Victorian box trees in Southern California. Affected trees tend to lose vigor gradually but steadily; canopies thin; leaves yellow, die, and drop; and twigs and branches die back, either generally over the whole tree or, at least initially, restricted to one or more branches. The exact cause of the decline is unknown but is commonly associated with a combination of improper cultivation, old age, and possibly one or more opportunistic pathogens. Because most of the trees exhibiting this decline are old and mature, perhaps overly so, natural senescence is likely a significant contributing factor; rarely are young, small trees, which are usually vigorously growing, showing symptoms.
Definition of a hedge
Taken from the current Tree Ordinance # O-18-1341

HEDGE: A row of planted trees, shrubs or other vegetation that forms a physical boundary or barrier, or otherwise obscures visibility into or onto the property upon which it is located.

Moon Valley Nursery has become the largest wholesale and retail tree and shrub nursery in Southern California and throughout the entire southwest region. Their website lists 26 large-scale hedge plants. Bay Laurel, Carolina Cherry and Japanese Privet are all included. A nursery representative told me over the phone that Brush Cherry is not produced because of a lack of demand due to a host-specific insect called Eugenia Psyllid, which persistently causes damage to leaves.

CONCLUSION

The removals of the trees and hedge plants were done in accordance with the city’s ordinance that was in place at that time; and no communication was provided to the licensed and approved arborists of the change either directly or on the city’s website. The current ordinance specifies Established, Heritage and Oak Trees as being Protected. It does not name trees that are part of a Hedge as being Protected. Most of the removals were a Hedge, and the Victorian Box, which were in advanced decline, as well as the Edible Fig, are the only trees that would qualify under the current ordinance as being Protected as Established Trees. Should a violation even exist it should be limited to the six Victorian Box and two Edible Figs, all in the 9" – 12" diameter range. This would require a mitigation of two 36" box trees for each, for a total of (16) 36" box trees, or an equivalent number of larger specimens. The planned landscape renovation will account for an appropriate mitigation.

The removals were also done within the objectives of a typical city tree ordinance, which is to promote the health and longevity of specimen trees; and to maintain the live canopy, and useful functions of trees in the landscape. The objectives of the removals were to remove an overgrown and unfunctional hedge, and as many of the declining trees allowable within the ordinance, to enhance the existing oaks. The work is also part of a landscape renovation plan, which will establish more area in the street frontage where additional oak trees can be installed; further improve the cultural conditions preferred by oaks; enhance the street frontage with a new design; and re-establish a functional screening hedge. The removals were progress towards a healthier, more substantial and functional tree canopy, and not a destruction of the healthy urban forest.
APPENDIX A – Photos

ABOVE: Looking southwest along Orlando Rd. from the east end of the property. Image taken Dec. 2107, courtesy of Google Maps. BELOW: The same view taken January 2020. Victorian Box and Edible Fig were removed.
ABOVE: Looking north along Orlando Rd. near the east end of the property. Image taken Dec. 2107, courtesy of Google Maps. BELOW: The same view taken January 2020. Victorian Box and Edible Fig were removed.
ABOVE: Looking west along Orlando Rd. near the center of the property. Image taken Dec. 2107, courtesy of Google Maps. BELOW: The same view taken January 2020. Victorian Box and Bay Laurel were removed.
ABOVE: Looking east along Orlando Rd. from near the west end of the property. Image taken Dec. 2107, courtesy of Google Maps. BELOW: The same view taken January 2020. Brush Cherry were removed.
ABOVE: Looking west along Orlando Rd. from the east end of the property. Image taken Dec. 2107, courtesy of Google Maps. BELOW: The same view taken January 2020. Privet were removed.
ABOVE: Looking north at a section of Brush Cherry hedge that has been unmaintained for many years. This is its tree-like form, which is narrow and shrubby. BELOW: Across the street from the subject property, at the corner of Orlando Rd and Orlando Pl. is a good example of a typical Brush Cherry hedge.
ABOVE: The trees at the front of the neighboring property to the north, 945 Orlando Rd., are Victorian Box that are in various stages of decline. The hedge in front is a typical Privet. BELOW: More declining Victorian Box are across the street to the east at 930 Orlando Rd. The hedge behind the trees is a typical Carolina Cherry.
ABOVE: At the southwest corner of the property a small volunteer native oak (Q. agrifolia) was preserved. This shows the diligence in respecting the tree ordinance. BELOW: The east entrance to the property has begun to be replanted with well-designed plan of drought tolerant plants along the street that will pair well with the existing and new oaks; and a hedge of Acacia, which will provide a functional screen.
APPENDIX B – City Tree Ordinances

The current and complete tree ordinance # O-18-1341 is found online at the link below. It is listed on page 11 of the ordinance as being passed, approved and adopted on an unspecified day and month in the year 2019.

https://www.cityofsanmarino.org/2%20O-18-1341_CS.pdf

The following Moratorium to the City Tree Ordinance is listed as being effective on October 26, 2018.

ORDINANCE NO. O-18-1343-U

AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN MARINO ENACTED PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65858 ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON THE ISSUANCE OF TREE REMOVAL PERMITS; PROHIBITING THE REMOVAL OF OR DAMAGE TO CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF TREES; AND DECLARING THE URGENCY THEREOF

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARINO DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Legislative Findings. The City Council of the City of San Marino (the “City”) makes the following findings in support of the immediate adoption and application of this interim urgency ordinance.

A. Government Code Section 65858(a) provides that for the purpose of protecting the public safety, health, and welfare, the City Council may adopt, without following procedures otherwise required prior to the adoption of a zoning ordinance, an interim urgency ordinance, prohibiting any uses that may be in conflict with a contemplated general plan, specific plan, or zoning proposal that the legislative body, planning commission, or the planning department is considering or studying or intends to study within a reasonable time. Such an urgency measure requires a four-fifths (4/5) vote of the City Council for adoption, and is of no further force and effect forty-five (45) days from the date of adoption, unless extended pursuant to Government Code Section 65858.

B. The City is known for its thousands of magnificent, mature trees, which enhance the City’s natural scenic beauty and have played a critical role in developing a unique community identity. These trees also provide shade and privacy for nearby buildings, increase property values, and contribute to the City’s overall environmental health by providing habitat for wildlife, moderating climatic extremes, reducing soil erosion, enhancing surface water quality, and improving air quality by filtering airborne pollutants. Conversely, the wanton damage to or destruction of such trees would diminish the scenic beauty of the City, cause erosion of top soil, create flood hazard and risk of
landsides, impair air quality, and increase the cost of construction and maintenance of drainage systems through the increased flow and diversion of surface waters.

C. Section 23.06.15 of the City Code currently regulates the removal and/or severe pruning of oak trees and other trees of a certain size and maturity, and establishes penalties for violations.

D. On May 9, 2018, during the regular City Council meeting, the City Council discussed ways to amend the existing regulations governing the preservation and removal of trees in order to better protect and preserve the City’s urban forest, and directed staff to prepare an ordinance.

E. On August 22, 2018, the Planning Commission considered a draft ordinance amending Section 23.06.15 of the City Code, and provided feedback and suggestions to staff. On September 26, 2018, the Planning Commission approved the proposed ordinance and recommended the City Council adopt it as amended. The proposed ordinance would extend and enhance the protections afforded to oak trees, established trees, and a newly defined category of “heritage trees,” in recognition of the benefits such trees provide to the public health, safety, and welfare of the entire community.

F. The City Council requires additional time to fully study and consider the issues associated with tree removal and the types of regulations that should be enacted. The City Council intends to undertake the required consideration within a reasonable period of time. In the interim, the City Council finds it necessary to establish a moratorium on the issuance of new tree removal permits, and prohibit the removal, severe pruning, or damage to trees that are likely to be subject to the protection of the contemplated regulations. Without the moratorium and prohibitions contained in this Urgency Ordinance, the City’s ability to protect its urban forest would be diminished and a current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, and welfare would exist. This Urgency Ordinance extends protections to trees not currently subject to permitting requirements, including trees that could have historic significance and be deemed a Historic Landmark under the City’s newly adopted Historic Preservation Ordinance. If the moratorium and prohibitions contained herein do not immediately go into effect, property owners will be incentivized to remove or damage soon-to-be-protected trees before the new requirements become effective, resulting in lasting and irreparable harm to the community. Therefore, the City Council finds that adoption of this Urgency Ordinance is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare.

SECTION 2. Definitions. For purposes of this Urgency Ordinance, the terms defined in this Section 2 shall have the following defined meanings unless otherwise clearly indicated from the context:

A. Certified Arborist: An individual who has been tested by, and is currently certified as, an “arborist” by the International Society of Arboriculture.
B. Damage: Any action which causes injury, disfigurement or death of a tree. This includes, but is not limited to, severely pruning, poisoning, drilling, under watering or improperly transplanting. Confirmation of damage shall be determined by the Planning and Building Director or his or her designee.

C. Established Tree: A tree that is not a Heritage Tree or an Oak Tree, that is at least fifteen feet (15’) in height, and whose diameter is at least six inches (6”) at its widest point, when measured at a point four and one-half feet (4.5’) above natural grade level.

D. Tree Height: The height of a tree as measured from the natural grade to the upper most foliage of the canopy.

E. Trunk: The trunk of a tree. In the event of tree with multiple trunks, the diameter shall be measured at a height of four and one-half feet (4.5’) above natural grade, and the combined trunk diameters shall be used to determine the tree’s size for the purposes of this ordinance.

F. Heritage Tree: A tree that is at least fifteen feet (15’) in height, including but not limited to the species Platanus racemosa (California Sycamore), Juglans californica (California Black Walnut), Sambucus nigra (Blue Elderberry), Sambucus mexicana (Mexican Elderberry), Aesculus californica (California Buckeye), Salix lasiolepis (Arroyo Willow), Populus fremontii (Western Cottonwood), Alnus rhombifolia (White Alder), Umbellularia californica (California Laurel), or Populus trichocarpa (Black Cottonwood), and whose diameter is at least four inches (4”) at its widest point, when measured at a point four and one-half feet (4.5’) above natural grade.

G. Oak Tree: Any tree of the genus Quercus including, but not limited to Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak), Quercus dumosa (coastal scrub oak), Quercus engelmannii (engelmann oak), Quercus berberidifolia (scrub oak), Quercus lobata (valley oak), and Quercus virginiana (southern live oak), that is at least fifteen feet (15’) in height, and whose trunk diameter is at least four inches (4”) at its widest point when measured at a point four and one-half feet (4.5’) above natural grade level.

H. Protected Tree: Any Established Tree, Heritage Tree, or Oak Tree. “Protected Tree” shall also include any tree currently subject to and protected by Section 23.06.15 of the City Code that does not otherwise meet the definition of Established Tree, Heritage Tree, or Oak Tree under this Ordinance.

I. Severely Prune: To remove foliage or branches from a tree in a manner that causes injury to the shape, health or natural growth of the tree or disfigures or kills the tree. Confirmation of server pruning shall be determined by the Planning and Building Director or his or her designee.
J. Transplant: To relocate a tree and its root system from its original location and replant the tree in a proper manner at another location that does not harm the health or vigor of the tree.

SECTION 3. Moratorium Established. Notwithstanding any other ordinance or provision of the Code, the City Council hereby establishes a moratorium on the issuance of tree removal permits pursuant to Section 23.06.15 of the City Code. During the period of this moratorium, no application for a tree removal permit shall be accepted, processed, issued, or approved, excepting such permits for which an application has been submitted and deemed complete in conjunction with a design review application.

SECTION 4. Removal, Severely Pruning, and Damaging Protected Trees Prohibited. No person shall remove, severely prune, or damage any Protected Tree located in any yard of any lot in the R-1 or C-1 zone, whether such tree is alive, dead, diseased or dying, except pursuant to an Emergency Tree Removal Permit granted under Section 5 of this Urgency Ordinance. No person shall permit, aid, or abet another person to violate this Section. Violations of this Section 4 are punishable pursuant to Section 23.06.15(E) of the City Code and any other remedy available at law.

SECTION 5. Emergency Tree Removals. An Emergency Tree Removal Permit may be approved when necessary to correct a hazardous or unsafe condition that poses a threat to life or property, such as a risk of falling, proximity to existing structures, or interference with utility service or pedestrian or traffic safety. An Emergency Tree Removal Permit shall only authorize such work as is necessary to correct the hazardous or unsafe condition, and upon and subject such terms, conditions and limitations as are necessary to correct the hazardous or unsafe condition. Such permits shall only be issued in accordance with the following:

A. The owner of the tree shall submit an application on a form prescribed by the Planning and Building Director, along with a tree hazard report prepared by a Certified Arborist which documents the existence of the hazard or unsafe condition.

B. Emergency Tree Removal Permits must be reviewed and approved by the City Council, except as provided in subsection C below.

C. In the event that the hazardous or unsafe condition presents an immediate hazard such that there is a significant likelihood of harm to life or property before the City Council can review the application, the City Manager or her designee, may declare that an immediate hazard exists and order the issuance an Emergency Tree Removal Permit upon and subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as are necessary to abate the immediate hazard. The City Manager shall report any such approval actions to the City Council at its next regular meeting.

SECTION 6. CEQA. The City Council hereby finds that it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the adoption of this Interim Ordinance, and the
moratorium established hereby, may have a significant negative effect on the environment, as it will impose greater limitations on the removal of trees than currently exists in the City and will thereby serve to eliminate potentially significant environmental impacts. It is therefore exempt from California Environmental Quality Act review pursuant to Title 14, Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Code of Regulations.

SECTION 7. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any portion of the Ordinance would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 8. Effective Date and Term. Based on the findings set forth in Section 1, the City Council finds that this Urgency Ordinance is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare, and declares that it shall take effect immediately upon its adoption as an urgency ordinance pursuant to Government Code Sections 65858 and 36937(b). This Urgency Ordinance shall expire forty-five (45) days after the date of adoption unless extended by the City Council pursuant to Government Code Section 65858.

SECTION 9. Publication. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Ordinance and cause the same to be published as required by law.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this day, October 26, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
City Clerk
Definitions of Protected Trees according to the City of San Marino
Tree Ordinance # O-12-1265 effective June 29, 2012 up to the
Moratorium of October 26, 2018

According to the City’s Tree Ordinance all Established and Oak Trees are Protected
and a permit is required for removal or pruning.

**Established Tree:** In the front yard and side yard adjacent to a street, any woody plant
that is at least fifteen feet in height and whose trunk is at least 36 inches or more in
circumference (11.5 inches in diameter) when measured at a point four and one-half feet
four and a half inches above natural grade level. In the rear yard and side yard not
adjacent to a street, any woody plant that is at least 15 feet in height and whose trunk is at
least 49 inches in circumference (15.5 inches in diameter) when measured at a point four
and one-half feet above the natural grade level.

**Oak Tree:** In the front, rear, and side yards, any oak tree in the Quercus genus, including
native and non-native species, that is at least fifteen feet in height and whose trunk is at
least 36 inches or more in circumference (11.5 inches in diameter) when measured at a
point four and one-half feet four and a half inches above natural grade level.
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The American Society of Consulting Arborists
Michael Crane, RCA #440

International Society of Arboriculture
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Tree and Hedge Removal
975 Orlando Rd., San Marino 90017
Michael Crane, RCA #440. February 2020
CERTIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE

I, Michael Crane, certify that:

- I have personally inspected the tree(s) and the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately.

- I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.

- The analysis, opinions, and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current scientific procedures and facts.

- My analysis, opinions, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices.

- No one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report.

- My compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party not upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.

I further certify that I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and the International Society of Arboriculture. I have been involved in the field of Horticulture in a full-time capacity for a period of more than 15 years.

Signed: 

Registered Consulting Arborist #440; American Society of Consulting Arborist Board Certified Master Arborist #WE 6643B; International Society of Arboriculture Licensed California Agricultural Pest Control Adviser #AA08269

Date: February 10, 2020
Tree and Hedge Removal
975 Orlando Road
San Marino, CA 90017

For a retroactive Private Tree Removal Permit
Subject to an illegal tree damage/removal violation
Dated November 7, 2019
Tree Replacement Plant List for 975 Orlando Road, San Marino, CA

11/18/19
Tree Replacement Plan for
975 Orlando Road,
San Marino

New plantings installed at 954 Orlando Road since November 9th observation by city of tree removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Botanical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24” box</td>
<td>Acacia baileyana ‘Purpurea’ (Purple leaf acacia) 11/01/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed plants to be installed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60” box standard</td>
<td>Koelreuteria bipinnata (Chinese Flame Tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>48” box columnar</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior (Fern Pine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36” Box</td>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens (Italian cypress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48” box columnar</td>
<td>Magnolia ‘Little Gem’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48” Box</td>
<td>Gingko biloba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48” Box</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia (standard trunk Oak tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 G</td>
<td>Vitex agnus-Castus ‘purpurea’ (Chastberry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 G</td>
<td>Duranta ‘Sheena’s Gold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: O with numbers 1-14 represent approximate location of trees removed.
Exhibit One

- Gate 8802
- Podocarpus gracilior columnar form

1 - 2 - Columnar form Podocarpus

40" box
3. 68" Box
Chinese Flame Tree

7. 48" Box Podocarpus gracilior (Fern Pine)
Solid Hedge of Podocarpus gracilior to screen view to Orlando
3 - 86" Box Espalier
4 - Podocarpus; columnar form to screen view to Orlando
1 - 48" Box Magnolia 'Little Gem'
- Proposed
  New
  3 - Cypress Trees
  36" Box

- Proposed
  New
  Chinese Flame Tree

- Proposed
  New
  3 - Cypress Trees
  36" Box

- Proposed
  New
  Oak Tree
  Size 18" Box

- Proposed
  New
  Oak Tree
  Size 24" Box

Planted 12 - 24" Box Acacia baileyana 'Purpleleaf Acacia'

Visual Screen easterly, along Orlando Rd

11/3/2017
Graw Residence
Sourced Nice

3-48" Quercus agrifolia (Volley Oak)
975 Orlando, San Marino, CA
Landscape photos prior to Plant removals

11/18/19
Before Removals — View to Orlando
Replanted with 12-24" Acacia baileyana 'Purpurea' 11/01/18

Visual screen easterly, along Orlando Rd 11/8/2017 (law) Residence
Tree Replacement Plan for
975 Orlando Road,
San Marino

New plantings installed at 954 Orlando Road since November 9th observation by city of tree removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Botanical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24” box</td>
<td>Acacia baileyana ‘Purpurea’ (Purple leaf acacia) 11/01/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed plants to be installed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60” box standard</td>
<td>Koelreuteria bipinnata (Chinese Flame Tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>48” box columnar</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior (Fern Pine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36” Box</td>
<td>Cupresses sempervirens (Italian cypress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48” box columnar</td>
<td>Magnolia ‘Little Gem’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48” Box</td>
<td>Gingko biloba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48” Box</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia (standard trunk Oak tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 G</td>
<td>Vitex agnus-Castus ‘purpurea’ (Chastberry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 G</td>
<td>Duranta ‘Sheena’s Gold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on plot plan symbol 1 → 14
Represents trees/shrubs removed and are numbered 1 – 14.
PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established tree/hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each coresponding form)

adversely impacted the growth of heritage oaks, over mature, and nonornamental

part of a re-landscaping plan

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 818 W 7th Street 410, L.A., 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achane@gamcapitol.wc.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant) 
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☐Heritage ☐Specimen ☐Native ☐Multi-trunk ☐Other
Tree Species: Pistacia vera/undulatum
Common Name: Victoria Box, Hedge

Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 11 inches
Height: 12' - 15', Spread: 7' - 9', Number of trunks: 1
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3 - 5'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: Timothy J. Li-Bing

Date: Nov. 20, 2017
PERMIT # 19-142

PRIVATE TREE REMOVAL REQUEST

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established tree/hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

Adversely impacted the growth of heritage oak species over mature. Port of a re-landscaping plan.

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 813 W 7th Street #10, L.A. 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: 
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: _______ City: _______ State: _______ Zip: _______
Phone Number: (day) _______ Fax Number: _______ E-mail: achene@gwdgportal.us.com

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: □Heritage □Specimen □Native □Multi-trunk □Other
Tree Species: P. X gustafii "Undulatum"
Common Name: Victoria Box Hedge

Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: _______ inches
Height: 12'-15' feet, Spread: 7'-9' feet, Number of trunks: 1
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3'-5'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: __________________________
Date: Nov 20, 2019

San Marino Planning and Building Department
http://www.ct.san-marino.ca.us
TREE # 2

Supplemental Application for
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established tree/hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: adversely impacted the growth of heritage oak & over mature/senescence (part of a relandscaping plan)

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:
In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:
Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 818 W 4th St. L.A. 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd
City: San Marino
State: CA
Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213.213.8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achena@gwecapitalusa.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)
Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☒ Other
Tree Species: P. Hosporum undulatum
Common Name: Victoria Box Hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: ________ inches
Height: ________ feet, Spread: ________ feet, Number of trunks: ________
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street Side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: ________ ft

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 
Date: Nov 26, 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
PERMIT # 19-42 

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: Established tree/hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (Provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

- Over-mature / Senescent
- Insiance or hazard to persons or property
- Part of a re-landscaping plan

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 818 W 7th St. 91107

Address: 975 Orlando Rd, City: San Marino, State: CA, Zip: 91107

Phone Number: (day) 213.213.8631 Fax Number: E-mail: 

Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)

Address: City: State: Zip:

Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail:

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (Complete a separate “Additional Tree” form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: □ Heritage □ Specimen □ Native □ Multi-trunk □ Other

Tree Species: P. Hispanica undulatum

Common Name: Victoria Box Hedge

Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: Location inches

Height: 12-15 feet, Spread: 7-9’, Number of trunks:

Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard):

Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line:

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 

Date: Nov. 20, 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: Established Tree/Hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)
Over mature/advanced age, nuisance or hazard to persons or property
(Park of a landscaping plan)

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:
In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A. Certified Arborist or I.S.A. Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:
Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 818 W 7th Street 91014, LA, 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achone@guscapitalusa.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip:
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail:

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)
Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☐ Other
Tree Species: Pittosporum undulatum
Common Name: Victoria Box Hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 11 inches
Height: 15' 11" feet, Spread: 7-9' feet, Number of trunks: 1
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3-5'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: [Signature]
Date: Nov. 20, 2019
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established tree hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

- Over mature, senescent nuisance or hazard to persons or property

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC 818 W 7th Street 910, L.A. 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: acheng@gawcapitalusa.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate “Additional Tree” form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☑ Other
Tree Species: Pittosporum undulatum
Common Name: Victoria Box Hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: Location 11 inches
Height: 12-15’ feet, Spread: 7-9’ feet, Number of trunks: 1
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3-5’

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 
Date: Nov. 20, 2017

Rev: 5/20/19
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established hedge/tree

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

- Over mature / Senescence: nuisance or hazard to person using swimming pool/deck
- Other

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St, 410 LA 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213.213.8631 Fax Number: E-mail: action@gawcapitolusa.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: □ Heritage □ Specimen □ Native □ Multi-trunk □ Other
Tree Species: Prunus caroliniana
Common Name: Cherry laurel, foundation plant (evergreen shrub)
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: less than 11" inches
Height: 12'-15' feet, Spread: 5'-6' feet, Number of trunks: one
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3'-5'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: Twinty Z. Lindsey
Date: Nov 20, 2019
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: Established hedge/tree

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

- Over mature/senescent; adversely impacted the growth of heritage tree.
- And future planting of heritage oak.

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A. Certified Arborist or I.S.A. Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St, 410 L.A. 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd, City: San Marino, State: CA, Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631, Fax Number: 
E-mail: Achen@21cecapitl1cose.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address:
City: State: Zip:
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: Achen@21cecapitl1cose.com

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☑ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☑ Multi-trunk ☐ Other
Tree Species: Laurel nobilis
Common Name: Bay laurel Hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 200 then 11 inches
Height: 10-12' feet, Spread: 8-9' feet, Number of trunks: Multi. 5-6
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard):
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line:

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 
Date: Nov. 20, 2019
PERMIT # 19-142
PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA
ZONING DESIGNATION: established hedge
REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)
Adversely impacted the growth of Heritage oak and future planting of oak

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:
In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:
Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando, LLC, 818 W 7th St, 410 L.A 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd, City: San Marino, State: CA
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631, Fax Number: E-mail: aclay@awcogi.telusa.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: __________________________, State: ____________ Zip: __________
Phone Number: (day) ____________, Fax Number: ____________, E-mail: ____________

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)
Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☒ Multi-trunk ☒ Other
Tree Species: Liguistrum japonicum 'Texanum'
Common Name: Wax leaf privet (evergreen shrub)
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: from thru 11 inches
Height: 8-10' feet, Spread: 4-6' feet, Number of trunks: 2-3
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 3-5'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: __________________________ Date: Nov 20, 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108
Phone: 626-300-0789
PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

adversely impact on future planting of heritage oak part of pohon

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St, 410 L.A, 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd, City: San Marino, State: CA, Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-6631, Fax Number: , E-mail: achon@jawa-capital.com

Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: , State: , Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) , Fax Number: , E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate “Additional Tree” form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: □Heritage □Specimen □Native □Multi-trunk
☑ Other

Tree Species: Syzygium paniculatum

Common Name: Brush cherry - evergreen hedge

Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 11 inches

Height: 15 feet, Spread: 3-4 feet, Number of trunks: One

Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street Side

Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 2-3

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: [Signature]

Date: 08/20/2019

Rev: 5/20/19
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd, San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)
adversely impact the growth of future planting of heritage or as part of a re-landscaping plan

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 815 W 7th St, 410 L.A., 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-666 Fax Number: E-mail: achon@gawcorpblue.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same) State: Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate “Additional Tree” form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☒ Other
Tree Species: Syzygium paniculatum
Common Name: Brush cherry - evergreen hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: Less Than 1 inch
Height: 15 feet, Spread: 3-4 feet, Number of trunks: 1
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 2-3'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: [Signature]
Date: Nov 20th 2019
PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd San Marino, CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established hedge

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)
Adversely impacts the growth of heritage oak tree

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:
In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:
Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St. 410 L.A. 90017
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achern@geowcapitoluse.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same) City: State: Zip:
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail:

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate “Additional Tree” form for each tree requested for removal)
Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☑ Other
Tree Species: Syzygium paniculatum
Common Name: Brush Cherry - evergreen hedge
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: _______ inches
Height: 15' feet, Spread: 3-4' feet, Number of trunks: One
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 2'-3'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 
Date: Nov 20th 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE
SAN MARINO, CA 91108
Phone: 626-300-0789
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd San Marino CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established fruit tree/bush

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St, San Gabriel CA 91776
Address: 975 Orlando Rd City: San Marino State: CA Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achen@gamsecpit.com
Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant)
Address: (Same)
City: State: Zip:
Phone Number: (day) Fax Number: E-mail:

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☐ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☒ Other
Tree Species: Ficus Carica
Common Name: Common Fig (edible Fig)
Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 11 inches
Height: 7-8 feet, Spread: 12-15 feet, Number of trunks: 5-6
Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street Side
Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 5-6 feet

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 

Date: Nov 20, 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
PERMIT # 19-142

PROJECT ADDRESS: 975 Orlando Rd San Marino CA

ZONING DESIGNATION: established fruit tree/bush

REASON FOR REMOVAL: (provide a separate reason for each tree being removed on each corresponding form)

adversely impacts the growth of heritage or c tree, generally fruit trees are not included in the city's tree replacement matrix

ARBORIST EVALUATION REPORT:

In order to make findings, it is recommended that an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist evaluate the tree to be removed and submit the evaluation report (see attached form).

APPLICANT/OWNER INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant: 975 Orlando LLC, 818 W 7th St, 91010
Address: 975 Orlando Rd
City: San Marino
State: CA
Zip: 91108
Phone Number: (day) 213-213-8631 Fax Number: E-mail: achan@calcorp.net

Name of Property Owner: (if different from applicant) 

Address: (Same) 
City: 
State: 
Zip: 
Phone Number: (day) 
Fax Number: 
E-mail: 

TREE INFORMATION/TREE #1: (complete a separate "Additional Tree" form for each tree requested for removal)

Type of Protected Tree: ☑ Heritage ☐ Specimen ☐ Native ☐ Multi-trunk ☐ Other

Tree Species: Ficus Carica

Common Name: Common Fig (edible Fig)

Tree diameter as measured 4.5 feet (DBH) above natural grade: 1.11 inches

Height: 7-8 feet, Spread: 12-15' feet, Number of trunks: 5-6

Location of Tree (i.e. front yard, rear yard, or east/west/south/north side yard): Street Side

Distance of tree trunk to the nearest property line: 5-6'

CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that I am the applicant or designated agent named herein and that I am familiar with the rules and regulations with respect to preparing and filing this petition for discretionary action, and that the statements and answers contained herein and the information attached are in all respects true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: 

Date: Nov 20, 2019

Rev: 5/20/19
### CITY OF SAN MARINO

**PLANNING: 101-14-3312-0000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Design Review</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Design Review Mod.</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup Application Minor</td>
<td>$1,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$3,165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup/Variance Modification</td>
<td>$955.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC Application Minor</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>$830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence/Wall Plan Review</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment/Lot Merger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Split Review</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc/Drc Design Review Mod.</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Review</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Permit</td>
<td>$605.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal To Pc Or Cc</td>
<td>$805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot Plan Review Minor</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice Mailing</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Closure</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each day after 1st day</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$1,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/Roof Material Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Review</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan Check Fee: 101-14-3308-0000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Plan Check</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Check</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Permit Fees: 101-14-3151-0000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Permit</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Permit</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Permit</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool/Spa Permit</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fire Inspection Fee: 103-34-3330-0000**

- (626) 300-0735
- Certificate of Occupancy: $145.00
- Inspections:
  - (626) 300-0706
  - Certificate of Occupancy: $95.00
  - Compliance Certificate: $65.00
  - Special Inspection: $160.00

**Tree Fees: 101-14-3106-0000**

- Removal Application: $245.00
- Appeal: $255.00
- Administrative Fee: $__

**Tree Fines: 101-14-3410-9245**

- $__

**Water Violation: 209-00-3410-0000**

- $100.00 x __________
- $200.00 x __________
- $500.00 x __________

**Maps/Fees: 101-14-3346-0000**

- San Marino Street Maps: $15.00 x __________
- Seismic Study Zone, Yard, Misc. Maps: $5.00 x __________
- Tract Maps (fee based on reproduction cost): $________

**Publications**

- General Plan, S.M. Comm. Plan, Comm./Res. Design Guidelines:
- Zoning Code-Chap. 23: $20.00 x __________
- Housing Element: $10.00 x __________
- Misc. City Doc. Copies: $0.20 x __________
- Misc. Docs or Tapes: $________
- Traffic Speed Study Zone: $12.00 x __________

**Misc. Fee**

- **PAID**
  - **OK No.**
  - **Cash**
  - **Date:** 11/20/19

**Total Amount Due:** $245
November 20, 2019

To: Aldo Cervanties, Director of Planning and Building
FROM: Tim Lindsay, as agent to the owner of 975 Orlando, San Marino
REASON: Filling an Appeal for Illegal Tree Damage/Removals at 975 Orlando Road, San Marino, CA

In October 2018, my client and I identified trees and shrubs for removal, along the street side of said property. The plant types were comprised of Pittosporum unduatum, Prunus caroliniana, Larual nobils, Ligustrum japonicum, Syzygium paniculatum and Ficus arica. Presumably planted in the 1950’s, to serve as a privacy hedge, once they matured. Over the ensuing decades, they had been neglected and were over grown and reached senescent. Many of them were also adversely impacting the growth of heritage oaks growing in the street side location. They provided little privacy for the estate and physically impeded the growth and further development of the many heritage oaks growing in the same area.

Decisions to remove the plants were based on one or more of the following criteria:

1. Poor health of the plant (leaf chlorosis, reduced leaf density of canopy, signs of root disease/canker)

2. Proximity of plants (competition) to the roots, trunks and canopies of existing heritage oak trees. And the nuisance or hazard they presented to people or property.

3. Function and appropriateness of the plant in the landscape when compared to the future landscape plans for restoration of the historic estate.

The overall premise for the rehabilitation of the landscape, was to selectively remove overgrown vegetation to provide opportunity to replant, with sustainable plantings, that would function to re-establish privacy for the residence and improve the character of the property, as it related to the surrounding properties and the architecture of the home, built by notable architect, Wallace Neff in 1928.

My client hired me to head up the restoration of his landscape, due to my specialization in historic landscape restoration and design. Horticulture Consulting Services is the name of my city registered business. My credentials include B.S. Plant and Soil Science, M.S. Forestry, prior Assistant Superintendent of the L.A. County Arboretum, Superintendent of the Virginia Robinson Gardens, previous Board member of the L.A. County Regional Planning Commission.

Rasmussen Tree Care was hired to perform the work and to obtain necessary city permits. Rasmussen Tree Service was selected because its owner, Charlie Rasmussen, is well established in the city. He was born and raised in the city and he is used extensively by residence in the community with a very good reputation.

We are appealing these violations, in large part, because the work was done in good faith. The owner’s intent was to strictly adhere to the city ordinance regulating tree removal. We deferred to the expertise of Rasmussen Tree Trimming to acquire appropriate permits. The contractor believes no permitting was
required to remove the trees/shrubs because they were less than 11" DBH. And, that any plants that were slated for removal, that were larger than 11" DBH, were left in the landscape, demonstrating he was following the ordinance of the city.

As part of the requirements for the Appeal, please find the Tree removal permits with payment, the payment for violations and the replanting plan for said property. Various plants shown on the plan were already installed since the date of the violation and many of those proposed to be replanted are listed by the city as heritage plants.

We are all very remorseful of how this situation played out. Consequently, the owner is amiable to rectify the situation with the purchase and installation of large plants to enhance the character of the property and the city of San Marino. Please review the submitted documents and let us know if we need further addendums to fully meet the requirements of the city.

Thank you.

Tim Lindsay

Cell phone: 626.808.6670
November 20, 2019

Attn: City Clerk
City of San Marino
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108

RE: Appeal to Illegal Tree Damage/Removal at 975 Orlando Road, San Marino, CA 91108

Dear City Clerk of City of San Marino,

Please be advised that Mr. Goodwin Gaw is currently traveling on business and hence has designated Mr. Tim Lindsay as an agent to file the Appeal to Illegal Tree Damage/Removal on his behalf. Tim has been hired by Mr. Gaw to provide Horticultural Consulting Services on our property since July of 2018 and therefore is very knowledgeable on all our tree work.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions at 213-213-8631 or Tim can be reached at 626-808-6670.

Sincerely,

Alice Chan
Executive Assistant to Mr. Goodwin Gaw
RESOLUTION NO. PCR20-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SAN MARINO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-13, A REQUEST FOR AN ADDITION OR ALTERATION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE, WHICH ADDS OR EXPANDS A SECOND STORY LOCATED AT 1100 AVONDALE.

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

SECTION 1. On July 1, 2019 an application for Design Review was submitted to the City of San Marino by Leo Chuang (James V. Coane & Associates), project architect. The applicant requests to construct a first and second story addition at 1100 Avondale. This requires one (1) Planning Commission action in accordance with Section 23.15.03A2 of the San Marino Municipal 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 IE and is located on the south side of Avondale Road, south of Orlando Road. The site is bordered in all directions by single family homes in Area District IE.

B. The current property contains approximately 84,052 square feet of land area and is improved with a two-story residence with an attached one-car and two-car garage.


D. The applicant proposes a first floor and second floor addition totaling 2,969 square feet to include a two-car attached garage and three-car attached garage, resulting in a 6-bedroom residence. Other proposed uses of space include a personal gym with resistance pool and second-story deck.

SECTION 4. The Planning Commission considered the Design Review request for an addition or alteration to an existing residential structure, which adds or expands a second story, pursuant to the required findings in San Marino City Code Section 23.15.03(A)(2).

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. The Planning Commission hereby finds as follows with respect to the application for Design Review No. DRC19-13:

A. The proposal is for demolition of 1,231 square feet of livable area and to construct an addition totaling 2,969 square feet. Demolition will include removal of the existing garages, office, kitchen areas, dining room, and bedroom on the first floor and removal of two bedrooms on the second floor. The addition will involve a new staff quarters, new kitchen/dining area, and new bathrooms on the first floor and two new master suites, office, and den on the second floor. Since the addition will not intensify the parking, privacy, or other functions on the property, the request is compatible with the surrounding residential uses.

B. The allowable livable area for the property is 13,205 square feet in which a total livable area of 13,191 square feet will result from the proposed addition. The minimum lot size for Area District IE is 60,000 square feet. In relation to the size of the lot, the overall square footage proposed is in keeping with the regulations prescribed for the IE District. For 5 or 6 bedrooms, a three-car enclosed space is required. A two-car and three-car garage is being provided to meet this requirement, therefore the proposal is within the intent of the R-1 zone and is compatible with similar size homes in the vicinity. The second-story deck is located off the master suite along the north side of the residence. Given that the property perimeter is lined with mature trees and shrubs and the deck is setback approximately 50 feet from the side property line, privacy impacts are minimal.

C. The addition proposes to match the existing residence with regard to window style, roof pitch, and wall finish in order to integrate with the design of the architecture previously established. Additionally, the roof pitch and style proposed for the addition will also be consistent with the existing residence.

D. Materials such as slate tile roof, stucco-finished walls, and wrought iron guardrails will all be used in the same manner to match the existing home. Precast concrete will also be used to continue the vertical elements of the existing home in order to provide a seamless appearance for the addition.
SECTION 6. Based upon the foregoing findings in Section 4, the Planning Commission hereby approves Design Review No. DRC19-13, subject to conditions of approval in attached Exhibit A.

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 WRIGHT, VICE-CHAIR DUSTIN, COMMISSIONER BOYLE, COMMISSIONER CHENG, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER OKAZAKI
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER HSU

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing Resolution No. PCR20-01 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 January 22, 2020.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED on this 26th day of February, 2020.

ATTEST: JERI WRIGHT
Chair, San Marino Planning Commission

ALDO CERVANTES,
Secretary, San Marino Planning Commission
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

STANDARD CONDITIONS

PROJECT #: Design Review No. DRC19-13

SUBJECT: One and two-story addition to an existing two-story residential structure

APPLICANT: Yee Yeh

LOCATION: 1100 Avondale Road

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0713, FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

A. General Requirements

1. The applicant shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers, or employees, because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees, for any Court costs and attorney's fees which the City, its agents, officers, or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition. ___/___/___

2. Copies of the signed Planning Commission Resolution of Approval or Approval Letter, Standard Conditions, and all environmental mitigations shall be included on the plans (full size). The sheet(s) are for information only to all parties involved in the construction/grading activities and are not required to be wet sealed/stamped by a licensed Engineer/Architect. ___/___/___

B. Time Limits

1. Any approval shall expire if Building Permits are not issued or approved use has not commenced within 1 year from the date of approval or a time extension has been granted. ___/___/___

C. Site Development

1. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans which include site plans, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, sign program, and grading on file in the Planning and Building Department, the conditions contained herein, and the Zoning Code regulations. ___/___/___
2. Prior to occupancy of the residence, all Conditions of Approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director. 

3. Front yard hedge shall not exceed 5'-6” or the height of existing fencing on the property.

4. The project shall provide appropriate divided lites on new windows and doors. The spacing of the mullions shall be shown on plans and shall be consistent with the existing windows.

5. Removal of any trees on site are prohibited prior or during construction without first obtaining a tree removal permit.

6. Prior to foundation inspection, the applicant shall submit a building setback verification signed by the project architect or engineer.

7. Prior to framing inspection, the applicant shall submit a building square footage verification signed by the project architect or engineer.

8. Sheet 10A.1 shall be revised to eliminate “one-inch steel tube” and replace with “wrought iron” for the proposed guardrail material.