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.

PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20
Members of the Planning Commission may teleconference into the meeting without noticing each teleconference location from which a member will be participating in a public meeting.

CORONAVIRUS DISEASE (COVID-19) ADVISORY
As a precaution to protect both staff, our constituents, and elected officials, the City is asking members of the public to follow the California Department of Health’s Guidance on Mass Gatherings when deciding whether to attend this meeting. All seating in the Council meeting will be spaced to allow for minimizing close contact, as recommended by the State guidelines. Although public access to the meeting in person will be allowed, if you are sick or identify yourself as being “higher risk” based on the CDC’s guidelines, you may wish to watch or listen to the meeting from home, or provide input electronically.

Members of the public may observe and offer comment at this meeting telephonically or otherwise electronically by 1) Public comment will be accepted by email to acervantes@cityofsan Marino.org before or during the meeting, prior to the close of public comment on an item, to be read by the City Clerk during public comment. Lengthy public comment may be summarized in the interest of time. 2) Public comment will be accepted electronically via the zoom.us teleconference module (Computer for Video Streaming). If you are an individual with a disability and need a reasonable modification or accommodation pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) please contact the Planning and Building Director via email at acervantes@cityofsan Marino.org or by phone at (626) 300-0710 prior to the meeting for assistance.
How to participate in the meeting from home:

1) **Via Computer for Video Streaming/Zoom Meeting**
   Website: [https://zoom.us/j/135996097](https://zoom.us/j/135996097)
   Meeting ID: 135 996 097
   Phone: (669) 900-9128

2) **Via Phone for Audio Only:**
   Phone Number: (669) 900-9128
   Meeting Id: 135 996 097

3) **Submit Public Comments via email:**
   Email: acervantes@cityofsanmarino.org

**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](http://www.cityofsanmarino.org)

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP AND DRC19-28**
   2275 S. OAK KNOLL AVE., (LU/LCRA ARCHITECTS)
   *This item was continued from the meeting of January 22, 2020. The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence, a detached three-car garage. This requires one conditional use permit and three design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.15.03(B) and 23.15.03(C).*
   *(Required Action Date: 6/8/2020)*

2. **DESIGN REVIEW NOS. DRC19-57HP AND DRC20-15**
   1215 SAINT ALBANS RD., (WANG/DIG INC.)
   The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence with an attached one-car garage and a detached two-car garage. The applicant also proposes front yard fencing, walls, and pilasters. This requires two design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.15.03(B) and 23.15.03(F).
   *(Required Action Date: 5/8/2020)*
3. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP20-3 AND DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-70**  
2275 LORAIN RD., (NEWTON/HANNA)  
The applicant requests to construct a first and second story addition and remodel of an existing two-story residence while maintaining the existing nonconforming thirty-degree structural encroachment line. This requires one conditional use permit and one design review action pursuant to City Code Sections 23.02.13 and 23.15.03(A).  
(Required Action Date: 5/8/2020)

4. **DESIGN REVIEW NO. 17-114**  
2731 GAINSBOROUGH DR., (CHIH/LIN)  
The applicant requests to construct a second-story to an existing single-story residence. This requires one design review action pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.03(A).  
(Required Action Date: 4/27/2020)

5. **APPEAL FOR DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 19-17**  
1706 HILLIARD DR., (KY/LIN)  
Pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.09, the Planning Commission will consider the appeal of Design Review Committee’s decision to deny a request to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications, and to install roofing materials not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application List.

6. **APPEAL FOR DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 19-19**  
2200 EL MOLINO PL., (CHEN)  
Pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.09, the Planning Commission will consider the appeal of Design Review Committee’s decision to deny a request to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate.

7. **APPEAL OF DETERMINATION OF DAMAGED TREES**  
1270 OXFORD RD., (LIANG)  
The Planning Commission will consider the appeal of determination of a damaged tree pursuant to City Code Section 23.06.15(E).

## OTHER MATTERS

### ORAL PUBLIC APPEARANCES

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

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

### PUBLIC WRITINGS DISTRIBUTED

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

The next meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for **Wednesday, April 22, 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.
TO: CHAIRMAN WRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR

BY: LISA EDWARDS, SENIOR PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 25, 2020

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW NOS. DRC19-27HP AND DRC19-28
2275 OAK KNOLL AVE., (LUI/LCRA)

STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

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

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting Design Review action for 1) construction of a new single-family residence 2) an accessory structure visible from public view which exceeds six hundred (600) square feet.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP – New two-story residence
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28 – Accessory structure exceeding 600 square feet visible from public view

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.
April 30, 2019 – Staff provided written comments on project plan completeness and requested additional information including a Historic Resources Report and Arborist Report.

January 22, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting – The DRC applications went before the Commission and were continued to the March 25, 2020 meeting to address the following comments:

1. Revise elevations to show accurate/consistent height
2. Provide more detail regarding brick veneer siding (i.e. brochure, materials sample) to show texture and size
3. Provide lighting details for porch lighting, landscape lighting, wall-mounted lighting, and fence lighting to include lumens. Also indicate if filters or cut-off will be used
4. Revise landscape plan to specify size, type, species for all new plantings; Indicate those trees to be replaced and specify how many and what size replacement trees
5. Reduce plate heights to reduce overall height and massing
6. Consider alternate design for transom and sidelites at front entry; reduce entry door height
7. Propose alternate roof material since comp shingle is only approved for those homes that have existing comp shingle
8. Consider reducing the front setback to the prevailing front yard setbacks for the neighborhood
9. Note on plans that ensures that front hedges along Oak Knoll will not exceed 8 ft
10. Revise the arborist report to include inventory of declining trees and statement of support/justification for removal of trees
11. Consider eliminating turf within rear yard area

February 26, 2020 – Staff met with the applicant to discuss revised plans addressing Commissioner comments from the January 22, 2020 meeting.

To respond, the applicant has shifted the residence and detached three-car garage back from its previously proposed location and reduced the overall vertical massing by decreasing the first floor plate height. Currently, the structure is located at 60’ from the front property line rather than the previous 50’, an increase in the front yard set back by 10 feet. The first floor plate height is reduced by 6 inches, resulting in a 9'-6" plate height for the first floor and 9'-0" height for the second floor.

Other revisions were also made to address several Commissioner’s concerns. The sidelites for the entryway are shown to have an alternate design, a planting plan has been provided, and the heights have been labeled consistently throughout the plans (29'-10"). Regarding tree replacement specifics, Staff points to Page 5 of the Arborist to address the Commissioner’s inquiry regarding the number and type of replacement trees. Since replacement mitigation is per the discretion of the City, the number and type of replacement trees is not being made part of the Design Review approval at this time. Rather, Staff has included a condition of approval to direct the City to qualify those trees being removed and replaced based on tree removal permit findings.
**BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan:</th>
<th>Estate Residential (0-2 dwelling unit per acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>R-1, Area District II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>The subject property is located on the west side of S Oak Knoll Avenue and north of Huntington Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size:</td>
<td>27,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use:</td>
<td>One-story residence with an attached two-car garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Uses:</td>
<td>The site is bordered in all directions by single family homes in Area District II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Determination:</td>
<td>Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR MAIN DWELLING</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/Lot Coverage</td>
<td>5,950 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Livable area: 5,940 sq. ft. Lot coverage: 5,381 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>31’-10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>125’-9’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR GARAGE STRUCTURE</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>16’</td>
<td>14’-11”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>81’-6”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is currently developed with a single-story residence with an attached garage on a 27,500 square-foot parcel. The applicant proposes to demolish all the buildings on site totaling 2,988 square feet and construct a 5,950 square-foot, two-story residence with detached 663 square-foot three-car garage. Other improvements on the property include a barbeque area with solid roof cover and open-air outdoor living room area with fireplace. Generally, the existing uses and proposed uses of the property will be similar in nature.

As per the City Arborist’s request, a tree report was provided to assess conditions of trees on site. The report dated September 24, 2019 conducted by Jan C. Scow Consulting Arborists, LLC concluded that with the removal of nine (9) established trees, the Consultant recommends that the protection plan must be adhered to in order to avoid health decline of the remaining twelve (12) established trees as well as the existing oak trees on site.

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 4
Object – 0
No response – 8

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

New two-story residence and accessory structure exceeding 600 square feet visible from public view

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:

That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.

Oak Knoll Avenue between Huntington Drive and Monterey Road is characterized by having deep setbacks, 6-foot high hedges along front property lines, and prominent homes with lot sizes between 25,000-55,000 square feet. Along the west side of South Oak Knoll Avenue, average home sizes range between 3,000-6,000 square feet containing 3 to 6 bedrooms. The east side of Oak Knoll Avenue have average home sizes ranging from 2,000-5,000 square feet on 25,000-35,000 square foot lots. Since the new home will be 5,950 square feet on a 27,500 square foot lot, the proposal will follow along with these same neighborhood trends and therefore will be consistent with the existing conditions of the immediate area.

There exists a variety of architectural style within the legal neighborhood and an even balance of one-story and two-story homes. A majority of the one-story homes in the surrounding area were built in the 1950s with front-loading attached garages, while the second-story homes are more Palladian-style architecture with Italian, Spanish, and Mediterranean influences with detached garages at the rear of the property. The proposed architectural style for the new residence will
be Neoclassical, usually recognized by Doric columns, narrow eaves, and building symmetry. These elements are also similar to the newer existing Palladian-style homes and therefore would be compatible with the massing and scale of those homes within the same block.

Several homes within the vicinity have detached garages located at the rear of their property with driveways leading to their entrance. Proposed for this property is a 15'-6” wide opening provided at the porte-cochere to allow drive-through clearance to the garage. Although the detached garage may be seen from public view, it will be minimized with the position of the porte-cochere along the north side of the structure.

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.

The new home will be centered on the lot to provide equal distance from both property lines. This allows for the property to continue a pattern of symmetry and at the same time provide a buffer from the adjacent properties. Because of the placement of the rear balcony at in the center line of the building wall, privacy impacts are also minimized.

The proposal is for a 5-bedroom home, which requires a total of three (3) enclosed parking spaces. As such, the 663 square-foot garage allows for three 10’ x 20’ enclosed spaces cars and meets this requirement.

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

Not applicable.

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

The detached three-car garage proposes to match in architectural design, materials, and colors to the primary home. The main home is primarily painted-brick siding with flat tile roofing. However, there is minimal opportunity to incorporate painted-brick at the front of the garage, therefore the garage will only mimic in color and roof pitch. The garage will also be in proportion to the main home with a height of approximately 14’ and utilize a garage door design that is consistent with the chosen Neoclassical style design.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends APPROVAL of DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28. 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 DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28 is categorically exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects).

2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment hereby makes the findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

3. The Planning Commission approves DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28, subject to the attached Conditions on Data Sheet No. 2, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Data Sheet I – Findings
2. Data Sheet II – Conditions of Approval
3. Planning Commission Staff Report – January 22, 2020
4. Application
5. DRC Neighborhood Map
6. Historic Assessment Report
7. Arborist Report
DATA SHEET 1 - FINDINGS

Design Review Case Nos. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28

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.
PLANNING AND BUILDING
DEPARTMENT

STANDARD CONDITIONS

PROJECT #: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NOS. DRC19-27HP and DRC19-28

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting Design Review action for 1) construction of a new single-family residence 2) an accessory structure visible from public view which exceeds six hundred (600) square feet.

APPLICANT: Raffi Agaian

LOCATION: 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0784, 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. Nothing contained herein shall prohibit city from participating in a defense 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, 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. Operation of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to commencement of operation, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The facility shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to start of operation. 

4. If required as part of the project scope of work, a grading permit shall be obtained, subject to the City Engineer’s approval. 

5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape plan shall be provided in accordance with MWELO requirements, subject to the Planning and Building Department’s approval. 

6. The Planning & Building Director/City Arborist shall determine tree replacement mitigation based on the findings made during the Tree Removal Permit process.
TO: CHAIRMAN WRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR

BY: LISA EDWARDS, SENIOR PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 22, 2020

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW NOS. DRC19-27HP AND DRC19-28 2275 OAK KNOLL AVE., (LU/LCRA)

STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

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

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting Design Review action for 1) construction of a new single-family residence 2) an accessory structure visible from public view which exceeds six hundred (600) square feet.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP – New two-story residence
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28 – Accessory structure exceeding 600 square feet visible from public view

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.
April 30, 2019 – Staff provided written comments on project plan completeness and requested additional information including a Historic Resources Report and Arborist Report

**BACKGROUND**

**General Plan:** Estate Residential (0-2 dwelling unit per acre)

**Zoning:** R-1, Area District II

**Location:** The subject property is located on the west side of S Oak Knoll Avenue and north of Huntington Drive

**Lot Size:** 27,500 square feet

**Existing Use:** One-story residence with an attached two-car garage

**Surrounding Uses:** The site is bordered in all directions by single family homes in Area District II

**Environmental Determination:** Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects)

**ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR MAIN DWELLING</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/Lot Coverage</td>
<td>5,950 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Livable area: 5,940 sq. ft. Lot coverage: 5,381 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEIGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>31’-10”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YARDS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>125’-9”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPEVIOUS COVERAGE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR GARAGE STRUCTURE</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEIGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>16’</td>
<td>14’-11”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YARDS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is currently developed with a single-story residence with an attached garage on a 27,500 square-foot parcel. The applicant proposes to demolish all the buildings on site totaling 2,988 square feet and construct a 5,950 square-foot, two-story residence with detached 663 square-foot three-car garage. Other improvements on the property include a barbeque area with solid roof cover and open-air outdoor living room area with fireplace. Generally, the existing uses and proposed uses of the property will be similar in nature.

As per the City Arborist's request, a tree report was provided to assess conditions of trees on site. The report dated September 24, 2019 conducted by Jan C. Scow Consulting Arborists, LLC concluded that with the removal of nine (9) established trees, the Consultant recommends that the protection plan must be adhered to in order to avoid health decline of the remaining twelve (12) established trees as well as the existing oak trees on site.

**NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve – 4  
Object – 0  
No response – 8

**DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS**

*New two-story residence and accessory structure exceeding 600 square feet visible from public view*

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:

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

Oak Knoll Avenue between Huntington Drive and Monterey Road is characterized by having deep setbacks, 6-foot high hedges along front property lines, and prominent homes with lot sizes between 25,000-55,000 square feet. Along the west side of South Oak Knoll Avenue, average home sizes range between 3,000-6,000 square feet containing 3 to 6 bedrooms. The east side of Oak Knoll Avenue have average home sizes ranging from 2,000-5,000 square feet on 25,000-35,000 square foot lots. Since the new home will be 5,950 square feet on a 27,500 square foot lot, the proposal will follow along with these same neighborhood trends and therefore will be consistent with the existing conditions of the immediate area.

There exists a variety of architectural style within the legal neighborhood and an even balance of one-story and two-story homes. A majority of the one-story homes in the surrounding area were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>5’</th>
<th>2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>81’-6”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
built in the 1950s with front-loading attached garages, while the second-story homes are more Palladian-style architecture with Italian, Spanish, and Mediterranean influences with detached garages at the rear of the property. The proposed architectural style for the new residence will be Neoclassical, usually recognized by Doric columns, narrow eaves, and building symmetry. These elements are also similar to the newer existing Palladian-style homes and therefore would be compatible with the massing and scale of those homes within the same block.

Several homes within the vicinity have detached garages located at the rear of their property with driveways leading to their entrance. Proposed for this property is a 15'6” wide opening provided at the porte-cochere to allow drive-through clearance to the garage. Although the detached garage may be seen from public view, it will be minimized with the position of the porte-cochere along the north side of the structure.

*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.*

The new home will be centered on the lot to provide equal distance from both property lines. This allows for the property to continue a pattern of symmetry and at the same time provide a buffer from the adjacent properties. Because of the placement of the rear balcony at in the center line of the building wall, privacy impacts are also minimized.

The proposal is for a 5-bedroom home, which requires a total of three (3) enclosed parking spaces. As such, the 663 square-foot garage allows for three 10’ x 20’ enclosed spaces cars and meets this requirement.

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

Not applicable.

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

The detached three-car garage proposes to match in architectural design, materials, and colors to the primary home. The main home is primarily painted-brick siding with flat tile roofing. However, there is minimal opportunity to incorporate painted-brick at the front of the garage, therefore the garage will only mimic in color and roof pitch. The garage will also be in proportion to the main home with a height of approximately 14’ and utilize a garage door design that is consistent with the chosen Neoclassical style design.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Staff recommends APPROVAL of DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP and DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28. 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 DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP and DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28 is categorically exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects).

2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment hereby makes the findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP and DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

3. The Planning Commission approves DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-27HP and DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-28, 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. Arborist Report
6. Colors and Materials Board
7. Data Sheet I – Findings
8. 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: MARCH 1, 2019

2. The undersigned applicant(s) is (are) the owner(s) of property located at:
   2275 SOUTH OAK KNOLL AVE.

3. And legally described as follow (Lot No., Block No., Tract No.):
   OAK KNOLL ADDITION NE 250 ft of NW 110 ft of LOT 7
   (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:
      NEW (2-STORY) SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED GARAGE & DETACHED COVERED BBQ PAVILION.

   b. The provisions or restrictions of the code which prompts the need for this application:
      NEW SEMI-ENCLOSED UNCONDITIONED BATHROOM AT DETACHED GARAGE (ACCESSORY STRUCTURE).

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: 2275 SOUTH OAK KNOLL AVE.

   Owner's Phone Number (Home): (______)

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

   Agent's Name and Address: RAFFI AGAIA
   LCRA ARCHITECTS - 35 HUGUS ALLEY, SUITE 220, PASADENA CA 91103

   Agent's Phone Number: (626) 449-9698

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE APPLICATION

DESIGN REVIEW NUMBER: 1927 & 19-28 (staff use only)

Project Address: 2275 South Oak Knoll Ave.

Proposed Use: ☑ Residential   ☐ Commercial
Project Type: ☑ New Construction  ☐ Exterior Remodel
☐ One Story Addition  ☐ Exterior Remodel
☐ (2) Two Story Addition
☐ Other

General Description of Proposed Improvements:

Proposed 2-story, 5 bedrooms, single family residence with detached 3-car garage.

PROPERTY OWNER: (Please Print)

NAME: Eric & Jackie Lui
ADDRESS: 2275 South Oak Knoll Ave.
CITY, STATE, ZIP: San Marino, CA 91108

PHONE: (626) 512 2286   (626) 703 4990
HOME    BUSINESS
E-MAIL:

I DECLARE, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 23, 2019, at San Marino, California.

Signature of Property Owner (Signature of Owner is required for all applications.)
APPLICANT: The applicant must be an authorized agent of the property owner. (Please Print)

Architect ☑ Builder / Developer ☐ Owner ☐ Other ☐

If “OTHER”, please explain: ____________________________________________________________

NAME: Raffi Agaian

ADDRESS: 35 Hugus Alley Suite #220

CITY, STATE, ZIP: Pasadena, CA 91103

PHONE: ( ) HOME (626)449-9698 BUSINESS

E-MAIL: ____________________________________________

I DECLARE, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 16, 2019 at Pasadena, California.

Signature of Applicant other than Property Owner

_________________________________________

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

DATE FILED: _____________________________

AMOUNT PAID: _________________________

REQUIRED ACTION DATE: ___________________
Design Review No. DRC 19-27HP & DRC 19-28

2275 Oak Knoll Avenue
Neighborhood Map

Neighbor Letters Summary
✓ Approve
× Object
O No Response
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a historic resource assessment for one parcel located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue (APN 5323-007-036). The property is situated on a residential street within the City of San Marino in Los Angeles County. One single-family Ranch-style residence is located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue.

The City of San Marino adopted a Historic Preservation and Design Review Regulations Ordinance (No. 0-18-1336) in April 2018 that expanded upon an earlier 1998 draft and adopted new criteria for eligibility. The proposed project would demolish one single-family dwelling. Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (Ms. Alexandra Madsen and Ms. Carrie Chasteen; Appendix A, Key Personnel Resumes) was retained to determine if the building located on the project site may be a historical resource in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The residence on this parcel was evaluated in this report using the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and for designation as a Historic Landmark using the guidelines for evaluation established in the Historic Preservation Ordinance.1 After careful research and evaluation, Sapphos Environmental, Inc. determined that the property does not possess sufficient historical or architectural significance to merit listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation as a Historic Landmark. Because 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue does not appear eligible for listing in a historical register, it is not considered to be a “historical resource” as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, demolition of the building would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

---
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SECTION 1.0
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND CURRENT SETTING

This report presents the results of a historic resources assessment for one parcel located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue (APN 5323-007-036). The property is situated on a residential street within the City of San Marino (City) in Los Angeles County. The project site comprises one parcel located on the west side of S. Oak Knoll Avenue just north of E. Huntington Drive. Development surrounding the project site is characterized by parcels with single-family residences and across from religious and educational facilities (Figure 1, Sketch Map for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue; Figure 2, Project Location Map for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue). These residences primarily date from the 1950s through the early 1960s.
Figure 1. Sketch Map for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, 2018
Figure 2. Project Location Map for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would demolish a single-family dwelling.
SECTION 2.0
METHODOLOGY

In preparing this report, the following tasks were completed:

1. Conducted a field inspection of the project site on August 23, 2018, to ascertain the general condition and physical integrity of the building thereon. Digital photographs were taken during the site inspection, which included only the exterior of the building. Field notes were made.

2. Obtained and reviewed the building permits for the parcel from the City of San Marino Planning and Building Department. Dates of construction and subsequent alterations were determined by the building permit record, as well as additional resources, such as the field inspection, Assessor information, Sanborn maps, and historic aerial photographs.


4. Researched the project site and surrounding area at the San Marino Public Library 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, San Marino City Directories, books, and articles.

5. Reviewed and analyzed ordinances, statutes, 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.

---

SECTION 3.0  
REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

3.1 FEDERAL

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, defines the criteria to be considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (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.” Integritiy is defined in National Register Bulletin No. 15 as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”\(^3\) 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.

3.2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

**3.3 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:

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 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.

---


5 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
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 4.0
RECORD SEARCH

4.1 RECORD SEARCH

A cultural resource record search was not conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton, due to time constraints. However, 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, the following sources of information were consulted as part of the record search:

- California Register of Historical Resources—Listed (2018)
- California State Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates)
- California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates)
- Inventory of Historic Resources (2012)

4.2 PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/DESIGNATIONS SUMMARY

It does not appear that the property was previously evaluated or found eligible for inclusion in a historical register.
SECTION 5.0
HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

The following historic context is derived from the City of San Marino’s History page; San Marino: A Centennial History by Elizabeth Pomeroy; and William Hertrich’s Early San Marino.6

5.1 HISTORIC CONTEXT

National Register Bulletin 24, Guidelines for Local Surveys, states that the historic context developed in support of historic resource surveys should analyze and describe the “broad pattern of historical development in a community or its region that may be represented by historic resources.”7 Developing a historic context for survey areas is further described by the National Register as vital for providing a basis for a survey effort, helping researchers successfully identify all significant resources, and helping eliminate unintended biases. Through a review of the history and prehistory of the state and region under consideration, the historic context should define important patterns of development that may be reflected in the area’s historic resources. Because San Marino has not yet authored a Historic Context Statement, the following history is derived from the City and other resources regarding the City’s development and growth.8,9

Early Settlement: The Mission and Rancho Years, 1810–1900

The early years of the area that would become the City of San Marino were shaped by its proximity to the Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, which was founded in September 1771 and became one of the wealthiest missions in California. The mission’s “Stone Gristmill” was erected in the area that would become San Marino between 1810 and 1812 under the direction of Father Zalvedeo.10 Following Mexican independence from Spain in 1821, calls for secularization of the mission system resulted in the 1833 proclamation, signed by Governor José Figueroa, to secularize California’s missions and distribute their vast land holdings. What would become San Marino was comprised of 10 ranchos, including Rancho Huerta de Cuati, Rancho San Pasqualito, and parts of Rancho San Pascual.11

In the 1830s, the Mexican government granted a portion of land that would eventually be San Marino to an indigenous woman named Victoria Reid, a widow of Scotsman Hugo Reid. The land thereafter was named the rancho “Huerta de Cuati.” Other regions of San Marino, as well as large

---


portions of Pasadena, Altadena, and South Pasadena, were granted by the governor to Juan Marviné, husband of Eulalia Pérez de Guillén, in compensation for his wife’s long service at Mission San Gabriel. Marviné named his land, originally referred to as El Rincón de San Pascual (the Corner of San Pascual), Rancho San Pasqual. After Marviné failed to build an improvement on the land as required by Mexican law to retain a land grant, Rancho San Pasqual was granted in 1843 to Manuel Garfias. In the United States period—after the 1848 conclusion of the United States-Mexican War and California statehood in 1850—owners of many such ranchos were obliged to prove the validity of their property titles following the 1851 creation of the U.S. Land Commission.

One early settler of the area was Michael White, an English sailor who adopted the name “Miguel Blanco” and who built an adobe circa 1845. This adobe still stands in San Marino and is listed in the National Register. Another early settler, Benjamin D. Wilson, also commonly referred to as “Don Benito,” took possession of the rancho Huerta de Cuati in 1852. Garfias’s claim to Rancho San Pasqual was confirmed by the U.S. Land Commission in 1854. However, by 1858, Garfias’ cattle ranch had gone into debt, and he ceded ownership of Rancho San Pasqual to Benjamin D. Wilson as well. Wilson, a trapper and trader from Tennessee who traveled to California in 1841 as part of the Workman-Rowland Party, became an important figure in the early settlement of Southern California. Wilson served as the first clerk of Los Angeles County and, in 1852, became Los Angeles’ second elected mayor.

Wilson deeded a portion of his land to his daughter Maria de Jesus, or Sue, who married J. de Barth Shorb. The couple renamed the land “San Marino” after Shorb’s grandfather’s plantation in Frederick County, Maryland. The Shorbs built a mansion on the Rancho San Marino in 1877 and enlarged it in 1888. It was later demolished. The land was largely agricultural and filled with vineyards for much of the late 19th and early 20th century. Early development of San Marino begun in 1903 after some of the land was purchased from Shorb by Henry E. Huntington.

Also in 1888, State Engineer William Hamilton Hall surveyed the San Marino area for his report, *Irrigation in California (Southern)*, which identified several natural springs, one of which was named Oak Knoll.

**Subdivision, Incorporation, and Growth 1900–1930**

Parts of the ranchos of Benjamin D. Wilson were later inherited by his son-in-law George Smith Patton, a son of a colonel in the Confederate Army. Patton attended the Virginia Military Institute and later pursued a career in law. In 1878, Patton moved to Los Angeles. He married Benjamin D. Wilson’s daughter Ruth Wilson six years after her father’s death and moved into the Lake Vineyard home. This ranch, combined with the lands previously sold to Henry E. Huntington, were combined to create the city of San Marino.

Many of the earlier, large estates were demolished and new, grand 20th-century residences were built. The most famous residence was that of Henry Huntington, which still remains at the Huntington Library and Garden of San Marino. This Beaux Arts-style residence was designed by Pasadena architect Myron Hunt at the location of the earlier Shorb house in 1909. Hunt’s other notable projects included the Rose Bowl, Pasadena Public Library, and the former Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles.

---

Development soon took hold of San Marino in the early 20th century with the Pacific Electric Railway line from Los Angeles to Monrovia, bisecting San Marino in 1903 and expanded in 1906. Pacific Electric Railway was owned by Huntington, who increasingly saw the need to retire. In 1911, he sold the Pacific Electric Railway system to the Southern Pacific Railroad. Increasingly, residents recognized the threat that their town could be pulled apart, and the need for incorporation grew.

On April 25, 1913, the charter for the City was granted and the area was incorporated as a city. The City Council was formed, and George S. Patton was elected as the first mayor. Patton also served as the manager of the Huntington Land Development Company, where he oversaw the subdivisions of the City. Four trustees were responsible for much of the early days of the City, including Patton, Richard H. Lacy, William L. Valentine, Edward H. Groenendyke, and Edwin G. Hart.

The 1920s were characterized by the subdivision of the new city, and residential growth as people from Los Angeles and elsewhere relocated to San Marino. The City was marketed as highly residential, moderately inexpensive, and only 25 minutes from downtown Los Angeles by fast Pacific Electric Railway. In the mid- and late-1920s, 70 acres of Huntington’s ranch and 55 acres of Patton’s property were developed. This growth continued in the 1930s, even with the onset of the Great Depression.

World War II and Post-War Growth, 1940–Present

In 1942, an Army anti-aircraft unit was installed in Lacy Park, serving as headquarters for a handful of soldiers. General George Patten, son of the town’s earlier George Smith Patton, visited the park when on leave from Europe. World War II brought an economic boost to San Marino, as in much of the United States, and the end of the war ushered in a period of growth and prosperity.

In the 1950s, San Marino neared its built-out capacity with over 13,500 residents. In 1952, the City established a Planning Commission to ensure the City would remain the residential haven citizens enjoyed. As well as a growth in population, the City also diversified. Early in the 20th century, there had been a relatively sizable population of Chinese and Japanese residents. With World War II and Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066, these residents were sent to internment camps. Only in the 1970s did the San Gabriel Valley again experience what author Elizabeth Pomeroy calls “An Asian Renaissance in the Valley.” The growth of San Marino, emphasis on residential living, and growth of diverse residents has defined the City over time.

SECTION 6.0
DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATED RESOURCES

6.1 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

The Ranch-style residence located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is situated on S. Oak Knoll Avenue just north of the intersection with Huntington Drive in the southwestern region of the City. It has a complex generally ‘U’-shaped footprint, is located in the center of the lot, and faces east. The residence measures approximately 3,000 square feet and was constructed in 1954. It has a combination of horizontal clapboard and vertical board and batten wood siding and composition shingles on the cross-gable roof (Figure 3, General View of Subject Property, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

![Figure 3. General View of Subject Property, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018](image)

The residence has a semi-circular driveway that loops in front of the main façade and encircles a swath of grass. The driveway is accessible from the street with two sets of low, metal, automatic gates separated by low brick piers and lined by tall hedges for privacy (Figure 4, View of Front Yard, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).
Front (Eastern) Façade

The residence has a complex, generally ‘U’-shaped footprint that is composed of a longer ell that serves as the main body of the residence, two small ells off the rear, and a perpendicular ell at the front façade that houses the double garage. The garage has vertical board-and-batten wood siding along the main body and horizontal clapboard along the upper reaches of the exterior beneath the gable roof. The roof is clad in composition shingles, has a deep overhang, and central false beam. Two full length double vents provide passive airflow for the garage. The garage door was replaced at an unknown date (Figure 5, View of Garage, Front Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).
The main ell of the residence features the cross-gable roof that opens to the primary entrance. The entrance has a gable roof with a central false beam that bisects a triangular vent among horizontal wood clapboard cladding. The main door is recessed below the roof which is upheld by a single squared wood column; this creates a sheltered entrance porch. The main door is wood and is flanked by a full length leaded glass window to one side and split rock veneer to the other. It is accessible via a low, single step covered in split stone. The main exterior is covered by vertical board and batten wood siding and has a tripartite horizontal window with a central fixed light flanked by casement windows (Figure 6, View of Entrance, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue; Figure 7, Detail of Entrance, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

Figure 6. View of Entrance, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018

Figure 7. Detail of Entrance, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018

The remainder of the primary façade’s main ell is defined by its low massing, gable roof, board and batten exterior, and tripartite casement windows. Numerous plants line this façade, which slightly
obscures it from view. A metal fence and brick pier close off the continuing driveway and rear of the property from public access (Figure 8, View of Main Ell, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

![Figure 8. View of Main Ell, Primary Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue](image)

The chimney is also located along this façade. It is brick covered in split rock veneer (Figure 9, View of Chimney, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

![Figure 9. View of Chimney, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue](image)

**Northern Façade**

The northern façade is mostly hidden by the black gate at the northeast corner of the residence and abuts the driveway. A wall constructed of concrete masonry units (CMUs) defines the northern parcel boundary and is lined with brick. This façade is clad in smooth textured stucco rather than
board and batten wood, although the uppermost region below the roof features vertical clapboard exterior. Windows are a combination of single and double casement and fixed windows (Figure 10, View of Northern Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

Figure 10. View of Northern Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018

Southern Façade

The southern façade features a smooth textured stucco exterior and cross gable roof that sits atop the projecting eaves. A concrete walkway leads to two doors that provide entrance to the residence via concrete steps. Casement and fixed windows are evident along this façade. A wall of CMUs lines the southern boundary of the parcel and includes a small enclave for garbage (Figure 11, View of Southern Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

Figure 11. View of Southern Façade, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018
Setting

Oak Knoll Avenue is lined with residential properties and oak trees (Figure 12, View of S. Oak Knoll Avenue Facing North). Most residences in the area appear to have been constructed between the 1950s and 1960s, although a number are newer constructions completed in the last 10 years or are currently under construction. The properties are characterized by Ranch-style residences and vernacular residences with deep setbacks (Figures 13A–B, Properties along S. Oak Knoll Avenue).
SECTION 7.0
PROPERTY HISTORY

7.1 CONSTRUCTION HISTORY

The residence located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue measures approximately 3,000 square feet. On June 8, 1954, then-owner Frank S. Genuser applied for a building permit for the subject residence. The permit was issued on June 22, 1954, and listed the architect as Culver Heaton and the contractor as Roberson Construction Company, Ltd. No information was available on Roberson Construction Company, Ltd. And Culver Heaton will be discussed below.

The constructed building had a concrete foundation, wood siding, and brick and stone chimneys. Prior to the construction of the residence, a block wall had been erected around the border of the parcel. In 1955, the garage was constructed, and the bedroom was remodeled. The garage was remodeled in 1966.

A redwood fence around the property and swimming pool were constructed in 1956. The residence was reroofed with composition shingles in 1987. In 1992, the front yard of the property was redesigned with the semicircular driveway, swath of grass, and brick piers and metal sliding gate entrance. That same year the pool was restored.

Although the residence was not constructed early enough to be included in the 1929 Sanborn fire insurance maps, the residence’s footprint is generally the same as it was in 1954 (Figure 14, Current Footprint, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue).

---

19 City of San Marino. 22 June 1954. Building Permit No. 9390.
20 City of San Marino. 22 September 1953. Building Permit No. 9017.
21 City of San Marino. 23 November 1955. Building Permit No. 10083.
22 City of San Marino. 29 August 1955. Building Permit No. 9977.
24 City of San Marino. 20 February 1956. Building Permit No. 10156.
25 City of San Marino. 1 February 1956. Building Permit No. 10135.
26 City of San Marino. 1 January 1987. Building Permit No. 45360.
Culver Heaton

The subject property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue was designed by architect Culver Heaton. Heaton was a Los Angeles native who attended the University of Southern California for a degree in Architecture. Heaton owned his own architecture firm, Culver Heaton & Associates, which was located in Pasadena, California. The American Architects Directory (ADA) of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) lists his notable projects as: Salem Lutheran Church in Glendale, Knox United Presbyterian Church in Pasadena, and the La Habra Methodist Church. He served as the President of the Pasadena chapter of the AIA in 1951 and as the Director in 1952. He was the Treasurer of the California Council of the AIA in 1952 and the Director in 1953.29

Heaton is best known for his religious architecture, as reported in the 1962 ADA. The Los Angeles Conservancy mentions Heaton as the architect of the Chapel of Jesus Ethic in Los Angeles, claiming Heaton was “a prolific architect who was best known for designing numerous churches throughout Southern California.”30 This church is notable for its steeple vault roof with flared eaves and is a strong example of expressionist Modern design. Aside from steeply pitched roofs, Heaton was also notable for his use of glass and light, as evident in his design of the Trinity Presbyterian Church in San Diego (Spring Valley).

Heaton is significant for his work on religious properties but does not evidence any mastery of residential architecture. Instead, the property at 2275 S. Oak Knoll is common in design and execution and does not integrate dramatic features or motifs. Instead, the property employs standard forms and features that exemplify the Ranch style of architecture. The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is a residential property that is not a strong example of Culver Heaton’s work and does not reflect his expertise as a master architect. Culver Heaton is not listed in the City of San Marino’s list of locally significant architects.31

7.2 OWNERSHIP/OCCUPANT HISTORY

Based upon a review of the Los Angeles County Assessor’s parcel data, the property was improved in 1954. The property changed ownership several times between 1950 and 2000 (Table 1, Assessor Data, APN 5323-007-036).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Book No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147 pt. 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1950–1954</td>
<td>Huntington Land Improvement Co. Frank S. and Helen Genuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Frank S. and Helen E. Genuser Chad B. and Margaret A. Glendhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5323</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Chad B. and Margaret A. Glendhill Joseph M. Tescher  Harry R. and Lorene N. Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Mitsubishi Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Haseko Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Chin Z. and Chin C. Tsai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hiu Fan Lui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * Denotes information obtained from the Los Angeles County Assessor’s public counter.

Frank S. Genuser was born in Texas circa 1889. He worked as an electrotyper and was married to Helen Genuser. Frank Genuser was an official of the California Electrotype and Stereotype Company. Helen Genuser was also born in Texas and did not list an occupation.

Harry R. Land was a management consultant and was married to Lorene N. Land. They were listed as living at the subject property in 1962. Joseph M. Tescher was a secretary and treasurer of the Joshua Hendy Corporation and was married to Ruby M. Tescher. In 1967, the couple was robbed at the subject property by a gunman.

No information was available on Chad B. and Margaret A. Glendhill.

7.3 USE HISTORY

The building at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue was constructed as a single-family residence; the building retains this use and is currently occupied.

34 Ancestry.com, Year: 1940; Census Place: Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California; Roll: m-t0627-00407; Page: 4A; Enumeration District: 60-218.
36 Ancestry.com, California State Library; Sacramento, California; Great Register of Voters, 1900–1968.
SECTION 8.0
HISTORIC CONTEXT

The property was evaluated using Section 23.18.030 of Article 18 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance No. 0-18-1336 which defined the designation criteria for Historic Landmarks.\(^{39}\) In order to best address B3, the property was considered as an example of Ranch-style architecture:\(^{40,41}\)

Ranch

The Ranch style of architecture was popular from the mid-1930s to the mid-1970s and was inspired by Spanish Colonial architecture and the 19th century working ranch houses. The popularity of Ranch-style homes grew as sprawling designs were increasingly possible after World War II and the associated economic boom. The most common subtype of the Ranch style is an asymmetrical one-story form with a low-pitched roof.

There are several substyles of the style, including the Colonial Revival, Storybook/Chalet, Polynesian/Asian, and Contemporary Ranch substyles. The below character-defining features are generally reflected in Ranch style houses regardless of substyle.

Character-defining Features

- One-story floor plan, with horizontal emphasis in form
- Low-pitched roof, with wide, overhanging eaves
- Exposed rafters
- Wood board siding or stucco
- Large windows
- Porches framed with wood posts
- Open wood trusses
- Open interior plan
- Integration of outdoors in the interior, through doors, window and house plan
- Glass doors that opened to outdoor patio
- Attached garage on street evaluation

---

\(^{39}\) 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


SECTION 9.0
EVALUATION OF ELIGIBILITY

9.1 EVALUATION

The City of San Marino’s Historic Preservation Ordinance No. 0-18-1336, Section 23.18.030 of Article 18 has defined the designation criteria for Historic Landmarks:

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 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.

Evaluation of 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll represents an example of a middle-class dwelling from the 1950s. The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue was built in the southwestern corner of the city as one of many houses built in the 1950s when the area and greater Southern California experienced a housing boom after the end of World War II. Residences immediately surrounding the subject property were also developed in this time frame; many were completed from the 1950s through 1960s. Other properties have since been demolished and are newer constructions. The property was not associated with an important event of broad pattern of significant development that made a contribution to the City, region, state, or nation. Therefore, the property is not eligible for listing under Criterion A/1/3 for the National Register, California Register, or as a Historic Landmark.

2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under Criteria B/2/4 for an association with persons significant in our past, as no one associated with this address can be documented to have significantly contributed to local, state, or national history to an extent significant enough to warrant designation.

2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is a common Ranch-style residence. The building was designed by Culver Heaton whose significance is limited to his Mid-Century Modern-designed religious architecture. Moreover, Culver Heaton is not listed in the City of San Marino’s list of locally significant architects.


Therefore, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under Criteria C/3/5 because the residence does not retain distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction and does not possess high artistic value.

**Statement of Integrity for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue**

The property, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue, was evaluated against the seven aspects of integrity as outlined in the California Code of Regulations (Section 4852 [C]), and described in the National Register Program. The seven aspects of integrity include *location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting*.

The subject property retains its *location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting*. The property has undergone some alterations, including refurbishment of the garage and re-roofing. However, these changes are minimal and do not affect the property’s integrity. The subject property therefore generally retains its *location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting* (Appendix B, DPR 523 Series Forms).

**9.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Because 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue, San Marino, Los Angeles County, California, does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or designation as a Historic Landmark, it is not considered to be a “historical resource” as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Should there be any questions regarding the information contained in this HRAR, please contact Ms. Alexandra Madsen at (626) 683-3547, extension 145.

---
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Ancestry.com, Year: 1940; Census Place: Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California; Roll: m-t0627-00407; Page: 4A; Enumeration District: 60-218.


City of San Marino. 1 February 1956. Building Permit No. 10135.

City of San Marino. 1 January 1987. Building Permit No. 45360.


City of San Marino. 19 January 1966. Building Permit No. 671.
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KEY PERSONNEL RESUMES
Carrie E. Chasteen, MS, BA

Senior Historic Resource Specialist

MS, Historic Preservation, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL

BA, History and Political Science, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Phi Alpha Theta historical honor society

- Cultural resources management and legal compliance
- History of California
- Identification and evaluation of the built environment
- Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Engineering Record (HAER) documentation
- Historic Property Survey Reports (HPSRs)
- Historical Resources Evaluation Reports (HRERs)

Years of Experience: 15+

Relevant Experience

- Certified Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) III CS3 Technical Lead
- Historic Preservation Commissioner, City of Pasadena, CA
- Historic consultant for the Shangri La Hotel renovation project, Santa Monica, CA
- Principal Architectural Historian for the Interstate 10 (I-10) Corridor Project
- HABS/HAER documentation for Mission Control at NASA JPL in Pasadena, CA

Ms. Carrie Chasteen has more than 15 years of experience in the field of cultural resources management and the built environment, including project management, agency coordination, archival research, managing large surveys, preparation of Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) sections, peer review, 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. Chasteen has served as Principal Investigator / Principal Architectural Historian on projects in Kern, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Imperial, and San Diego Counties in Southern California. She has extensive experience with the California Office of Historic Preservation, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, the City of Los Angeles, and various other State, county, and local government agencies.

Ms. Chasteen served as the historic consultant for the design team for the renovation of the Shangri La Hotel, Santa Monica, California, which won a historic preservation award from the Santa Monica Conservancy. For the Shangri La Hotel project, Ms. Chasteen documented and ranked the character-defining features of the building and structures on the property; reviewed plans for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; assisted with developing creative solutions to meet the objectives of updating the hotel amenities while maintaining the historic character of the building; assisted with the entitlement process including presentations before the Planning Commission; and prepared Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation of the linoleum flooring which was set in unique patterns per room throughout the entire building. Additional experience includes serving as Principal Architectural Historian for the Interstate 10 (I-10) Corridor Project. For this project, Ms. Chasteen prepared a Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR), Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), and a Finding of No Adverse Effect with Non-Standard Conditions (FNAE). As part of the FNAE, she conducted agency consultation with the Cities of Redlands, Upland, and Ontario, and with other interested parties including regional historical societies. Ms. Chasteen has also prepared Historic American Buildings Survey / Historic American Engineering Record (HABS / HAER) documentation for the former Caltrans District 7 headquarters building and the Space Flight Operations Facility, commonly referred to as Mission Control, a National Historic Monument, at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) in Pasadena.

Ms. Chasteen is a member of the Society of Architectural Historians, National Trust for Historic Preservation, California Preservation Foundation, and Pasadena Heritage. Ms. Chasteen is also a Historic Preservation Commissioner for the City of Pasadena.
Ms. Alexandra Madsen, Senior Architectural Historian for Sapphos Environmental, Inc., has over six years of experience in the field of cultural resource management. Ms. Madsen has a Master’s Degree in Art History from the University of Texas at Austin, where she focused on built environments, and a Bachelor’s Degree in History from Saint Anselm College. She meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History.

Ms. Madsen is experienced with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards). She has extensive experience in archival research and field surveys, completing cultural resources reports, and in evaluating properties under federal, State, and local criteria. She has worked on historic projects located in Los Angeles, Orange, and Kern Counties in Southern California.

In addition to these assessments, Ms. Madsen considered over 20 Los Angeles County Parks and Golf Courses for inclusion in federal, State, and local registers. These evaluations were documented with Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms and informed by site visits, historic context statements, and substantial archival research. She also has extensive survey experience, and completed a Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) and Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in support of the SR 55 improvement project in Orange County.

Moreover, Ms. Madsen evaluated several educational institutions for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), including Canfield Avenue Elementary School, Canoga Park High School, and Locke High School, consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These reports documented the construction of the school campuses, their early history, and notable events, people, or architectural styles encompassed on the campuses.

Ms. Madsen has reviewed the design of proposed construction, alterations, and additions to ensure compliance with the Standards for residential, commercial, and municipal properties. Properties assessed for compliance include a proposed podium-style building on Melrose Avenue in Los Angeles, alterations to a Mid-Century Modern clubhouse at the Los Verdes Golf Course, and an addition to a private residence in Sierra Madre, among others.

Ms. Madsen completed Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation in support of the 24th Street Widening Project in the City of Bakersfield, consistent with the requirements of Section 106. For this project, she authored a Historic Context Statement exploring the history of Bakersfield and a pamphlet illustrating the subject historic district’s character.

Ms. Madsen is a member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, California Preservation Foundation, L.A. Conservancy, and Pasadena Heritage. She is a board member of the Highland Park Heritage Trust.
The Ranch-style residence located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is situated on S. Oak Knoll Avenue just north of the intersection with Huntington Drive in the southwestern region of the City. It has a complex generally 'U'-shaped footprint, is located in the center of the lot, and faces east. The residence measures approximately 3,000 square feet and was constructed in 1954. It has a combination of horizontal clapboard and vertical board and batten wood siding and composition shingles on the cross-gable roof. The residence has a semi-circular driveway that loops in front of the main façade and encircles a swath of grass. The driveway is accessible from the street with two sets of low, metal, automatic gates separated by low brick piers and lined by tall hedges for privacy. (See Continuation Sheet Page 4)

*P3b. Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): HP2 Single-family residence

*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 #: View facing west; August 23, 2018; IMG_1672.jpg

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ☒Historic ☐Prehistoric ☐Both

*P7. Owner and Address:
Hui Fan Lui
2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
San Marino, CA 9118

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

*P9. Date Recorded: August 29, 2018

*P10. Survey Type (Describe):
Intensive, CEQA Compliance
P—Project Review

*P11. Report Citation (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none"): Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 2018. Historical Resource Assessment Report for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue, San Marino, CA 91108
B1. Historic Name: 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue  
B2. Common Name: 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue  
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence  
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence  
*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch  
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)  

The residence located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue measures approximately 3,000 square feet. On June 8, 1954, then-owner Frank S. Genuser applied for a building permit for the subject residence. The permit was issued on June 22, 1954, and listed the architect as Culver Heaton and the contractor as Roberson Construction Company, Ltd. No information was available on Roberson Construction Company, Ltd. and Culver Heaton will be discussed below.  

The constructed building had a concrete foundation, wood siding, and brick and stone chimneys. Prior to the construction of the residence, a block wall had been erected around the border of the parcel. In 1955, the garage was constructed, and the bedroom was remodeled. The garage was remodeled in 1966. A redwood fence around the property and swimming pool were constructed in 1956. The residence was reroofed with composition shingles in 1987. In 1992, the front yard of the property was redesigned with the semicircular driveway, swath of grass, and brick piers and metal sliding gate entrance. That same year the pool was restored.  

*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown  
Date: N/A  
Original Location: N/A  
*B8. Related Features: N/A  
B9a. Architect: Culver Heaton  
b. Builder: Roberson Construction Co.  
*B10. Significance: Theme: Residential architecture  
Area: San Marino  
Period of Significance: 1954  
Property Type: Residence  
Applicable Criteria: N/A  
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)  

Culver Heaton  

The subject property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue was designed by architect Culver Heaton. Heaton was a Los Angeles native who attended the University of Southern California for a degree in Architecture. Heaton owned his own architecture firm, Culver Heaton & Associates, which was located in Pasadena, California. The American Architects Directory (ADA) of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) lists his notable projects as: Salem Lutheran Church in Glendale, Knox United Presbyterian Church in Pasadena, and the La Habra Methodist Church. He served as the President of the Pasadena chapter of the AIA in 1951 and as the Director in 1952. He was the Treasurer of the California Council of the AIA in 1952 and the Director in 1953. (See Continuation Sheet page 7)  

B11. Additional Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): N/A  
*B13. Remarks: N/A  
*B14. Evaluator:  
Alexandra Madsen  
Sapphos Environmental, Inc.  
430 N. Halstead Street  
Pasadena, CA  91107  
*Date of Evaluation: August 29, 2018  

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

*Map Name: El Monte

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of map: 1994
Front (Eastern) Façade

The residence has a complex, generally 'U'-shaped footprint that is composed of a longer ell that serves as the main body of the residence, two small ells off the rear, and a perpendicular ell at the front façade that houses the double garage. The garage has vertical board-and-batten wood siding along the main body and horizontal clapboard along the upper reaches of the exterior beneath the gable roof. The roof is clad in composition shingles, has a deep overhang, and central false beam. Two full length double vents provide passive airflow for the garage. The garage door was replaced at an unknown date.

The main ell of the residence features the cross-gable roof that opens to the primary entrance. The entrance has a gable roof with a central false beam that bisects a triangular vent among horizontal wood clapboard cladding. The main door is recessed below the roof which is upheld by a single squared wood column; this creates a sheltered entrance porch. The main door is wood and is flanked by a full-length leaded glass window to one side and split rock veneer to the other. It is accessible via a low, single step covered in split stone. The main exterior is covered by vertical board and batten wood siding and has a tripartite horizontal window with a central fixed light flanked by casement windows.

The remainder of the primary façade’s main ell is defined by its low massing, gable roof, board and batten exterior, and tripartite casement windows. Numerous plants line this façade, which slightly obscures it from view. A metal fence and brick pier close off the continuing driveway and rear of the property from public access. The chimney is also located along this façade. It is brick covered in split rock veneer.

Northern Façade

The northern façade is mostly hidden by the black gate at the northeast corner of the residence and abuts the driveway. A wall constructed of concrete masonry units (CMUs) defines the northern parcel boundary and is lined with brick. This façade is clad in smooth textured stucco rather than board and batten wood, although the uppermost region below the roof features vertical clapboard exterior. Windows are a combination of single and double casement and fixed windows.

Southern Façade

The southern façade features a smooth textured stucco exterior and cross gable roof that sits atop the projecting eaves. A concrete walkway leads to two doors that provide entrance to the residence via concrete steps. Casement and fixed windows are evident along this façade. A wall of CMUs lines the southern boundary of the parcel and includes a small enclave for garbage.

Setting

Oak Knoll Avenue is lined with residential properties and oak trees. Most residences in the area appear to have been constructed between the 1950s and 1960s, although a number are newer constructions completed in the last 10 years or are currently under construction. The properties are characterized by Ranch-style residences and vernacular residences with deep setbacks.
*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Continued from Primary Record page 1)

- View of Garage
- View of Entrance, Primary Façade
- View of Northern Façade

(See Continuation Sheet page 6)
**Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder)**: 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

**P5a. Photo or Drawing**: (Continued from Continuation Sheet page 5)

- **View of Southern Façade**
- **View of Setting**
Heaton is best known for his religious architecture, as reported in the 1962 ADA. The Los Angeles Conservancy mentions Heaton as the architect of the Chapel of Jesus Ethic in Los Angeles, claiming Heaton was “a prolific architect who was best known for designing numerous churches throughout Southern California.” This church is notable for its steeple vault roof with flared eaves and is a strong example of expressionist Modern design. Aside from steeply pitched roofs, Heaton was also notable for his use of glass and light, as evident in his design of the Trinity Presbyterian Church in San Diego (Spring Valley).

Heaton is significant for his work on religious properties but does not evidence any mastery of residential architecture. Instead, the property at 2275 S. Oak Knoll is common in design and execution and does not integrate dramatic features or motifs. Instead, the property employs standard forms and features that exemplify the Ranch style of architecture. The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is a residential property that is not a strong example of Culver Heaton’s work and does not reflect his expertise as a master architect. Culver Heaton is not listed in the City of San Marino’s list of locally significant architects.

Ownership History

Frank S. Genuser was born in Texas circa 1889. He worked as an electrotyper and was married to Helen Genuser. Frank Genuser was an official of the California Electrotype and Stereotype Company. Helen Genuser was also born in Texas and did not list an occupation.

Harry R. Land was a management consultant and was married to Lorene N. Land. They were listed as living at the subject property in 1962. Joseph M. Tescher was a secretary and treasurer of the Joshua Hendy Corporation and was married to Ruby M. Tescher. In 1967, the couple was robbed at the subject property by a gunman.

No information was available on Chad B. and Margaret A. Glendhill.

Ranch

The Ranch style of architecture was popular from the mid-1930s to the mid-1970s and was inspired by Spanish Colonial architecture and the 19th century working ranch houses. The popularity of Ranch-style homes grew as sprawling designs were increasingly possible after World War II and the associated economic boom. The most common subtype of the Ranch style is an asymmetrical one-story form with a low-pitched roof.

There are several substyles of the style, including the Colonial Revival, Storybook/Chalet, Polynesian/Asian, and Contemporary Ranch substyles. The below character-defining features are generally reflected in Ranch style houses regardless of substyle.

Character-defining Features

- One-story floor plan, with horizontal emphasis in form
- Low-pitched roof, with wide, overhanging eaves
- Exposed rafters
- Wood board siding or stucco
- Large windows
- Porches framed with wood posts
- Open wood trusses
- Open interior plan
- Integration of outdoors in the interior, through doors, window and house plan
- Glass doors that opened to outdoor patio
- Attached garage on street evaluation

(See Continuation Sheet page 8)
Evaluation of 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll represents an example of a middle-class dwelling from the 1950s. The property located at 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue was built in the southwestern corner of the city as one of many houses built in the 1950s when the area and greater Southern California experienced a housing boom after the end of World War II. Residences immediately surrounding the subject property were also developed in this time frame; many were completed from the 1950s through 1960s. Other properties have since been demolished and are newer constructions.

The property was not associated with an important event of broad pattern of significant development that made a contribution to the City, region, state, or nation. Therefore, the property is not eligible for listing under Criterion A/1/3 for the National Register, California Register, or as a Historic Landmark.

2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under Criteria B/2/4 for an association with persons significant in our past, as no one associated with this address can be documented to have significantly contributed to local, state, or national history to an extent significant enough to warrant designation.

2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is a common Ranch-style residence. The building was designed by Culver Heaton whose significance is limited to his Mid-Century Modern-designed religious architecture. Moreover, Culver Heaton is not listed in the City of San Marino’s list of locally significant architects.

Therefore, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under Criteria C/3/5 because the residence does not retain distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction and does not possess high artistic value.

Statement of Integrity for 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue

The property, 2275 S. Oak Knoll Avenue, was evaluated against the seven aspects of integrity as outlined in the California Code of Regulations (Section 4852 [C]), and described in the National Register Program. The seven aspects of integrity include location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting.

The subject property retains its location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting. The property has undergone some alterations, including refurbishment of the garage and re-roofing. However, these changes are minimal and do not affect the property’s integrity. The subject property therefore generally retains its location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and setting.
*B12. References: (Continued from Building, Structure, and Object Record page 2)
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SUBJECT: Arborist Report for 2275 S Oak Knoll Avenue, San Marino

REFERENCES:
1) City of San Marino Ordinance 23.06.15: Preservation of Trees, undated
2) Application Status Notification for CUP No. CUP19-9, dated 4/30/19, Christine Song (Assistant Planner, City of San Marino)
3) Email, dated 9/18/19 at 10:10AM, Ron Serven (City Arborist, City of San Marino) to Robert Artura (request for arborist report)
4) Email, dated 9/18/19 at 10:50AM, Ron Serven (City Arborist, City of San Marino) to Jan Scow

BACKGROUND
The applicant is proposing the demolition of an existing single-story, single-family home and construction of a new two-story, single-family home at the subject address. There are established trees and an oak tree on the property, requiring an inventory of all trees at least 15 feet in height and with a trunk diameter of at least six inches, a tree protection plan, and an arborist report to satisfy the City of San Marino Ordinance and the request for an arborist report by City Arborist Ron Serven.

We visited the site on June 17, 2019, and did a complete inventory of all established and oak trees on or near the property. We visited the site again on July 12, 2019, to gather additional information for the enclosed Tree Protection Plan. The following is an arborist report based upon those two site visits, upon discussion with the applicant, and upon the provided site plan, that satisfies requirements as laid out by Ron Serven in the referenced emails.

ASSIGNMENT
We agreed to do the following work to satisfy the arborist report requirement as laid out by Ron Serven in the referenced emails:
1. Inventory, map, and photograph all established and oak trees on the site (previously completed).
2. Provide an arborist report containing the following information:
   a. Detailed health information about each established and oak tree.
   b. Reasons for removal of any established or oak tree.
   c. Mitigation information for established and oak trees to remain on the site.
   d. Color photograph of each established and oak tree.
OBSERVATIONS

Site description:
The site is located in southwest San Marino, just north of Huntington Drive. The site is bordered by residences on three sides and S Oak Knoll Avenue on the fourth. The property is fully developed with a single-story, single-family home, a circular driveway at the front, and a pool and tennis court at the rear. There are mature, non-native trees throughout the site, lawn areas at the front and rear, and other minor landscaping areas.

Project description:
The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing house, pool, and tennis court, and construction of a new two-story, single-family home, expanded driveway/entry area in the front, and a new pool in the rear. The project will also include construction of a covered BBQ area, half basketball court, and various porch and landscape areas. Some existing trees will be protected in place during the project, and new landscaping will be installed around them.

Tree description:
We inventoried all qualifying trees on or near the site, of which there are a total of 21. Three of the trees are street trees, a cork oak (*Quercus suber*) and two camphor trees (*Cinnamomum camphora*). One of the trees, another camphor tree, is located off property to the south. All required information about the trees is found on the attached Field Inventory Data sheet. Additional detailed information about the health and condition of each tree is found in the TREE HEALTH AND CONDITION section below.

Tree safety:
We have not evaluated trees on this property for safety. Without a thorough and focused "risk assessment," it is difficult to estimate the likelihood that a tree may fail and cause damage to life or property. Even with such an assessment, there are no guarantees that a tree will not fail unexpectedly. Trees are dynamic living organisms subject to many influencing factors. All trees are potentially hazardous, regardless of their apparent health and vigor. It is impossible to be certain that a tree is absolutely safe.

TREE HEALTH AND CONDITION

The following is a detailed description of the health and condition of each inventoried established/oak tree on the site. For additional required information about each tree, please refer to the attached Field Inventory Data sheet. For a color photo of each tree, please refer to the attached photos.

Tree ST1- This tree is a cork oak that is in fair health but has a lean, is heavily imbalanced to the southwest, and has no notable root flare. It is located in a public right-of-way planting strip that appears to receive little watering. There is some dieback in the canopy and adventitious sprouting on the main trunk, both of which are indicative of drought stress.

Tree ST2- This tree is a camphor tree that is in fair health. It is infected with Verticillium wilt, as evidenced by dieback of the outer branches and adventitious sprouting along the interior branches. It has a multi-stem configuration and will overgrow/damage the sidewalk and curb if it hasn’t already. It also has long, horizontal and diagonal limbs in all directions that should be considered for reduction pruning.
**Tree ST3** - This tree is a camphor tree that is in fair health. It is infected with Verticillium wilt, as evidenced by dieback of the outer branches and adventitious sprouting along the interior branches. It has codominant trunks but no included bark.

**Tree 4** - This tree is a Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) that is in good health. It is growing within a perimeter hedge that is regularly trimmed up to 15 feet high, and as a result has an abnormal canopy structure. The root crown of this tree is questionable as it was not completely accessible within the hedge and is buried in a thick layer of leaf litter. No other health concerns were noted for this tree at the time of our site visit, but it seems likely that this tree will have aphid activity that is common in Chinese elms this time of year.

**Tree 5** - This tree is a saucer magnolia (*Magnolia x soulangeana*) that is in poor health. It is severely drought stressed, and as a result most of its canopy has died back. I suspect that the winter rains this year contributed to the regrowth evident in the lower canopy of this tree, but I do not believe that the tree is likely to continue thriving without sustained watering. This tree has also been topped in the past, likely contributing to its poor condition.

**Tree 6** - This tree is a Japanese black pine (*Pinus thunbergii*) that is in good health. It is a little sparse and may be slightly drought stressed, but overall appears in good condition. It has codominant trunks with included bark that could be considered for cabling or some other tree support system.

**Tree 7** - This tree is a queen palm (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*) that is in fair health. This palm is skinny and small and does not appear to have thrived in this location. The fronds appear chlorotic, most likely due to nitrogen deficiency (potassium deficiency in queen palms is also a common issue, but symptoms do not match).

**Tree 8** - This tree is a xylosma (*Xylosma congesta*) that is in good health. It is growing within a perimeter hedge that is regularly trimmed up to 15 feet high, and as a result has a raised canopy. Due to the location of this tree within the hedge, a full assessment of its root crown was not possible. The root crown should be investigated further as the tree is growing in close proximity to the brick perimeter wall and may be imbedded.

**Tree 9** - This tree is a xylosma that is in good health. It is growing within a perimeter hedge that is regularly trimmed up to 15 feet high, and as a result has a raised canopy. This tree is intertwined with Tree 10, making its structure difficult to ascertain, but it appears to have a strong lean and canopy imbalance.

**Tree 10** - This tree is a xylosma that is in poor health. It is growing within a perimeter hedge that is regularly trimmed up to 15 feet high, and as a result has been pruned very poorly. This tree is intertwined with Tree 9, making its structure difficult to ascertain, but it appears to have one trunk that was topped and has very minimal foliage remaining.

**Tree OP11** - This tree is a camphor tree located on the neighbor’s property to the south that is in fair health. It is infected with Verticillium wilt, as evidenced by dieback of the outer branches and adventitious sprouting along the interior branches. It has a multi-stem configuration that will more than likely lead to bark inclusion in the future. The root crown of this tree is buried in leaf litter, making an assessment of its root crown impossible without entering the neighboring property.
Tree 12- This tree is a white champaca (*Magnolia x alba*) that is in good health. This tree is very typical for its species and has no notable health concerns. It is clear this tree has been pruned many times over the years, as is typical for small ornamental trees, but the pruning work has been poor and the resulting structure of this tree is not ideal. However, due to the small size of the tree, failure is not a concern.

Tree 13- This tree is a fern pine (*Afrocarpus gracilior*) that is in good health. This tree appears a bit sparse near the center of its canopy and may be slightly drought stressed. It has an abnormal root crown that may need further investigation. This tree also has a main crotch with multiple attachments.

Tree 14- This tree is a shamel ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*) that is in poor health. This tree has been suppressed by Trees 13 and 15, and is likely also drought stressed. It has been topped in the past and has remnants of ivy that used to grow up its trunk and into the canopy. Overall, tree is very sparse and poorly structured.

Tree 15- This tree is a shamel ash that is in poor health. This tree is likely drought stressed. It has been topped in the past, has codominant trunks, and has remnants of ivy that used to grow up its trunk and into the canopy. Overall, tree is very sparse and poorly structured.

Tree 16- This tree is an Australian brush cherry (*Syzygium australe*) that is in good health. It is growing directly out of the existing tennis court, adjacent to a light post and perimeter wall/fence. The tree leans, lacks adequate trunk taper or acceptable root crown, and has been pruned over the years into an imbalanced, rectangular shape.

Trees 17-20- These trees are all weeping figs (*Ficus benjamina*) in good health. They are all typical for their species and don’t appear to be suffering from drought stress or have any real health concerns.

Tree 21- This tree is a glossy privet (*Ligustrum lucidum*) that is in poor health. It has only one live branch remaining (and some basal sprouts), and the live branch appears stressed. This tree appears large and old for its species, and it is possible that the tree is senescing.

**IMPACTS**

*Impact assumptions:*
The impact analysis is based on several assumptions, as stated below. Should these assumptions prove to be incorrect, additional impacts could result from the project.

1. All protective mitigation measures will be followed carefully as described.
2. Our understanding of the proposed project is accurate
3. The proposed project design will not change significantly.
4. We have correctly identified where the property lines are.
5. All trees are mapped correctly.

---

1 The plans we were provided with are limited, and we may not know all proposed details.
Tree removals:
This project will cause the removal of Trees 4-7 and Trees 17-21 for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Removal Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Revised perimeter wall and hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Driveway construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Building footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Driveway construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pool demolition, grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pool demolition, grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pool demolition, grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pool demolition, grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Detached garage footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tree encroachments:
The proposed project will encroach on all of the remaining established and oak trees (Trees ST1-3 and Trees 8-16). We anticipate that impacts due to the proposed project can be minimized if our specific and general tree protection measures are adhered to.

MITIGATION
Tree replacement mitigation:
Per the City of San Marino Ordinance, the provided “tree replacement matrix shall not be applicable to the required Tree Protection Plan”. For this reason, we have not calculated required mitigation for tree removals due to the proposed project; tree replacement requirements are left to the discretion of the City of San Marino Planning and Building Director, the City Arborist, or their designee.

Specific tree protection measures:
The following tree protection measures can also be found on the enclosed Tree Protection Plan.

Arborist oversight- The Project Arborist shall be notified at least 72 hours before:

- the property is to be cleared or graded;
- any digging, excavating, trenching, or building within the canopy dripline any tree on the site commences;
- any pruning of any tree’s canopy or roots takes place;
- commencement of any other activity within the canopy dripline of any tree on the site.

Order of operations- The following order of operations are necessary for adequate protection of private and public trees on the site during demolition and construction and should be adhered to:

1. Install protective fencing around public trees ST1-ST3 as indicated on the Tree Protection Plan (see mitigation measures for PROTECTIVE FENCING).
2. Before any other demolition or construction activity on the site begins, any demolition work (such as hardscape removal, tree/landscape removal, etc.) required within the canopy dripline of a protected tree should be completed (see mitigation measures for DEMOLITION).
3. After step 2 is complete and before any other demolition or construction activity on the site begins, protective fencing should be installed around the remaining protected trees as indicated on the Tree Protection Plan (see mitigation measures for PROTECTIVE FENCING).

4. After protective fencing is installed, all other demolition and construction activity on the site that is located outside of protective fencing may begin (see mitigation measures for ARBORIST OVERSIGHT and ROOT AND CANOPY PRUNING). Equipment, material, and personnel access to the site should be as indicated on the Tree Protection Plan (see mitigation measures for INGRESS AND EGRESS).

5. Only after all other demolition and construction activity on the site is complete may work within the protective fencing zones begin (see mitigation measures for HARDSCAPING AND FOOTINGS, PERIMETER FENCING, and LANDSCAPING AROUND MATURE TREES).

Protective fencing- Protective fencing shall be installed as shown on the Tree Protection Plan around all trees to be protected in place. The Project Arborist shall inspect all protective fencing prior to any work commencing on the site.

Protective fencing shall be installed prior to any demolition, grubbing, grading, or other construction activities. Fencing will be chain-link, at least 5 feet high, and held in place by steel stakes driven directly into the ground. There shall be no gate or easy access into the protection zone and all protective fencing shall remain intact until construction is completed.

No workers shall enter the fenced protection zone. No storage, waste disposal, equipment clean-out, outhouse, or vehicle parking will be allowed within the fenced area. The purpose is to keep the tree’s root zone area free from any disturbance of any sort throughout the period of construction activity.

Any activities that must be completed within the fenced zones (such as landscaping and trenching) shall be left until after all other construction activities on the site are completed and the Project Arborist has determined it is safe to remove the protective fencing.

Ingress and egress- Due to the nature of the canopy imbalance of Tree ST1 above the southernmost driveway entrance, we recommend that the primary ingress and egress for the duration of the project be through the northernmost driveway entrance as indicated by the bold arrows on the Tree Protection Plan.

Demolition- All demolition of existing structures, walls, asphalt, trees/landscaping, etc., within the canopy dripline of a protected tree that is to remain on the site must be completed carefully to not damage any protected tree trunk, canopy, or root system. All demolition work should begin closest to the tree and move away from it, keeping equipment on existing asphalt or concrete whenever possible/applicable. **No roots two inches or larger are to be cut or removed unless the Project Arborist is present.** Cuts should be made cleanly with a sharp saw or pruning tool, far enough behind any damage that all split and cracked root portions are removed. The cut should be made at right angles to the root so that the wound is no larger than necessary. When practical, cut roots back to a branching lateral root. Do not apply any pruning wound treatment to cuts.
Root and canopy pruning- The Project Arborist must be consulted prior to any root or canopy pruning of any protected tree. All pruning will be carried out by an ISA Certified Arborist, or under the direction of the Project Arborist. All pruning shall conform to ANSI A-300 standards at a minimum.

Hardscaping and footings- All hardscaping or excavation for footings within a protected tree canopy dripline (such as walkways, paver stones, patios, pergolas, etc) should be installed on grade whenever possible. Materials that require as minimal base layer as possible are ideal. Patios should be installed at grade or on piles or other non-continuous footings whenever possible. Planter wall footings should be kept as minimal as possible and excavated by hand tools only. If root cutting is necessary for hardscaping or excavation for footings, no roots two inches or larger are to be cut or removed unless the Project Arborist is present. Cuts should be made cleanly with a sharp saw or pruning tool, far enough behind the damage that all split and cracked root portions are removed. The cut should be made at right angles to the root so that the wound is no larger than necessary. When practical, cut roots back to a branching lateral root. Do not apply any pruning wound treatment to cuts.

Perimeter fencing- Perimeter fencing can damage tree roots excessively and is an impact that is often overlooked. The following guidelines apply:

If a perimeter fence/wall requiring a continuous footing is being built at the property line, it shall stop at least 10 feet from the trunk of any protected tree. Where the fencing will pass within 10 feet of any protected tree, that section shall be installed as a post-in-concrete type of construction, rather than continuous footing. Typically, this means that there will be panels of fence near the protected trees that are wrought iron, wooden, or other types of construction not requiring a continuous footing.

In these sections, post-holes shall be no wider than fourteen inches, and shall be dug manually. While digging, if any roots two-inches in diameter or larger are encountered, the post-hole shall be moved to avoid the root.

Landscaping around mature trees- When designing and installing landscaping and irrigation around existing mature trees, the following guidelines should be followed:

- No planting of any type, irrigation, or irrigation overspray shall occur within ten feet of any trunk;
- Only drought tolerant or native plants should be planted within twenty feet of any trunk;
- No lawn or groundcover requiring frequent irrigation shall be planted within the canopy dripline of any tree;
- Three to four inches of organic mulch (freshly shredded tree trimmings) should be maintained within twenty feet of all trunks;

Underground irrigation lines should be kept out of the canopy driplines to the extent possible, and should be installed (when they are necessary within the dripline) without doing any root damage to the tree. Irrigation trenching shall be done using hand tools only.
**General tree protection measures:**
The following additional measures should be applied where they are relevant. If there is a conflict between the specific tree protection measures for this project above and any of these general protection measures, the specific tree protection measures supersede.

1. All work conducted in the ground within the root protection zone of any protected tree should be accomplished with hand tools only. The root protection zone is defined as the area within a circle with a radius equal to the greatest distance from the trunk to any overhanging foliage in the canopy.

2. Where structural footings are required and major roots will be impacted, the footing depth should be reduced to 12". This may require additional "rebar" for added strength. An alternative would involve bridging footings over roots and covering each root with plastic cloth and 2-4" of Styrofoam matting before pouring concrete.

3. Any required trenching which has multiple trench path options should be routed in such a manner to minimize root damage. Radial trenching is less harmful than tangential trenching because it runs parallel to tree roots rather than diagonal or perpendicular to them. Whenever possible trenching should work around roots rather than cutting them. Place pipes and cables below uncut roots, and utilize the same trench for as many utilities as possible.

4. In areas where grade will be lowered, or where footings will be dug, some root cutting may be unavoidable. Cuts should be made cleanly with a sharp saw or pruning tool, far enough behind the damage that all split and cracked root portions are removed. The cut should be made at right angles to the root so that the wound is no larger than necessary. When practical, cut roots back to a branching lateral root. Do not apply any pruning wound treatment to cuts.

5. Pruning of oaks should be limited to the removal of dead wood and the correction of potentially hazardous conditions, as evaluated by a qualified arborist. Pruning oaks excessively is harmful to them. Removal or reduction of major structural limbs should be done only as required for actual building clearance or safety. If limbs must be removed, cuts should be made perpendicular to the branch, to limit the size of the cut face. The branch bark collar should be preserved (i.e. no "flush cuts"), and cuts should be made in such a way as to prevent the tearing of bark from the tree. All pruning should be done in accordance with ANSI A300 pruning standards. No pruning wound treatment (e.g. "Tree Seal") should be applied.

6. To minimize soil compaction, keep all activity and traffic to a minimum within the root protection zone.

7. It is important that the root protection zone not be subjected to flooding incidental to the construction work, or to disposal of construction debris such as paints, plasters, or chemical solutions. No equipment fueling or chemical mixing should be done within the root protection zone.

8. In general, it is best to minimize the amount of environmental change which trees will be subjected to. This includes drastic changes in watering practices from historic conditions, including drastic increases as well as decreases in the amount or frequency of water applied.
CONCLUSIONS
This project will cause the removal of nine established trees and will encroach on the 12 remaining established and oak trees. It is critical that all recommendations in this report are followed; otherwise the health of these trees could be seriously compromised. Failure to adhere to the recommended procedures and protocols could lead to serious decline and ultimate loss of these trees.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance or if you have any additional questions. Our goal is to satisfy our clients and help them to better care for their trees in the most effective way possible. We look forward to working with you toward that goal!

Sincerely,

Alison Lancaster
Associate Arborist
Jan C. Scow Consulting Arborists, LLC.
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-12464A

Attached: Field Inventory Data sheet
Photos (16)
Site Location Map
Arborist Disclosure Statement
Arborist Qualification Certificate

Enclosed: Tree Protection Plan, dated 7/18/19, Lancaster
### FIELD INVENTORY DATA

**Date:** 6/17/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DSH (inches)*</th>
<th>Height**</th>
<th>Spread***</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Quercus suber</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25SW</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34/36/27/27</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>34 @ 1'</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14/18/15/15</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia</td>
<td>~10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Magnolia x soulangeana</td>
<td>9.5, 6 @ .5'</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pinus thunbergii</td>
<td>9, 8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14/9/12/8</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Syagrus romanzoffiana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8r</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Xylosma congesta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12/9/9/14</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Xylosma congesta</td>
<td>~14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11/—/12/19</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Xylosma congesta</td>
<td>8 @ 3'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6W</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP11</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>~20, 16, 14, 8, 8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>~19r</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Magnolia x alba</td>
<td>6 @ 2.5'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Afrocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>25 @ 4'</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22/20/18/14</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fraxinus uhdei</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fraxinus uhdei</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24/13/10/29</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Syzygium australe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12/3/6/3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ficus benjamina</td>
<td>13 @ grade</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8r</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ficus benjamina</td>
<td>7, 6 @ 1'</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ficus benjamina</td>
<td>9 @ grade</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ficus benjamina</td>
<td>4, 4, 2 @ .5'</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>6, 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>remove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diameter measured at the standard height of 4.5-feet above grade, unless otherwise specified.

** Height is estimated in feet.

*** For impacted protected trees, canopy is the distance to the North/East/South/West. "r" indicates canopy as a radius estimated in feet.

South Oak Knoll Avenue is the East reference for canopy data.
Tree ST1
Tree ST3
Tree 4 – Trunk disguised within perimeter hedge; note the Chinese elm foliage protruding near the top center of the photo.
Tree 5
Tree 8
Trees 9 and 10 – Note that the trunks of these trees are disguised by the perimeter hedge, but their foliage is clearly visible.
Tree OP11
Tree 12
Tree 13
Trees 14 and 15 – Tree 14 is in center but hidden somewhat by Tree 13 on the left; Tree 15 is on right.
Tree 16
Trees 17-20 – From right to left, trunks are somewhat disguised by their own foliage.
Tree 21
ARBORIST DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist's services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, landlord-tenant matters, etc. Arborists cannot take such issues into account unless complete and accurate information is given to the arborist. The person hiring the arborist accepts full responsibility for authorizing the recommended treatment or remedial measures.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near a tree is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risks is to eliminate all trees.

Please note the following important considerations:

• You should never authorize or do any work on any tree unless you are certain of that tree’s ownership, and you have confirmed that you solely own the tree, or that anyone else having a claim to the tree has given you permission in writing authorizing your proposed action.
• Before removing a tree, be sure it is your tree to remove.
• Trees on property lines belong to both properties.
• Working on trees hanging into or over your yard that belong to a neighbor may result in “unreasonable damage” to their tree and could expose you to litigation.
The American Society of Consulting Arborists

Jan C. Scow

upon recommendation of the Membership Committee, and in recognition of professional qualifications in the field of arboricultural consultation, confers upon

Jan C. Scow

Registered Membership

with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities provided by the Bylaws and Standards of Professional Practice of the Society.

Registered Member Since July 14, 1999

Registered Arborist E-302

[Signature]

[Stamp]
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

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

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence with an attached one-car garage and a detached two-car garage. The applicant also proposes front yard fencing, walls, and pilasters. This requires two design review actions pursuant to City Code Sections 23.15.03(B) and 23.15.03(F).

REQUIRED ACTIONS

DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 19-57HP – New Two-Story Residence
DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 20-15 – Front Yard Fencing

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.

January 2020 – Staff advised the project architect regarding completeness items and discussed the proposed change in architectural design from Italianate to French Eclectic architectural design.

BACKGROUND

General Plan: Very Low Residential (2-4 dwelling units per acre)
Zoning: R-1, District II
Location: The subject property is located on the west side of Saint Albans Road, south of Mills Lane and north of Monterey Road.
Lot Size: 19,347 square feet
Existing Use: Two-story single-family residence with a one-car attached garage and two-car detached garage.
Surrounding Uses: The site is bordered by residences in Area District II in all directions.
Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects)

ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR MAIN DWELLING</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/Lot Coverage</td>
<td>5,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Livable area: 5,169 sq. ft. Lot coverage: 3,572 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEIGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>32’-6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YARDS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>61’-9”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>12’-6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13’-11”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>74’-10”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site is currently developed with a ranch-style single-story residence with an attached garage on a 19,347 square-foot parcel. The applicant proposes to demolish all the buildings on site totaling 2,647 square feet and construct a 5,193 square-foot, two-story residence with attached one-car garage and detached two-car garage. Generally, the existing uses and proposed uses of the property will be similar in nature.

A Historic Assessment Report was prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. which did not conclude that any of the structures as a “historical resource” given that the property was not eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or designation as a Historic Landmark.

An Arborist Report was prepared by Javier Cabral (Consulting Arborist) identifying those trees in poor condition. The summary on Page No. 3 of the report indicates that some trees will be removed based on their poor condition and others will be removed to accommodate the footprint layout. Another tree is proposed to be removed due to the proximity of the new pool and its tendency to attract fruit flies would be a potential nuisance. A total of thirteen (13) trees are proposed to be removed as a result of the proposed new residence.

**NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS**

Approve – 5  
Object – 1  
No response – 5

An adjacent resident that abuts the rear yard of the subject property opposes the project because of the proximity of the detached garage and pool equipment at their shared property line. Their concerns also include opposition of the previously proposed Italianate architecture and noted that not enough elements were used to accurately depict the chosen architectural style. The resident also expressed concerns with potential privacy issues of their pool area.
DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

New Two-Story 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.

Saint Albans Road between Mill Lane and Monterey Road is characterized by having deep setbacks, dense front yard landscaping, and prominent homes with lot sizes between 20,000-30,000 square feet. Along the west side of Saint Albans Road, average home sizes range between 2,000-5,000 square feet containing an average of 4 bedrooms. The east side of Oak Knoll Avenue have average home sizes ranging from 3,000-6,000 square feet containing an average of 5 bedrooms. Since the new home will be 5,193 square feet containing 5 bedrooms on a 19,347 square foot lot, the proposal will follow along with these same neighborhood layouts and therefore will be consistent with the existing conditions of the immediate area.

There exists a variety of architectural styles within the legal neighborhood and an even balance of one-story and two-story homes. A majority of the existing one-story homes in the surrounding area were modest in size and built in the 1950s with front-loading attached garages, while the newer second-story homes possess more architectural mass with Italian, Spanish, and Mediterranean influences and detached garages. The proposed architectural style for the new residence is French Eclectic architecture, usually characterized by asymmetrical steeper-pitched roofs and decorative accents within pediments. These elements are also similar trends of the existing two-story homes and therefore would be compatible with the massing and scale of those homes within the same block.

Several homes within the vicinity have two to three-car detached garages located at the rear of their property with narrow driveways leading to their entrance. Proposed for this property is a 528 square-foot two-car detached garage and a 355 square-foot attached garage. The proposal is for a 5-bedroom home, which requires a total of three (3) enclosed parking spaces. As such, the one-car attached garage and two-car detached garage allows for the required number of enclosed parking spaces and meets this requirement.

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.
The new home will be centered on the lot to provide equal distance from both property lines (12'-6" & 13'-11"). This allows for the property to maintain privacy from other adjacent properties and to minimize the privacy impact onto neighboring rear yards at the second-floor terraces. The applicant has also provided fast-growing trees (29 – 24" box size Carolina Laurel trees) along the south property line in response to a neighbor’s concern regarding privacy of their pool area. Previously, a barbeque area along the southern boundary was proposed and has also been removed as a courtesy to this same neighbor adjacent to the south.

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

Not applicable.

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

All the structures on the property are proposed to match in architectural design, materials, and colors to the primary home. Wall finish is primarily smooth plaster painted in neutral colors with a gray slate-tile roof and pre-cast concrete accents. These pre-cast accents include the balustrades at the front elevation, the corbels underneath the first-floor windows, second-story terrace columns, and the planters atop pilasters upon entering the front porch. Other accents include the use of copper material for the roof at the kitchen window, rain gutters, and chimney cap. Wrought-iron railing is used at the second floor for terrace guard rails and Juliet balconies.

The garages are approximately 15 feet in height and have generally typical dimensions for a one-car (25" x 14") and two-car (21'-10" x 24") garage. These garages are also proposed to be compatible in materials, colors, and wall finishes. Wooden sectional garage doors are to be in the style of the wood main entry door and stained in similar dark colors. The roof will have the same French roof style and roof slope as the main home.

New Front Yard Fencing, Walls, and Pilasters

San Marino City Code Section 23.13.04G identifies separate design review findings relating to the approval of fence, gates, walls and pilasters. The Planning Commission shall approve the application for the front yard walls if it finds all of the following to be true:

1. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.
2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.
3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
The placement of the front yard fencing, walls, and pilasters along the property’s frontage is consistent with the location of neighboring fence lines. Additionally, vehicular and pedestrian visibility while exiting the property is sufficient as the fencing height and location do not impede line-of-sight.

Design of the front yard fencing is proposed to be 3'-6" in overall height with stucco masonry walls standing at 1'-10" and decorative wrought-iron fencing atop the walls. No gate across the driveway is being proposed. The pilasters will be 12" x 12" and have a stone veneer application with pre-cast concrete caps. In evaluating the proposed front yard fencing, staff feels that the design is not compatible with the style of the home. The selection of stone veneer for the pilasters is introducing a material that is not applied on the residence and the wrought-iron pattern does not attempt to simulate the pattern used for the balcony/terrace railings. Staff recommends that the applicant consider revising the front yard fencing in order to present a more compatible design.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Design Review Nos. DRC 19-57HP AND DRC 20-15. 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 DRC 19-57HP AND DRC 20-15 is Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 32.

2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment hereby makes the findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for Design Review Nos. DRC 19-57HP AND DRC 20-15, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

1. The Planning Commission approves Design Review Nos. DRC 19-57HP AND DRC 20-15 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval on Data Sheet No. 2, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Data Sheet 1 – Design Review Findings
2. Data Sheet 2 – Conditions of Approval
3. Application
4. Historic Resources Assessment Report (Sapphos Environmental, Inc.) dated June 26, 2019
5. Arborist Report (Javier Cabral) dated September 19, 2019
6. Radius Map
7. DRC Neighborhood Map
8. Objection Letter – 1234 Old Mill Road
DATA SHEET 1 - FINDINGS

DESIGN REVIEW DRC 19-57HP – NEW RESIDENCE

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.

DESIGN REVIEW DRC 20-15 – FRONT YARD FENCING

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

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

That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves site lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
STANDARD CONDITIONS

PROJECT #: Design Review Nos. DRC 19-57HP and DRC 20-15

SUBJECT: The applicant requests to construct a new two-story residence with an attached one-car garage and a detached two-car garage. The applicant also proposes front yard fencing, walls, and pilasters.

APPLICANT: Alex Chang

LOCATION: 1215 Saint Albans

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0784, 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, 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. Operation of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to commencement of operation, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The facility shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to start of operation. [___/___/___]

4. If required as part of the project scope of work, a grading permit shall be obtained, subject to the City Engineer’s approval. [___/___/___]

5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape plan shall be provided in accordance with MWEO requirements, subject to the Planning and Building Department’s approval. [___/___/___]
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE APPLICATION

DESIGN REVIEW NUMBER: 19-57HP (staff use only)

Project Address: 1215 SAINT ALBANS ROAD

Proposed Use: ☑ Residential ☐ Commercial

Project Type: ☐ One Story Addition ☑ New Construction
             ☑ (2) Two Story Addition ☐ Exterior Remodel
             ☐ Other

General Description of Proposed Improvements: NEW 2 STORY RESIDENCE
5 BED RMS 5 1/2 BATH, 3 CAR GARAGE.

PROPERTY OWNER: (Please Print)

NAME: EILEEN WANG

ADDRESS: 1215 SAINT ALBANS RD.

CITY, STATE, ZIP: SAN MARINO CA 91108

PHONE: (626) 489-3557 ( )
        HOME BUSINESS

E-MAIL:

I DECLARE, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 8-5-19, at SAN GABRIEL, California.

Signature of Property Owner (Signature of Owner is required for all applications.)
APPLICANT: The applicant must be an authorized agent of the property owner. (Please Print)

Architect ☑   Builder / Developer ☐   Owner ☐   Other ☐

If “OTHER”, please explain: ________________________________

______________________________

NAME: DIG INC. / ALEX CHANG

ADDRESS: 8730 HUNTINGTON DR.

CITY, STATE, ZIP: SAN GABRIEL, CA 91775

PHONE: ( ) HOME (626) 287-1859

BUSINESS

E-MAIL: ________________________________

I DECLARE, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 8-5-19 at SAN GABRIEL, California.

Signature of Applicant other than Property Owner

______________________________

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

DATE FILED: ________________________________

AMOUNT PAID: ________________________________

REQUIRED ACTION DATE: ________________________________
HISTORIC RESOURCES ASSESSMENT REPORT

1215 St. Albans Road
San Marino, California 91108

Prepared for:

Eileen Wang
1215 St. Albans Road
San Marino, CA 91108

Prepared by:

Sapphos Environmental, Inc.
430 North Halstead Street
Pasadena, California 91107

June 26, 2019
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a historic resource assessment for a single parcel located at 1215 St. Albans Road, San Marino, Los Angeles County (APN 5325-018-018). The property is situated on a residential street within the City of San Marino (City), Los Angeles County, California. One single-family Ranch-style residence and a detached cabana are located at the subject property.

The City adopted a Historic Preservation and Design Review Regulations Ordinance (No. 0-18-1336) in April 2018 that expanded upon an earlier 1998 draft ordinance and adopted new criteria for eligibility. The proposed project would demolish the single-family dwelling and the cabana; therefore, the City must determine if the property is an historical resource afforded consideration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Sapphos Environmental, Inc. architectural historian (Ms. Carrie Chasteen; Appendix A, Key Personnel Resume) was retained to determine if the buildings located on the project site may be historical resources in accordance with the CEQA. Ms. Chasteen meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in the fields of History and Architectural History. The buildings on this parcel were evaluated in this report using the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and for designation as a City Historic Landmark under local ordinance using the guidelines for evaluation established in the Historic Preservation Ordinance. After careful research and evaluation, Sapphos Environmental, Inc. determined that the property does not possess sufficient historical or architectural significance to merit listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation as a City Historic Landmark. Because 1215 St. Albans Road does not appear eligible for listing in a historical register, it is not considered to be a “historical resource” as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

---
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SECTION 1.0
PROJECT SETTING AND DESCRIPTION

This Historic Resources Assessment Report presents the documentation and results of evaluating the subject property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and for designation as a Historic Landmark. The property owner proposes to demolish an existing single-family residence to be replaced with a new single-family residence. The existing cabana would also be demolished. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if the buildings on the subject property may be eligible for listing in a historical register and would qualify as “historical resources” pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. In order to inform this evaluation, a site visit was conducted to document the current conditions of the buildings on the site using digital photography and research was conducted in the Los Angeles County Assessor records, San Marino Public Library, California Office of Historic Preservation online records, and other online sources such as ancestry.com and ProQuest (Los Angeles Times).

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND CURRENT SETTING

This report presents the results of a historic resources assessment for one parcel located at 1215 St. Albans Road (APN 5325-018-018). The property is situated on a residential street within the City of San Marino (City) in Los Angeles County. A site visit was conducted on June 17, 2019 to document the current condition of the subject property and its setting. The project site comprises one parcel located on the southwest side of St. Albans Road; west of Lacy Park. Development surrounding the project site is characterized by parcels with single-family residences and the San Marino Tennis Center is located across the street (Figure 1, Sketch Map for 1215 St. Albans Road; Figure 2, Project Location Map for 1215 St. Albans Road). These buildings primarily date from 1940s through the early 2000s and are largely infill construction.
Figure 1. Sketch Map for 1215 St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, 2019
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would demolish a single-family dwelling and replace the building with a new single-family residence. The cabana would also be demolished.
SECTION 2.0
REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The two buildings that are located at 1215 St. Albans Road, in the City, were evaluated using the eligibility criteria for listing or designation at the federal, State, or local level.  

3.1 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.

3.2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Section 5024.1(c), Title 14 California Code of Regulations (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 CCR\(^4\) 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.

3.3 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:\(^5\)

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 three of the City's criteria, Nos. 3, 4, or 5:

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


\(^5\) 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
5. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of 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.
In preparing this report, five tasks were completed:

1. Conducted a field inspection of the project site on June 7, 2019, to ascertain the general condition and physical integrity of the buildings thereon. Digital photographs were taken during the site inspection. Field notes were made.

2. Obtained and reviewed the building permits for the parcel from the City of San Marino Planning and Building Department. Dates of construction and subsequent alterations were determined by the building permit record, as well as additional resources, such as the field inspection, Assessor information, Sanborn maps, and historic aerial photographs.


4. Researched the project site and surrounding area at the San Marino Public Library 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, San Marino City Directories, books, and articles.

5. Reviewed and analyzed ordinances, statutes, 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.
SECTION 4.0
RECORD SEARCH

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, the additional sources of information were consulted as part of the record search:

- California Register of Historical Resources—Listed (2019)
- California State Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates)
- California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates)

4.2 PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS/DESIGNATIONS SUMMARY

The reference materials available at the San Marino Public Library were consulted on June 17, 2019, and the only available information was related to the occupants of the buildings in the San Marino City Directories (see Section 7.2). The property has not been previously evaluated or found eligible for inclusion in a historical register.
SECTION 5.0
HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

The historic context is derived from the City of San Marino’s History page; San Marino: A
Centennial History by Elizabeth Pomeroy; and William Hertrich’s Early San Marino. 11

Early Settlement: The Mission and Minimal Traditional Years, 1810–1900

The early years of the area that would become the City of San Marino were shaped by its proximity
the Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, which was founded in September 1771 and became one of
the wealthiest missions in California. The mission’s “Stone Gristmill” was erected in the area that
would become San Marino between 1810 and 1812 under the direction of Father Salvededo. 12
Following Mexican independence from Spain in 1821, calls for secularization of the mission
system resulted in the 1833 proclamation, signed by Governor José Figueroa, to secularize
California’s missions and distribute their vast land holdings. What would be San Marino was
comprised of 10 ranchos, including Rancho Huerta de Cuati, Rancho San Pascualito, and parts of
Rancho San Pascual. 13

In the 1830s, the Mexican government granted a portion of land that would eventually be San
Marino to an indigenous woman named Victoria Reid, a widow of Scotsman Hugo Reid. The land
thereafter was named the rancho “Huerta de Cuati.” Other regions of San Marino, as well as large
portions of Pasadena, Altadena, and South Pasadena, were granted by the governor to Juan Mariné,
husband of Eulalia Pérez de Guillén, in compensation for his wife’s long service at Mission San
Gabriel. Mariné named his land, originally referred to as El Rincón de San Pascual (the Corner of
San Pascual), Rancho San Pascual. After Mariné failed to build an improvement on the land as
required by Mexican law to retain a land grant, Rancho San Pascual was granted in 1843 to
Manuel Garfias. In the United States period—after the 1848 conclusion of the United States-
Mexican War and California statehood in 1850—owners of many such ranchos were obliged to
prove the validity of their property titles following the 1851 creation of the U.S. Land Commission.

One early settler of the area was Michael White, an English sailor who adopted the name “Miguel
Blanco” and who built an adobe circa 1845. This adobe still stands in San Marino and is listed in
the National Register. Another early settler, Benjamin D. Wilson, also commonly referred to as
“Don Benito,” took possession of the rancho Huerta de Cuati in 1852. Garfias’s claim to Rancho
San Pascual was confirmed by the U.S. Board of Land Commission in 1854. However, by 1858,
Garfias’ cattle ranch had gone into debt, and he ceded ownership of Rancho San Pascual to
Benjamin D. Wilson as well. Wilson, a trapper and trader from Tennessee who traveled to
California in 1841 as part of the Workman-Rowland Party, became an important figure in the early
settlement of Southern California. Wilson served as the first clerk of Los Angeles County and, in
1852, became Los Angeles’ second elected mayor.

marino.ca.us/196/History-of-San-Marino; Pomeroy, Elizabeth. 2012. San Marino: A Centennial History. San Marino,
Club.
24–25.
Wilson deeded a portion of his land to his daughter Maria de Jesus, or Sue, who married J. de Barth Shorb. The couple renamed the land “San Marino” after Shorb’s grandfather’s plantation in Frederick County, Maryland. The Shorbs built a mansion on the Rancho San Marino in 1877 and enlarged it in 1888. It was later demolished. The land was largely agricultural and filled with vineyards for much of the late 19th and early 20th century. Early development of San Marino began in 1903 after some of the land was purchased from Shorb by Henry E. Huntington.

Also in 1888, State Engineer William Hamilton Hall surveyed the San Marino area for his report, *Irrigation in California (Southern)*, which identified several natural springs, one of which was named Oak Knoll.15

**Subdivision, Incorporation, and Growth 1900–1930**

Parts of the ranchos of Benjamin D. Wilson were later inherited by his son-in-law George Smith Patton, a son of a colonel in the Confederate Army. Patton attended the Virginia Military Institute and later pursued a career in law. In 1878, Patton moved to Los Angeles. He married Benjamin D. Wilson’s daughter Ruth Wilson six years after her father’s death and moved into the Lake Vineyard home. This ranch, combined with the lands previously sold to Henry E. Huntington, were combined to create the city of San Marino.

Many of the earlier, large estates were demolished and new, grand 20th-century residences were built. The most famous residence was that of Henry Huntington, which still remains at the Huntington Library and Garden of San Marino. This Beaux Arts-style residence was designed by Pasadena architect Myron Hunt at the location of the earlier Shorb house in 1909. Hunt’s other notable projects included the Rose Bowl, Pasadena Public Library, and the former Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles.16

Development soon took hold of San Marino in the early 20th century with the Pacific Electric Railway line from Los Angeles to Monrovia, bisecting San Marino in 1903 and expanded in 1906. The Pacific Electric Railway was owned by Huntington, who increasingly saw the need to retire. In 1911, he sold the Pacific Electric system to the Southern Pacific Railroad.17 Increasingly, residents recognized the threat that their town could be pulled apart, and the need for incorporation grew.

On April 25, 1913, the charter for the City was granted and the area was incorporated as a city. The City Council was formed, and George S. Patton was elected as the first mayor. Patton also served as the manager of the Huntington Land Development Company, where he oversaw the subdivisions of the City. Four trustees were responsible for much of the early days of the City, including Patton, Richard H. Lacy, William L. Valentine, Edward H. Groenendyke, and Edwin G. Hart.

The 1920s were characterized by the subdivision of the new city, and residential growth as people from Los Angeles and elsewhere relocated to San Marino. The City was marketed as highly residential, moderately inexpensive, and only 25 minutes from downtown Los Angeles by fast Pacific Electric Railway. In the mid-and late-1920s, 70 acres of Huntington’s ranch and 55 acres of

Patton’s property were developed.\textsuperscript{16} This growth continued in the 1930s, even with the onset of the Great Depression.

**World War II and Post-War Growth, 1940–Present**

In 1942, an Army anti-aircraft unit was installed in Lacy Park, serving as headquarters for a handful of soldiers. General George Patten, son of the town’s earlier George Smith Patton, visited the park when on leave from Europe. World War II brought economic boost to San Marino, as in much of the United States, and the end of the war ushered in a period of growth and prosperity.

In the 1950s, San Marino neared its built-out capacity with over 13,500 residents. In 1952, the City established a Planning Commission to ensure the City would remain the residential haven citizens enjoyed.\textsuperscript{19} As well as a growth in population, the City also diversified. Early in the 20th century, there had been a relatively sizable population of Chinese and Japanese residents. With World War II and Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066, these Japanese residents were sent to internment camps. Only in the 1970s did the San Gabriel Valley again experience what author Elizabeth Pomeroy calls “An Asian Renaissance in the Valley.”\textsuperscript{20} The growth of San Marino, with emphasis on residential living, and growth of diverse residents has defined the City over time.


SECTION 6.0
DESCRIPTION OF Evaluated Resources

The Ranch-style residence located at 1215 St. Albans Road was built in 1950, is generally ‘L’-shaped in plan and is situated in the eastern end of the lot (Figure 3, General View of 1215 St. Albans Road). The cross gable on hip roof is clad in compositions shingles. Brick chimneys accent the ridgeline of the roof. The exterior walls are clad in painted brick veneer. The aluminum casement, fixed pane, and sash windows appear to be original.

Figure 3. General View of 1215 St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Saphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Primary (Eastern) Façade

The primary façade features two bays which form the ‘L’-shaped footprint of the building. The primary entrance is slightly raised and is located in the crook of the ‘L.’ The entry porch, which wraps around the building to the south, has been re-clad in irregular granite tile veneer. A large bay window with fixed panes faces the street and is accented with a Roman brick planter. The entryway adjacent to the attached two-car garage, with roll-up door, is also accented with a Roman brick planter and drainpipes leading from the roof (Figure 4, View of Primary Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road).
Figure 4. View of Primary Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

The garage has been altered with a concrete block addition of a pair of single-car garage bays with roll-up doors (Figure 5, View of Garage, 1215 St. Albans Road).

Figure 5. View of Garage, 1215 St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Southern Façade

The southern façade features modern metal casement windows, a large Roman brick chimney that is typical of the Ranch style of architecture, and a woodshed addition. The woodshed addition features a shed roof with boxed eaves, and panels to access the storage areas (Figure 6, View of Southern Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road).
Western Façade

The western façade features three bays. The central bay appears to be an enclosed porch based upon the roof line, stucco cladding, paired modern doors, and modern concrete patio. The remaining two bays feature large ribbons of aluminum sliding doors with patterned concrete patio areas (Figure 7, View of Southern Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road).
Northern Façade

The northern façade features minimum detailing and is located close to the northern lot line. The west façade of the garage addition features a small apartment addition with vinyl sliding windows and a modern hollow core door with lunette light (Figure 8, View of Northern Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road).

![Image](image_url)

Figure 8. View of Northern Façade, 1215 St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

Cabana

An in-ground pool spans the western end of the parcel, and the cabana is located on the southern end of the pool. The cabana is a small, square building with a side gabled roof clad in composition shingles. The northern façade of the cabana features a centrally located pair of wood with glazing French doors flanked on both sides with full-height fixed-pane windows. The exterior walls are clad in stucco and vertical wood siding. The eastern façade of the cabana features a large bank of aluminum windows and stucco siding (Figures 9 A–B, View of Cabana, 1215 St. Albans Road).
Setting

The subject property is located near the intersection of Monterey and Old Mill roads on a street primarily lined with residential buildings with lush landscaping. Architectural styles range from Ranch to Colonial Revival to Contemporary (Figures 10A–D, Properties along St. Albans Road).

Figure 10A–D. Properties along St. Albans Road
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019
7.1 CONSTRUCTION HISTORY

Tract 6012 was recorded in April 1923. The tract was developed by the Huntington Land and Improvement Company. Based upon a review of the historic Los Angeles Times and Los Angeles Sentinel, these persons and organizations do not appear to be noted real estate developers nor was the establishment of this real estate tract a noted event.

In 1949, a permit was issued for a one-story Ranch-style residence. The owner and contractor was Kenneth Chrisman, and the architect was L.S. Banton. Based upon a review of the Los Angeles Times and Los Angeles Sentinel, Banton does not appear to be a master architect due to lack of press coverage or awards. A permit was issued for the construction of the pool and patio in 1952. A permit for the construction of a fence was issued in 1953. Also in 1953, a permit was issued to install a door in the exterior wall in portion of the enclosed front porch and enclosing recessed front porch area with a metal sliding door. In 1956, a permit was issued to repair the fencing. Also in 1956, a permit was issued for the construction of a "Chinese Modern" style freestanding bedroom and bath in the southwest corner of the property, and it assumed this is the cabana. In 1970, a permit was issued to remove the wood louvers and install glass on the cabana. Other permits were issued for minor work such as reroofing in kind.

Although the residence was not included in the 1929 Sanborn fire insurance maps, the residence's footprint is generally the same as it was in 1950 (Figure 11, Current Footprint, 1215 St. Albans Road).

---

21 County of Los Angeles. 1923. Tract 6012 map. Available at: http://dpw.lacounty.gov/sur/landrecords/index.cfm?docType=TM
22 City of San Marino. Issued 30 June 1952. Building permit no. 8360.
23 City of San Marino. Issued 15 April 1953. Building permit no. 5779.
26 City of San Marino. Issued 26 June 1956. Building permit no. 10413.
Figure 11. Current Footprint, 1215 St. Albans Road

SOURCE: Los Angeles County Assessor, Property Assessment Information System,
June 24, 2019
7.2 OWNERSHIP/OCCUPANT HISTORY

Based upon a review of the County of Los Angeles Assessor records, the property changed ownership multiple times between 1950 and 2012 (Table 1, Summary of Ownership History, 1215 St. Albans Road).

### TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF OWNERSHIP HISTORY
1215 ST. ALBANS ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1950–1954</td>
<td>Kenneth Chrisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert W. and Priscilla M. Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1955–1959</td>
<td>Robert W. and Priscilla M. Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5326</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1960–1964</td>
<td>Robert W. and Priscilla M. Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974*</td>
<td>Priscilla M. Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999*</td>
<td>Angela Y. Fu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999*</td>
<td>Diamondcrest Investment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>Weizhong Ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>Hong Gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004*</td>
<td>St. Albans Investment Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>V and D Investment Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>Victor F. Vans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Robert Gentry was a surgeon. No information was available pertaining to the life and career of Kenneth Chrisman, Priscilla Gentry/Austin, Angela Fu, Diamondcrest Investment Services, Weizhong Ji, Hong Gu, St. Albans Investment Inc., V and D Investment Inc. and Victor F. Vans.

The San Marino city directories were reviewed at the public library. Of the years that the directories are available (1951–1971), the property was occupied by Kenneth Chrisman in 1951, but was otherwise occupied by Robert and Priscilla Gentry.

7.3 USE HISTORY

The buildings at the subject property was constructed as a single-family residence and a detached cabana; the buildings retain this use and are currently occupied.

---

29 San Marino City Directory Company. 1951. San Marino.
SECTION 8.0
EVALUATION CRITERIA

The subject property was evaluated using Section 23.18.04 of Article 18 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance No. 0-18-1336 which defined the designation criteria for Historic Landmarks. In order to best address B3, the property was considered as an example of Ranch-style architecture:

Ranch

The Ranch style of architecture was popular in the United States beginning in the 1960s and remains a popular style of architecture. The style is loosely based upon early Spanish Colonial precedents of the American southwest with influences borrowed from Craftsman and Prairie.

Character-defining features include:

- Asymmetrical
- One-story
- Low-pitched roof
- Moderate or wide eave overhang
- Boxed or open eaves
- Wood and brick cladding, sometimes in combination
- Decorative iron or wood porch supports
- Ribbon windows
- Enclosed courtyards or patios
- Outdoor living areas to the rear

---

9.1 EVALUATION

Evaluation of 1215 St. Albans Road

The subject property represents an example of a middle-class dwelling from the 1950s development of the City, after the community's incorporation as a city in California. The subject property was built in the southwestern end of the City as one of many constructed in the 1950s. Residences immediately surrounding the subject property were also developed in this general time frame; many are modern infill construction. The property was not associated with an important event of broad pattern of significant development that made a notable contribution to the City, region, state, or nation. Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing under Criterion A/1/3 for the National Register, California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under local ordinance.

The subject property is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under local ordinance under Criteria B/2/4 for an association with persons significant in our past, as no one associated with this address can be documented to have significantly contributed to local, state, or national history to an extent significant enough to warrant designation.

The subject property was designed as a Ranch-style residence. Although the building features some of the character-defining features of this style of architecture, these features are not distinctive. The building has minimal architectural detailing and does not possess high artistic value. Additionally, the buildings do not represent the work of a master. Therefore, the buildings located on the subject property do not possess sufficient architectural merit to be considered eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark pursuant to Criteria C/3/5.

Statement of Integrity for 1215 St. Albans Road

The subject property was evaluated against the seven aspects of integrity as outlined in the California Code of Regulations (Section 4852 [C]), and described in the National Register Program. The seven aspects of integrity include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The subject property has not been moved and retains integrity of location. However, the buildings on the subject property have been substantially altered and do not retain integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, and feeling. Additionally, several of the surrounding buildings are modern infill construction, and therefore, the subject property does not retain integrity of setting (Appendix B, DPR 523 Series Forms).
9.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Because 1215 St. Albans Roads, San Marino, Los Angeles County, California, does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or designation as a Historic Landmark, it is not considered to be a “historical resource” pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Should there be any questions regarding the information contained in this MFR, please contact Ms. Carrie Chasteen at (626) 683-3547, extension 102.
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Ms. Carrie Chasteen has more than 16 years of experience in the field of cultural resources management and the built environment, including project management, agency coordination, archival research, managing large surveys, preparation of Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) sections, Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Initial Study (IS) sections, peer review, and regulatory compliance. She has served as Principal Investigator / Principal Architectural Historian on projects throughout Los Angeles County. Ms. Chasteen meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in the fields of History and Architectural History. She has extensive experience with the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources (OHPR), California Office of Historic Preservation, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, and various other state, county, and local government agencies.

On behalf of the County of Los Angeles (County) Department of Parks and Recreation, Ms. Chasteen is managing the documentation and evaluation of 54 parks, golf courses, and arboreta. The historic evaluations assess County facilities that were identified as priorities due to the age of the facility, architect of record, or affiliation with event of importance to the history of development of Los Angeles County. The historic evaluations consider eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the standards provided in CEQA, and the County Register of Landmarks and Historic Districts. The results documented in the historic evaluations were used by the County to address future projects in the facilities, alter plans as needed, and to inform a Cultural Resources Treatment Plan (CRTC) and Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training.

On behalf of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Ms. Chasteen prepared a historical evaluation of the Fries Avenue Elementary School. The evaluation tiered off the historic context and registration criteria developed for the award-winning LAUSD Historic Context Statement, 1870 to 1969. The property was determined to be a historical resource pursuant to CEQA. As a result, Ms. Chasteen also reviewed the design of the proposed campus revisions to determine if the proposed project complied with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

On behalf of the County of Los Angeles, Ms. Chasteen reviewed plans for the proposed renovation of the plaza at the Los Angeles Music Center. Design refinements were suggested and implemented in order to reduce impacts to the plaza and it’s character-defining features.

Ms. Chasteen is a member of the Society of Architectural Historians, National Trust, California Preservation Foundation, Los Angeles Conservancy, Pasadena Heritage, and currently serves as a City of Pasadena Historic Preservation Commissioner.
APPENDIX B
DPR 523 SERIES FORMS
*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): 1215 St. Albans Road

P1. Other Identifier: None

P2. Location: □ Not for Publication □ Unrestricted
   *a. County: Los Angeles \( \text{and} \) (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
   *b. USGS 7.5' Quad: El Monte
   c. Address: 1215 St. Albans Road
   d. UTM (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone: ______ mE/____ nN
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate): APN: 5325-018-018

P3a. Description (Describe resource and its major elements, include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries): The Ranch-style residence located at 1215 St. Albans Road was built in 1958, is generally 'L'-shaped in plan and is situated in the eastern end of the lot. The cross gable on hip roof is clad in compositions shingles. Brick chimneys accent the ridgeline of the roof. The exterior walls are clad in painted brick veneer. The aluminum casement, fixed pane, and sash windows appear to be original.

Primary (Eastern) Façade

The primary façade features two bays which form the 'L'-shaped footprint of the building. The primary entrance is slightly raised and is located in the crook of the 'L.' The entry porch, which wraps around the building to the south, has been re-clad in irregular granite tile veneer. A large bay window with fixed panes faces the street and is accentuated with a Roman brick planter. The entryway adjacent to the attached two-car garage, with roll-up door, is also accentuated with a Roman brick planter and drainpipes leading from the roof. (See Continuation Sheet page 4)

P3b. Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): H P2 Single-family residence

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 #: Facing west; June 17, 2019; IMG_3625.jpg

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:
□ Historic □ Prehistoric □ Both
1949 LA County Assessor

P7. Owner and Address:
Elleen Wang
1215 St. Albans Road
San Marino, CA 91108

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

P9. Date Recorded: June 17, 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 1215 St. Albans Road, San Marino, CA 91108.

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):
B1. Historic Name: 1215 St. Albans Road  
B2. Common Name: 1215 St. Albans Road  
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence  
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence  
*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch  
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)  
In 1949, a permit was issued for a one-story Ranch-style residence. The owner and contractor was Kenneth Chrisman, and the architect was L.S. Banton. Based upon a review of the Los Angeles Times and Los Angeles Sentinel, Banton does not appear to be a master architect due to lack of press coverage or awards. A permit was issued for the construction of the pool and patio in 1952. (See Continuation Sheet page 7)  
*B7. Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown  
Date: N/A  
Original Location: N/A  
*B8. Related Features: N/A  
B9a. Architect:  
*B10. Significance: Theme: Residential architecture  
Period of Significance: 1949  
Property Type: Residence  
Applicable Criteria: N/A  
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)  
The subject property represents an example of a middle-class dwelling from the 1950s development of the City, after the community's incorporation as a city in California. The subject property was built in the southwestern end of the City as one of many constructed in the 1950s. Residences immediately surrounding the subject property were also developed in this general time frame; many are modern infill construction. The property was not associated with an important event of broad pattern of significant development that made a notable contribution to the City, region, state, or nation. Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing under Criterion A/1/3 for the National Register, California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under local ordinance.  
The subject property is not eligible for the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark under local ordinance under Criteria B/2/4 for an association with persons significant in our past, as no one associated with this address can be documented to have significantly contributed to local, state, or national history to an extent significant enough to warrant designation.  
The subject property was designed as a Ranch-style residence. Although the building features some of the character-defining features of this style of architecture, these features are not distinctive. The building has minimal architectural detailing and does not possess high artistic value. Additionally, the buildings do not represent the work of a master. Therefore, the buildings located on the subject property do not possess sufficient architectural merit to be considered eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, or as a Historic Landmark pursuant to Criteria C/3/5. (See Continuation Sheet page 7)  
B11. Additional Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes):  
N/A  
*B13. Remarks: N/A  
*B14.Evaluator:  
Carrie Chasteen  
Sapphos Environmental, Inc.  
430 N. Halstead Street  
Pasadena, CA 91107  
*Date of Evaluation: June 26, 2019  

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)  

(This space reserved for official comments.)  

DPR 523J (9/2013)  
*Required information
The garage has been altered with a concrete block addition of a pair of single-car garage bays with roll-up doors.

Southern Façade

The southern façade features modern metal casement windows, a large Roman brick chimney that is typical of the Ranch style of architecture, and a woodshed addition. The woodshed addition features a shed roof with boxed eaves, and panels to access the storage areas. (See Continuation Sheet page 5)
Western Façade

The western façade features three bays. The central bay appears to be an enclosed porch based upon the roof line, stucco cladding, paired modern doors, and modern concrete patio. The remaining two bays feature large ribbons of aluminum sliding doors with patterned concrete patio areas.

Northern Façade

The northern façade features minimum detailing and is located close to the northern lot line. The west façade of the garage addition features a small apartment addition with vinyl sliding windows and a modern hollow core door with lunette light. (See Continuation Sheet page 6)
Cabana

An in-ground pool spans the western end of the parcel, and the cabana is located on the southern end of the pool. The cabana is a small, square building with a side gabled roof clad in composition shingles. The northern facade of the cabana features a centrally located pair of wood with glazing French doors flanked on both sides with full-height fixed-pane windows. The exterior walls are clad in stucco and vertical wood siding. The eastern facade of the cabana features a large bank of aluminum windows and stucco siding.

(See Continuation Sheet page 7)
A permit for the construction of a fence was issued in 1953. Also in 1953, a permit was issued to install a door in the exterior wall in portion of the enclosed front porch and enclosing recessed front porch area with a metal sliding door. In 1956, a permit was issued to repair the fencing. Also in 1956, a permit was issued for the construction of a "Chinese Modern" style freestanding bedroom and bath in the southwest corner of the property, and it assumed this is the cabana. In 1970, a permit was issued to remove the wood louvers and install glass on the cabana. Other permits were issued for minor work such as reroofing in kind.

The subject property has not been moved and retains integrity of location. However, the buildings on the subject property have been substantially altered and do not retain integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, and feeling. Additionally, several of the surrounding buildings are modern infill construction, and therefore, the subject property does not retain integrity of setting.

City of San Marino. Issued 30 June 1952. Building permit no. 8360.
City of San Marino. Issued 15 April 1953. Building permit no. 5779.
City of San Marino. Issued 29 March 1956. Building permit no. 10242.
City of San Marino. Issued 26 June 1956. Building permit no. 10413.
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Summary

Mr. Chang,

You have retained my consulting arborist services to provide tree inventory and tree protection plan for the property described as 1215 St. Albans Rd. San Marino, CA 91108. You are in the planning process of demolishing the existing single family home and re-developing the property with a new two story single family home.

The proposed demolition and construction is expected to have minimal impact to all the on-site protected trees that will remain due to the substantial distance of excavations, trenches, and footings to the tree trunks. Established trees are proposed for removal. No Oak trees are proposed to be removed. All of the protected trees to remain are expected to survive in good health. A complete tree protection plan will be included to protect above and below ground tree parts from physical damage, soil compaction, and chemical damage.

Tree #6 is proposed to be removed because it is in poor condition due to a very large cavity at the base of the tree trunk that has already affected the canopy size and presents a hazard of failing.

Trees #7, 8, and 11 thru 20 are proposed to be removed because they are either directly on the proposed footprint of the proposed structures, driveway, or to close to survive excavations and severe trimming. Tree # 9 is proposed for removal because the fruit is a heavy attractor of flies when it fruits and is adjacent to the swimming pool and surrounding hardscape.

Background and assignment

Mr. Chang is the luxury home designer that has been hired to design the proposed home new home and separate structures.

Mr. Chang has requested that I provide the following arboricultural services.

1) Identify all protected trees on the subject property and any trees on adjacent properties that may be affected by the proposed project.
2) Evaluate the current health and possible impacts of the proposed construction based on the provided site plan and make recommendations.
3) Provide a tree protection plan that will help ensure the short and long term health of the protected trees during and after construction activities are completed.

The following report is based on my site visit on September 16, 2019, and my analysis of the trees, site plan, and surrounding landscape. For the purpose of this report I will address these trees as Trees # 1 thru 20.
Existing conditions

This lot is currently developed with a one story single family home bordered by adjacent single family homes north and south of the property lines. There are 20 total trees on this property of which 2 are protected Oak trees and 10 are Established Trees that qualify for protection from the City of San Marino Tree Preservation Ordinance. 6 Established Trees one which has a large cavity at the base of the tree trunk are proposed for removal due to their proximity to the proposed construction features. The landscape plan shall be submitted and shall depict the species and location of any replacement trees required by the City of San Marino Tree Planning Department and its designees. 60 ft. of protection fencing shall placed along the front south property line to ensure protection of neighboring trees. Most of the demo and construction access shall be done from the north side of the property along the path of the existing driveway.

Google Earth Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Diameter at 4.5 feet (dbh)</th>
<th>Height (in feet)</th>
<th>Spread (in feet)</th>
<th>Physiological condition</th>
<th>City Tree Yes or No</th>
<th>Tree status</th>
<th>REMOVE OR PRESERVE</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td>Large cuts on lower trunk Bleeding on scaffold branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>multi 4+6+8+24+25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>multi 3+6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>multi 27+30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tartara Lemonwood</td>
<td>Pittosporum eugenioides</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Large cavity at base of trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glossy privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>multi 2+2+3+3+3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexican fan palm</td>
<td>Washingtonia robusta</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Edible fig</td>
<td>Ficus carica</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arborvitae</td>
<td>Thuja occidentalis</td>
<td>multi 8+8+8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>PRESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>multi 1+1+2+2+2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chinese banyan</td>
<td>Ficus microcarpa</td>
<td>multi 4+6+8+24+25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chinese banyan</td>
<td>Ficus microcarpa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>stumped tree, cut at 5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Camellia japonica</td>
<td>multi 1+1+1+1+1+1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chinese elm</td>
<td>Ulmus parviflora</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>strong lean to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chinese elm</td>
<td>Ulmus parviflora</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Camellia japonica</td>
<td>multi 1+1+1+1+1+1+2+2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Evergreen pear</td>
<td>Pyrus kawakami</td>
<td>multi 6+6+7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>sparse canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>multi 3+4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chinese banyan</td>
<td>Ficus microcarpa</td>
<td>multi 3+4+4+5+6+9+10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree # 1 (facing west)

Tree # 1 Southern magnolia
DBH = 41 in.
Trees # 2 & 3 (facing north)

Tree # 2 Redwood
DBH = 4+6+8+24+25 in.

Tree # 3 Oak
DBH = 3+6 in.
Tree # 4 (facing west)

Tree # 4 Redwood
DBH = 27+30 in.
**Tree # 5 (facing south)**

![Tree Image]

**Tree # 5 Oak**  
DBH = 13 in.
Trees # 6 (facing southwest)

Tree # 6 Tartora lemonwood
DBH =14 in.
Trees # 7 (facing east)

Tree # 7 Glossy privet
DBH = 2+2+3+3+3 in.
Tree # 8 (facing east)

Tree # 8 Mexican fan palm
DBH = 25 in.
Trees # 9 & 10 (facing southwest)

Tree # 9 Fig
DBH = 13 in.

Tree # 10 Thuja
DBH = 8+8+8 in.
Trees # 11 thru 13 (facing north)

Tree # 12 Ficus
DBH = 4+6 in.

Tree # 13 Ficus
DBH = 5 in.

Tree # 11 Orange
DBH = 1+1½+2½+2 in.
Trees # 14 thru 16 (facing northwest)

Tree # 14 Camellia
DBH = 1+1+1+1+1+1 in.

Tree # 15 Chinese elm
DBH = 21 in.

Tree # 16 Chinese elm
DBH = 13 in.
Tree # 17 (facing north)

Tree # 17 Camelia
DBH= 1+1+1+1+1+1+2+2 in.
Tree # 18 (facing west)

Tree # 18 Evergreen pear
DBH= 6+7+7 in.
Tree # 19 (facing north)

Tree # 19 Orange
DBH= 3+4 in.
Tree # 20 (facing north)

Tree # 20 Ficus
DBH= 3+4+4+4+5+6+9+10 in.
General Tree Protection Guidelines

1) **Avoid damaging the roots, stem, and branches** with mechanical and manual equipment. No roots shall be severed within the Tree Protection Zone “TPZ” which is the same as the area within the Tree Protection Fencing “TPF.” Roots greater than two inches in diameter outside of the TPZ shall be cleanly severed with a sharp tool such as a hand saw or manual pruners.

2) **Avoid soil compaction** by prohibiting the use of heavy equipment such as backhoes and bobcats under the tree drip line. If access within the TPZ is required during the construction process, the route shall be covered in a 6 inch layer of mulch in the TPZ and the area shall be aerated and fertilized at the conclusion of construction.

3) **Do not store or park tools**, equipment, vehicles, or chemicals under the tree drip line. No equipment or debris of any kind shall be placed within the TPZ. No fuel, paint, solvent oil, thinner, asphalt, cement, grout, or any other construction chemical shall be stored or allowed in any manner to enter within the TPZ.

4) **Avoid washing of equipment** and tools such as wheel barrels, shovels, and mechanical motors under the tree drip line.

5) **Prevent flooding and pooling** of service water under the drip line. Grade changes that will flood the TPZ are prohibited unless a drainage plan is implemented. No grade changes within the TPZ shall be allowed.

6) **Avoid cutting tree roots whenever possible.** This can sometimes be accomplished by bridging roots, tunneling, or radial trenching. If roots must be cut use a sharp tool that will make a clean flush cut and not tear the roots. If possible all digging under the tree drip line should be done manually to avoid tearing out of roots. Roots outside of the TPZ may be cleanly severed vertically with a sharp garden tool.

7) **Do not raise or lower the grade** within the tree protection zone of any protected trees unless approved by the project arborist. Roots greater than 1 inch in diameter that are exposed or damaged shall be cut with a sharp tool such as a hand saw, pruners, or loppers and covered with soil in conformance to industry standards. If any work is required within the TPZ the Arborist shall be consulted previous to beginning. The Arborist shall be contacted as soon as possible to arrange for a timely inspection and prevent delays.
8) **Place a protective barrier** or temporary fencing as directed by the consulting arborist in the diagram below. The protection fencing shall be in place before demolition begins and shall only be removed or reduced when all heavy equipment such as back-hoes, bobcats, loaders, and other heavy equipment with tires and tracks will not be required. Fencing can be adjusted or sections reduced or removed as the project advances into the landscaping phases of the project. The consulting arborist shall be contacted if there are doubts about the placement or removal of fencing.

9) **Landscape preparation & excavation within the TPZ** shall be limited to the use of hand tools and small hand-held power tools and shall not be of a depth that could cause root damage. No attachments or wires other than those of a protective or non-damaging method shall be attached to a protected tree.

10) **Construction personnel should be briefed** on the importance of the guidelines before construction begins and reminded of it during tailgate meetings and as necessary. A printed copy should be posted where employees can be reminded of it.

11) **All protected trees shall be watered** before, during, and after construction as needed to prevent drought stress and tree death until sprinklers have been installed and are functional.
Blue dashed line = "Tree Protection Fencing" which shall be the same as "Tree Protection Zone" unless otherwise stated by the Consulting Arborist. "TPF" shall be in place before any work begins including demolition and grading and only removed or adjusted when no heavy equipment will be used within the "TPZ" and landscaping work is to begin. The "TPF" illustrated is a minimum requirement and should be increased when possible. No heavy equipment wheels or tracks shall be allowed within the "TPZ" and demolition within the "TPZ" shall be done from outside the perimeter of the "TPZ". If there are any doubts about the "TPZ" the consulting arborist shall be contacted as soon as possible to schedule a site inspection.
Thank you and feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours truly,

Javier Cabral / Consulting arborist
1390 El Sereno Ave Pasadena, Ca 91103
International Society of Arboriculture # WE 8116A
Certificate of Performance & Arborists Disclosure Statement

I Javier Cabral certify the following:

- No warranty is made, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the trees or the property will not occur in the future, from any cause. The Arborist shall not be responsible for damages or injuries caused by any tree defects, and assume no responsibility for the correction of defects or tree related problems. The Arborist assumes no responsibility for damage to trees as a result of the construction activities as the Arborist cannot be present at all times to witness all construction tasks near the subject trees.

- The owner and client of the trees may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the Arborist or seek additional advice if the owner decides not to accept the Arborists findings or recommendations.

- The Arborist has no past, present or future interest in the removal or preservation of any tree. The opinions contained in the Arborist report are independent and objective judgements of the Arborist.

- The findings, opinions, and recommendations of the Arborist are based on based on the physical inspection of said property. The opinions are based on knowledge, experience, and education.

- The Arborist shall not be required to provide testimony, provide site monitoring, provide further documentation for changes beyond the control of the Arborist, be deposed, or to attend any meeting without contractual arrangements for additional fees to the Arborist.

- The Arborist assumes no responsibility for verification of ownership or location of property lines, or for any recommendations based on inaccurate information.

- This Arborist report may not be reproduced without the expressed written permission of the Arborist and the client to whom the report was provided to. Any changes or alteration of this report invalidates the entire report.

- Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, make recommendations to prevent or minimize damage to trees during and after construction projects, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice.

- Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

- Treatment, pruning and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist’s services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. Arborists cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

- Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.
CITY OF SAN MARINO

DESIGN REVIEW

APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, (name) Andrea Patzakis am a property owner of (address)
1234 Old Mill Road, San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at (address)
1215 St. Albans Road

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

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

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

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

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

5. I object in particular to the following: First off, I am in support of a remodel as the current house isn’t in great shape. I am concerned about the 5-foot setback on the detached garage and the location of the pool equipment near the border of our properties (our rear yard). I love the idea of a Mediterranean-style home, but the ornamentation above the door doesn’t look like a classic 1920’s or 30’s home and looks kind of... "Orange County" as do the cast stone surrounds around the windows. If you drive around, you’ll see no original Spanish/Modern home has those. I also don’t like over three balconies facing into my back yard on the rear of the proposed design.
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 first and second story addition and a remodel of an existing two-story residence while maintaining the existing nonconforming thirty-degree structural encroachment line. This requires one conditional use permit and one design review action pursuant to City Code Sections 23.02.13 and 23.15.03(A).

REQUIRED ACTION

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP20-3 - TO MAINTAIN AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING THIRTY-DEGREE STRUCTURAL ENCROACHMENT LINE

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-70 - SECOND STORY ADDITION

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 1, 2019 – Staff provided written comments on project plan completeness and requested the applicant to reconsider the front porch design, reduce the volume of the second-story addition and better integrate the addition with the existing residence.

February 13, 2020 Meeting with property owner to discuss the need for a Conditional Use Permit because of the existing nonconforming 30-degree encroachment plane.

BACKGROUND

General Plan: Low Density Residential (4-6 dwelling unit per acre)
Zoning: R-1, Area District VI
Location: The subject property is located on the north side of Lorain Road and one property east of San Marino Avenue
Lot Size: 9,037 square feet
Existing Use: Two-story residence with a detached two-car garage
Surrounding Uses: The site is bordered in by single family homes with Area District VI to the south, east and west, and Area District V to the north.

Proposed Square-Footage: Livable Area 3,000 sq. ft. / Lot Coverage 2,100 sq. ft.
Parking Required/Proposed: 2 garage spaces for a 4 bedrooms project/2 garage spaces
The project will retain the existing detached garage.

Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt under Section 15332, Class 1 (In-fill Development Projects)

ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ ALLOWED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/ Lot Coverage</td>
<td>3,00 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Livable area:</strong> 2,180 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Livable area:</strong> 3,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lot coverage:</strong> 1,817 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>Lot coverage:</strong> 2,100 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>23'-5&quot;</td>
<td>No Change, Addition to the rear is at the existing height or lower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a front entry porch, a first and second floor addition, and interior remodel project. The proposed design program provides common spaces such as living room and dining room on the first floor, and four bedrooms with dedicated bathroom on the second floor.

The existing two-story residence is nonconforming to the thirty-degree encroachment plane where a portion of the second floor along the west side yard encroaches into the thirty-degree plane. Sheet A-7 (Proposed Rear/North Elevation) shows the exact areas that encroach into the thirty-degree plane which involved only the upper portion of the second-floor exterior walls, where Bedroom# 3, Bath 3 (wash sink and water closet and tub) are located. The chimney is not subject to the thirty-degree encroachment requirement because it is considered as an accessory structure.

Due to this existing nonconforming condition, pursuant to City Code Section 23.02.22, the proposed project cannot exceed fifty percent (50%) of the current residence’s replacement value based on industry recognized value published by the International Code Council, and this fifty percent (50%) allowance is calculated cumulatively over a consecutive five (5) year period. The current proposal is the first building expansion and alteration request in the last five years. The current proposal represents 61.4% of the existing residence’s replacement value. For this reason, a Conditional Use Permit is requested to determine the impact of allowing the residence to maintain this nonconforming condition and implement a project that exceeds the fifty percent (50%) threshold. To negate the Conditional Use Permit request, the applicant would have to reduce the scope of work to not exceed the fifty percent (50%) replacement value.
value threshold or remove the nonconforming condition. Staff find the removal of a portion of the second-floor to be an ineffective method in solving the nonconforming condition given the residence’s symmetrical façade. The amount of structure that needs to be removed in order to meet the encroachment requirement would consequently remove prominent architectural features of the residence.

**CONDITIONAL USE PEMRIT**

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

Staff does not find the existing nonconforming thirty-degree structural encroachment line to have a detrimental effect to the health, safety, peace, morals, and comfort of the surrounding neighborhood nor the general welfare of the City. The existing residence complies with the required five-foot side yard setback on both east and west side yard and only the upper portion of the exterior walls are encroaching into the thirty-degree plane. Given the location and the degree of this nonconforming condition, and the fact that this condition existed with the construction of the residence in 1938 prior to the thirty-degree encroachment requirement; staff concludes that the impacts on the west neighbor are minimal, if any.

The proposed second floor addition (Bedroom 4) along the west side yard provides a greater setback from the property line and is in full compliance with zoning code. The proposed project will not exacerbate the nonconforming condition.

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

The proposed addition extends the structure to the rear yard in similar building layout as neighboring structures. The addition provides sufficient space between neighboring structures. The site will remain adequate in size and shape to accommodate development features that allow the property to integrate well with the land and uses found within the neighborhood.

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

The request to maintain the existing nonconforming thirty-degree structural encroachment line will not have a detrimental effect upon the nature, condition, and development of nearby uses.
as the building has maintained the nonconforming encroachment since the initial construction of the structure. Additionally, the proposed addition will not intensify the nonconforming condition.

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 project provides a traditional floor plan layout where common living areas are located on the first floor with private bedrooms on the second floor. The project delivers one additional bedroom and two additional full bathrooms in the residence; however, the property remains a single-family residence. Nearby streets will continue to be adequate in width and pavement to accommodate the quantity of traffic generated by the single-family residence.

 DESIGN REVIEW ACTION

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 12
Object – 0
No response – 1

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – SECOND STORY ADDITION

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 existing residence is well integrated with the streetscape along Lorain
Road. The new entry porch provides the necessary coverage in front of the front door, but the porch projects further than neighboring front porches. Neighboring front entry treatments are modest with limited projection into the front yard. While the first and second story addition are located in the rear of the property away from public view; however, the massing and volume of the second story, and the roof form are inconsistent with the existing elements and style of the residence. The Residential Design Guidelines encourages addition to respect the scale and rhythm of the existing residence.

The proposed addition project would not have privacy impacts on adjacent neighbors given the locations of new windows and orientation of adjacent structures. The proposed exterior colors and materials match those existing on the residence and they are consistently carried throughout the residence.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission continue CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. CUP20-3 AND DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-70 so that the applicant can consider revising the scale of the addition project and to provide better integration with the existing structure.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. DRC Neighborhood Map
4. Data Sheet 1 – Findings
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: 02/13/2020

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

   2275 Lorain Rd.

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:

      In bedroom 3, our intended use is a young child, so we want an bathtub instead of a shower. This would require the upstairs western wall to continue a very short distance (~3 feet) which brings that wall into a variance due to the original structure not providing 30" clearance.

   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:

   __________________________

   __________________________

   Mailing Address: 2275 Lorain Road

   Owner’s Phone Number (Home): (310) 486-4249

   Owner’s Phone Number (Work): (310) 486-4249

   Agent’s Name and Address:

   __________________________

   Agent’s Phone Number: (____ )

*The verification form being signed under penalty of perjury does not require notarization.
Conditional Use Permit No. CUP20-3

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.

Design Review Case No. DRC19-70 – Second Story Addition

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.
TO: CHAIR WRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: ALDO CERVANTES, PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR
BY: MARLON CERVANTES, ASSISTANT PLANNER
DATE: MARCH 25, 2020
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC 17-114
2731 GAINSBOROUGH DR., (CHIH/LIN)

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 first-floor addition, a new detached garage and a new second story on an existing single-story home. This requires one design review action pursuant to City Code Section 23.15.03(A2).

The existing detached two-car garage will be demolished and replaced with a new 593 square foot two-car garage and workshop. The applicant is also proposing a 144 square foot first floor addition, a 963 square foot new second story and a new entry portico along with exterior modifications.

REQUIRED ACTION

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC 17-114

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.

Staff has been working with the designer starting in early 2018 regarding the design and integration of the proposed second story as well as the new entry portico. Staff believes that that the second-story addition is incompatible with the legal neighborhood and with the existing home in terms of scale.

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 Gainsborough Drive and two properties north of Huntington Drive
Lot Size: 8,110 square feet
Existing Use: One-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 San Marino High School to the west.
Proposed Square-Footage: Livable Area 3,200 sq. ft. / Lot Coverage 2,372 sq. ft.
Parking Required/Proposed: 2 garage spaces for a 4 bedroom project/2 garage spaces
The project will replace the existing detached garage with a new two car garage.
Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt under Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities)

ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR MAIN DWELLING</th>
<th>REQUIRED/ALLOWED</th>
<th>PROPOSAL MAR. 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Living Area/Lot Coverage</td>
<td>3,244 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Livable area: 3,200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot coverage: 2,372 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT:</td>
<td></td>
<td>21'-1”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>21'-1”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YARDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Rear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>8' South</td>
<td>42' 6''</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARKING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garage Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing detached 2-car garage to be replaced with new 2-car garage

DESIGN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Architectural Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing: Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed: Cape Cod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new 144 square foot addition along the rear of the home. The new second floor addition consists of 963 square feet including a hallway and two ensuites. Proposed modifications to the exterior include a new entry portico, relocation of existing windows, replacement of existing composition shingle roof with Boral Cedarlite roofing material in the Ironwood color, new 8” exposure cementitious siding in the Wickham Gray color and two dormers all along the street elevation. The applicant is also proposing to replace all windows except for the existing bay windows along the front elevation with aluminum clad Pella Architect Series windows.

The side and rear elevations will each feature a reconfiguration and addition of new windows on the first floor and gable dormers on the second floor and incorporate a sand finish stucco material in the Simply White color.

The existing two-car garage will be removed and replaced with a new 593 square foot garage and workshop located at the rear of the property. As part of the construction of the new garage, the applicant is also proposing to remove an existing ficus tree. The removal of the tree is subject to a tree removal permit that requires an arborist report to confirm the health of the tree as well as recommendation for replacement trees.
DESIGN REVIEW ACTION

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 5
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 is primarily made up of single-story homes in a variety of architectural styles, staff finds that the proposed second-story addition is not compatible with the neighborhood in terms of scale and overall massing. Further, the proposed second-story would be incompatible in particular with the homes on either side of the project site which are both single-story and smaller in scale.

The project is designed in a manner that address the privacy concerns both of residents in the subject property as well as the neighbors residing on contiguous properties. New windows including second-story dormer windows have been strategically placed so as to not have any direct sightlines into adjacent homes.

The building addition will substantially alter the appearance and change the style of the existing home from a one-story Minimal Traditional to a two-story Cape Cod home. Staff believes that new features including the dormer windows and entry portico are out of scale with the home.
As part of the project, the applicant is proposing a change in the color scheme of the home. Staff finds that the proposed colors and materials are consistent with the change from a Minimal Traditional style to the Cape Cod style of the home.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission continue DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 17-114 so that the applicant can reconfigure the second story floor plan to reduce the massing of the overall home as viewed from the outside and provide greater compatibility within the legal neighborhood.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. DRC Neighborhood Map
4. Data Sheet 1 - Findings
DATA SHEET I - FINDINGS

Design Review Case No. DRC17-114 – Second Story Addition

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.
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

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

PROPOSAL

The applicant requests the Commission to consider the Design Review Committee’s denial to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing single-story residence and provide roofing material that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application List. The proposed roof material is a simulated slate, manufactured by DaVinci.

REQUIRED ACTION

DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC19-17 – ADDITION AND EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS VISIBLE FROM STREETVIEW

BACKGROUND

On January 15, 2020, on a four to one vote the Design Review Committee (DRC) denied Case No. DRC19-17 involving a request to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to the existing residence on the corner lot. The Committee found the project to have made little progress to address their prior concerns. Additionally, the Committee was presented with insufficient material and information to evaluate the proposed DaVinci simulated
slate material; the Committee was concerned that the new material would not blend seamlessly with the existing material which is no longer in production. However, the designer stated that a complete re-roof for the residence represents a financial burden to the property owners.

Please refer to the attached DRC staff report from January 15, 2020, specifically the Background section on design issues leading up to the final hearing.

**NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of 10/2/2019 hearing)**

- Approve – 3
- Object – 1 (letter attached)
- Neither – 1
- No response – 7

**DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS – SINGLE-STORY ADDITION AND EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS**

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 proposed project would minimally alter the massing and compatibility of the existing single-story residence with the legal neighborhood. The addition and its roof design is generally integrated with the existing residence; a small portion of the new roof over the family room has a different roof pitch from the remainder of the residence. Staff finds this acceptable since it is an efficient way to connect with the existing roof and is not visible from street view.

The exterior modifications consist of various design features, including the addition of three skylights away from street view, new lighting fixture, and new entry porch with sidelites. The new skylights will not impact the appearance of the residence and neighbors’ privacy. The entry door treatment with sidelites detracts from the Minimal Traditional style of the residence and is not compatible with the legal neighborhood.
The proposed roofing product is a single-width simulated slate in the Brownstone color, manufactured by DaVinci. While the DRC and Planning Commission previously approved to add the DaVinci simulated slate material on the City’s list, it was only for the Multi-Width slate product. In this case, the designer found that the single-width product would be the closest match in appearance with the existing roofing material. The project designer provided a list of locations throughout the greater Los Angeles region where the single width product in various colors, including the proposed Brownstone color, is installed.

A variety of roof materials are found in the neighborhood, these included composition shingles, simulated shake tiles, natural wood shakes, and red tiles. The subject property is improved with a simulated slate product that is no longer in production and as such only the addition areas will be improved with the single-width simulated slate product. To further ensure a cohesive roof appearance from the street view, staff recommends removing some of the existing roof material from the east/rear portion of the structure and re-install them over the new entry porch, and only use the new DaVinci single width material for the rear portion of the structure.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission to overturn the prior decision and approve Design Review No. DRC19-17. 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 Design Review No. DRC19-17 is categorically exempt from CEQA under 15301 Class 1 for an existing facility involves no expansion of an existing use.

2. The Planning Commission in the exercise of its independent judgment is able to make all of the required findings listed on attached Data Sheet No. 1 for DRC19-17, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

3. The Planning Commission approves Design Review No. DRC 19-17 subject to the attached Conditions on Data Sheet No. 2, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Data Sheet 1 – Findings
2. Data Sheet 2 – Conditions of Approval
3. Appeal Application
4. Location/Radius Map
5. DRC Neighborhood Map
6. Objection Letter (1714 Hilliard Drive)
7. DRC staff reports from 10/2/19, 11/6/19, 12/4/19, and 1/15/2020
8. Roofing Product Brochure
DATA SHEET 1 - FINDINGS

Appeal for Design Review Case No. DRC19-17

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 #: Appeal of Design Review Nos. DRC 19-17

SUBJECT: The applicant requests to construct a single-story addition with exterior modifications and use of single-width simulated slate roofing material that is not found on the City’s Pre-approved material list.

APPLICANT: Eric Lin

LOCATION: 1706 Hilliard Drive

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT.

APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, (626) 300-0784, 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. Nothing contained herein shall prohibit city from participating in a defense 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.

   completion date
   ___/___/___

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.

   completion date
   ___/___/___

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.

   completion date
   ___/___/___
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, 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. Install new DaVinci simulated slate roof material only on the rear portion of the residence. The new entry porch shall have consistent roofing material and color as the remainder of the residence fronting Hilliard Drive and Duarte Road. __/__/__

4. Sidelites shall be removed from the front door treatment, and the designer shall have the ability to reconfigure the interior layout of the living room and the kitchen to achieve Building Code conformance. __/__/__

5. Operation of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all California Building Code and Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to commencement of operation, plans shall be submitted to the San Marino Fire Department and the Building Department to show compliance. The facility shall be inspected for compliance and final acceptance granted prior to start of operation. __/__/__
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 30th, 2020

Regarding: DRC 19-17 at 1706 Hilliard Dr., San Marino, CA
(DRC No.) (Address)

APPELLANT INFORMATION:

Name: Eric Lin

Address: 2275 Huntington Dr. #796, San Marino, CA 91108

Phone Number: 626-594-5005  Email Address: linework.dv@gmail.com

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.)

See attached

__________________________________________  1/30/2020
Appellant Signature  Date
January 30, 2020

1706 Hilliard Ave.,
San Marino, CA 91108
Application no. DRC 19-17
Design Review Committee Appeal’s Letter

Dear Commissioner,

I am writing this letter to appeal the decision made by the Design review committee ("DRC"). We believe this project should be approved given the modest size of the proposed design and its minimal impact to the neighborhood.

We spent months in collaboration with the planning staff where we were able to land on a modest renovation with the majority of the existing building exterior remaining in place. We were able to balance the client’s desire to increase bedroom and bathroom count with sensitivity to the existing structure. The design was able to increase an existing 2-bedroom, 1.75 bathroom residence to a 4-bedroom, 3 bathroom home. The ground coverage of 2453 SF and existing livable square footage of 1790 SF increased by 105 SF and 152 SF respectively to the final size of 2558 SF in ground coverage and 1945 SF of livable square footage. That’s an increase of only 4% and 8% respectively. The final tally falls within the limits of the Residential Development Guidelines for this property.

Since we took the time to work with the planning staff for the design of the home addressing all of the planners’ concerns and keeping the design as a single story we thought the DRC would be fair in their review of the project and provide guidance based on existing rules and regulations. However, one year and four DRC meetings later we find that we are at an impasse because the requests of the DRC are contrary to codified regulations.

Below are DRC’s three main objections as to why the project was denied:

- **Front door sidelites and Skylights:** The committee stated that the project cannot have any sidelites or skylights citing inappropriateness due to incompatibility with neighbors

  California code section R303 requires that “habitable rooms shall have an aggregate glazing area of not less than 8 percent of the floor area of such rooms.” The building code section requiring natural lighting has been included for your reference.

  Based on this California code section R303, the proposed project needs to include natural light in all habitable rooms. The proposed design achieved natural lighting with a combination of skylights and sidelites. For the living room, flanking sidelites around the front door was used in conjunction with a skylight to provide the necessary natural lighting. The kitchen and family room used skylights to provide natural lighting. The DRC initially requested that we reduce the number of skylights down to three. We complied. Then at the very next meeting the committee denied the project stating that they do not want any skylights or sidelites in the project. This is in direct violation of the California code cited above.

  The proposed skylights on this project will be the FCM line by Velux. This product is considered the industry leader for reliability. The FCM line is a low profile unit sitting on a 6 inch curb, actual dimension is 5.5 inches. Accounting for the roof tile profile of about 1 inch, the total unit
only sits approximately 4 inches above the roof tiles. The glazing on the skylight is flat and therefore promotes the "low profile" look. The unit also comes with an integrated curb flashing that protects against potential leaks with a 10 year product warranty, a 20 year warranty on the glass.

- **Roof material**: The DRC denied the project stating that the existing roof needs to be replaced with a brand new roof.

The homeowner’s have been out of their home now for over a year, adding the requirement of a brand new roof when the design only calls for the modest addition of a total of 152 SF to the project is burdensome and will cause a financial hardship to the homeowner.

The current roof made of faux slate fiberglass is in good condition as evidenced by the home inspection report. Unfortunately the faux slate fiberglass roof tiles are no longer manufactured. We were however able to find a matching roofing material by DaVinci which would match well with the existing roof. The new roof will be in the rear yard, facing completely away from the street. The committee, however, is asking that the homeowner install a brand new roof over the entire house. This is a financial burden that the client had not anticipated on having to address, especially since the home inspection report showed the roof to be in good working order. It is an unnecessary financial burden and an unreasonable request by the DRC. We request that the DaVinci single width slate in Brownstone be permitted for use on the new section of the roof.

The homeowners, in their desperation to move forward with this project, is willing to replace the entire roof with the Composite Fiberglass roof by CertainTeed, Landmark TL series, Shenandoah color as provided on the San Marino preapproved roofing material list if this commission deems it absolutely necessary to replace the entire roof.

- **Color**: The DRC also denied the project stating the color scheme was inappropriate. The color scheme was the same in all four meetings, however, it was only at the fourth meeting that the DRC raised for the first time that it was inappropriate. The proposed color scheme for the project is white walls with bronze colored window frames. This is a very popular style but still very unassuming in appearance and does not stand out.

Given the modest expansion of this project and limited impact to the neighborhood, we earnestly ask that this Commission consider reversing DRC’s decision and approve the project as presented. I hope the commission can see that the majority of the work to the home is interior renovation and the limited exterior modifications really pose no adverse impact to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and review of this appeal,

signature

Eric Lin
Designer, LineWork Development
drainage, piping and similar openings or penetrations shall be permitted.

Exceptions:

1. Floor assemblies located directly over a space protected by an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section R313, NFPA 13D, or other approved equivalent sprinkler system.
2. Floor assemblies located directly over a crawl space not intended for storage or fuel-fired appliances.
3. Portions of floor assemblies shall be permitted to be unprotected where complying with the following:
   3.1. The aggregate area of the unprotected portions does not exceed 80 square feet (7.4 m²) per story.
   3.2. Fireblocking in accordance with Section R302.11.1 is installed along the perimeter of the unprotected portion to separate the unprotected portion from the remainder of the floor assembly.
4. Wood floor assemblies using dimension lumber or structural composite lumber equal to or greater than 2-inch by 10-inch (50.8 mm by 254 mm) nominal dimension, or other approved floor assemblies demonstrating equivalent fire performance.

R302.14 Combustible insulation clearance. Combustible insulation shall be separated not less than 3 inches (76 mm) from recessed luminaires, fan motors and other heat-producing devices.

Exception: Where heat-producing devices are listed for lesser clearances, combustible insulation complying with the listing requirements shall be separated in accordance with the conditions stipulated in the listing.

Recessed luminaires installed in the building envelope shall meet or exceed the requirements specified in the California Energy Code for recessed luminaires installed in insulated ceilings.

SECTION R303 LIGHT, VENTILATION AND HEATING

R303.1 Habitable rooms. Habitable rooms shall have an aggregate glazing area of not less than 8 percent of the floor area of such rooms. Natural ventilation shall be through windows, skylights, doors, louvers or other approved openings to the outdoor air. Such openings shall be provided with ready access or shall otherwise be readily controllable by the building occupants. The openable area to the outdoors shall be not less than 4 percent of the floor area being ventilated.

Exceptions:

1. The glazed areas need not be openable where the opening is not required by Section R310 and a whole-house mechanical ventilation system is installed in accordance with the California Mechanical Code.
2. The glazed areas need not be installed in rooms where Exception 1 is satisfied and artificial light is provided that is capable of producing an average illumination of 6 footcandles (65 lux) over the area of the room at a height of 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor level.

3. Use of sunroom and patio covers, as defined in Section R202, shall be permitted for natural ventilation if in excess of 40 percent of the exterior sunroom walls are open, or are enclosed only by insect screening.

4. The windows, doors, louvers and other approved closeable openings not required by Section R310 may open into a passive solar energy collector for ventilation required by this section. The area of ventilation openings to the outside of the passive solar energy collector shall be increased to compensate for the openings required by the interior space.

5. Glazed openings may open into a passive solar energy collector provided the area of exterior glazed opening(s) into the passive solar energy collector is increased to compensate for the area required by the interior space.

R303.2 Adjoining rooms. For the purpose of determining light and ventilation requirements, any room shall be considered to be a portion of an adjoining room where not less than one-half of the area of the common wall is open and unobstructed and provides an opening of not less than one-tenth of the floor area of the interior room and not less than 25 square feet (2.3 m²).

Exception: Openings required for light or ventilation shall be permitted to open into a sunroom with thermal isolation or a patio cover, provided that there is an openable area between the adjoining room and the sunroom or patio cover of not less than one-tenth of the floor area of the interior room and not less than 20 square feet (2.3 m²). The minimum openable area to the outdoors shall be based upon the total floor area being ventilated.

R303.3 Bathrooms. Bathrooms, water closet compartments and other similar rooms shall be provided with aggregate glazing area in windows of not less than 3 square feet (0.3 m²), one-half of which must be openable.

Exception: The glazed areas shall not be required where artificial light and a local exhaust system are provided. The minimum local exhaust rates shall be 50 cubic feet per minute (25 L/s) for intermittent ventilation or 20 cubic feet per minute (10 L/s) for continuous ventilation in accordance with the California Mechanical Code, Chapter 4. Exhaust air from the space shall be exhausted directly to the outdoors.

R303.3.1 Bathroom exhaust fans. Each bathroom containing a bathtub, shower or tub/shower combination shall be mechanically ventilated for purposes of humidity control in accordance with the California Mechanical Code, Chapter 4; and the California Green Building Standards Code, Chapter 4, Division 4.5.

Note: Window operation is not a permissible method of providing bathroom exhaust for humidity control.
Design Review Committee

MEETINGS
Design Review Committee meetings begin take place on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 7:00 PM at City Hall Council Chambers.

Preliminary discussion of proposed plans is welcome during Open Forum.

Open Forum is held at each meeting, following the regular agenda items.

AGENDAS & MINUTES
Agendas are available 72 hours prior to the meeting. Minutes are available following approval by the DRC.

Click here to view the Meeting Agendas.

MEMBERS
The Design Review Committee consists of five regular members and two alternates. All members are appointed by the mayor. The current members are:

- Howard Brody, Chair
- Kevin Cheng, Vice Chair
- Joyce Gatsoulis Batnij
- Christa Lakon
- Peter Wong
- Rick Chou, Alternate

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE
The Design Review Committee is appointed by the City Council to ensure that new development is compatible with the physical setting of the site and the visual character of the neighborhoods. Specific design guidelines have been adopted by the Council which are used by the Committee to evaluate and take action on each application.

DUTIES
In order to implement the General Plan, the Design Review Committee is empowered to administer the City’s zoning laws, ordinances, rules and regulations which:

- Foster new development that is aesthetically compatible with existing buildings and infrastructure.
- Encourage and assist building owners to restore and rehabilitate existing buildings in a cost effective, sensitive manner and in such a way as to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Encourage originality and creativity in the design of new buildings and additions, or the remodeling of existing buildings.

https://www.cityofsanmarino.org/government/boards_commissions_design_review_committee.php
DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS
Committee members shall be qualified to analyze and interpret architectural and site planning information, including, but not limited to, licensed landscape architects, architects, urban planners, engineers, and licensed general contractors.

Meets on the first and third Wednesday evenings of each month at 7:00 PM. (unless otherwise announced and publicly noticed) in the City Council Chamber of San Marino City Hall at 2200 Huntington Drive.

RELATED DOCUMENTS

COMMISSION APPLICATION

DRC PUBLIC SPEAKER FORM
CITY OF SAN MARINO
DESIGN REVIEW
APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTER

I, [Neighborhood's Name], am a property owner of
[Neighborhood's Address], San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
[Project Address].

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

1. [I object to the project.]

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

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

4. Comments: [This project will change the neighborhood from mostly three-bedroom houses on both sides of Hilliard Dr. It will be a monster house just like the other houses taking over San Marino.]

[Neighborhood's Name]
Neighboring Property Owner's Signature

[June 19, 2019]
Date
I, Amelia Patnell, am a property owner of
1714 Hilliard Dr., San Marino and have been shown
the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at
1706 Hilliard Drive
(project address)

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

1. I object to the project.

2. I do not object to the project.

3. I neither object nor support the project.

4. Comments: This project will change the neighborhood from mostly three bedroom houses on late sides of Hilliard Dr. It will be a monster house just like the other houses taking over San Marino

Amelia Patnell
Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature

June 19, 2019
Date
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing single-story residence.

TREE PRESERVATION

The applicant proposes to remove two trees adjacent to the residence. Removal of these trees are not required to implement the proposed project.

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

October 2, 2019 – First hearing before the DRC
November 9, 2019 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 3
Object – 1 (Letter attached)
No response – 7
Neither approve nor object - 1
DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

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

   *Comments:* The proposed addition introduces an entry porch and a new family room. The project maintains the existing single-story massing and remains compatible with the neighborhood with respect to massing and scale.

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

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

   *Comment:* The one-story addition would not pose significant privacy concerns given the yard backs from adjacent neighbors.

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

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

   *Comments:* The proposed entry porch addition is well integrated with matching roof forms. The roof pitch over the family room addition is inconsistent with the rest of the roof structure. The new entry door system consists of a wood door and two sidelites, staff finds the sidelites incompatible with the style and size of the home.

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

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

   *Comments:* Staff finds the earth tone exterior colors and materials appropriate for the style of the structure. Staff recommends removal of two skylights on the west elevation, immediately above the entry porch, and provision of a traditional style lighting fixture with either frosted or seeded glass.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing single-story residence, and provide roofing material and color not found on the City's Pre-Approved Material and Color List.

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

October 2, 2019 – First hearing before the DRC
November 6, 2019 – Second hearing before the DRC
November 9, 2019 – Required action date

BACKGROUND

At the October 2nd hearing, DRC continued the project citing concerns with the proposed skylight locations, front door treatments, exterior lighting feature and whether the new roofing material will seamlessly match with the existing material.

On October 7th, staff mailed a decision letter notifying the property owner of the project being continued to the November 6th meeting and that revised plans must be submitted by October 22nd. The same letter was emailed to the project designer. On October 28th, an email reminder was sent to the property owner and the designer to submit revised plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Committee denies DRC19-17 due to the lack of project plans and the required action date based on the Permit Streamlining Act.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing single-story residence, and provide roofing material and color not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Materials Colors and Application List.

TREE PRESERVATION

The applicant proposes to remove two trees adjacent to the existing structure. Staff recommends that the City Arborist determines whether these trees can be removed, and any replacement trees be provided through the Tree Removal Permit process prior to submitting the project for structural plan check.

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

October 2, 2019 – First hearing before the DRC
November 6, 2019 – Second hearing before the DRC
December 4, 2019 – Third hearing before the DRC
February 7, 2020 – Required action date

BACKGROUND

At the October 2nd hearing, the Committee continued the project citing concerns with the proposed skylight locations, front door treatments, exterior lighting feature and whether the new roofing material will seamlessly match with the existing material.
At the November 6th meeting, the Committee granted a request by the project designer to continue the project to the December 4th meeting as he was compiling information on the proposed roofing material and needed additional time to submit the revised plans. The project design also agreed to waive the Permit Streamlining Act pertaining to the project processing time.

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS
(as of 10/2/19 meeting)
Approve – 3
Object – 1 (letter attached)
Neither - 1
No response – 7

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

1. That the proposed structure is compatible with the neighborhood.
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comments: The legal neighborhood predominantly consists of modest single-story structures. The proposed addition would be in keeping with the massing and exterior treatments of the existing residence, therefore also maintaining its compatibility with the legal neighborhood.

2. That the proposed structure is designed and will be developed in a manner which balances the reasonable expectation of privacy of persons residing on contiguous properties with the reasonable expectations of the applicants to develop their property within the restrictions of this Code.
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comments: The single-story addition in the rear of the structure provided ample setbacks and would not provide any direct sightlines into the north and south neighbors’ homes. Thus, the project would not impact any reasonable expectation of privacy.

3. In the case of a building addition, the proposal is compatible with the existing building which includes the rooflines.
   
   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES □ NO □ NOT APPLICABLE
   
   Comments: Staff finds that the proposed addition is generally integrated with the existing structure. Although the roof pitch over the family room addition is different from the
rest of the structure, staff finds this element acceptable given that it renders the addition invisible from public's view.

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

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

   **Comments:** The proposed earth tone color palette is consistent for the style of the structure and similar to homes in the immediate area. The proposed skylights are located away from street view which helps to preserve the appearance of the structure. The proposed exterior lighting fixture's style has an industrial appearance, staff recommends a downcast fixture that is also Dark Sky friendly.

   The applicant is requesting to use a roofing product that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list (City’s list). The proposed product is a simulated slate, manufactured by DaVinci. While the DRC and Planning Commission approved to add the DaVinci simulated slate material on the City’s list, it was only for the Multi-Width slate product. In this case, the applicant found that the single-width product would provide the least visual differences between the existing roofing material which is no longer available, and the proposed single-width simulated slate in the Brownstone color. The project designer provided a list of locations where the single width product in various colors, including the proposed Brownstone color, is installed.

   To further ensure a cohesive roof appearance, staff recommends removing some of the existing roof material from the east/rear portion of the structure and re-install them over the new entry porch, and only use the new DaVinci single width material for the rear portion of the structure.
TO: Chair Cheng and Members of the Design Review Committee
FROM: Eva Choi, Associate Planner
DATE: January 15, 2020
SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-17
1706 HILLIARD DR., (KY/LIN)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a single-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing single-story residence, and provide roofing material and color not found on the City’s Pre-Approved Materials Colors and Application List.

TREE PRESERVATION

The applicant proposes to remove two trees adjacent to the existing structure. Staff recommends that the City Arborist determines whether these trees can be removed, and any replacement trees be provided through the Tree Removal Permit process prior to submitting the project for structural plan check.

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

October 2, 2019 – First hearing before the DRC
November 6, 2019 – Second hearing before the DRC
December 4, 2019 – Third hearing before the DRC
January 15, 2020 – Fourth hearing before the DRC
February 7, 2020 – Required action date

BACKGROUND

At the October 2nd hearing, the Committee continued the project citing concerns with the proposed skylight locations, front door treatments, exterior lighting feature and whether the new roofing material will seamlessly match with the existing material.
At the November 6th meeting, the Committee granted the designer’s request to continue the project to the December 4th meeting for additional time to compile information on the proposed roofing material. The project designer also agreed to waive the Permit Streamlining Act pertaining to the project processing time.

At the December 4th meeting, the DRC expressed concern with the excessive number of skylights on the roof. Only two of the five committee members found the proposed roof material, DaVinci single-width simulated slate in the Brownstone color, to be a close match with the existing roof material on the structure.

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (As of 10/2/19 hearing)

Approve – 3
Object – 1 (letter attached)
Neither - 1
No response – 7

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

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

   Comments: The legal neighborhood predominantly consists of modest single-story structures. The proposed addition would be in keeping with the massing and exterior treatments of the existing residence, therefore also maintaining its compatibility with the legal neighborhood.

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

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

   Comments: The single-story addition in the rear of the structure provided ample setbacks and would not provide any direct sightlines into the north and south neighbors' homes. Thus, the project would not impact any reasonable expectation of privacy.

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

   Staff can make this finding: ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
Comments: Staff finds that the proposed addition is generally integrated with the existing structure. Although the roof pitch over the family room addition is different from the rest of the structure, staff finds this element acceptable given this addition area is not visible from public’s view.

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

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

Comments: The proposed earth tone color palette is consistent for the style of the structure and similar to homes in the immediate area. The proposed exterior lighting fixture’s style has an industrial appearance, staff recommends a downcast fixture that is also Dark Sky friendly. Since the December 4, 2019 hearing, the designer has removed three of the six skylights. The remaining three skylights are visible from the rear yard of the subject property. Further, sidelites have been added to the front entry door.

The applicant is requesting to use a roofing product that is not on the City’s Pre-Approved Roof Materials Colors and Application list (City’s list). The proposed product is a simulated slate, manufactured by DaVinci. While the DRC and Planning Commission approved to add the DaVinci simulated slate material on the City’s list, it was only for the Multi-Width slate product. In this case, the applicant found that the single-width product would provide the least visual differences between the existing roofing material which is no longer available, and the proposed single-width simulated slate in the Brownstone color. The project designer provided a list of locations where the single width product in various colors, including the proposed Brownstone color, is installed.

To further ensure a cohesive roof appearance, staff recommends removing some of the existing roof material from the east/rear portion of the structure and re-install them over the new entry porch, and only use the new DaVinci single width material for the rear portion of the structure.
I, [Name of Neighboring Property Owner], am a property owner of [Address of Neighboring Property].

[Address of Proposed Property], San Marino and have been shown the plans and elevations of proposed changes to the neighboring property located at [Address of Proposed Property].

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

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

4. Comments: This project will change the neighborhood from mostly three bedroom houses on both sides of Hilliard Dr. It will be a monster house just like the other houses taking over San Marino.

[Signature of Neighboring Property Owner]  [Date]
Neighboring Property Owner’s Signature  Date
November 20, 2019

Re: DaVinci Single width roof tile existing roof top installs
1706 Hilliard Ave.,
San Marino, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5560 Ackerfield Ave., Long Beach, CA 90805</td>
<td>Bellaforte</td>
<td>Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163 Indian Creek Rd., Diamond Bar, CA 91765</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254 South Oak Knoll Ave., Pasadena, CA 91106</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 22nd St., Santa Barabara, CA 90402</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Slate Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146 Summit Dr., Beverly Hills, CA 90210</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Slate Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12115 Viewcrest Rd., Studio City, CA 91604</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Smokey Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13554 Luca Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90272</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Brownstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30948 Broad Beach Rd., Malibu, CA 90265</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Brownstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DaVinci SLATE

Historically, attaining the luxurious look of natural slate hasn't been easy. The cost, the weight and the required army of skilled tradesmen made the installation process complicated and costly. Thanks to the genius of DaVinci, the look of slate is more viable than ever.

MULTI-WIDTH

*Multi-width tiles provide the greatest degree of authenticity and flexibility.*

SINGLE-WIDTH

*Single-width tiles reduce material and speed up installation time without compromising style.*

BELLAFORETÉ

*The look of slate at a fraction of the cost and weight.*
DaVinci offers the beauty of natural slate and cedar shake in different tile options, giving you the ability to meet your aesthetic vision as well as respect your budget.

**MULTI-WIDTH**

Our most authentic-looking and versatile option, DaVinci’s Multi-Width tiles set the high mark for luxury. Laying tiles of multiple widths in a straight or staggered pattern creates the most natural, non-repeating appearance possible.

MULTI-WIDTH SLATE .................................. Page 14  
MULTI-WIDTH SHAKE .................................. Page 24

**SELECT SHAKE**

Created from real cedar profiles, Select Shake gives your home the beauty of authentic wood while remaining maintenance-free. The versatile design provides a worry-free, best-in-class roof that speeds up installation with the look of multi-width shake.

SELECT SHAKE .................................. Page 26

**SINGLE-WIDTH**

Single-width tiles add a budget-friendly touch of tradition to your home in either a straight or staggered pattern. The uniform tile size and impact-resistant composite construction work to reduce waste and speed up installation.

SINGLE-WIDTH SLATE .......................... Page 16  
SINGLE-WIDTH SHAKE .......................... Page 28

**BELLAFORETÉ**

The inspired engineering of Bellaforeté makes uncommon beauty considerably more attainable. Its innovative design requires less overlap (reducing waste and cost), making it a stylish upgrade that won’t bust the budget.

BELLAFORETÉ SLATE .......................... Page 18  
BELLAFORETÉ SHAKE .......................... Page 30
Some homes were created with the promise of a slate roof in mind. DaVinci's Single-Width Slate delivers on that promise with its astonishing versatility. Our single-width tile construction streamlines installation but still enables the flexibility of straight or staggered appearances.
SAVOY HOUSE FUNCTIONAL 1 LIGHT OUTDOOR WALL SCONCE

- 8" HIGH X 5" WIDE. EXTENDS 6" FROM THE WALL. WEIGHS 1.1 LBS.

- BLACK FINISH.

- CLEAR GLASS SHADE.

- DESIGNED TO CAST A SOFT AMBIENT LIGHT OVER A WIDE AREA.

- WET LOCATION OUTDOOR RATED.
DAVINCI SLATE

Historically, attaining the luxurious look of natural slate hasn't been easy. The cost, the weight and the required army of skilled tradesmen made the installation process complicated and costly. Thanks to the genius of DaVinci, the look of slate is more viable than ever.

MULTI-WIDTH
Multi-width tiles provide the greatest degree of authenticity and flexibility.

SINGLE-WIDTH
Single-width tiles reduce material and speed up installation time without compromising style.

BELLAFORE
The look of slate at a fraction of the cost and weight.
DaVinci offers the beauty of natural slate and cedar shake in different tile options, giving you the ability to meet your aesthetic vision as well as respect your budget.

**MULTI-WIDTH**

Our most authentic-looking and versatile option, DaVinci’s Multi-Width tiles set the high mark for luxury. Laying tiles of multiple widths in a straight or staggered pattern creates the most natural, non-repeating appearance possible.

**MULTI-WIDTH SLATE** Page 14
**MULTI-WIDTH SHAKE** Page 24

**SELECT SHAKE**

Created from real cedar profiles, Select Shake gives your home the beauty of authentic wood while remaining maintenance-free. The versatile design provides a worry-free, best-in-class roof that speeds up installation with the look of multi-width shake.

**SELECT SHAKE** Page 26

**SINGLE-WIDTH**

Single-width tiles add a budget-friendly touch of tradition to your home in either a straight or staggered pattern. The uniform tile size and impact-resistant composite construction work to reduce waste and speed up installation.

**SINGLE-WIDTH SLATE** Page 16
**SINGLE-WIDTH SHAKE** Page 28

**BELLAforté**

The inspired engineering of Bellaforté makes uncommon beauty considerably more attainable. Its innovative design requires less overlap (reducing waste and cost), making it a stylish upgrade that won’t bust the budget.

**BELLAforté SLATE** Page 18
**BELLAforté SHAKE** Page 30
Some homes were created with the promise of a slate roof in mind. DaVinci’s Single-Width Slate delivers on that promise with its astonishing versatility. Our single-width tile construction streamlines installation but still enables the flexibility of straight or staggered appearances.
November 20, 2019

Re: DaVinci Single width roof tile existing roof top installs
1706 Hilliard Ave.,
San Marino, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5560 Ackerfield Ave., Long Beach, CA 90805</td>
<td>Bellaforse</td>
<td>Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163 Indian Creek Rd., Diamond Bar, CA 91765</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254 South Oak Knoll Ave., Pasadena, CA 91106</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 22nd St., Santa Barbara, CA 90402</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Slate Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146 Summit Dr., Beverly Hills, CA 90210</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Slate Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12115 Viewcrest Rd., Studio City, CA 91604</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Smokey Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13554 Luca Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90272</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Brownstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30948 Broad Beach Rd., Malibu, CA 90265</td>
<td>Single Width slate</td>
<td>Brownstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate.

REQUIRED ACTION

DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-19 – CONSTRUCT A STREET-FACING SIDE YARD DRIVEWAY GATE

BACKGROUND

In March, 2019, the applicant submitted an application to the Design Review Committee to review and consider the installation of a wrought iron sliding gate along the street side-yard driveway adjacent to Pasqualito Dr. to match the existing wrought iron fence. The applicant cited issues of privacy and security due to proximity to the Stoneman School and the San Marino Recreation Department which generate additional foot traffic.

At the February 5, 2020 meeting, the DRC heard and denied the applicant’s request for the gate due to concerns over the poor condition of the existing pilasters and low wall, safety, and
the creation of a “fortress-like” nature in the side yard. The DRC also had concerns over the remaining chain-link fence and requested that it be removed and replaced with a wrought iron fence to match.

On February 20, 2020, the applicant filed an appeal stating that the removal of the chain link fence and replacement with a matching wrought iron fence would require a deep footing that could risk damaging the adjacent tree. The applicant also proposed to add safety features to the sliding gate including optical sensors.

DESIGN REVIEW ACTION

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS (as of February 5, 2020)

Approve – 5
Object – 0
No response – 8

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 fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence,
2. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining is consistent with the size and location of fences, gates, pilasters, yard walls and retaining walls on the block on which the property is located.
3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves sight lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

The proposed gate is compatible as it matches the existing fence in material, color and design; the gate also preserves sight lines, allows for visibility and does not create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The size and location of the gate are inconsistent with other properties on the block, however Staff recognizes that proximity to Stoneman School and the San Marino Recreation Department creates a need for a gate for security and privacy at this location. Staff can support the construction of the gate with the added conditions that the center-bar across the fence be lowered to reduce opaqueness and that the existing pilasters and low wall be repainted and all cracks repaired.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission overturn the Design Review Committee’s decision to deny DRC 19-19.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Design Review Committee Appeal Application
2. Location/Radius Map
3. DRC Neighborhood Map
4. DRC Staff Report
5. DRC February 5, 2020 meeting minutes
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate at the property known as 2200 El Molino Pl., San Marino.

The subject property is bound by El Molino Pl. along the front and Pasqualito Dr. along the street side yard. The proposed driveway gate will be located adjacent to Pasqualito Dr., measuring six feet in height and consist of a wrought iron frame to match existing side yard fence. The sliding gate will be operated by an electrical motor located behind the existing concrete post.

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

February 5, 2020 – First hearing before the DRC.
March 22, 2020 – Required action date

NEIGHBOR APPROVAL/OBJECTION LETTERS

Approve – 5
Object – 0
No response – 8
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 fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall is architecturally compatible with the existing residence.

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

   Comments: The proposed gate is composed of similar color and materials as the features found on the existing residence and is architecturally compatible.

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

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

   Comments: The size and location of the proposed gate are inconsistent with other properties on the block however, Staff recognizes that proximity to Stoneman School and the San Marino Recreation Department generates additional foot traffic and creates a need for a gate for security and privacy.

3. That the proposed fence, gate, pilaster, yard wall or retaining wall preserves sight lines and is otherwise located in a manner not to create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

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

   Comments: The proposed gate preserves sight lines, allows for visibility through the gate and does not create a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE SAN MARINO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 5, 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 NOs. DRC19-80 and DRC 19-81
3325 MONTEREY RD., (YANG/DESIGN INSPIRATION GROUP INC.)

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

Alex Chang, project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

Margarita Jarabek, Architectural Historian, provided detail explanation of restoration process and answered questions regarding aspects of the project.

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

Alternate Committee Member Chou expressed appreciation for the project and felt it provided a much needed face lift.

Committee Member Brody felt it was necessary to incorporate the two documents distributed by historic consultant as part of project file and expressed support for the project.

Committee Member Lakon had concerns over the privacy and massing along the neighbor's side to the west and would like to see it pulled away from the side property line. Also had
concerns regarding excessive light and removal of the guest house which would result in an
opening along the shared property line adjacent to Lacy Park.

Vice-Chair Batnij believed the changes made to be insignificant, that the massing issue had not
been resolved and that the addition may impact the oak tree.

Chair Cheng felt that the applicant had made changes as deemed fit for the project.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

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

2. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE CASE NO. DRC19-61**
   **1380 BELHAVEN RD., (LAW/LOUIE)**

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

Ron Louie, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

The following person(s) spoke on the project:
Ms. Kathy Martinson, 1370 Belhaven.

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

Vice-Chair Batnij moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Transom windows on the east elevation shall be removed.
2. Continuation of the six-foot wall.
3. The project shall provide screening vegetation/planting and working with staff and the
   north neighbor on privacy concerns.

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

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

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

Tracy Gao, project designer, provided a brief overview of the project and answered questions.
Chair Cheng moved to approve the project with a condition added to require wrought iron fencing throughout.

Lacking a second, the motion failed.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed fence created a fortress-like enclosure of the yard.

Committee Member Brody moved to deny the project.

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

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

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

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

Virginia Paca, project architect, presented the project and answered questions and recommended flexibility of survey requirement.

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

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

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

Vice-Chair Batnij returned to the dais.

5. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-96**
   **2851 SHAKESPEARE DR., (NGUYEN)**

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

Michael Chen, project designer, presented the project and answered questions.

There were no public comments.

Committee Member Lakon expressed support for the project and noted the 12 support letters received for the project.
Vice-Chair Batnij noted that the family room addition was compatible, however she also felt the extension in the back disrupted the development pattern of the neighborhood, recommended reducing the side wing or shifting the massing.

Committee Member Brody expressed support for the project and noted that the custom nature of the homes allowed for variation.

Alternate Committee Member Chou agreed with Vice-Chair Batnij’s comments regarding the massing of the addition.

Chair Cheng was able to support the project as proposed.

Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

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

Motion failed.

Vice-Chair Batnij moved to continue the project.

Second by Alternate Committee Member Chou. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, and Chair Cheng. NOES: Committee Member Brody.

6. DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC20-03
2133 ROANOKE RD., (AGAJANIAN/DEYOUNG)

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

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

John DeYoung, project contractor, spoke and provided a sample of wrought iron material and 3/4" tongue and groove for the proposed gate.

There were no public comments.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the gate was compatible with the home and the neighborhood.

Committee Member Lakon moved to approve the project.

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

Vice-Chair Batnij returned to the dais.
6. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-89**
   1650 LAS FLORES AVE., (CHANG/PAN)

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

   George Chang and Catherine Pan, property owners, presented the project and answered questions.

   The following person(s) spoke on the project:
   Ms. Hoda Rad, 1640 Las Flores Ave.

   Committee Member Lakon and Alternate Committee Member Chou could not support the request due to failure to meet prerequisite.

   Committee Member Brody moved to approve the project.

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

7. **DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. DRC19-51**
   811 SANTA ANITA AVE., (LU/HAN)

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

   Freeman Han, project architect, presented the project and answered questions.

   Tom and Carolyn Lu, property owners, answered questions regarding the project.

   It was the consensus of the Committee that the proposed changes and the color scheme were inappropriate for a Cape Cod style home and also expressed concerns over the relocation of the front yard walkway and the rear yard patio cover.

   Vice-Chair Batnij Chou moved to continue the project.

   Second by Committee Member Lakon. AYES: Committee Member Lakon, Alternate Committee Member Chou, Vice-Chair Batnij, 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 19, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The San Marino Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 25, 2020, at 7 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California, regarding the following item:

APPEAL FOR DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 19-19
2200 EL MOLINO PL., (CHEN)
The Planning Commission will consider the appeal of Design Review Committee’s decision to deny a request to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate.

The application being considered by the Planning Commission and any subsequent modifications, additions, or deletions, may potentially affect your property and neighborhood. Consequently, you are encouraged to attend and participate at said hearing. If you cannot personally attend the Planning Commission meeting, you may choose to review the application at City Hall, 2200 Huntington Drive, and submit a letter of support or objection to the Planning Commission before the meeting date. Additional information regarding this application, including the plans, is available for review by any interested party at City Hall. This item is exempt from environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To appeal a decision considered adverse to your position on the merits of the application or on the environmental documents, please raise all pertinent issues that could impact the project, the California Environmental Quality Act, General Plan, or any other relevant document or procedure at the time of the hearing. Failure to do so may require an appeals board or court to disallow evidence not submitted initially.

Aldo Cervantes
Director, Planning and Building Department

Date: March 25, 2020
Publish: March 13, 2020
Notice #: N-20-12
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The San Marino Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 25, 2020, at 7 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, California, regarding the following item:

APPEAL FOR DESIGN REVIEW NO. DRC 19-19
2200 EL MOLINO PL., (CHEN)
The Planning Commission will consider the appeal of Design Review Committee’s decision to deny a request to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate.

The application being considered by the Planning Commission and any subsequent modifications, additions, or deletions, may potentially affect your property and neighborhood. Consequently, you are encouraged to attend and participate at said hearing. If you cannot personally attend the Planning Commission meeting, you may choose to review the application at City Hall, 2200 Huntington Drive, and submit a letter of support or objection to the Planning Commission before the meeting date. Additional information regarding this application, including the plans, is available for review by any interested party at City Hall. This item is exempt from environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To appeal a decision considered adverse to your position on the merits of the application or on the environmental documents, please raise all pertinent issues that could impact the project, the California Environmental Quality Act, General Plan, or any other relevant document or procedure at the time of the hearing. Failure to do so may require an appeals board or court to disallow evidence not submitted initially.

Aldo Cervantes
Director, Planning and Building Department

Date: March 25, 2020
Publish: March 13, 2020
Notice #: N-20-12

Dear Members,

I am writing in support of the Planning Commission’s decision to deny a request to construct a street-facing side yard driveway gate. I have great respect for the decisions of the Design Review Committee. They have done a commendable job and it is appreciated.

Signed: Dorothy V. Sellier
Date: 3/19/2020
STRATEGIC PLAN CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

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

BACKGROUND

On April 11, 2019, it was observed by City staff that nine (9) branches of an established Magnolia tree (greater than 21” DBH) were removed/cut on the property known as 1270 Oxford Road. Due to the nature of the removal/cuts, it was the City Arborists determination that the Magnolia tree was damaged and severely pruned. Due to the violation and pursuant to City Code Section 23.06.15G, a fine of $44,000 was issued to the owner of the property on April 15, 2019.

On June 21, 2019, the City Hearing Officer heard the appeal regarding this item and subsequently reduced the fine for $44,000 to $40,000. It’s worth noting that on April 30, 2019, the owner submitted a payment of $9,000 bringing the balance of the fine down to $31,000. Subsequent to the hearing officer’s decision, an appeal was submitted to the City.

ANALYSIS

According to the owner, the tree was pruning in this manner due to concerns regarding the wind and the potential of limb failure. An arborist was hired soon after the violation in order to provide long-term care for the tree and to plant additional trees around the property. The submitted Tree Restoration Plan is attached to the report and it provides recommendations to ensure the future health of the Magnolia Tree.
The owner has been maintaining the tree pursuant to the recommendations of the Arborist. To date, the tree appears to be live and well and most importantly, will survive the April 2019 pruning (See attached photos). The photos provided by the owner (07/29/2019) show a tree that has new growth. So long as the owner follows the Tree Protection Plan and prunes the tree pursuant to the recommendations, the Magnolia tree will continue to grow in a health and natural way.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the staff’s assessment of the severe pruning and the current condition of the tree, staff recommends the Planning Commission overturn the decision of the hearing officer and determine that the Magnolia Tree was not severely pruned or damaged.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Appeal letter from property owner
2. Notice of Violation, Staff Photos and Tree Protection Plan
3. Photos provided by the Owner (7/29/2019)
Dear Mr. Aldo Cervantes,

Thank you for taking the time to review my case of the tree pruning violation at 1270 Oxford Road, San Marino CA 91108. I am writing to request another appeal for a reduction in the violation penalty amount. We heard back from the hearing officer, who only reduced our penalty amount from $44,000 to $40,000. I am terribly sorry for unknowingly violating San Marino city’s tree pruning policies, but would like to emphasize that this amount is still very burdensome for my family financially. I hope you can understand and reconsider the penalty reduction amount.

I have been doing everything I can to remedy this situation for the past few months, and have already begun the tree restoration process as recommended by our arborist. I have attached some photos of our tree restoration progress, where you can see noticeable improvement in regrowth of the tree’s foliage and branches. Furthermore, we plan to plant two more trees on the property and replace our old irrigation system as part of our tree restoration effort.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Li Wei
May 28, 2019

Wells Liang/Oxford Trust
1270 Oxford Road
San Marino, CA 91108

Subject: Administrative Tree Hearing Request

To whom it may concern:

A letter of Notice of Administrative Citation was prepared and mailed on April 15, 2019, informing the property owner that a City Code Violation had occurred on your neighbor's property located in the City of San Marino at 1270 Oxford Road, in the form "Illegal Tree Removal/Tree Damage".

In letter, the violation notice indicated a penalty fine assessed for the code infraction (partial payment made), and a required tree restoration plan submitted for review. The plan must be submitted by an I.S.A Certified Arborist or I.S.A Registered Consulting Arborist. Also in the letter was the indication that if the owner disagreed with the City's finding, an option for an administrative tree hearing may be requested to contest the City's findings.

You have requested a tree hearing. Your hearing has been scheduled for June 21, 2019, at 11:20 A.M. in the morning at San Marino City Hall, 2200 Huntington Drive, 91108, in the "E.O.C." room. Please access through the San Marino Police Department lobby and advise the desk personnel you have an Administrative Hearing in the EOC room.

You may bring any information or anyone to assist and aid you in your defense or explanation as why the tree was removed; which has been declared as violation according to City Code and standard by the City's Code Enforcement Manager.
If you have any additional questions in regards to this letter of notice please give me a call anytime for discussion at (626) 300-0789 or email me at rserven@cityofsanmarino.org

I thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation in this important community matter. There is ample free parking east of City Hall, off Huntington Drive in the parking lot adjacent to the San Marino Fire Department.

Sincerely,

Ron Serven, Code Enforcement Manager
April 15, 2019

Wells Liang/Oxford Trust
1270 Oxford Road
San Marino, CA 91108

Re: NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CITATION-SEVERE TREE PRUNING/DAMAGE AT (ADDRESS), SAN MARINO, CA

To whom it may concern:

An inspection of the above-referenced property (hereafter "premises") on April 11, 2019, revealed the following violation of the City of San Marino's Tree Ordinance:

**SMMC 23.06.15G Severe Tree Pruning/Tree Damage**

It was observed that nine (9) branches exceeding 3” in diameter from an established 21” diameter Magnolia grandiflora tree, were illegally removed/cut from the property known as (property address). In accordance with San Marino City Code Section 23.06.15G.2 a penalty in the amount of $35,000 (Class III) is due and payable to the City. In addition, in accordance with San Marino City Code Sections 1.06.06 et seq., and administrative fine in the amount of $9,000 ($1,000 per branch) is due and payable at City Hall located at 2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108 on or before April 30, 2019

In addition, you must obtain the services of a licensed arborist to provide a Tree Restoration Plan. The required Tree Restoration Plan must include any suggested measures required to ensure the trees recover from such severe damage properly. The due date for submittal of said Tree Restoration Plan is also April 30, 2019. For information on what should be contained within a Tree Restoration Plan please contact Ron Serven at (626) 300-0789. Email rseven@cityofsanmarino.org

*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:

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 SERVEN

Code Enforcement Manager, City Arborist

Cc: Aldo Cervantes, Director of Planning and Building
1270 OXFORD RD, SAN MARINO, CA 91108

Site Address: 1270 OXFORD RD SAN MARINO, CA 91108
Parcel Number: 5329-025-012
Owner 1: LIANG, WELLS
Owner 2: OXFORD TRUST
Owner Address: 1270 OXFORD RD SAN MARINO, CA 91108
Legal Desc.: TRACT NO 10895 LOT ON E LINE OF OXFORD RD COM S THEREON 60 FT FROM NW COR OF LOT 56 TH N 79 48'15 E TO NE LINE OF SDLOT TH S
No. of Units: 1
Year Built: 1951
Building Area: 2,689 SF
Building/Lot Ratio: 0.15
Lot Area (Assr.): 17,602 SF (0.4 ACRES)
Lot Area (Calc.): 17,563 SF (0.4 ACRES)
Flood Zone: X
FIRM Panel ID: R-1 DISTRICT IV
Zoning: View
Add Tree: Click Here
Full Prop Detail: View
Opportunity Zone: No

Add to List

Shared Notes
Manage Notes

Shared Documents
Manage Documents

Address Management
- Single Address: Add a single custom address
- Repeating: Add a repeating custom address
Dear Mr. Ron Serven,

I am writing to apologize for the tree pruning violation at 1270 Oxford Road, San Marino CA 91108. I’m very sorry for violating the city’s policy, but I was not at all aware of this regulation, and would like to request an appeal.

I had the tree pruned because I was worried about high winds potentially causing the tree or its branches to damage our roof. I did not at all intend to damage the tree in any way. If I had known about the city’s policy, I would’ve certainly made sure to get an approval first. I hope you can understand.

The fine for this violation is financially burdensome, so I am requesting an appeal in hopes of reducing the penalty amount. I have written a $9,000 check (attached) that I am able to pay now.

I have also hired an arborist to draw up a detailed restoration plan for the tree, and am looking to plant several more around my property in an effort to remedy the situation. Please let me know if there is anything else I can do. My cell number is 626-216-4896 and email is liang.edu@gmail.com.

Thank you so much for your time.

Best regards,

Li Wei

4/30/2019
JOB LOCATION:

Primary Owner: Li Wei/Wells Liang
Site Address: 1270 Oxford Road
San Marino, CA 91108
Mailing Address: 1270 Oxford Road
San Marino, CA 91108
County: Los Angeles
Assessor Parcel Number: N/A

SUMMARY:

On April 22, 2019, the owner of the property, Ms. Li Wei, asked me to come and take a look at a Magnolia grandiflora – a Southern Magnolia tree – that was severely pruned back recently.

Ms. Li Wei received a notice of administrative citation from the City of San Marino regarding the damaged tree.

The objective of my report is to check the condition of the damaged tree and prepare a Tree Restoration Plan to help the tree recover. As part of my preparation for this report, I visited the property on April 22, 2019 and met with Ms. Li Wei.
LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION:

1270 Oxford Road is one block north of Monterey Road and one block west of San Marino Ave. Above shows a map courtesy of Google Maps.

The property is a one story single-family residence that appears to be in fair-to-good condition.

The landscape is maintained and is in fair condition.
This aerial view (courtesy of Google Maps) has been illustrated to show the approximate boundary lines. The location of the Protected Tree is the symbol X.
FIELD OBSERVATIONS:

THE DAMAGED TREE (*Magnolia grandiflora*; Southern magnolia)

Characteristic: 21” DBH as measured 4 1/2 feet (DBH) above natural grade, Symmetric form, Dominant crown.

Health Matrix: Poor foliage density, Average shoot growth, Poor wound defense, Average vigor class.

This mature specimen is situated in a maintained, dry dirt area, and located on the right side of the main front entry.

During my on-site observation, the severity of the tree pruning was easily noticeable. The City’s citation is accurate – nine (9) branches exceeding 3” in diameter from the tree were cut (Supporting Information #1).

I also noticed the root system is extremely close to the property, as close as 19” or less to the foundation of the planter located right next to the property (Supporting Information #2). The surrounding area is dry, which causes the root systems to seek moisture from the ground. If the ground is very dry for a long period of time, roots can shrink. Roots are unlikely in this case to cause direct damage to home foundation; however, it is possible for small roots to invade preexisting cracks. There are some extensive root systems that grow beneath shallow house structures, like in this case, and can cause uplift to the house’s foundation.

DISCUSSION:

Property owner Ms. Li Wei was present the whole time I was at the site. I asked Ms. Li Wei the following questions regarding the tree pruning: Why did she ask the tree trimmers to cut the tree so severely? Did she know she had to obtain a tree-pruning permit from the City? Did she know that the City has the right to fine
her for violating SMMC 23.06.15G Severe Tree Pruning/Tree Damage? Did she know the consequences of severely topping the tree?

Ms. Li Wei stated that the main reason for pruning back the tree so much was that she was afraid the tree was too tall and too close to her house, so the tree might fall and not just damage the property, but also hurt someone inside or outside of the house. Ms. Li Wei told me she did not know that she cannot trim the trees on her property; she was only aware of the Protected Oak Trees that could not be cut. She also stated she likes trees – it was one of her reasons for purchasing a property in the City of San Marino. The only reason she pruned the Magnolia tree was because of safety concerns, as she wanted to avoid any potential unforeseen incidents. I addressed to Ms. Li Wei that the tree can be damaged when it is pruned this severely and will take time to recover.

I personally believe Ms. Li Wei did not intend to prune this tree so severely. During our conversation, Ms. Li Wei emphasized numerous times that she likes trees and pruned the tree for safety reasons. She also admitted that it was her fault and that she should not have pruned the tree so severely as to damage tree’s health. However, she did not know there was a City code for this matter.

CONCLUSION:

I have advised Ms. Li Wei that while reducing a tree’s height is possible for safety concerns or to avoid storm/wind damage, it should be correctly done by a method called crown reduction or drop crotch pruning. The procedure involves the removal of a main leader or main branch at the point of attachment of a lateral branch. The final cut should be parallel to the lateral branch bark ridge without cutting into the bark ridge. All the pruning technique should follow the guidelines from International Society of Arboriculture’s proper pruning techniques: Cleaning, Thinning, Raising and Reduction. I have also advised to Ms. Li Wei that in addition to the unsightly appearance, topping directly results in
several other problems for trees – the most severe being internal decay. If a tree is correctly pruned at its point of attachment to the trunk just outside of the branch collar and the branch bark ridge, internal decay is usually stopped from progressing into the trunk by a barrier inside the collar. Also, a correct cut results in more rapid wound closure by callus tissues so that the bark’s continuity is eventually re-established.

RECOMMENDATION:

I believe the present condition of this damaged tree still makes it viable due to the amount of remaining live tissues (mainly the leaves) still present on the tree; however, it will take time for this tree to recover and grow back to its original maturity size. For the Tree Restoration Plan, I recommend the following, which Ms. Li Wei has agreed to:

- Follow the guidelines for “Restoring Topped Trees” (see attached Supporting Information #3), to assist the tree back into its original shape and condition.
- Have a licensed application to make sure the tree has enough nutrients/fertilizers to recover, especially with slow-release fertilizer at least twice a year.
- Check the surrounding irrigation system to make sure the tree receives adequate water supplies.
- Re-condition the surrounding soil area, if necessary.
- Follow the City’s replacement options, at the City’s discretion of location, species, size and quantities, if the tree is deemed unable to survive.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION #1:

Pictures: (Left) Branches been heavily pruned back, (Right) looking east of the tree from the main entrance.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION #2:

Pictures: (Left) DBH shown at approximately 21"-22" at 4M' above ground level. (Right) Roots system very close to the house.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION #3:

Restoring Topped Trees

Restoration pruning conducted on topped or damaged trees over time. New sprouts readily grow to replace lost foliage (Figure 1). Sprouts provide the means to restore energy reserves in the living wood inside the tree and to grow a new crown. However, sprouts can become weakly attached and can break if not managed correctly. Restoration pruning helps prevent this by guiding growth and selectively pruning sprouts and branches to produce structurally strong architecture.

**Figure 1.** Restoration pruning trains sprouts into the new crown.

**SPROUTS ARE GOOD!**
- Selected sprouts become the new crown and restore energy reserves.
- Restoration pruning encourages sprouts to form a strong replacement crown. Two or more pruning applications may be required over several years.
- Delay pruning sprouts until the tree’s foliage volume is substantial and approaches the pre-topping amount. This may take several years.
- Remove or reduce undesirable sprouts once sprouts begin forming branches that compete for space on the parent branch and in the crown.

**MANAGE SPROUTS**
Sprout growth depends on the season when the topping or damage occurs and the vigor of the tree. Sprouts may begin growing immediately, or growth may be delayed until the following growing season. Proper sprout management is the key element of restoration pruning. The position and orientation of sprouts is important because they become the new branches that replace those that were lost or destroyed.

One sprout should be trained into the leader at each headed branch by subordinating and removing others that compete with it (Figure 2). Reduce sprout crowding so future growth will not interfere (Figures 2 and 3). Sprouts on species sensitive to decay may not form strong connections with parent branches. In these species, crown reduction in perpetuity may be necessary.

**Figure 2.** Remove some sprouts and reduce others (dashed lines) so selected sprouts can dominate and help close the wound. Older sprouts are pruned in the same manner.

**Figure 3.** Sprouts shown in white should be removed and the others shortened so the largest one can dominate. This encourages the dominant sprout to grow faster than the others and assume the role of the replacement branch. Over time replacement branches may need to be shortened to balance branch size with sprout attachment strength and parent branch decay.

Photos: Restoring Topped Trees
ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS:

- Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
- Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose without the prior written consent of the consultant.
- This report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant, and the consultant's fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a stipulated result, a specified value, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
- There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the tree(s) or property in question may not arise in the future.
- Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. It is highly recommended that you follow the arborist recommendations; however, you may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations and/or seek additional advice.
- Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specific period of time.
- Any recommendations and/or performed treatments (including, but not limited to, pruning or removal) of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist's services, such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and any other related issues. Arborists cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist can then be expected to consider and reasonably rely on the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.
- I have no personal or prospective interest or bias with respect to the subject matter of this report or the parties involved. I have inspected the subject tree(s) and to the best of my knowledge and belief, all statements and information presented in the report are true and correct.
- This report represents the opinion of the Arborist, any fee or compensation is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

The intent of this report was to provide as complete and unbiased an opinion as possible with regards to the current health and condition of the tree(s) addressed above. I further certify that I am a member in good standing of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and Department of Pesticide Regulations (DPR).

JOHNNY TIEN
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-11346A
DPR Qualified Applicator License #132992

Signed:

Property Owner, LI WEI

Signed:
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## 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>CUP APPLICATION Major</td>
<td>$3,165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP or VARIANCE MODIFICATION</td>
<td>$955.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC APPEAL</td>
<td>$805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC APPLICATION Minor</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC APPLICATION 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</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>PLANNING COMMISSION APPEAL</td>
<td>$805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT PLAN REVIEW Minor</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT PLAN REVIEW 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 x</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>
<tr>
<td>WIRELESS COMM. ADMIN. REVIEW</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLAN CHECK FEE: 101-14-3308-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Check</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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>

### ADDRESS: 1270 Oxford Rd

### FEE WORKSHEET

#### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

### FIRE INSPECTION FEE: 103-34-3330-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(626) 300-0735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSPECTION FEES: 101-14-3312-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(626) 300-0706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL INSPECTION</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TREE FEES: 101-14-3106-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REMOVAL APPLICATION</td>
<td>$245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAL</td>
<td>$255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE FEE</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TREE FEES: 209-00-3410-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER VIOLATION</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00 x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAP/PUBLICATION FEES: 101-14-3346-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARINO STREET MAPS</td>
<td>$10.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEISMIC STUDY ZONE, YARD, MISC. MAPS</td>
<td>$5.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACT MAPS (fee based on reproduction cost)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL PLAN, S.M. COMM. PLAN, COMM./RES. DESIGN GUIDELINES, ZONING CODE-CITY CODE CH. 23</td>
<td>$20.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING ELEMENT</td>
<td>$10.00 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS CITY DOC. COPIES</td>
<td>$.20 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS DOCS OR TAPES</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SPEED STUDY ZONE</td>
<td>$12.00 x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MISC. FEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL AMOUNT DUE: $9,000.00

---

*Date: 4/30/19*