

633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, California 91206-4386 (818) 548-2140 (818) 548-2144 (818) 548-2115 Fax (818) 240-0392 www.ci.glendale.ca.us

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Weeting Date <u>August 23, 2012</u>	DRB Case No.	2-PDR 1225/14-A
	Address	2700 Piedmont
Danism Daviene	Applicant	Gary Akopian
Design Review		

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Keuroghelian			Х			
Geragos	Х		Χ			
Malekian				Χ		
Sakai		Х	Х			
Zarifian					X	
Totals			3	1		
DRB Decision	Return for Redesign					

CONDITIONS

- 1. Re-evaluate and reconfigure the building forms to be more fully integrated. Specifically, intersections between the forms with flat roofs and those with gable should be resolved. Portions of flat roofs may remain, but should make sense 3 dimensionally, while better transitions between the pitched and gable roofs should be developed.
- 2. Provide more integration and design interest on the south and west facades in keeping with the north and east elevations. The south and east sides should be as fully developed as the street facing portions of the building. In particular, the south side of the building facing the Storybook house should be fully developed to provide a coherent building design and better relate to the Storybook house.
- 3. Neutralize the color for the stucco walls to better fit the neighborhood context. Provide a palette that includes greens, grays or muted earthy colors, eliminating the yellow or bright colors proposed.
- 4. Preserve the existing oak tree slated for removal adjacent to the driveway if possible (in light of the site plan changes and the relocation of the building corner away from the Storybook single family house). If necessary, remove or reduce the small portion of the building that will impact the tree.
- 5. Reconfigure the common outdoor space, incorporating more landscape screening between the single family house and the deck areas of the multi-family project for more comfortable and useable open spaces. Provide a continuous planter at the interior property line, with certain pop-out portions a minimum of 5 foot wide and 3 foot deep to provide for at least 2 or 3 trees.
- 6. Provide confirmation from the Fire and GWP Departments regarding these proposed locations of the meter locations and backflow devices prior to plan check submittal.



7. Provide a protection plan for approval by staff prior to plan check submittal for the protection of the Storybook house during construction, and a historic preservation plan for ongoing preservation of the Storybook house prior to building permit issuance.

Site Planning: Overall, the site planning responds to the site constraints. The building footprint appropriately reflects the unusual angled corner, while also taking into account the existing Storybook residence and protected Oak trees on-site. The project also addresses the street edge by providing individual stoops and walkways from the sidewalk for each of the four units. The proposed podium designed floor plate of the townhouse-style project could be staggered to better reflect the site's topography. Also, the open space design between the two structures should be better integrated into the overall project and the common deck area should feature larger planters for trees. The development should also be designed so as to potentially save the existing Oak tree by the driveway.

Mass and Scale: While the project's massing complies with the R-1650 development standards in regards to height, FAR, and setbacks, as approved by variance, the massing, however, could be more fully integrated. The flat roof forms appear to have some unresolved areas when intersecting the pitched roofs, and the hipped and flat roof forms should be better integrated. Furthermore, the west and south elevations appear boxier and not as thoughtfully executed as the east and north, so these facades need to be redesigned. The south elevation should also relate more existing Storybook house.

Building Design and Details: The previous Craftsman-influenced project has been redesigned in a more contemporary style. This different design expression is detailed with materials consistent with a contemporary development (standing seam roof system, Hardie Plank siding, fiberglass clad doors and windows, metal railing, etc), and is more appropriate for the proposed massing. However, the proposed stucco and siding color should be muted.

*Contact the case planner for an appointment for a DRB stamp. DRB Plans will not be stamped over the counter without an appointment.

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the Design Review Board decision, plans may be submitted for Building Department plan check. **Prior** to Building Department plan check submittal, Design Review Board approved plans must be stamped approved by Design Review Board staff.

<u>Any</u> changes to the approved plans may constitute returning to the Design Review Board for approval. <u>Prior</u> to Building plan check submittal, <u>all</u> changes in substantial conformance with approved plans by the Design Review Board must be on file with the Planning Department.

Please make an appoin	tment with the case planner for DRB stamp/sign-off prior to submitting for Building plan check.
DRB Staff Member	VILIA ZEMAITAITIS V
	()