

## City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division

633 E. Broadway, Room 103
Glendale, CA 91206-4386
Tel (818) 548-2140 or (818) 548-2115
Fax (818) 240-0392 www.glendaleca.gov

April 20, 2017

Franco Noravian 409 West Broadway Glendale, CA 91204

RE: 1665 ARBOR DRIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1612650

Dear Mr. Noravian:

On April 20, 2017, the Director of Community Development, pursuant to the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.47, **APPROVED** your design review application to add 567 square-feet to the first floor of an existing two-story, 2,382 square-foot single-family house, originally constructed in 1954, on an 18,890 square-foot, double-frontage lot in the R1R Zone, Floor Area District II, located at **1665 Arbor Drive.** The addition will face Parkridge Road.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. That the trash storage area be identified on the plans and out of public view.
- 2. That the elevation drawings be revised to identify the downspouts and gutters for staff review and approval.
- 3. That a lighting plan be submitted for staff review and approval that shows any new and existing lighting on the property.

## SUMMARY OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT'S DECISION

**Site Planning** – The proposed site planning is appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 567 square-foot addition, located towards the rear of the existing house, modifies the original building footprint in an appropriate manner. The addition encloses the covered patio and porch along the southwesterly elevation into livable area.
- The applicant's proposal will legalize the existing conditions on-site, with no changes proposed to what is there now.
- The lot is a double-frontage lot and no changes are proposed to the existing substantial street-front setbacks. Along Arbor Drive, the setback will remain unchanged at 79'-7", and along Parkridge Road, the setback will remain 39'-3", as currently exists to the to-be legalized addition. The interior side setback for the addition is 7'-0", which complies with code.
- The existing attached two-car garage and driveway will remain unchanged.
- The existing landscaping, walls, and fences will also remain "as-is", as part of the proposal.

**Mass and Scale** – The proposed massing and scale are appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 567 square-foot addition is on the first floor of the existing two-story single-family home. The addition is appropriate and in-keeping with the neighborhood, and will not have an overwhelming presence facing the street.
- The property slopes up from Arbor Drive and Parkridge Road, with the current house located on an existing flat pad. No alterations to the topography are proposed.
- The addition will face Parkridge Road and based on the topography of the site and existing development, there will be limited visibility from the street.
- The addition is setback a minimum of 7'-0" from the neighbor to the south and based on the topography of the site, the enclosure of the patio and porch area along this elevation will have minimal visual impact to this neighbor.
- The overall height of the existing two-story home remains at 33'-2", where the maximum height allowed in this zone is 35'-0" for a house with a pitched roof. The addition is only one-story in height.
- The house features primarily gable roof forms, with gable-on-hip roof forms at the front elevation with varying roof pitches throughout. The proposal includes a gable roof with a 3:12 pitch, and a shed roof towards the rear with a 2:12 pitch. Although these roof forms vary, their limited visibility from the street and adjacent neighbors, based on topography, minimizes visual impacts.

**Building Design and Detailing** – The proposed design and detailing are appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- Overall, the addition's design and detailing is appropriate and consistent with the existing style of the residence through the use of the same materials, windows, and colors.
- The applicant's proposal will legalize what is currently on-site, with no changes proposed
  to the existing conditions or materials. City records do not indicate that there are any
  open code enforcement cases regarding this addition.
- The existing entryway will remain unchanged as part of the proposal.
- The windows of the addition are white fiberglass, with clear glass fixed windows and hung windows with external grids.
- The addition has a smooth stucco finish to match the existing house in both color and texture.
- The gutters, downspouts and location of the trash storage area are not identified on the plans. Conditions of approval require that the drawings be revised to identify these.

This approval is for the project design only. Administrative Design Review approval of a project does not constitute compliance with the Zoning Code and/or Building Code requirements. Please refer to the end of this letter for information regarding plan check submittal. If there are any questions, please contact the case planner, Vista Ezzati, at 818-937-8180 or via email at VEzzati@glendaleca.gov.

## RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY INPUT RECEIVED DURING COMMENT PERIOD

 The setting of the neighborhood will be altered if the proposal involves the removal of any of the existing trees on the property. It will have a negative impact on the neighborhood. The applicant's proposal is to legalize an existing addition, and as noted in the staff report there are no alterations being proposed to the existing landscaping on the subject property.

The subject property features several high-powered light fixtures mounted on tall
poles. This exterior lighting on the subject property significantly illuminates the
exterior surroundings along the northwest edge of the property, and is distracting
and a nuisance to the neighbors specifically along Parkridge Road and Brockmont
Drive.

The drawings do not indicate any exterior lighting either existing or proposed for the project site. Staff is adding a condition of approval that an exterior lighting plan, that avoids spillover onto adjacent properties, be submitted for staff review and approval.

## APPEAL PERIOD (effective date), TIME LIMIT, LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES, TIME EXTENSION

The applicant's attention is called to the fact that this grant is not a permit or license and that any permits and licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper City and public agency.

Under the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.62, any person affected by the above decision has the right to appeal said decision to the Design Review Board if it is believed that the decision is in error or that procedural errors have occurred, or if there is substantial new evidence which could not have been reasonably presented. It is strongly advised that appeals be filed early during the appeal period and in person so that imperfections/incompleteness may be corrected before the appeal period expires. Any appeal must be filed on the prescribed forms within fifteen (15) days following the actual date of the decision. Information regarding appeals and appeal forms will be provided by the Permit Services Center (PSC) or the Community Development Department (CDD) upon request and must be filed with the prescribed fee prior to expiration of the 15-day period, on or before MAY 5, 2017 at the Permit Services Center (PSC), 633 East Broadway, Room 101, Monday thru Friday 7:00 am to 12:00 pm, or at the Community Development Department (CDD), 633 East Broadway, Room 103, Monday thru Friday 12:00 pm to 5 pm.

# APPEAL FORMS available on-line: www.glendaleca.gov/appeals

To save you time and a trip - please note that some of our FORMS are available on line and may be downloaded. AGENDAS and other NOTICES are also posted on our website. Visit us.

## TRANSFERABILITY

This authorization runs with the land or the use for which it was intended for and approved. In the event the property is to be leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them regarding the conditions and/or limitations of this grant.

**EXTENSION**: An extension of the design review approval may be requested one time and extended for up to a maximum of one (1) additional year upon receipt of a written request from the applicant and demonstration that a reasonable effort to act on such right and privilege has commenced within the two (2) years of the approval date. In granting such extension the

applicable review authority shall make a written finding that neighborhood conditions have not substantially changed since the granting of the design review approval.

## NOTICE – subsequent contacts with this office

The applicant is further advised that all subsequent contact with this office regarding this determination must be with the case planner, **Vista Ezzati**, who acted on this case. This would include clarification and verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished **by appointment only**, in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the decision, plans may be submitted for Building and Safety Division plan check. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, approved plans must be stamped approved by Planning Division staff. **Any** changes to the approved plans will require resubmittal of revised plans for approval. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, **all** changes to approved plans must be on file with the Planning Division.

An appointment must be made with the case planner, Vista Ezzati, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Vista Ezzati directly at 818-937-8180 or via email at VEzzati@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME

**Director of Community Development** 

Urban Design \$tudio Staff

JP:ve

# City of Glendale Community Development Department Design Review Staff Report – Single Family Hillside

Meeting/Decision Date: April 18, 2017	Address: 1665 Arbor Drive
Review Authority: DRB ADR HPC CC	<b>APN:</b> 5632-005-003
Case Number: PDR 1612650	Applicant: Franco Noravian
Prepared By: Vista Ezzati, Planning Assistant C	Owner: Dhia Alsarraf & Celerina Martin
Project Summary The applicant is proposing to add 567 square-feet of floor square-foot single-family house (originally constructed in located in the R1R (FAR District II) zone. The addition will	1954) on an 18.890 square-foot, double-frontage lo
The proposed work includes:	
<ul> <li>Adding 567 square-feet of floor area to the first floor located along the southwesterly elevation.</li> <li>The applicant's proposal will legalize what is current</li> </ul>	2 ASA 19970 YA 944 Cast Meas
Existing Property/Background	
Originally developed in 1954, the project site is an 18,890 square-foot through lot with frontage on Arbor Drive to the east and Parkridge Road to the west. The site is currently developed with a 2,382 square-foot, two-story single-family house with an attached two-car garage. The project site is accessed via an existing driveway easement from Kempton Road to the north. The project site is an irregularly shaped lot and features a steep upslope from both Parkridge Road and Arbor Drive, with the existing development sitting of the flat portion of the lot. The addition is on this flat portion of the lot on an existing pad. No grading or land alteration is being proposed. Based on the topography of the lot, the addition will have limited visibility from Parkridge Road and Arbor Drive.	
Staff Recommendation  ☐ Approve ☐ Approve with Conditions ☐ F	Return for Redesign
Last Date Reviewed / Decision  ☑ First time submittal for final review. ☐ Other:	
<b>Zone:</b> R1R <b>FAR District:</b> II Although this design review does not convey final zoning a consistency with the applicable Codes and no inconsistence.	approval, the project has been reviewed for noies have been identified.
Active/Pending Permits and Approvals  ☑ None ☐ Other:	
<ul> <li>CEQA Status:</li> <li>☑ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 1 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines.</li> <li>☐ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 3 Structures" exemption pursuant to Section 15303 of th</li> <li>☐ Other:</li> </ul>	3 "New Construction or Conversion of Small

and/or fill); no additi		an 1500 cubic yards of earth i	movement (cut
☐ 50% or greater curre	ent average slope:		
Comparison of Neig	hborhood Survey:		
	Average of Properties within 300 linear feet of subject property	Range of Properties within 300 linear feet of subject property	Subject Property Proposal
Lot size	16,170 sq. ft.	11,480 sq. ft 51,900 sq. ft.	18,890 sq. ft.
Setback	27'-0"	5'-0" to 45'-0"	79'-7" (Arbor Drive) 39'-3" (Parkridge Road)
House size	2,913 sq. ft.	1,338 sq. ft 3,992 sq. ft.	2,949 sq. ft.
Floor Area Ratio	0.19	0.06 - 0.31	0.16
Number of stories	11 out of 18 homes surveyed are two-story	1 to 2 stories	2 stories
Building Location    yes	n no elow and explain: eldings on site acks on the street ecks follow topography adform minimized	le with the project site and	surrounding area?
☐ Outdoor areas ☐ Use of retaining ☐ Provide landsca ☐ Decorative mat	no  elow and explain: andform to create flat yards integrated into open space	and the second s	
If "no" select from be  □ Consistent with	no	rt	

☐ Permeable paving material ☐ Decorative paving
Landscape/Hardscape Design ☐ yes ☑ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □Complementary to building design and surrounding site □Maintain existing trees when possible □Appropriately sized and located □Maximize permeable surfaces
□Stormwater runoff minimized
Walls and Fences ☐ yes ☑ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □ Front yard maintains sense of openness  □ Appropriate style/color/material  □ Appropriately sized and located
Determination of Compatibility: Site Planning
The proposed site planning is appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:
<ul> <li>The proposed 567 square-foot addition, located towards the rear of the existing house, modifies the original building footprint in an appropriate manner. The addition encloses the covered patio and porch along the southwesterly elevation into livable area.</li> <li>The applicant's proposal will legalize the existing conditions on-site, with no changes proposed to what is there now.</li> <li>The lot is a double-frontage lot and no changes are proposed to the existing substantial street-front setbacks. Along Arbor Drive, the setback will remain unchanged at 79'-7", and along Parkridge Road the setback will remain 39'-3", as currently exists to the to-be legalized addition. The interior side setback for the addition is 7'-0", which complies with code.</li> <li>The existing attached two-car garage and driveway will remain unchanged.</li> <li>The existing landscaping, walls, and fences will also remain "as-is", as part of the proposal.</li> </ul>
Massing and Scale Are the following items satisfactory and compatible with the project site and surrounding area?
Building Relates to its Surrounding Context  yes  n/a  no  If "no" select from below and explain:
☐Appropriate proportions and transitions ☐Impact of larger building minimized
Building Relates to Existing Topography ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:

□ Form and profile follow topography □ Alteration of existing landform minimized □ Retaining walls terrace with slope
Consistent Architectural Concept  ☑ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □Concept governs massing and height
Scale and Proportion  ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □ Scale and proportion fit context □ Articulation avoids overbearing forms □ Appropriate solid/void relationships □ Entry and major features well located □ Avoids sense of monumentality
Roof Forms  ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □Roof reinforces design concept □Configuration appropriate to context
termination of Compatibility: Mass and Scale e proposed massing and scale are appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and it
roundings for the following reasons:
<ul> <li>The proposed 567 square-foot addition is on the first floor of the existing two-story single-family home.</li> <li>The addition is appropriate and in-keeping with the neighborhood, and will not have an overwhelming presence facing the street.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The property slopes up from Arbor Drive and Parkridge Road, with the current house located on an existing flat pad. No alterations to the topography are proposed.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The addition will face Parkridge Road and based on the topography of the site and existing development, there will be limited visibility from the street.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The addition is setback a minimum of 7'-0" from the neighbor to the south and based on the topography of the site, the enclosure of the patio and porch area along this elevation will have minima visual impact to this neighbor.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The overall height of the existing two-story home remains at 33'-2", where the maximum height allowed in this zone is 35'-0" for a house with a pitched roof. The addition is only one-story in height.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>The house features primarily gable roof forms, with gable-on-hip roof forms at the front elevation with varying roof pitches throughout. The proposal includes a gable roof with a 3:12 pitch, and a shed roof towards the rear with a 2:12 pitch. Although these roof forms vary, their limited visibility from the stree and adjacent neighbors, based on topography, minimizes visual impacts.</li> </ul>
sign and Detailing the following items satisfactory and compatible with the project site and surrounding area?
Overall Design and Detailing  ☑ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

□ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □Well integrated into design  □ Avoids sense of monumentality  □ Design provides appropriate focal point  □ Doors appropriate to design
Windows ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □ Appropriate to overall design □ Placement appropriate to style □ Recessed in wall, when appropriate
Privacy ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □Consideration of views from "public" rooms and balconies/decks  □Avoid windows facing adjacent windows
Finish Materials and Color  ☑ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  ☐ Textures and colors reinforce design ☐ High-quality, especially facing the street ☐ Respect articulation and façade hierarchy ☐ Wrap corners and terminate appropriately ☐ Natural colors used in hillside areas
Paving Materials  ☐ yes ☑ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □ Decorative material at entries/driveways □ Permeable paving when possible □ Material and color related to design
Equipment, Trash, and Drainage □ yes □ n/a ⊠ no
If "no" select from below and explain:  □ Equipment screened and well located  ☑ Trash storage out of public view  ☑ Downspouts appropriately located
□Vents, utility connections integrated with design, avoid primary facades  The trash storage area, downspouts, and gutters are not shown on the drawings. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the drawings be revised to identify these

☐ yes   ☑ n/a   ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Design consistent with primary structure
□Design and materials of gates complement primary structure

## **Determination of Compatibility: Design and Detailing**

The proposed design and detailing are appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- Overall, the addition's design and detailing is appropriate and is consistent with the existing style of the residence through the use of the same materials, windows, and colors.
- The applicant's proposal will legalize what is currently on-site, with no changes proposed to the
  existing conditions or materials. City records do not indicate that there are any open code
  enforcement cases regarding this addition.
- The existing entryway will remain unchanged as part of the proposal.
- The windows of the addition are white fiberglass, with clear glass fixed windows and hung windows with external grids.
- The addition has a smooth stucco finish to match the existing house in both color and texture.
- The gutters, downspounts, and location of the trash storage area are not identified on the plans. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the drawings be revised to identify these.

#### Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends **approval** of the project with **conditions**, as follow:

#### Conditions

- 1. That the trash storage area be identified on the plans and located out of public view.
- 2. That the elevation drawings be revised to identify the downspouts and gutters for staff review and approval.

#### **Attachments**

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Neighborhood Survey
- 3. Photos of Existing Property
- 4. Reduced Plans