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

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

| Meeting Date _ | January 11, 2018 | DRB Case No | o. PDR 1722993 |
|----------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Address | 1112-1118 N. Columbus Ave. |
| | | Applicant | Brian Wickersham of AUX Arch. |

PROPOSAL: To demolish the existing residential buildings and to construct a new three-story, 11-unit, townhouse-style multi-family residential development on an 11,490 SF lot, zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential), with a total of 25 parking spaces in a one-level subterranean garage.

ENVIRONMENTAL

| Board Member | Motion | Second | Yes | No | Absent | Abstain |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------------|----|--------|---------------|
| Arzoumanian | | | Х | | | |
| Benlian | | Х | Х | | | |
| Charchian | 300 | | Х | | | Walter Walter |
| Malekian | | | (L = 100 m) | | Х | 325. |
| Simonian | X | 77 | Х | | | 1.00 |
| Totals | | ***** | 4 | | | |

| Commission of the Commission o | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| DRB Decision | Adopt Negative Declaration. |

DESIGN REVIEW

| Board Member | Motion | Second | Yes | No | Absent | Abstain |
|---------------------|--------|--------|-----|----|--------|---------|
| Arzoumanian | | Х | X | | | |
| Benlian | | | Х | 3 | | |
| Charchian | | | Х | | | |
| Malekian | | | | | Х | |
| Simonian | X | | Х | | | |
| Totals | | | 4 | | | |

| DRB Decision | Approve with Conditions. | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|

CONDITIONS:

1. Review, and possibly revise, proposed cladding materials to ensure they are clearly differentiated in terms of their module, material, color, and/or texture.

- 2. Ensure that all planters are integrated into the landscape and that they provide adequate buffers at the edges of the property.
- 3. Confirm with Building + Safety staff that all aspects of the project are ADA compliant.
- 4. Enlarge the landscape planters to ensure that the required 24-inch box trees along the interior property lines (vertically and horizontally) to provide adequate space for tree roots and maturation.
- 5. Provide decorative paving treatment at the driveway and clarify the paving material for the walkways; submit the proposed material/treatment for staff review and approval.
- 6. Submit a lighting plan for staff review and approval prior to plan check submittal.

ANALYSIS:

Site Planning: The proposed site planning is appropriate to the site and its surroundings, as modified by any conditions, for the following reasons:

- The compact building footprint is located on the somewhat trapezoidal lot (with an angled front property line) in such a way as to provide the additionally required front yard open space at the front and the additionally required building setbacks along the north and south property lines.
- Vehicular access to the semi-subterranean garage will be from Columbus Avenue, utilizing the location of the existing driveway along the northerly property line. Primary pedestrian access to the 11 units will be from ramp, stairs and walkways designed to complement the architectural design.
- Common open space and additional open space areas are provided throughout the property. The majority of the required additional open space is located at the front facing Columbus Avenue, increasing the street front setback from the angled front property line, resulting in a larger buffer between the building and street. Given the additional open space and interior setback requirements, the project features substantial open space around the building, more so than typically seen in neighboring developments. Discrete seating benches are placed within the interior, landscaped side yards, while the rear yard has room for outdoor dining and bar-b-que areas that are screened from the rear units by landscaping.
- The project features substantially-sized, private roof-top decks for the individual units (440 SF total required private open space, with 2,575 SF provided an average of 234 SF per unit).
- The new landscaping will be drought-tolerant and appropriate to the modern design of the building.

Mass and Scale: The proposed mass and scale are appropriate to the site and its surroundings, as modified by any conditions, for the following reasons:

- The massing of the proposed three-story, townhouse-style development is somewhat less articulated (and tiered) than the massing of neighboring 2- and 3-story multi-family buildings. The proposed volumes are articulated by subtractions rather than through additions, as is more commonly seen. Staff believes that the high quality of the design, comparable height, and generous setbacks offer a well-suited sense of mass and scale for the project that is compatible with, though somewhat different from, the neighborhood context.
- Rather than designing the project to meet the required minimum and average setbacks for all four elevations, thereby resulting in the "wedding cake" massing of typical, newer apartment buildings, the architect specifically chose to design the project in a more contemporary expression. This necessitated that the building walls be pulled further back in order to comply with the required setback averages and additional setbacks required for the additional density. The angular recesses, clad in horizontal wood siding, provide relief along the flatter building elevations and add a sense of play across the facades; such treatment, in addition to the greater setbacks from the

- adjacent property lines, effectively deal with the massing and scale of the flatter vertical plane of the building walls.
- The flat roof design is consistent with the modern design of the building. The overall height of the project is approximately 34½ feet, which is less than the 36-foot height limit in this zone and is compatible with the height and massing of nearby multi-family buildings on the immediate street block.

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

- The immediate neighborhood exhibits an eclectic mix of building styles and a contemporary design is appropriate. The streamlined design features a modular emphasis of vertical/horizontal and angled lines, contemporary materials, and architectural details. The combination of flat fiber cement panel sided elevations with angular recesses clad in horizontal siding is a refreshing departure from the somewhat "wedding cake" architecture of neighboring, stucco box buildings.
- The project features a neutral color palette and modern finishes: grey fiber cement panel siding, horizontal wood siding, board-formed concrete planters and walls, concrete pavers with pebbles surrounds, and anodized bronze aluminum doors and windows. Such textures and colors reinforce the contemporary design and are consistent on all four sides of the building.
- All of the proposed windows are to be aluminum casement windows (or a combination of picture/casement windows) that are appropriate to the overall contemporary style.
 The materials included by the project's design are high quality and complementary appearance that supports the overall design of the building.

The Design Review Board approves the design of projects only. Approval of a project by the Design Review Board does not constitute an approval of compliance with the Zoning Code and/or Building Code requirements.

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the Design Review Board decision, plans may be submitted for Building and Safety Division plan check. Prior to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, Design Review Board approved plans must be stamped approved by Design Review Board staff. Any changes to the approved plans may constitute returning to the Design Review Board for approval. Prior to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, all changes in substantial conformance with approved plans by the Design Review Board must be on file with the Planning Division.

Please make an appointment with the case planner for DRB stamp/sign-off prior to submitting for Building plan check.

| DRB Staff Member | Vilia Zemaitaitis, AICP |
|------------------|--|
| - | at a second of the second of t |

A RESOLUTION OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, the Director of Community Development considered the Initial Study prepared on behalf of Design Review Case No. PDR 1722993 for the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new 3-story,11-unit multi-family apartment building above a semi-subterranean garage with 25 parking spaces on a 11,490 SF project site, zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential) and approved on <u>January 11, 2018</u>, a Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed Negative Declaration was made available for a 20-day public review and comment period; and

WHEREAS, a Final Negative Declaration has been prepared incorporating any comments received during the review period and any responses to those comments; and

WHEREAS, the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City of Glendale; and

WHEREAS, the Design Review Board has read and considered the Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the Design Review Board acknowledges the findings of the Director of Community Development with respect to the preparation of the Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the Glendale Planning Division has been identified as the custodian of record for the Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Design Review Board of the City of Glendale finds on the basis of the whole record including the Initial Study, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and that the Design Review Board adopts the Negative Declaration prepared on behalf of Design Review Case No. PDR 1722993.

Adopted this 11th day of January, 2018.

Design Review Board Chairperson