

August 2, 2018

Alen Malekian
2255 Honolulu Avenue IA
Montrose, CA 91020

**RE: ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1804780
2125 ARMOUR PLACE**

Dear Mr. Malekian,

On August 2, 2018, 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 construct a two-level, 1,046 square-foot, addition to the rear, and a one-level, 426 square-foot, addition to the side of an existing 2,026 square-foot, two-story, single-family dwelling (constructed in 1951) on a 9,680 square-foot lot, zoned R1R, FAR District II, located at **2125 Armour Place**.

CONDITION(S) OF APPROVAL:

1. Paving material of the new driveway should be identified and reviewed by staff prior to building plan check submittal.
2. Revise drawings to show locations of gutters and downspouts for staff review and approval prior to plan check submittal.

SUMMARY OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT'S DECISION

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

- The project does not significantly alter the site planning of the lot.
- The proposed additions will maintain the existing relationship with adjacent buildings because the first and second level additions are proposed to be located at the rear and sited away from Armour Place. The building's foot print will extend as close as 6-feet and 10-feet away from the western and eastern interior property lines, respectively.
- The project will not affect the existing oak tree located at the front yard, as well as the two oak trees identified on the adjacent parcel to the northwest. The proposed additions are approximately 35 feet away from the closest tree's trunk.

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

- The overall massing of the project will be compatible with the adjacent dwellings in terms of mass and scale. The maximum height of the two-story single-family dwelling will be 25-feet, 5-inches.
- The form of the addition relates well with the overall building concept and surrounding context of the neighborhood.

- The hipped roof forms will be consistent with the overall building design and relate well with the building concept.

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

- The new front gable and overall remodel are consistent with the existing style and the proposed materials will maintain the use of vertical cladding materials while providing a more contemporary appearance.
- The project incorporates design details that are complementary to the desired style of the single-family dwelling, such as a fiberboard panel and vertical siding, smooth trowel plaster, and a metal roof with standing seam.
- The design of the nail-on, casement and fixed windows coordinate well with the architectural design of the building.
- A condition is included calling for the drawings to indicate the locations of downspouts and gutters for staff review and approval.

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, Dennis Joe, at 818-937-8157 or via email at djoe@glendaleca.gov.

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 **August 17, 2018** 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.

RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY INPUT RECEIVED DURING COMMENT PERIOD

1. **We would still request that story poles be put up. The staff report describes the existing building as a two-story residence, but it is a one-story over a garage (see property permit file). A basement does not make it a two-story house. We observe that the owners of 1311 San Luis Rey, which is also a one-story over a garage located in the Woodlands, were required to put up story poles before their much smaller two-story side/rear addition to the existing residence could be approved.**

The project is to construct a two-level, 1,046 square-foot, addition to the rear, and a one-level, 426 square-foot, addition to the side of an existing 2,026 square-foot, two-story, single-family dwelling. Per section 30.40.020 G of the Municipal Code, applications for design review pursuant to Chapter 30.47 involving new dwelling unit construction in the ROS or R1R zones shall be required to provide a temporary frame. For all other applications, the director of community development shall have the discretion to require applications for design review involving all other projects in the ROS and R1R zones to provide a temporary frame. Because the project is an addition, rather than new construction, the project will not significantly increase the mass of the dwelling directly facing the street, or in a manner affecting adjacent properties, it has been determined that story poles would not be required.

- 2. The setback is given as 9'6", which is non-conforming in this zone (and well out of keeping with the average setback of 30 feet within 300 linear feet of the subject property). Has a setback variance been granted?**

On March 12, 1951, the Planning Commission granted a setback variance to construct a building within five-feet from the street front property line. The total distance between the dwelling to curb is eight-feet, as there is a three-foot parkway between the street front property line and existing improved right-of-way.

- 3. There is also a balcony that projects over the garage, which appears to terminate within 7' from the street. The roof at the front facade is proposed to be raised another two feet, and a front gable added that will extend the roof further over what is now an open entryway. These alterations to the balcony and roof in particular increase the monumentality of the house and will create greater mass within less than ten feet of the street.**

Overall, the roof design reinforces the architectural idea and maintains visual interest. The height of the dwelling will extend an additional two-feet higher (from 23-feet, 5 inches, to 25-feet, 5-inches) – which is a minor increase of height of 8.5 percent. The new offset gable roof design facing the street is consistent with the existing style, and fits well with the surrounding neighborhood context. The existing balcony above the garage will maintain its configuration and will not extend closer towards the street front property line.

- 4. As proposed the project is not compatible with the Design Guidelines for the Woodlands, which the Comprehensive Design Guidelines supplemented rather than replaced (i.e. "These are additional to the guidelines tailored to a specific place or neighborhood," ["Comprehensive Design Guidelines," Chapter 2, November 2011, p. 12]). The Woodlands Design Guidelines specifically address the problem of "incompatible mansionized homes that break the rhythm of the streetscape, and encroach on the prevailing front setback" ("Woodlands Neighborhoods," n.d., p. 31). Moreover, the Woodlands Design Guidelines note that to avoid bulkiness, height should relate to lot width (p. 27); the width where the property directly abuts the street is extremely narrow, and yet the height is proposed to be increased here rather than left as is. The point of creating the gable and raising the roofline seems to be merely to increase the prominence of the front entryway, an effect that is exacerbated by the awkward truncation of the gabled roof on the other side of the front door. This sort of forced monumentality at the**

entrance is explicitly discouraged in the Comprehensive Design Review Guidelines (p. 18).

“Design Guidelines” for the Woodlands neighborhood are included within the Single-family Neighborhood Design Guidelines (April 1991), which were superseded by Comprehensive Design Guidelines (November 2011) by City Council Resolution No. 11-231. Per the recitals of the resolution: “Whereas, the Council intends that the Comprehensive Design Guidelines will be applicable citywide and supersede the previously adopted guidelines for hillside, residential and commercial neighborhoods, including the Hillside Design Guidelines, Single-family Neighborhood Design Guidelines and Commercial Design Guidelines...”

Summary of staff analysis of the project’s mass and scale in comparison to the Comprehensive Design Guidelines (2011) can be reviewed above.

- 5. Notwithstanding that the cementboard will be “vertical” like the rare redwood siding it aspires to replace, we fail to see how the design or materials are “consistent with the existing style.” The proposed changes are in fact radically inconsistent: the original design works because of the modesty of the minimal traditional style; grafting contemporary materials and features on to it changes that style and is completely out of keeping with the architecture on Armour Place.**

The proposed finishes are complementary to the style of the dwelling while giving it a more contemporary appearance. A combination of cementitious fiberboard panel, vertical siding, and smooth trowel plaster will be applied at the street facing façade. The interior facing facades will be finished with smooth trowel plaster painted in white and gray. A standing seam metal roof will be applied at the additions and over existing portions of the roof. Overall, the materials used for this project reinforce the desired style for the building with high-quality design and detailing.

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, **Dennis Joe**, 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, Dennis Joe, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Dennis Joe directly at 818-937-8157 or via email at djoe@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME
Director of Community Development



Urban Design Studio Staff

EK:DJ