



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Meeting Date January 10, 2019 **DRB Case No.** PDR1723012-B

Address 1633 Victory Boulevard

Applicant Jayesh Kumar

Project Summary:

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing one-story, 3,537 square-foot, commercial building and associated shade structures (constructed in 1966), and to construct a new three-story, 35,575 square-foot 64 room hotel with a two-level subterranean garage with 66 parking spaces on a 21,647 square-foot lot, located in the C3 (Height District I) Zone. As proposed, the development will involve a total export of 11,610 cubic yards of soil.

Environmental Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Arzoumanian			X			
Benlian			X			
Malekian	X		X			
Simonian		X	X			
Totals			4	0		
DRB Decision		Adopt Final Mitigated Negative Declaration				

Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Arzoumanian			X			
Benlian			X			
Malekian	X		X			
Simonian		X	X			
Totals			4	0		
DRB Decision		Approve with Conditions				

Conditions:

1. Redesign the street and alley facades to provide greater visual emphasis at the corners and a better balance between the projecting and recessed volumes. Avoid large expanses of unbroken wall surfaces. Possible solutions include relocating the interior stair at the southeast to allow for windows in the blank wall at the corner of Victory and Winchester or providing an exterior stair at this location.
2. Revise the design to include a greater variety of window sizes and/or configurations.
3. Provide a deeper recess at the front entry to enhance the sense of arrival and allow for an outdoor seating area that will improve the street life along Victory.
4. Revise the following drawings/details prior to check submittal for staff review and approval:
 - a. Revised plans demonstrating how the roof top equipment will be adequately obscured from view of public rights-of way;
 - b. Drawings of the proposed trash enclosure;
 - c. Window sections demonstrating the recessed window placement depicted in the renderings; and
 - d. Lighting detail demonstrating appropriateness to the building design shielding to avoid spillover onto adjacent properties.
5. That an appropriately designed fence/wall along the north property line and also at the east and west sides to enclose this area and discourage public access.
6. Remove the planter boxes from the upper levels.
7. Use larger sized plants at the pool deck to ensure adequate buffering between this area and the neighbors to the north.

Analysis:

Site Planning:

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

- The site planning of the hotel is appropriate to the lot and the surrounding neighborhood.
- Landscaping will be provided between the building and northern property lines to buffer between the adjacent residential uses. Ground cover and shrubs will be provided along the right-of-ways to provide texture and pedestrian interest at the street level.
- Access to the two-level subterranean garage is located away from the street intersection via an existing alley, thus minimizing conflict with the traffic on the streets.

Mass and Scale:

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

- The mass and scale of the proposed three-story hotel is appropriate for the site and the adjacent properties.
- The massing is lower at the northeast corner to defer to the single-story houses to the north and east.
- The design employs a variety of architectural strategies to avoid overbearing forms, such as, variations in building height, recessed volumes and breaking up the facades into separate forms. A condition is recommended by staff that the architectural elements at these facades be shifted and

focused at the corners of the building to enhance the appeal of each elevation and improve the volumetric relationships between each adjoining facade.

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:

- The building maintains a high level of design and is consistent with a common vocabulary of building massing, forms and materials.
- The flat roof design is consistent with the design of the building, and varies in form and height demphasizing the mass of the building and maintaining visual interest.
- As conditioned, the design of the building is appropriate to the commercial context along Victory Boulevard.

DRB Staff Member Dennis Joe

Notes:

Contact the case planner for an appointment for a DRB stamp. DRB stamps will no longer be stamped over the counter without an appointment.

The Design Review Board approves the design of project 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 approved for Building Division plan check. Prior to Building Division plan check submittal, Design Review Board approved plans must be stamped approved by the Design Review staff.

Any changes to the approved plans may constitute returning to the Design Review Board for approval. Prior to Building 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.