



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA

Community Development
Planning

633 E. Broadway, Suite 103
Glendale, CA 91206-4311
Tel. (818) 548-2140 Fax (818) 240-0392
glendaleca.gov

July 14, 2020

Edward Cavanaugh
1130 Highland Ave
Glendale, CA

**RE: ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW NO. PDR2006158
1130 Highland Avenue**

Dear Mr. Cavanaugh,

On July 9, 2020, the Director of Community Development, pursuant to the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.47, **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS** your design review application proposing to construct a 68 square-foot first level addition and 352 square-foot second level addition (total 420 square-foot) at the side and rear of an existing, two-story, 2,054 square-foot single-family dwelling located on an approximately 8,247 square-foot lot in the R1-1(Low Density Residential, Floor Area District I) Zone, at **1130 Highland Avenue**.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Revise drawings to correctly depict all existing and proposed roof pitches, indicating that roof over second floor addition will have the same pitch as the roof over the existing one-story portion at the rear of the house.
2. Revise drawings to indicate that all new stucco cladding will match the existing stucco in terms of texture, application method, and overall appearance. In addition, the image of the proposed stucco shall be replaced with one that accurately reflects this goal.
3. Revise drawings to show existing and proposed locations of gutters and downspouts for staff review and approval prior to plan check submittal.
4. Revise site plan to show existing interior and street setbacks.
5. Provide a vertical window section detail and a detailed window schedule.

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 existing single-family dwelling is centrally located on the property with a detached garage in the rear interior corner. The proposed two-story addition will be constructed within the existing footprint of the dwelling and does not propose any significant alterations to the existing site planning. All prevailing street and interior setbacks will remain unchanged.

Mass and Scale – The proposed massing and scale are appropriate 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 scale and proportion. The proposed two-story addition will not affect the existing overall height of the dwelling.
- The form of the addition relates well with the overall building concept and surrounding context of the neighborhood. The addition will be located at the side and rear of the building, and constructed within the existing footprint of the building to avoid an overbearing presence on the street or toward the immediate neighbors.
- The proposed 68 square-foot first level addition and 352 square-foot second level addition (total 420 square-foot) will be at the rear half of the existing dwelling. The second level addition will be set back 18 inches from either side to maintain the existing roofline of the first floor. The addition will have a new shed roof with a pitch that matches the existing roof pitch at the one-story rear portion of the house, which is shallower than the roof over the two-story front volume. The shallower pitch and shed roof design are appropriate because these, along with the 18 inch inset at each side, will allow the addition to resemble a dormer, which is appropriate to the style of the house and allows the existing rooflines to remain legible.

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 surrounding neighborhood features a mix of architectural styles. The proposed addition to the side and rear is compatible with the neighborhood context, as the addition does not propose substantial changes to the Colonial style of the existing dwelling.
- The proposed approximately 86 square-foot second-floor balcony will not have any privacy concerns, as it is well tucked into the existing building footprint and does not directly overlook the adjacent neighbors.
- The proposed plans and elevations do not show existing and proposed locations of gutters and downspouts. Staff will require drawings to show existing and proposed locations of gutters and downspouts prior to plan check submittal.
- The new windows at the addition will be white, wood nail-on frames that will be recessed into the wall with new wood sills. All new windows will be hung windows with external grids in a six-over-one configuration to match the other windows, which are proposed to remain. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the applicant provide a vertical window section detail and a more detailed window schedule prior to plan check submittal.
- Color and materials for the addition include grey-colored composite roof shingles, grey-colored stucco, and white windows and trim. The stucco sample depicted on the drawings for the walls of the addition has a very rough texture that does not match the existing stucco on the house. A condition is added requiring that all references to new stucco indicate that it will match the existing in texture, application method, and overall appearance, and that the image depicting the new stucco be changed to reflect this goal.

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, Minjee Hahm, at via email at mhahm@glendaleca.gov.

RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY INPUT RECEIVED DURING COMMENT PERIOD

During the public comment period, staff received two emails and a phone call regarding the project from nearby residents. Several points of concern were raised in the comment emails and the phone call received by staff; below is a summary of the points from the comment emails and the phone call and staff responses.

1. Nonconforming use on property

A respondent expressed concern that the existing house and garage on the subject property may be nonconforming uses that may have been improved in the past without permit or review. The subject lot is zoned as R-1 (Low Density Residential) and the existing dwelling and its garage are conforming residential uses. Per the original building permit and staff's own measuring of the setbacks of the existing dwelling per the scale indicated by the architect on plans (1/16" = 1'0"), the dwelling meets current setback standards of the zone. However, since the existing setbacks are not shown on the site plan, a condition has already been incorporated into the decision, asking for the applicant to provide the existing setbacks of all buildings on the property.

2. Setback

A respondent expressed concern that the sides of the second-story portion of the addition should be stepped back five feet to seven feet from the side facades, instead of the proposed 18 inches. Staff supports the proposed 18-inch setback because it appropriately allows the new mass of the addition to defer to the existing massing while maintaining the overall building form. It is unclear what benefit would be provided by more significant step backs.

3. Privacy

A respondent expressed concern that the rear second-story balcony and windows pose privacy issues to the respondent's property immediately to the north. Because of the site planning of the property, the existing dwelling is centrally located on a diagonal axis. The proposed second-floor balcony is tucked in the middle of two proposed volumes, and is oriented to the northeast with limited lateral visibility. The balcony's predominant views are toward the subject property's garage and the roofs and garages of adjacent neighbors. In general, two story houses provide more visibility of neighboring properties than is the case with one story houses. The placement of the deck between the two wings, its indirect orientation toward the property to the north, and its greater-than-Code-required setback from the property lines indicate that care has been taken to avoid any undue impact on any neighbor's privacy. With regard to the new second story windows, these openings are from a bedroom and a closet, which are not the type of spaces for which privacy is considered under the Zoning Code. The view from these windows, however, will not be substantially different than that from the existing windows and should not have any further impact on the privacy of neighboring properties.

4. Sound Levels

A respondent expressed concern that the proposed design “does not mitigate sound levels that are the normal expectation of a second-story addition to a neighborhood of small structures on small lots”. The existing house has always been a two-story single family dwelling. Staff does not expect that the proposed expansion of the second floor area will have differing sound levels from its current condition or contribute to excessive noise that will negatively affect the neighborhood and the nearby residents.

5. Landscaping

A respondent expressed concern that the plants planted along the northern property line of the subject property is a safety concern because it hinders visibility for drivers backing down the driveway of the property to the north. While Planning staff recognizes this could be a safety concern, the landscaping is already in place and is not part of the current design review. Please contact Neighborhood Services Division (818 548 3700) to file a formal complaint regarding vehicular visibility.

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 **July 29, 2020** via email at Zoning@glendaleca.gov.

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 online and may be downloaded. AGENDAS and other NOTICES are also posted on our website.

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, **Minjee Hahm**, 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, **Minjee Hahm**, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Minjee Hahm directly at via email at mhahm@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME
Director of Community Development



Urban Design Studio Staff
JP:MH