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## Project Summary

The project proposes a 510 square-foot addition at the rear of an existing two-story, 2,925 square-foot single-family dwelling (built in 1931) with a detached 492 square-foot garage located on a 7,340 square-foot lot. The proposed addition will be on the second-story, replacing an existing attic space and contained within the existing envelope of the house. The front façade will also be remodeled to repair the existing balcony, and no style changes will be made.

## Environmental Review

The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 1 "Existing Facilities" exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines because the proposed addition to the existing structure will not result in an increase of more than $50 \%$ of the floor area of the structure before the addition.

## Existing Property/Background

The subject site is a 7,340 square-foot interior lot that was originally developed in 1931 with the existing Monterey Revival house and detached, three-car garage. The house features a red, tiled gable-front-and-wing roof form and smooth stucco on all facades. A second-story front-facing balcony, typical of the Monterey Revival style, features wooden columns and a unique wood railing with chess-piece-shaped posts that are mirrored in the first-story window shutters. In 1988, the original brick chimney at the north was replaced with a prefab chimney. In 2015, one window along the south was replaced to better resemble the original windows. Otherwise, the house remains generally unaltered from it's original form.

The site's garage is accessed via Gardner Lane, a minor/local street that runs parallel to Hollister and provides rear access to neighboring properties.

The property is of historic interest as the home of Bob Wian, founder of Bob's Big Boy. Wian lived at the house through his high school years, and it was his residence when he sold his car in 1936 to start the burger stand. Another property more closely related to Wian and his period of significance has been identified and is on the Glendale Register.

## Staff Recommendation

Approve with Conditions

## Last Date Reviewed / Decision

First time submittal for final review.

## Zone: R1R - FAR District: II

Although this design review does not convey final zoning approval, the project has been reviewed for consistency with the applicable Codes and no inconsistencies have been identified.

## Active/Pending Permits and Approvals

None.

## Site Slope and Grading

Less than $50 \%$ current average slope and less than 1500 cubic yards of earth movement (cut and/or fill); no additional review required.

## Neighborhood Survey

|  | Average of Properties <br> within 300 linear feet <br> of subject property | Range of Properties <br> within 300 linear feet <br> of subject property | Subject Property <br> Proposal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot size | 8,110 sq. ft. | 3,842 sq. $\mathrm{ft} .-11,760$ <br> sq. ft. | $7,340 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Setback | 23 feet | 7 feet -55 feet | 32 feet |
| House size | 2,103 | 1,302 sq. $\mathrm{ft} .-3,499$ <br> sq. ft. | $2,416 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.28 | $0.2-0.75$ | 0.33 |
| Number of stories | 14 homes are 1 -story <br> $\& 9$ homes are $2-$ <br> stories | 1 to 2 -stories | 2 -story |

## DESIGN ANALYSIS

## Site Planning

Are the following items satisfactory and compatible with the project site and surrounding area?

## Building Location

$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:Setbacks of buildings on sitePrevailing setbacks on the streetBuilding and decks follow topographyAlteration of landform minimized

Yards and Usable Open Space
$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Avoid altering landform to create flat yards
$\square$ Outdoor areas integrated into open spaceUse of retaining walls minimizedProvide landscaping to reduce visual impact of retaining wallsDecorative material used for retaining walls to blend into landscape and/or complement the building design

## Garage Location and Driveway

区 yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Consistent with predominant pattern on street
$\square$ Compatible with primary structure
$\square$ Permeable paving material
$\square$ Decorative paving

Landscape Design (Existing Landscaping to Remain)
$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Complementary to building design and surrounding siteMaintains existing trees when possibleMaximizes permeable surfacesAppropriately sized and located
Walls and Fences
区 yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:Appropriate style/color/materialPerimeter walls treated at both sidesRetaining walls minimizedAppropriately sized and locatedStormwater runoff minimized

## 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:

- Overall, the site planning is appropriate and remains relatively unchanged with the second-floor addition remaining within the existing envelope of the house.
- The 510-square foot addition will sit above the existing patio at the rear of the house.
- The addition at the rear of the house will not alter the existing home's appearance as viewed from the street. The addition will be visible from Gardner Lane but will be setback further than its immediate neighboring properties and is in keeping with the patterns of the area.
- The attached covered patio at the rear will be rebuilt at the rear of the new addition.
- No other site changes are proposed and the existing landscaping and detached garage will be maintained.


## Massing and Scale

Are the following items satisfactory and compatible with the project site and surrounding area?

## Building Relates to its Surrounding Context Q yes n/a no

If "no" select from below and explain:Appropriate proportions and transitionsImpact of larger building minimized

## Building Relates to Existing Topography <br> 区 yes <br> n/a <br> no

If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Form and profile follow topographyAlteration of existing land form minimizedRetaining walls terrace with slope

## Consistent Architectural Concept <br> 区 yes n/a no

If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Concept governs massing and height

## Scale and Proportion

$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Scale and proportion fit contextArticulation avoids overbearing formsAppropriate solid/void relationshipsEntry and major features well locatedAvoids sense of monumentality

Roof Forms
$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:Roof reinforces design conceptConfiguration appropriate to context

## Determination of Compatibility: 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:

- Overall, the mass, height, proportions, and architectural concept of the project are consistent with and appropriate to the existing residence and the neighborhood.
- The west facing façade is broken up by a 96 square-foot patio.
- The addition features a gabled-roof design with a 8:12 pitch, which matches the existing roof form and appropriately reduces the massing appearance on the rear addition.


## Design and Detailing

Are the following items satisfactory and compatible with the project site and surrounding area?

Overall Design and Detailing
$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:Consistent architectural conceptProportions appropriate to project and surrounding neighborhoodAppropriate solid/void relationships

## Entryway

区 yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:Well integrated into designAvoids sense of monumentalityDesign provides appropriate focal pointDoors appropriate to design

## Windows

$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no

If "no" select from below and explain:Appropriate to overall designPlacement appropriate to styleRecessed in wall, when appropriate

## Privacy <br> yes $\boxtimes$ n/a $\square$ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Consideration of views from "public" rooms and balconies/decksAvoid windows facing adjacent windows

## Finish Materials and Color

$\boxtimes$ yes $\square$ n/a $\square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Textures and colors reinforce design
$\square$ High-quality, especially facing the street
$\square$ Respect articulation and façade hierarchyWrap corners and terminate appropriatelyNatural colors appropriate to hillside area

## Paving Materials

yes $\mathbb{X}$ n/a no If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Decorative material at entries/driveways
$\square$ Permeable paving when possible
$\square$ Material and color related to design
The driveway will be unaltered.
Lighting, Equipment, Trash, and Drainage $\square$ yes $\square$ n/a $\boxtimes$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ Light fixtures appropriately located/avoid spillover and over-lit facades
$\square$ Light fixture design appropriate to project
$\square$ Equipment screened and well locatedTrash storage out of public viewDownspouts appropriately locatedVents, utility connections integrated with design, avoid primary facades Location of lighting fixtures and downspouts not properly identified on the plans. Final approval will be conditional upon Planning review.

## Ancillary Structures

yes $\boxtimes \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \square$ no
If "no" select from below and explain:
$\square$ 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:

- The overall design, detailing and architectural concept of the addition will be consistent with the character of the existing Monterey Revival house.
- The finish materials are appropriate to the style including stucco finish, wood-clad windows and terracotta attic vents.
- The new windows for the addition are wood-clad and feature casement operations. The new windows will match the pattern of the existing windows, including the wood mullions. A condition is included to revise the window schedule to show complete details of frame type and provide a window section drawing.
- Red clay roof tiles are proposed for the addition to match existing.
- The wood railings on the proposed west-facing balcony will match the existing railing at the front of the house. This balcony could pose privacy concerns to the neighboring single-story house.
- At the front, the detailing and styling of the existing balcony will be replicated. The decorative wood railing and the mirroring false shutters will be rebuilt to match the existing. No style changes are proposed at the front.


## Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends Approval. This determination is based on the implementation of the following recommended conditions:

## Conditions

1. That the window schedule be revised to show frame type and window sections.
2. That specifications (cut sheets) for the exterior lighting fixtures on the new building and locations shall be submitted for staff review and approval prior to plan check submittal. The exterior lighting should be appropriate to and consistent with the style of the addition and their locations should be limited to the main entry and patio doors.
3. That the gutters shall be painted to match the adjacent wall color.

## Attachments

1. Reduced Plans
2. Location Map
3. Neighborhood Survey
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| window schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| window | location | type | unit size ( $\mathrm{W}_{\times}$H) | material | gazing | glass | la | egress | Ufactor | shgc | notes 8 remarks |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | living room |  | 6-0.0x6-96" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | fixed |
| 2 e | living room |  | 3-0.044-6" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| зе | living room |  | 3-0."x4-6" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| 48 | bath. \#1 $^{\text {d }}$ |  | 1-8883 ${ }^{\text {P }}$-0" | ood | single |  |  |  |  |  | double hung |
| 5 | bath. \#1 |  | 1-88x ${ }^{3}-00$ | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | double hung |
| ${ }^{6}$ | guest bedroom \#1 |  | 3-0"x4-6" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | doule hung |
| ${ }^{7}$ | kitchen |  | 4.-6.x4-0" | woodlclad | dual |  |  |  |  |  | casementifix-casement |
| 8 | breakast nook |  | 3-0.0x4-6" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing hinged |
| ${ }^{\text {ge }}$ | breakast nook |  | 3-0.044-6" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing hinged |
| 100 | dining room |  | 2'44x6.5" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| 11e | dining room |  | 2'44x6-5" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {fixed }}$ |
| 12 e | dining room |  | 2-4.486.5" | wood | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| ${ }^{138}$ | bedroom \#3 |  | 2-88x4-6" |  | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| 148 | bedroom \#3 |  | 2 2-88x4-6" |  | single |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| 158 | bedroom \#3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 168 | bath. *3 |  | 2-0.0x2-0" |  | singr |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| 17 | (n) bedroom \#4 | b | 2-88x4-6" | woodlclad | dual | - |  | - | TBD | TBD | single casement, egress |
| 18 | (n) betroom \#4 | a | 3-0.0x4-6" | woodrlad | dual | $\bullet$ |  |  | тBD | тBD | double casement |
| 19 | (n) bedroom \#4 | a | 3-0.04-68" | woodlclad | dual | $\bullet$ |  |  | твD | твD | double casement |
| 20 | (n) betroom \#4 | a | 3-0.0x4-6" | woodlclad | dual | $\bullet$ |  |  | TBD | TBD | double casement |
| 21 | (n) bedroom 45 | a | 3 3-0"x2-6" | woodlclad | dual | - |  |  | TBD | твD | double casement |
| 22 | (n) bedroom \#5 | a | 3-0."x4-6" | woodlclad | dual | - |  |  | TBD | TBD | double casement |
| ${ }^{23}$ | (n) bedroom \#5 | a | 3-0.044-6" | woodlclad | dual | $\bullet$ |  |  | тBD | TBD | double casement |
| 24 e | primar bath |  | 1-6"x ${ }^{11-60^{\prime \prime}}$ | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| ${ }^{25}$ | primary bath |  | 1-6.6x1-6" | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| 26 | primary bath |  | 1-0.00x 3 -0" | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | single inswing |
| ${ }^{27}$ | primary bath |  | 1-0.0x3-00 | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | single casement |
| 288 | primary bedroom |  | 2-88x ${ }^{\text {c-6 }}$ | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| ${ }^{298}$ | primary berroom |  | 2-88x $\times 1.60^{\prime \prime}$ | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| 30 e | primary bedroom |  | 3-0.0x6000 | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| 310 | primary bedroom |  | 3-0.0x6-0" | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |
| 32 e | primary bedroom |  | 3-0"xe 0 -0" | wood |  |  |  |  |  |  | pair of inswing hinged |

legend
$\square$ (e) windows to remain
$\square$ (n) windows

## door type




Note: All exterio wood doors by Weather Shied doors
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## LOCATION MAP

2427 HOLLISTER TERRACE
GLENDALE, CA 91206
APN: 5666-007-026
500' RADIUS
DATE: 01-26-2023
Centerpint

## Survey List

| Number | Address | Stories | Approx Setback (ft) | Floor Area Ratio | House Size (sf) | Lot Size (sf) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2427 Hollister Ter | 2 | 32.2 | 0.33 | 2416 | 7340 |
| 2 | 2423 Hollister Ter | 1 | 37.4 | 0.23 | 1626 | 7180 |
| 3 | 2419 Hollister Ter | 1 | 37.8 | 0.24 | 1706 | 7030 |
| 4 | 2415 Hollister Ter | 2 | 33.6 | 0.28 | 1991 | 7063 |
| 5 | 2411 Hollister Ter | 1 | 32.6 | 0.19 | 1488 | 7891 |
| 6 | 2405 Hollister Ter | 2 | 32.7 | 0.19 | 2108 | 11287 |
| 7 | 2404 Hollister Ter | 1 | 19.5 | 0.21 | 2173 | 10155 |
| 8 | 2408 Hollister Ter | 2 | 12.1 | 0.35 | 3336 | 9445 |
| 9 | 2414 Hollister Ter | 1 | 21.5 | 0.19 | 1930 | 10072 |
| 10 | 2416 Hollister Ter | 1 | 18.5 | 0.36 | 3499 | 9668 |
| 11 | 2420 Hollister Ter | 1 | 17.6 | 0.2 | 2038 | 10083 |
| 12 | 2424 Hollister Ter | 1 | 15.5 | 0.14 | 1302 | 9607 |
| 13 | 2428 Hollister Ter | 1 | 17.6 | 0.14 | 1400 | 9660 |
| 14 | 2432 Hollister Ter | 1 | 15.3 | 0.16 | 1544 | 9520 |
| 15 | 2436 Hollister Ter | 1 | 9.9 | 0.35 | 3274 | 9340 |
| 16 | 2500 Hollister Ter | 2 | 8.1 | 0.75 | 2870 | 3842 |
| 17 | 2508 Hollister Ter | 2 | 6.7 | 0.44 | 2600 | 5867 |
| 18 | 2515 Hollister Ter | 1 | 31.1 | 0.25 | 1336 | 5399 |
| 19 | 2509 Hollister Ter | 1 | 28.2 | 0.28 | 1906 | 6920 |
| 20 | 2431 Hollister Ter | 2 | 32.7 | 0.3 | 2043 | 6895 |
| 21 | 443 Edwards Pl | 2 | 13.1 | 0.43 | 2130 | 5006 |
| 22 | 451 Edwards Pl | 2 | 8.4 | 0.35 | 1950 | 5503 |
| 23 | 2404 Gardner PI | 1 | 45.7 | 0.15 | 1713 | 11760 |
| Averages |  |  | 22.9 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 1 0}$ |

