

**MINUTES**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
**CITY OF GLENDALE, CA**

**Thursday, February 27, 2025**

---

Meeting called to order at 5:01 p.m. in MSB Room 105, 633 E. Broadway.

**1. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Halajian, Kaskanian, Welch

Absent: Lockareff, Simonian

Community Development Department Staff: Eric Ji, Columba Diaz, Milca Toledo

**2. REPORT REGARDING POSTING OF THE AGENDA:**

The Agenda for the February 27, 2025 Regular Meeting of the Glendale Design Review Board was posted on the City's website on February 20, 2025, and on the Bulletin Board outside City Hall on February 24, 2025.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

a. Approval of Design Review Board Minutes from January 23, 2025.

Continued to the next DRB meeting.

b. Approval of Design Review Board Minutes from February 13, 2025.

Continued to the next DRB meeting.

**4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None.

**5. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS:** Staff introduced Board Member Halajian to the Commission.

**6. OLD BUSINESS:** None.

**7. NEW BUSINESS:**

**a) 5236 Maryland Avenue**  
**Design Review No. 004075-2024**

Speaking on the item: Tim Cotter, speaker

Vachik Ter Sarkissian, applicant

James Babor, caller

Motion: Approved with Conditions (Record of Decision attached)

Moved by: Welch  
Second: Halajian

Vote as follows:

Ayes: Halajian, Kaskanian, Welch  
Noes: -  
Absent: Lockareff, Simonian  
Abstain: -

**b) 1826 Ransom Road**  
**Design Review No. 004199-2024**

Speaking on the item: Aram Alajajian, applicant/architect

Katya Orphali, speaker  
Serko Khatchadourian, contractor  
Jirair Konialian, speaker  
Aleen Orfali, caller  
Astghik Sahagian, caller  
Ara Ghiulezian, caller  
Lena Therkezian, caller  
Jirar Orfali, caller  
Edward Cherkezian, caller  
Arus Pogosian, caller  
Alexa Siraki, caller  
Natalie Orfali, caller  
Verona Orphlia, caller

Motion: Approved with Conditions (Record of Decision attached)  
Moved by: Welch  
Second: Halajian

Vote as follows:

Ayes: Halajian, Kaskanian, Welch  
Noes: -  
Absent: Lockareff, Simonian  
Abstain: -

**c) 1712 Glorietta Avenue**  
**Design Review No. 003436-2024 B**

Speaking on the item: Danny Manasserian, speaker/consultant on project  
Stephen Bodozian, owner

Lusine Karapteyan, owner  
Nune Margaryan, speaker  
Nina Oganyan, speaker  
Ana Aharonian, speaker  
Bert Ring, speaker  
Patti Ring, speaker  
Vardan Kasemyan, speaker  
Vic Chalabian, caller  
Ani Khachatourian, caller  
Naira Avetisian, caller  
Roman Sarkisyan, caller  
Aleen Khachatourian, caller  
Anna Mkrtchyan, caller  
Irene Sarutkhanyan, caller

Motion: Approved with Conditions (Record of Decision attached)  
Moved by: Halajian  
Second: Welch

Vote as follows:

Ayes: Halajian, Kaskanian, Welch  
Noes: -  
Absent: Lockareff, Simonian  
Abstain: -

8. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT UPDATES:** None.
9. **ADJOURNMENT:** 7:38 PM

---

Joseph Kaskanian  
Chair

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

**Meeting Date** February 27, 2025

**DRB Case No.** PDR-004075-2024

**Address** 5236 Maryland Avenue

**Applicant** Ara Hayrapetyan

### Project Summary:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the detached 263 SF garage and build a new 3,496 SF two-story single-family residence with an attached 436 SF two-car garage on a 19,860 SF cul-de-sac lot in the R1-II (Low Density Residential Zone, Floor Ratio District II). The existing 1,036 square-foot residence will be converted into an accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

### Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Lockareff					X	
Kaskanian			X			
Simonian					X	
Welch	X		X			
Halajian		X	X			
Totals			3	0		
<b>DRB Decision</b>		Approve with conditions.				

### Conditions:

1. Revise the plans to reduce the height of the attached garage.
2. Revise the plans to show the locations of the trash storage and downspouts in appropriate location
3. Reduce the scale of the window marked 'A' and door '6' to be proportional with the façade of the new residence.
4. Use concrete or other high-quality material for moldings.
5. Eliminate the exterior lights at the front and relocate them to be inside the porch.

6. Use 2-piece mission clay tile roof.

**Considerations:**

1. Ensure the drainage leads out to the street front and away from the neighboring properties.
2. Ensure the retaining wall is sufficient for the proposed fill.

**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:

- The new residence will be located in front of the existing residence that will concurrently be converted into an ADU. The proposed residence will be setback in line with the prevailing front and side setbacks of the neighborhood.
- The attached garage facing the street is consistent with the existing street pattern and the design is integrated with the overall design of the residence.
- The existing driveway will be replaced with a new driveway featuring decorative permeable pavers. The front yard will also feature a new walkway in decorative pavers and drought tolerant landscaping and planters that are appropriate to the new home.
- The plan features concrete masonry retaining walls along both side yards of the home that gradually increases in height towards the rear. Adjacent landscaping will minimize the visual impact of these walls.

**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:

- The proposed two-story residence will be approximately 3 feet below the street grade level and the massing and scale is consistent with the existing street pattern.
- The style of the residence is consistent with the eclectic neighborhood patterns of traditional homes.
- The façade and roof design feature variations in form, plane, and material that break the massing. The recommended condition to reduce the height of the attached garage will improve the proportion of the project massing.

**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 recommendation to reduce the scale of the windows marked 'A' and door '6' will create a more balanced and proportional façade.

- There is no neighboring property to the north and there is no direct line of sight from the subject property windows viewing out towards the neighboring adjacent properties that will impede on their privacy.
- The house features a variety of high-quality materials, including solid wood door, stone veneer, red mission clay tiles, permeable decorative driveway and walkways, concrete masonry retaining walls, metal railings, and steel garage door that is consistent across the house and the condition to change the urethane molding to concrete molding or other high-quality material will improve the quality of the design.
- A condition is placed to revise the plan to include the locations of trash storage and downspouts in appropriate locations.
- The condition to use 2-piece mission clay tiles will enhance the quality of the design.
- The condition to eliminate the exterior lights on the front of the property to be relocated inside the porch will ensure there are no overspill of lights and create a more compatible design.

DRB Staff Member Eric Ji, Planning Associate

**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.

# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

<b>Meeting Date</b>	February 27, 2025	<b>DRB Case No.</b>	PDR-004199-2024
		<b>Address</b>	1826 Ransom Drive
		<b>Applicant</b>	Aram Alajajian

## Project Summary:

To remodel and construct a new 1,203 square-foot two-story addition to the existing 4,769 square-foot two-story single-family residence with an existing attached three-car garage on a hillside site, consisting of two adjoining lots totaling 43,784 square feet with an average current slope of 40 to 50 percent (according to City's record), zoned R1R-I (Floor Area Ratio District I). The project will remove approximately 48 percent of the existing roofs and exterior walls.

## Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Lockareff					X	
Kaskanian			X			
Simonian					X	
Halajian		X	X			
Welch	X		X			
Totals			<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>DRB Decision</b>		Approved with Conditions				

## Conditions:

1. Restudy any privacy concern for adjacent properties and if necessary, adjust the lower-level cantilevered projection of the deck extension to ensure it will not impact the privacy of the south-facing neighboring properties.
2. Update landscape plan to include the existing three oak trees/shrubs on the site.
3. Obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit from the Maintenance Services Division (Urban Forestry) for protection of the existing oak trees/shrubs.
4. Update plans to reduce the height of the proposed 8-foot tall side gate (west side) to align with the walls, screening the trash stoarge and mechanical equipment.
5. Update site plan to include the location of the proposed 8-foot tall metal fence shown on the side elevations.

6. Restudy the exterior lighting and either reduce the light count or the voltage, if necessary to ensure the lights are designed to illuminate the architectural elements of the façade without causing excessive light pollution on neighboring properties.

### **Determination of Compatibility: Site Planning**

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

- The proposed additions and remodel will not significantly replace the existing footprint and will not alter the existing topography and site planning. The proposed deck extension at the rear of the house will cantilever over the downhill slope. A condition of approval is added to restudy any privacy concern for adjacent properties and if necessary, adjust the lower-level cantilevered projection of the deck extension to ensure it will not impact the privacy of the south-facing neighboring properties.
- The existing non-conforming three-car garage will remain in its current location and be remodeled to bring it into zoning code compliance. The existing asphalt driveway will be replaced with decorative concrete pavers and grasscrete pavers (permeable paving), compatible with the proposed design concept.
- The proposed new landscape appropriately incorporates permeable pavers, low-water use plants, and maintains the existing chaparral vegetation on the hillside to complement the proposed design. A condition of approval is added to update the landscape plan to include the existing three oak trees/shrubs on the site; and obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit from the Maintenance Services Division (Urban Forestry) to protect the oak trees/shrubs.
- There are no proposed changes to the existing entry gate and retaining walls. The design of the new side gates are appropriate to the overall design concept. A condition of approval is added to update the plans to reduce the height of the proposed 8-foot tall metal side gate (west side) to align with the walls screening the trash and mechanical equipment. A condition of approval is also added to update the site plan to include the location of the proposed 8-foot tall metal fence/gate shown on the side elevations.
- The existing pool will remain, while the existing separate spa will be removed.

### **Determination of Compatibility: 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 proposed remodel involves changing the architectural style from a ranch style with Cape Cod revival influences to a contemporary modern design. The neighborhood fabric primarily consists of single-story Ranch-style houses, some with a Mid-Century Modern influence. The proposed proportions and transitions of the house relate to the site and its surrounding.
- No grading work is being proposed for this project as all additions to the house are to remain within the existing flat pad of the site.

- The proposed height of 25 feet is less than the existing height of 25'-6". The maximum allowed height limit in this zone is 32 feet.
- The proposed flat roof is consistent with the proposed architectural style.
- The proposed remodel and change of the architectural style to a contemporary modern house is consistent with the design guidelines. The roof patio above the attached three-car garage reduces massing by proposing an open space without walls, providing transparency and airflow.
- The existing one-story house has a gable roof design with a 7:12 roof pitch. The addition proposes a hipped-roof design for the new second story with a matching 7:12 roof pitch. While different from the existing roof design, the hipped-roof form is appropriate, and it minimizes the visual impact of the larger building.

### **Determination of Compatibility: 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 overall design, detailing, materials, and color palette are consistent with the proposed modern architectural style. They provide clean lines, geometric shapes, large windows, and a neutral color palette with natural and industrial materials. The proposed exterior materials and color include smooth finish cement plaster, limestone veneer, travertine splitface wall tiles, metal cladding (roof canopy/parapet), glass railings, and concrete planter boxes.
- The proposed windows are appropriate to the overall design and are not directly aligned with the neighboring windows, as the steep slope and significant grade differences create an angled visual orientation. The proposed windows include recessed black color fiberglass windows with an appropriate combination of hung, fixed, and horizontal sliding operation, without exterior sill and trim.
- The proposed deck extension features a lower-level seating area that cantilevers from the main structure, overlooking the ungraded open space below. A condition of approval is added to restudy any privacy concern for adjacent properties and if necessary, adjust the lower-level cantilevered projection of the deck extension to ensure it will not impact the privacy of the south-facing neighboring properties.
- The design of the exterior light fixtures is appropriate to the proposed architectural style and includes strip recessed lighting on the second floor covered outdoor patio and the outdoor wall lanterns. A condition of approval is added to restudy the exterior lighting and either reduce the light count or the voltage, if necessary to ensure the lights are designed to illuminate the architectural elements of the façade without causing excessive light pollution on neighboring properties.
- The trash bin enclosure area and mechanical equipment are appropriately screened from public view.
- The downspouts are concealed within the walls, ensuring they do not create any visual impact.

DRB Staff Member Columba Diaz, Planner

Notes:

Contact the case planner for an appointment for a DRB stamp prior to submittal for plan check.

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.

# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

**Meeting Date** Feb. 27, 2025

**DRB Case No.** PDR-003436-2024 B

**Address** 1712 Glorietta Ave.

**Applicant** Stephen Bodozian

## Project Summary:

To demolish the existing, one-story, 1,246 square-foot (SF) single-family house (built in 1931) and construct a new, two-story, 3,100 SF single-family house with an attached 448 SF two-car garage on a 7,765 SF lot, zoned R1-II (Low Density Residential, Floor Area Ratio District II).

## Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Lockareff					X	
Kaskanian			X			
Simonian					X	
Halajian	X		X			
Welch		X	X			
Totals			3	0		
<b>DRB Decision</b>	Approved with Conditions					

## Conditions:

7. Restudy and reduce the building's mass and scale as viewed from the street and adjacent development by addressing the following:
  - a. Redesign the second story at the front façade by proposing less (vertical) stucco wall surfaces and introduce more roof surface, introducing, for example, dormers on the second floor, appropriately integrating with the roof and the overall design of the house;
  - b. Push in the second-floor (east side) an additional minimum one to two feet (preferred);
  - c. Reduce the first-floor ceiling height by one foot (propose 10 ft. ceiling height); and
  - d. Use warmer/earhtone colors, contrasting colors and materials, appropriately integrating with the surrounding neighborhood.
8. Reduce the width of the driveway a minimum of three feet (on the subject site), thereby proposing a 15-foot-wide driveway immediately adjacent to the pubic sidewalk, widening as it approaches the garage while providing code-required turn radius for the garage.
9. Comply with Urban Forestry Comments as noted in their memo dated July 5, 2024.

10. Introduce a privacy glass on the second floor, east side master bathroom window (noted as window # 7 on the schedule and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor plan).

### **Consideration:**

1. To the extent possible, work with the City's Public Works Urban Forestry in order to plant the same (existing) tree species (*Magnolia grandiflora*) in the City's parkway.

### **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:

- The new house appropriately follows the site's topography, reflecting the lot's current topographical features and characteristics. The proposed house will be generally in the same location similar to the existing house but within an enlarged footprint that conforms to the building pad on the site.
- The new house will be accessible from Glorietta Avenue and driveway access will remain on the east side of the property, on or about the same location as the existing driveway.
- Overall, the building location and proposed street front setback of 27'-9" to the building's first floor is appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- New drought tolerant landscaping is proposed, appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- A covered porch is proposed at the front of the house and a patio trellis is proposed attached to the rear of the house. Both the front porch and the rear patio are appropriately located on the ground level, respecting the privacy of adjacent properties.
- The new house will be accessible from Glorietta Avenue and driveway access will remain on the east side of the property. The proposed driveway apron and on-site driveway is too wide and introduces excessive paving at the front. As conditioned by the Board to reduce the width of the driveway on-site a minimum of three feet, thereby proposing 15 feet wide immediately adjacent to the public sidewalk, widening as it approaches the garage while providing code-required turn radius for the garage, and Comply with Urban Forestry Comments as noted in their memo dated July 5, 2024.

### **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:

- In an effort to further reduce the home's perceived mass and scale as viewed from the street and adjacent properties, the Board conditioned the project to: 1) redesign the second story at the front façade by proposing less (vertical) stucco wall surfaces and introducing more roof surface, thereby making the roof of first floor more prominent, and introducing, for example, dormers, which appropriately integrates with the overall roof and design of the house; 2) push in the second floor (east side) further a minimum one to two feet (preferred); and 3) reduce the ceiling height on the first floor by one foot (propose 10 ft. ceiling height); and 4) use warmer/earthtone colors, contrasting colors and cladding material, appropriately integrating with the surrounding neighborhood.

### **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 new house is designed in a contemporary modern style with some traditional style elements incorporated into design. The house employs a variety of volumes and mix of materials for architectural effect. As conditioned by the Board, the façades are appropriately articulated through the use of color, fenestration, roof design, cladding material, using warmer/earthtone colors, contrasting colors and cladding material, appropriately integrating with the surrounding neighborhood.
- As conditioned by the Board, the proposed materials include a variety of finishes, which helps reinforce the overall contemporary building design including, using warmer/earthtone contrasting colors and materials, and dark brown-colored (fiberglass) windows, and introduce a privacy glass for the second floor (east side) master bathroom window.
- Also, the front entry door as well as the garage door provides a natural wood finish. Overall, as conditioned by the Board, using warm/earthtone colors, contrasting colors and materials would complement and integrate with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The main entryway to the house consists of a modest, single wood door, properly integrated into the front porch roof and overall building design. The entry is not monumental in scale or character, as suggested in the Comprehensive Design Guidelines.
- The design of the new house, featuring a covered entry front porch and attached patio trellis at the rear of the house are appropriately located on the ground level, not compromising the privacy of adjoining development.
- Mechanical equipment and the trash area are appropriately located on the ground level, screened by the house along the east side of the property, towards the rear.
- The project features dark brown fiberglass windows, recessed within the opening with a wood sill and frame, and casement and fix operation. The windows are appropriate to the style of the house in terms of their material, operation and overall appearance.

DRB Staff Member      Milca Toledo, Senior Planner

### **NOTES:**

Contact the case planner for an appointment for a DRB stamp prior to submittal for plan check. 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 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.