

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

Thursday, February 8, 2024

Meeting called to order at 5:11 p.m. in MSB Room 105, 633 E. Broadway.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present: Kaskanian, Lockareff, Simonian, Tchaghanyan, Welch

Absent: -

Community Development Department Staff: Milca Toledo, Vilia Zemaitaitis, Teresa Santilena

2. REPORT REGARDING POSTING OF THE AGENDA:

The Agenda for the February 8, 2024, Regular Meeting of the Glendale Design Review Board was posted on the City's website on February 1, 2024, and on the Bulletin Board outside City Hall on February 5, 2024.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Approval of Design Review Board Minutes from January 25, 2024.

Motion: Lockareff

Second: Welch

4. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Board member Welch nominated Danielle Lockareff for chair, and Board member Tchaghanyan seconded the nomination. Vote: 5-0.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

6. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS: None.

7. OLD BUSINESS: None.

8. NEW BUSINESS:

- a) **1645 Las Flores Drive**
DRB Case No. 001671-2023

Speaking on the item: Danny Manasserian, consultant
Vartan Jangozian, applicant
Alexander Yesayante, caller

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

Vote as follows:

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

b) Citywide
Zone Change Text Amendment Case No. PZC-0008-2023

Speaking on the item: Allan Durham, speaker

Advisory Comments attached

9. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT UPDATES: None.

10. ADJOURNMENT: 9:01 PM

Danielle Lockareff
Chair

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Meeting Date February 8, 2024 **DRB Case No.** PDR-001671-2023

Address 1645 Las Flores Dr.

Applicant Vartan Jangozian

Project Summary:

To demolish the existing, one-story, 1,621 square-foot (SF) single-family house (built in 1948) and construct a new, two-story, 4,345 SF single-family house with an attached three-car garage on a 13,933 SF hillside lot, zoned R1R-II (Restricted Residential, Floor Area Ratio District II) and with an average current slope of 13 percent. The project features a swimming pool at the rear of the house. Site improvements involve grading 862 cubic yards of cut, and 210 cubic yards of fill and 652 cubic yards export.

Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Lockareff			X			
Kaskanian			X			
Simonian	X		X			
Tchaghayan			X			
Welch		X	X			
Totals			5	0		
DRB Decision		Approved with conditions				

Conditions:

1. Introduce a small, narrow window on the second floor, left side (north) elevation on opposite ends of the (bedroom) wall, thereby reducing the overall amount of stucco.
2. Identify gutters and downspouts on the building painted to match the adjacent wall color.
3. Submit window sections depicting a typical opening in a stucco cladded wall and stone veneer cladded wall, showing the window recessed in the opening, frame and sill underneath.
4. Provide drawing details of all junctions where different materials intersect, including corner details where materials turn the corners for staff's review and approval prior to plan check submittal.

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 sloping topography. The proposed site plan reflects the lot's current topographical features/grading, with the new house proposed in generally the same location as the existing, but within an enlarged footprint that conforms to the contoured building pad on the site.
- The new house will be accessible from Las Flores Drive and driveway access to the new attached garage will be from a new driveway proposed to be constructed on the west side of the property, on or about the same location as the existing driveway; the front setback to the front porch columns will be 18'-2". Overall, the new building location and garage design are complementary to the site and the neighborhood.
- New drought tolerant landscaping is proposed throughout, including a new swimming pool behind the house. Additionally, new five-foot high (split face) retaining walls are proposed at the side and rear of the house. Overall, landscaping and wall are appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.
- Balconies/deck are oriented towards the front, north (left) side and the rear area of the lot's hillside (open space). Further, the adjacent home's driveway is located adjacent to the subject site, which creates a buffer between the subject and adjacent homes. Overall, the balconies are appropriately located on the site and respect the privacy of adjacent properties.

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 mass and scale of the house is compatible with those of adjoining two-story homes and nearby properties in the neighborhood. The new home's mass and scale appropriately relates to the surrounding context. The two-story volume appropriately steps back away from the first level, thereby minimizing its perceived mass and scale from the street and adjacent homes. Overall, the proposed two-story house with an overall building height of 32 ft., 4-inches fits well on the site and in the neighborhood.
- The building footprint relates to its topography in that its form and profile follows the existing topography, especially along the left (northwest) side where the garage steps upward. The majority of the house is situated on a flat portion of the site with the exception of portions of the sides of the house situated on sloping topography. Placement of the new house conforms to the contoured building pad, appropriately following the site's topography.
- The facades are appropriately articulated through the use of volumes, breaks in plane and roof line, design details, fenestration, etc. The building's façades adequately mitigate the building's mass and scale throughout and appropriate use of cladding material and fenestration. As conditioned by the Board, introduce a small, narrow window on the second floor left side (north elevation on opposite ends of the bedroom wall, thereby reducing the overall amount of stucco.

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

Advisory Review and Comments

Meeting Date: February 8, 2024

Project: Multi-family Zoning and Objective Design Standards (ODS)

Applicant: City of Glendale

Project Summary:

Presentation of the draft multi-family zoning and ODS concepts – amendments to GMC Chapter 30.11 Residential Districts – for Design Review Board's review and comment.

Design Review Board:

Board Member	Present	Absent
Lockareff	X	
Kaskanian		X*
Simonian	X	
Tchaghayan	X	
Welch	X	

* Was there for the presentation and had to leave prior to DRB discussion

SUMMARY OF DRB DISCUSSION / COMMENTS

Site Planning

- Setbacks
 - DRB supports elimination of current “wedding cake” setback standards
 - Interior Setback Options: Allow for either the 5’ minimum / 8’ average interior setback without additional horizontal modulation requirements OR for the 6’ minimum setback with the additional horizontal modulation requirements
- Common Open Space Area (COSA)
 - Do not require COSA to be at grade, within the front 80% of the lot, or outside of setbacks only; such standards are too limiting for high density projects
 - Allow COSA to be provided on rooftop decks, within interior setbacks, and at rear of lot, etc.
 - COSA requirement – 10% or 15% of lot area, depending on interior setback option, OR reduced minimum square footage per unit OR percentage of total building square footage – to be studied

- COSA on larger lots versus smaller lots – consider requiring a certain portion be at grade on larger lots, but not on smaller lots, OR consider incentivizing locations of the COSA, such as if there is a desire to have COSA at grade, etc.
- Landscaping within COSA - do not limit 50% of landscaping to be at-grade within COSA; allow for planters throughout
- Lot Coverage
 - Increase lot coverage maximum from 50% to 70% for R-1650 and R-1250

Massing and Scale

- Horizontal Modulation
 - Horizontal modulation recess/offsets not required for projects utilizing the 5' minimum / 8' average interior setback option
 - Lengths – consider increasing the minimum applicable length from 40 feet to a greater width (50 feet?)
- Vertical Modulation
 - DRB supports the new 3-story height limit for lots less than 90' in width
 - Proposed 10' step-back for 4th floors and above of density bonus projects depends on priority of City - at rear to preserve privacy of neighbors, or at front to preserve current streetscapes
 - Location of 4th floor massing for density bonus projects should not be limited to the rear half of the building; allow for massing to be spread across
 - For sloped lots – consider a building envelope that addresses sloped topography
- Façade Articulation Modulation
 - Proposed options might not encompass other possibilities, or future trends or designs; allow for flexibility, such as articulated window awning designs, etc.

Architectural Elements

- Materials
 - Rather than list permitted materials, consider listing prohibited materials, so as to allow future materials that may develop
 - Do not limit synthetic stucco and EIFs to 50% of the facades
 - Consider developing incentives for use of environmentally sensitive materials\
- Colors
 - DRB supports not limiting colors; ok with prohibiting neon as primary façade color and allowing as accent color
- Rooflines
 - Rather than specifying pitched roof and flat roof options, which currently do not include barrel roofs and other possibilities, allow for any roof design, but require a change in height / modulation for flat roofs over a certain length

- Fenestrations
 - Options good, but be sure to include all shapes of windows, not just rectangles

Pattern Book

- DRB concerned with current format – menu options shown as a kit of parts, “Mr. Potato Head”; this is contrary to the preferred holistic, contextual design process
- Pattern Book should include more “aspirational photos” rather than the current photos of local unexceptional examples

KEY ISSUES AND DRB DISCUSSION / DIRECTION

- **Background / Intent of the ODS:** ODS State-mandated by legislation. ODS intended to streamline housing development and to create predictability and transparency in the process. State might be eliminating the City’s ability for Design Review and if so, ODS should be in place.
- **ODS, as written, perhaps too restrictive/prescriptive:** DRB concerned that standards limit creativity. Comments were that individual projects should be holistically designed, rather than formulated from options, or constrained by prescriptive limits. ODS should have enough flexibility for advancements in architectural building techniques and possible future housing options (co-housing communities, etc.).
- **Discussion of the fine line balance of the ODS:** Objectives are to allow high density development, to allow design flexibility/creativity, to prohibit boxy, bland construction, to ensure compatibility with neighborhood context, to provide appropriate transitions, while also drafting and implementing minimum design regulations for those who would otherwise develop unmodulated, unarticulated boxes with up to double the density permitted by right (for density bonus projects); need regulations as a threshold for development.
- **Meeting with local multi-family architects:** Based on the Board’s recommendation, staff will be meeting with architects who work on multi-family projects in Glendale to get their feedback on the proposed amendments and ODS.

DRB Staff Members: Vilia Zemaitaitis, AICP, and Teresa Santilena, AICP