



## CITY OF GLENDALE, CA

### DESIGN REVIEW STAFF REPORT – HILLSIDE SINGLE FAMILY

<b>April 25, 2024</b> <i>Hearing Date</i>	<b>1000 Sandringham Drive</b> <i>Address</i>
<b>Design Review Board (DRB)</b> <i>Review Type</i>	<b>5650-001-017</b> <i>APN</i>
<b>PDR 002532-2023</b> <i>Case Number</i>	<b>Malekian and Associates, Inc.</b> <i>Applicant</i>
<b>Roger Kiesel, AICP</b> <i>Case Planner</i>	<b>Garnik Hovsepyan</b> <i>Owner</i>

#### Project Summary

To construct a new 5,067 SF single-family residence and an attached three-car garage on a 31,290 SF lot in the R1R, FAR District III zone. The first floor will contain 2,880 SF and the second floor will contain 2,129 SF. A swimming pool and 1,400 SF basement are also proposed.

#### Environmental Review

The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 3 "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures" exemption pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines because the project is the construction of a new single-family house. The property does not appear eligible for historic designation at the federal, state or local levels and is, therefore, not considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act.

#### Existing Property/Background

The subject property is currently vacant. A single-family house (similar to the current proposal) was approved in 2008. Additionally, a lot line adjustment for the site was approved in 2005.

#### Staff Recommendation

Approve with Conditions

---

#### Last Date Reviewed / Decision

First time submittal for final review.

#### Zone: RIR      FAR District: III

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 within 300 linear feet of subject property	Range of Properties within 300 linear feet of subject property	Subject Property Proposal
Lot size	15,945 SF	9,271 – 31,290 SF	31,290 SF
Setback	11 FT	8 – 15 FT	30 FT
House size	3,833 SF	1,965 – 5,515 SF	5,067 SF
Floor Area Ratio	0.30	0.18 – 0.51	0.17
Number of stories	N/A	3 – one story, 6 – two story	Two story

## DESIGN ANALYSIS

---

### Site Planning

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

#### Building Location

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Setbacks of buildings on site
- ☐ Prevailing setbacks on the street
- ☐ Building and decks follow topography
- ☐ Alteration of landform minimized

#### Yards and Usable Open Space

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Avoid altering landform to create flat yards
- ☐ Outdoor areas integrated into open space
- ☐ Use of retaining walls minimized
- ☐ Provide landscaping to reduce visual impact of retaining walls
- ☐ Decorative material used for retaining walls to blend into landscape and/or complement the building design

**Garage Location and Driveway**

☒ **yes**    ☐ **n/a**    ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Consistent with predominant pattern on street
- ☐ Compatible with primary structure
- ☐ Permeable paving material
- ☐ Decorative paving

**Landscape Design**

☐ **yes**    ☐ **n/a**    ☒ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☒ Complementary to building design and surrounding site
- ☐ Maintains existing trees when possible
- ☐ Maximizes permeable surfaces
- ☐ Appropriately sized and located

The driveway retaining walls are the most prominent feature of the site from the public right-of-way. In addition to the shrubs proposed adjacent to these walls, vines or other hanging plants shall be installed to soften the appearance of these walls.

**Walls and Fences**

☒ **yes**    ☐ **n/a**    ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Appropriate style/color/material
- ☐ Perimeter walls treated at both sides
- ☐ Retaining walls minimized
- ☐ Appropriately sized and located
- ☐ Stormwater 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:

- The residence does not have much presence from the adjacent streets, given the unusual shape of the lot.
- The residence will be located on a relatively flat portion of the subject site.
- The attached garage proposed is typical of the neighborhood. The garage (as well as the residence) will be located within the main body and not the “flag” portion of the lot and, therefore, is not readily visible from the public right-of-way.
- The landscape plans propose drought-tolerant plants, consistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines. As conditioned, vines or other hanging plants shall be installed to soften the appearance of the driveway adjacent retaining walls.

---

## Massing and Scale

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

### Building Relates to its Surrounding Context

☒ yes   ☐ n/a   ☐ no

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Appropriate proportions and transitions
- ☐ Impact of larger building minimized

### Building Relates to Existing Topography

☐ yes   ☐ n/a   ☒ no

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☒ Form and profile follow topography
- ☐ Alteration of existing land form minimized
- ☐ Retaining walls terrace with slope

The proposed residence will be located on a relative flat portion of the subject site. The southern portion of the lot slopes steeply down. As encouraged by the Hillside Design Guidelines, the building form and profile should follow the existing topography. The second floor of the south elevation is in line with the floor below it and a large balcony off the primary bedroom cantilevers over the first floor, in opposition to the Guidelines. Given the location of the proposed residence as well as existing topography and development in the greater neighborhood, the lack of the second floor stepping back from the first floor on the southern elevation should not be problematic.

### Consistent Architectural Concept

☒ yes   ☐ n/a   ☐ no

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Concept governs massing and height

### Scale and Proportion

☐ yes   ☐ n/a   ☒ no

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Scale and proportion fit context
- ☐ Articulation avoids overbearing forms
- ☐ Appropriate solid/void relationships
- ☐ Entry and major features well located
- ☒ Avoids sense of monumentality

The proposed residence is large and appears monumental. The architectural design of the residence emphasizes its monumentality. Similarly, the entry is overscaled, inconsistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines. However, the proposed residence is set

back significantly from the adjacent streets, given the unique shape of the lot, and will not be readily visible or have a street presence from either Balmoral or Sandringham Drives.

### **Roof Forms**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Roof reinforces design concept
- ☐ Configuration 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:

- The proposed residence is located on a flat portion of a relatively steep lot.
- While the south elevation of the proposed residence does not follow the topography of the site, given the location of the proposed residence as well as existing topography and development in the greater neighborhood, this should not be problematic.
- While the proposed residence (including its entry) is large and appears monumental, it is set back significantly from adjacent streets, and is not readily visible nor will it have a street presence from either Balmoral or Sandringham Drives.

---

### **Design and Detailing**

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

#### **Overall Design and Detailing**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Consistent architectural concept
- ☐ Proportions appropriate to project and surrounding neighborhood

#### **Entryway**

☐ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☒ **no**

*If "no" select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Well integrated into design
- ☒ Avoids sense of monumentality
- ☐ Design provides appropriate focal point
- ☐ Doors appropriate to design

As previously mentioned, the entryway is monumental. However, the proposed residence is set back significantly from the adjacent streets and this feature will not be readily visible from either Balmoral or Sandringham Drives.

**Windows**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Appropriate to overall design
- ☐ Placement appropriate to style
- ☐ Recessed in wall, when appropriate

**Privacy**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Consideration of views from “public” rooms and balconies/decks
- ☐ Avoid windows facing adjacent windows

**Finish Materials and Color**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Textures and colors reinforce design
- ☐ High-quality, especially facing the street
- ☐ Respect articulation and façade hierarchy
- ☐ Wrap corners and terminate appropriately
- ☐ Natural colors appropriate to hillside area

**Paving Materials**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Decorative material at entries/driveways
- ☐ Permeable paving when possible
- ☐ Material and color related to design

**Lighting, Equipment, Trash, and Drainage**

☒ **yes**   ☐ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ Light fixtures appropriately located/avoid spillover and over-lit facades
- ☐ Light fixture design appropriate to project
- ☐ Equipment screened and well located
- ☐ Trash storage out of public view
- ☐ Downspouts appropriately located
- ☐ Vents, utility connections integrated with design, avoid primary facades

**Ancillary Structures**

☐ **yes**   ☒ **n/a**   ☐ **no**

*If “no” select from below and explain:*

- ☐ 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:

- While the entryway is monumental, the residence is set back significantly from the adjacent streets and will not be readily visible from either Balmoral or Sandringham Drives.
  - The large balcony located off the primary bedroom should not pose privacy concerns given its location and orientation and distance from the adjacent property to the west.
  - The various materials used, including smooth stucco, slate roofing and fiberglass windows, are of high quality and re-enforce the architectural design of the proposed residence.
- 

### **Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision**

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

#### **Conditions**

1. Vines or other hanging plants shall be planted adjacent to the driveway retaining walls to soften the appearance of these features.
- 

### **Attachments**

1. Reduced Plans
2. Photos
3. Location Map
4. Neighborhood Survey



## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Meeting Date April 25, 2024

DRB Case No. PDR 002532-2023

Address 1000 Sandringham Dr.

Applicant Malekian and Associates

### Project Summary:

To construct a new 5,067 SF single-family residence and an attached three-car garage on a 31,290 SF lot in the R1R, FAR District III zone. The first floor will contain 2,880 SF and the second floor will contain 2,129 SF. A swimming pool and 1,400 SF basement are also proposed

### Design Review:

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Lockareff			x			
Kaskanian					x	
Simonian					x	
Tchaghayan	x		x			
Welch		x	x			
Totals			3	0		
DRB Decision		Approved with Conditions				

### Conditions:

1. Vines or other hanging plants shall be planted adjacent to the driveway retaining walls to soften the appearance of these features.
2. Rescale the entry of the residence slightly to reduce its mass, while maintaining the balance of the overall façade composition.
3. To visually minimize the rear retaining walls, the color and materials used shall blend with the adjacent earth and substantial landscaping shall be planted above and below them.



### **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 residence does not have much presence from the adjacent streets, given the unusual shape of the lot.
- The residence will be located on a relatively flat portion of the subject site.
- The attached garage proposed is typical of the neighborhood. The garage (as well as the residence) will be located within the main body and not the “flag” portion of the lot and, therefore, is not readily visible from the public right-of-way.
- The landscape plans propose drought-tolerant plants, consistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines. As conditioned, vines or other hanging plants shall be installed to soften the appearance of the driveway adjacent retaining walls as well as the walls at the rear of the house.

### **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 residence is located on a flat portion of a relatively steep lot.
- While the south elevation of the proposed residence does not follow the topography of the site, given the location of the proposed residence as well as existing topography and development in the greater neighborhood, this should not be problematic.
- While the proposed residence (including its entry) is large and appears monumental, it is set back significantly from adjacent streets. As conditioned, the entry shall be slightly reduced in scale, while maintaining the balance of the overall façade composition.

### **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 large balcony located off the primary bedroom should not pose privacy concerns given its location and orientation and distance from the adjacent property to the west.
- The various materials used, including smooth stucco, slate roofing and fiberglass windows, are of high quality and re-enforce the architectural design of the proposed residence.
- As conditioned, to visually minimize the rear retaining walls, the color and materials used shall blend with the adjacent earth.

DRB Staff Member Roger Kiesel, Senior Planner

#### **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.