City of Glendale Community Development Department Design Review Staff Report – Single Family Hillside

Meeting/Decision Date: January 10, 2019 Address: 910 Laird Drive (previously 2512 E.

(continued from December 13, 2018) Chevy Chase Drive

Review Authority: DRB DRB HPC CC APN: 5662-019-011

Case Number: PDR1709694 Applicant: Elizabeth Herron

Prepared By: Kathy Duarte Owner: Raymond Munro

Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to construct a new three-story, 3,275 square-foot single family residence and an attached 2-car garage on a vacant 81,296 square foot hillside lot zoned R1R, Floor Area Ratio District II. The lot features an average current slope of 54 percent and the project involves a total of 1,450 cubic yards of grading (including previous unpermitted grading). The house is designed in a Spanish architectural style.

The proposed work includes:

- 2,230 square-foot first floor living space
- 1,045 square-foot second floor living space
- 500 square-foot garage
- Swimming pool and spa

Existing Property/Background

The existing property is a vacant, 81,296 square foot, irregularly-shaped hillside lot with an average current slope of 54 percent. It is located in the Chevy Chase Canyon residential area and has frontage on East Chevy Chase Drive and Laird Drive. The topography of the lot slopes upward from the Chevy Chase street front property line. The 1.86 acre lot does not contain any blue line stream or primary or secondary ridgelines. The property contains an oak-sycamore woodland with 25 protected indigenous trees on the property. Previously, there were 24 protected indigenous trees, but Tree #2 has grown and is now considered a protected tree. No trees are proposed to be removed. Chevy Chase Drive is an improved street with all public utilities in place. Laird Drive is improved up to the terminus at the project property line. Construction would involve a total of approximately 1,450 cubic yards of grading (1,313 CY of cut and 137 CY of fill), including previously unpermitted grading. The proposed residence will be built into the natural slope of the lot following the site's topography. Approximately 91 percent of the site is ungraded, in compliance with the minimum required 40 percent in the R1R Zone.

The neighborhood is characterized by irregularly-shaped hillside lots. The property is larger than surrounding properties, with the average lot size (within 300 linear feet) of 8,523 square feet. The surrounding homes in the neighborhood are a mix of 1, 2, and 3 stories, range in size from 1,072 to 3,729 square feet, vary in architectural style and street front setbacks, and have attached garages at the front of the house. The proposed house size of 3,275 square feet is larger than the average house size of 2,035 square feet, but has one of the lowest floor area ratios (.04) for the area surveyed. The average floor area ratio is .25.

Previous proposals were submitted for this site: On January 22, 2014, the Planning Hearing Officer granted with conditions an application for conditional use permit Case No. PCUP1322910 to allow the construction of a new 4,143 square foot, 2-story single family residence with an attached three car garage and detached 500 square foot guest house. Approval of a conditional use permit was required for new dwelling unit construction on lots having an average current slope exceeding 50% and grading of more than 1,500 cubic yards. The approval was appealed by two neighbors and the appeal was heard by the Planning Commission. On August 20, 2014, the Planning Commission denied the Conditional Use Permit (overturning the Planning Hearing Officer decision). The conditional use permit is no longer valid, due to the

denial by Planning Commission. However, recent changes to the Zoning Code do not require a conditional use permit for grading or slope. These two items are to be reviewed by the Design Review Board as part of the design.

The applicant hired a different architect and submitted plans with the house located on the south side of the property under the tree drip lines; however, city staff did not support this location because of the impact to the Oak Woodland. Therefore, the applicant redesigned the house to about the same location as the original proposal that was submitted with the Conditional Use Permit application. The house size was reduced by 403 square feet and the 500 square-foot guest house was eliminated. This proposal was considered by the Design Review Board on August 11, 2016 (Case No. PDR1403541) and the project was "returned for redesign."

Another architect (the current architect) was hired and Case No. PDR1709694 was considered by the Design Review Board on December 14, 2017 and "returned for redesign." The applicant proposed to construct a new three-story, 3,515 square foot single family residence and an attached 3-car garage. The project involved a total of 1,417 cubic yards of grading (including previous unpermitted grading).

The project was again considered by the Design Review Board on April 12, 2018 (continued from March 22, 2018 due to lack of quorum). The applicant proposed to construct a new three-story 3,496 square-foot residence and an attached 2-car garage. The project involved a total of 1,377 cubic yards of grading (including previous unpermitted grading). The Record of Decision, plans and staff report for the April 12, 2018 meeting are attached as a reference.

Staff Recommendation ☐ Approve ☐ Approve with Conditions ☐ Return for Redesign ☐ Deny					
Last Date Reviewed / Decision ☐ First time submittal for final review. ☐ Other: See summary above.					
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 ☐ Other:					
 CEQA Status: ☐ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 1 "Existing Facilities" exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. ☐ 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. ☐ Other: An addendum was prepared for the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration that was adopted March 11, 2014 for Case No. PCUP1322910. 					
Site Slope and Grading ☐ None proposed ☐ Less than 50% current average slope and less than 1500 cubic yards of earth movement (cut and/or fill); no additional review required. ☐ 1500 cubic yards or greater of earth movement: ☐ Total of 1,377 CY of grading (1,240 CY of cut and 137 CY of fill). Approximately 91 percent of the site is ungraded, in compliance with the minimum required 40 percent in the R1R Zone. ☐ 50% or greater current average slope:					

Comparison of 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	8,355 SF	4,000 - 15,500 SF	81,296 SF
Setback	18 FT	4 - 30 FT	70 FT
House size	2,035 SF	1,371 - 3,729 SF	3,496 SF
Floor Area Ratio	.26	0.14 - 045	.04
Number of stories	2-story	1 - 3 story	3

☐Maximize permeable surfaces

DESIGN ANALYSIS				
	te Planning e 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			
ř	Landscape/Hardscape Design ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no			
	If "no" select from below and explain: □ Complementary to building design and surrounding site □ Maintain existing trees when possible □ Appropriately sized and located			

☐ Stormwater runoff minimized
Walls and Fences ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no
If "no" select from below and explain: □ Front yard maintains sense of openness □ Appropriate style/color/material □ Appropriately sized and located
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 garage was relocated to the existing unpaved driveway (elevation 778'), which will prevent future vehicular use along the remainder of the unpaved driveway, addressing the Board's concern. All indigenous trees will remain and all potential impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Urban Forester.
 The grading for the current project involves 1,240 CY of cut and 137 CY of fill (including previously unpermitted grading) to allow the house to be constructed into the hillside thereby reducing the massing of the building and appropriately addressing the topography of the lot. About 91 percent of the hillside lot will be left ungraded. In addition, the previous unpermitted graded driveway at Chevy Chase will be partially filled and landscaped with native vegetation.
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 landform minimized □ Retaining walls terrace with slope
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:

□ Articulation avoids overbearing forms □ Appropriate solid/void relationships □ Entry and major features well located □ Avoids sense of monumentality
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 square footage of the house was reduced from 3,496 square feet to 3,275 square feet. The overall mass and scale of the residence were adjusted from the previous design to better address the Hillside Design Guidelines; the majority of the house is 2-stories, with only a small portion over the garage being 3-stories. Additionally the garage relocation reduces the 3-story appearance.
 The building volumes are broken up with the front entry providing a focal point (relocated further down the hill) and the second story volume setback from the first story. The front balconies and various hipped roof forms create an interesting roofline that helps break up the overall massing.
 As evident in the submitted cross-section drawings (Sheet A8.0), the height and massing of the proposed residence appropriately fits within its hillside context and the goals of the Hillside Design Guidelines.
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
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
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 used in hillside areas	
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	
Equipment, Trash, and Drainage ⊠ yes □ n/a □ no	
If "no" select from below and explain: □ 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:

- The Spanish style of the proposed residence is appropriate for the neighborhood context and is compatible with the various designs of the surrounding houses.
- The project features high quality materials: smooth stucco (sand finish) walls, mission roof tiles, wood clad windows (in chocolate bronze), wood doors and garage door, wood corbels, metal railing, decorative driveway entry and split-face block retaining walls (Harvest color). The materials and colors are generally appropriate for the chosen style and are complementary to the neighborhood.

• The windows are recessed with wood trim and sills with an exterior divided light pattern at the top. Such design is appropriate to the style.

Review of Previous Conditions

The following analysis relates to the revisions made to the proposed project since the last DRB meeting.

Conditions from the last DRB meeting of April 12, 2018, voted to Return for Redesign (2-1):

 Revise landscape plan to include a number of sizable oak trees and other native vegetation at the graded but unpaved portion of the driveway to help restore this illegally graded area and prevent its future vehicular use.

This issue was addressed by the garage relocation (see Condition 3). In addition, new trees will be planted in the unpaved driveway area to enhance the overall landscaping of the site.

2. Reduce the square footage or mass of the house to be more in keeping with other properties in the area.

The square footage of the house was reduced from 3,496 square feet to 3,275 square feet. The majority of the house is 2-stories, with only a small portion over the garage 3-stories. Additionally the garage relocation reduces the 3-story appearance.

3. Revise the site plan to accomplish the goals of Conditions 1 and 2, including the possible repositioning of the house and/or garage.

The garage was relocated to the unpaved driveway, which will prevent future vehicular access to the other side of the property and reduces the massing of the house.

4. If still required after implementing Conditions 2 and 3, clarify or correct the drawings of the roofs at the first and second levels above the porch to the right side of the entry and revise the design to improve the appearance of this area.

This issue was resolved with the redesign.

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends approval of the project with conditions, as follow:

Conditions

1. Provide a cut sheet of the proposed textured concrete pavers for staff's approval.

Attachments

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Neighborhood Survey
- 3. Photos of Existing Property
- 4. Reduced Plans for Current Proposal
- 5. Record of Decision, Staff Report (without attachments), and Plans April 12, 2018 DRB meeting
- 6. Addendum to Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) December 2018
- 7. Adopted MND
- 8. Comments Received
- 9. Geological and Soils Engineering Exploration Update by Robles Engineering, Inc., dated Nov. 23, 2016
- 10. Indigenous Tree Report Dated October 26, 2017
- 11. November 4, 2018 Addendum to Tree Preservation Report Dated October 26, 2017

























