



**CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

AGENDA ITEM

Hearing: Public Hearing on Appeal of Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976 located at 2941-2943 Honolulu Avenue

1. Motion to sustain the Design Review Board's decision to approve the Design Review Board application with conditions.
2. Motion to continue, directing City Attorney to draft findings supporting denial of the Design Review Board application.
3. Motion to remand the case to the Design Review Board for further consideration.

COUNCIL ACTION

Item Type: Public Hearing

Approved for February 16, 2021 **calendar**

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Submitted by:

Philip Lanzafame, Director of Community Development

Prepared by:

Milca Toledo, Senior Planner

Reviewed by:

Erik Krause, Deputy Director of Community Development

Michele Flynn, Director of Finance

Michael J. Garcia, City Attorney

Kristen Asp, Principal Planner

Kristine Agardi, Urban Designer

Approved by:

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., Interim City Manager

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council sustain the Design Review Board's determination to approve Case No. PDR 2004976, based on the rationale used by the Design Review Board.

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

This hearing is an appeal of a decision made by Design Review Board on July 23, 2020, to approve Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976 for the demolition of the existing, approximately 4,600 SF, two-story commercial building (built in 1983) and a surface parking lot in conjunction with the construction of a new three-story, 18-unit 18,493 SF multi-family residential density bonus, affordable housing development over a 23-space, semi-subterranean parking garage located on a 13,299 SF lot (before dedication) in the C1 (Neighborhood Commercial) zone.

General Information

Appellant: Grant Michaels

Co-appellants: Montrose/Verdugo City/Sparr Heights Neighborhood Association - Represented by: Grant Michals,
Far North Glendale Homeowners Association – Represented by: Mary-Lynne Fischer
Crescenta Valley Community Association – Represented by: Susan Bolan
Verdugo Woodlands West – Represented by: Catherine Jurca
Adams Hill – Represented by: Stephen Meek

Status of Appellant: Representatives for Neighborhood Associations

Applicant: Garo Nazarian c/o Domus Design
109 E. Harvard Street # 306
Glendale, CA 91205

Owner: Tigran and Melissa Basmadjyan
1026 Bramford Drive
Glendale, CA 91207

Requested Action by the Appellant:

The appellant is requesting that the City Council overturn the Design Review Board decision to approve Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976 (Exhibit 5).

Legal Description: A Portion of Lot 14, Block E, Crescenta Canada Tract

APN: 5610-015-043

Zone: “C1” — Neighborhood Commercial

Land Use Element: Neighborhood Commercial

Lot Size and Frontage: The subject site totals approximately 13,299 square feet (100 feet wide by 133 feet deep).

Existing Site Characteristics: The site is currently developed with an approximate 4,600 square-foot commercial building (built in 1983) and a surface parking lot. Presently, the building is vacant. According to City records, the building was last occupied by a ground floor tavern use and second floor office use. The proposed project is located along a portion of Honolulu Avenue with an approximate 95 to 100-foot wide right-of-way (sidewalk, on-street parking, four traffic lanes (two in each direction) and a center median). Honolulu Avenue is an improved street with all public utilities in place.

Circulation Element: This portion of Honolulu Avenue (between La Crescenta Avenue and Lowell Avenue) is considered a minor arterial street in the Circulation Element of the City General Plan. This type of street is designed to carry up to 30,000 vehicles per day. On-street parking is located on both sides of Honolulu Avenue and adjacent to the subject property.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning: The context of the project site along Honolulu Avenue is a mix of uses/buildings, including commercial uses across the street to the south, one-story commercial buildings directly adjacent to the project site on the east and west, and one- and two-story multi-family residential further to the east and west. Across the 20-foot alley to the north are one-story single-family residential uses with detached private garages.

The property is zoned C1 (Neighborhood Commercial). This zone is intended as a zone for small shopping centers, professional buildings and services to the surrounding residential neighborhood in conformance with the comprehensive general plan of the City. Per GMC 30.12.020, multiple residential dwelling units are permitted in the “C1” zone in compliance with the R-1250 development standards (a CUP is required to allow residential uses on the ground floor).

	Zone	Existing Uses
North	Alley & R1-II (Low Density Residential)	Alley & Single-family Residential across the alley
South	C1 (Neighborhood Commercial)	Commercial (retail/offices/personal services)
East	C1 (Neighborhood Commercial)	Office(s)
West	C1 (Neighborhood Commercial)	Offices(s)
Project Site	C1 (Neighborhood Commercial)	Vacant two-story commercial building & surface parking lot

Environmental Determination: The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 32 “Infill Development” exemption pursuant to Section 15332 of the State CEQA Guidelines because the project meets all the conditions for an in-fill development project. a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations; b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban areas; c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species; d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services (Exhibit 5).

PROJECT HISTORY:

Planning Hearing Officer Case No. PCUP1913153:

January 9, 2020 – The Planning Hearing Officer granted with conditions a Conditional Use Permit Case No. PCUP1913153 to allow multi-family dwellings on the ground floor of the proposed project located in the C1 zone.

Density Bonus Case No. PDBP1904390

February 14, 2020 – The Director of Community Development approved with conditions a Density Bonus Housing (PDBP 1904390) and findings for three concessions because at least 15% of the base number of units are reserved for very low income households.

Concessions (Incentives Pursuant to GMC Section 30.36.070 A)

1. Increase the maximum allowed floor area ratio (FAR) to 1.4.
2. Increase the maximum height and stories to 42'-3" and three stories.
3. Reduce required parking – seven space shortfall. The project will require a total of 30 parking spaces by utilizing the Density Bonus Law automatic parking concession under Government Code 56915(p). The project will provide 23 parking spaces total. The project will result in a parking shortfall of seven (7) spaces.

Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976

July 23, 2020 – The project (Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976) was presented to the Design Review Board with the recommendation to approve with conditions; the Board approved the project with conditions.

August 7, 2020 – Grant Michals (Montrose/Verdugo City/Sparr Heights Neighborhood Association) and co-appellants representing neighborhood associations appealed the case.

SUMMARY OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD'S DISCUSSION FROM JULY 23, 2020:

- Four members of the Design Review Board heard the case. One seat was vacant at the time. Board member Arzoumanian provided her comments during the Board's deliberation, but left the meeting prior to voting on the Project.
- Board member Welch requested clarification from the City Attorney staff, Yvette Neukian regarding the approved Density Bonus and three concessions. Ms. Neukian discussed the Board's purview as it relates to design, indicating that the DRB had design discretion, however, they could not consider items related to the approved Density Bonus nor concessions approved for the project. Further, the Board could not reduce the approved density nor eliminate concessions that were already approved for the project subject to the Director of Community Development's decision letter issued February 14, 2020.

- Three Board members believed that the Project could be approved with modifications to the building's mass, with clear, specific conditions, without compromising the Density Bonus approval and concessions granted for the project.
- Board Member Smith did not agree with the other Board members' direction to approve the project with conditions because she believed the proposed project did not adhere to nor consider the North Glendale Community Plan. She had concerns regarding the building's mass because she believed the building was too large and boxy considering the site and surrounding context developed with low-scale buildings. Also, she mentioned the project's open space and landscaping did not enhance the project; and the building's contemporary architecture and color palette did not complement the design nor the neighborhood. In addition, she noted gutters and downspouts should not be painted, but rather, factory finish colors should be proposed. Lastly, she requested light fixture cutsheets for the Board's review.
- Board Member Welch supported the project. Contrary to Board Member Smith's comments, Board Member Welch indicated that the building's mass and architecture were appropriate since the neighborhood is comprised of a variety of styles and architecture. In order to further reduce the apparent mass of the building facing the street, he suggested modifying condition no. 7 in the staff report which recommended to redesign the front entry to the building designing an interesting focal point entrance and remove the lift at the front and suggested creating a pedestrian ramp or lowering the lobby floor elevation and relocating the lift to the interior of the building. Board member Welch suggested lowering the entire building, thereby, removing the lift at the front. Also, he had concerns with the front of the building being too busy and recommended incorporating river rock on the building similar to other buildings in the North Glendale area.
- Board member Arzoumanian concurred with Board Member Welch's comments; and indicated she would support the project with conditions outlined in the staff report including modifying condition no. 7 as suggested by Board member Welch. Board member Arzoumanian left the meeting after she made her comments.
- Chairman Simonian indicated he agreed with the staff report prepared for the project and the suggested conditions. Additionally, he provided suggestions for the Board members to consider in an effort to break up the building's mass and enhance the design. The suggestions included: lowering the garage, thereby leveling the building and eliminating the need for a lift at the front. Alternatively, if the City Attorney staff did not agree it was possible to lower the overall building

height without compromising the approved concession for height, a suggestion was made to incorporate a ramp in lieu of a lift that was appropriately integrated into the building design. In addition, Chairman Simonian suggested several additional changes including: redesign and emphasis of the main entry to the building, relocation of the roof trellis further away from the Honolulu Avenue facade, and softening all of the building corners. Regarding finish materials, he suggested modifying the siding to have a more traditional appearance. He also suggested changing the distribution of materials to minimize stucco walls and use more cladding material, proposing earth tone colors, and incorporating river rock where appropriate on the building.

The Board voted to approve the project with conditions with Motion by Board Member Welch, second by Board Member Smith (2-yes, 1-no (Smith), 1-absent (Arzoumanian)) to approve with 15 conditions and 1 consideration as follows:

Conditions:

1. Push the building down to a lower elevation to allow for street-level access without requiring a lift or extensive ramping. If the City Attorney determines that implementing this condition conflicts with the SB-1818 Density Bonus previously approved by the City, an ADA-accessible ramp, rather than a lift, may be utilized.
2. Redesign the front entry to make it more prominent and establish a focal point of the front façade.
3. Redesign the upper level at the four building corners to reduce the overall sense of mass and provide greater articulation at the roofline. This may be accomplished by lowering parapet heights above the balconies, introducing hipped roof forms, pushing back walls at the balconies, and/or other revisions that will accomplish the goal of this condition.
4. Increase the amount of cladding employed at all facades to reduce the overall amount of stucco. Consider emphasizing the building corners with additional cladding in conjunction with Condition 3.
5. Use smooth-faced, horizontal cementitious siding rather than the proposed synthetic wood-grained siding to be more compatible with materials traditionally employed in this area.
6. Revise the color palette to incorporate earth-toned colors rather than the more vibrant colors proposed.
7. Move the trellis at the roof deck further back from the front façade to limit its visibility from the street.
8. Clearly depict street trees and parkways on the plans and introduce street parkways and new trees in the right-of-way to the satisfaction of the City's Urban Forestry section.

9. Introduce tall vertical landscaping adjacent to the rear boundary wall in order to screen and soften the wall adjacent to the alley.
10. Provide specifications (cutsheets) for the exterior light fixtures on the building (or landscape plan for site lighting) and locations for staff's review and approval prior to plan check submittal. Specify fixtures consistent with the contemporary aesthetic of the building.
11. Submit details of all junctions where different materials intersect, including corner details (materials should wrap corners) for staff's review and approval prior to plan check submittal.
12. Ensure that all gutters and downspouts are finished to match the adjacent wall color.
13. Submit window sections depicting a typical opening in a stucco-clad wall and a siding-clad wall.
14. Submit a complete window schedule consistent with the City's window handout.
15. Revise the drawings to indicate decorative paving for the driveways and entries per the Zoning Code.

Consideration:

1. Incorporate river rock cladding at planter walls in the front landscaped area to help improve compatibility with the surrounding context.

SUMMARY OF APPELLANTS' DISCUSSION:

In their appeal application (Exhibit 6), the appellants contend that there was a violation of a specific provision of law, the DRB failed to fulfill a mandatory duty by a provision of law, and that evidence before the Board was insufficient or inadequate to support its action, determination or ruling or any specific finding in support thereof. Below is a summary of the statements made by the appellant in the appeal application (Exhibit 6) in Part 4 "Statement of Error" (grounds for the appeal), as required by GMC 288.030:

- A. The appellants contend the DRB disregarded Section 30.47.404 (A) (GMC) where it states, "the review authority shall ensure that all projects are consistent with the adopted community plans."
- B. The appellants contend that the DRB failed to fulfill a mandatory duty under Section 30.47.010 (GMC) where it states, "to discourage poor exterior design, appearance and inferior quality which are likely to have a depreciative effect on the local environment and surrounding area."
- C. The applicant alleges that the evidence before the DRB was insufficient or inadequate to support its action, determination or ruling or any specific finding in support thereof in that the "project report did not present findings that satisfied GMC Section 30.47.404 (A)." The appellants' cited the Code where it states, "the

review authority shall ensure that all projects are consistent with adopted community plans.”

STAFF’S ANALYSIS OF APPEAL:

The appellants’ main argument focuses on the massing and the design of the proposed multi-family residential project as well as compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and consistency with the North Glendale Community Plan.

Staff’s Response:

The North Glendale Community Plan serves as a guide to development within the City’s neighborhoods, including Verdugo City Village Center. The Plan suggests that new development (even if larger than existing context) should relate to existing adjacent buildings through use of proportion, transition, or other design features. While new projects need not copy existing development, mass and scale should respect adjacent building context.

The buildings massing is broken up by recessed or staggered building forms, breaks in roof and walls, fenestration patterns and varied cladding materials. Applying these features appropriately avoids long, blank horizontal facades as it creates an interesting design element and minimizes a boxy outline as recommended by the North Glendale Community Plan Guidelines. Furthermore, the proposed palette of materials (e.g., siding, stucco, and iron treatment) and a variety of colors help to reinforce the reading of different volumes and add articulation to the building façades in order to provide appropriate massing relief especially at the front façade facing Honolulu Avenue as recommended in the North Glendale Community Plan. Overall, to reflect the development pattern of the neighborhood, the building’s massing is well-articulated by using various techniques, such as rhythm and variety of forms, recesses, and use of colors and varied cladding material to accentuate building elements as suggested by the Comprehensive Design Guidelines.

Additional conditions were imposed by the DRB to further mitigate the overall mass and scale of the building without conflicting with the approved Density Bonus and concessions for the project, including but not limited to: 1.) Lower the building elevation to allow for street-level access without requiring a lift or extensive ramping; 2.) Redesign the upper level at the four building corners to reduce the overall sense of mass and provide greater articulation at the roof line. This may be accomplished by lowering parapet heights above the balconies, introducing hipped roof forms, pushing back walls at the balconies, and/or other revisions that will accomplish the goal of this condition; 3.) Move the trellis at the roof deck further back from the front façade to limit its visibility

from the street; and 4). Introduce tall vertical landscaping adjacent to the rear boundary wall in order to screen and soften the wall adjacent to the alley.

The Board made a motion to approve the project and imposed conditions that would further address mass and scale issues associated with the design. With the imposed conditions, the proposed mass and scale of the project would fit within the context of the neighborhood.

The appellants contend that the DRB failed to fulfill a mandatory duty under Section 30.47.010 (GMC) where it states, “to discourage poor exterior design, appearance and inferior quality which are likely to have a depreciative effect on the local environment and surrounding area.”

Staff’s Response:

The majority of the Design Review Board members supported the project’s streamlined, contemporary design. The majority of the Board agreed the design and details were thoughtfully executed and suggested additional conditions to further enhance the design. Overall, the majority of the Board believed the project was appropriate, fit well, and complemented the neighborhood. To further enhance the building design, the Board imposed conditions to the project including but not limited to: 1.) Revise the color palette to incorporate earth-toned colors, use smooth-faced, horizontal cementitious siding to be more compatible with materials traditionally employed in the neighborhood, and the combination of materials and colors should complement the building’s contemporary style; 2.) Relocate the trellis at the roof deck to be further back from the front façade to limit its visibility from the street; 3.) Increase the amount of cladding employed and thereby reduce the overall amount of stucco, and consider emphasizing the building corners with additional cladding; 4) Lower the building elevation to allow for street-level access without requiring a lift or extensive ramping. If the City Attorney determines that implementing this condition conflicts with the SB-1818 Density Bonus previously approved by the City, an ADA-accessible ramp, rather than a lift, may be utilized; and 5.) Redesign the front entry facing Honolulu to be more prominent and establish a focal point of the front façade that will appropriately complement the building. In addition, the Board included a consideration to incorporate river rock cladding at planter walls in the front landscaped area to help improve compatibility with the surrounding context.

Overall, the majority of the Board agreed that the building proposes many of the character-defining features associated with modern-style architecture including a combination of materials (stucco and horizontal siding), fiberglass windows, metal railings, rectangular shapes, recesses, etc., all complementary to the chosen style and the neighborhood. The proposed project appropriately responds to the Guidelines in that it enhances the beauty, livability and prosperity of the neighborhood. The Board

also determined the project was appropriately scaled and articulated and complements the neighborhood through its use of high quality materials and landscaping, which integrates and complements the building design and the neighborhood. Overall, the majority of the Board members determined the project fit well within its surrounding context because it is a high quality development consistent with the Guidelines and the Community Plan, respects adjoining properties and integrates well with existing neighborhood development. The project utilizes a variety of design techniques to accomplish a thoughtfully executed design that complements the neighborhood context thereby avoiding depreciating the community and surrounding area.

The applicant alleges that the evidence before the DRB was insufficient or inadequate to support its action, determination or ruling or any specific finding in support thereof in that the “project report did not present findings that satisfied GMC Section 30.47.404 (A). The appellants’ cited the Code where it states, “the review authority shall ensure that all projects are consistent with adopted community plans.”

Staff’s Response:

The majority of the Board members believed that the project was consistent with the North Glendale Community Plan as it relates to site planning, mass and scale, and building design and detailing. The design guidelines are intended to convey overall best practices. However, conditions vary from site to site, and there may be a more appropriate solution that is not included in the guidelines. Innovative design solutions that are consistent with the spirit of the community vision will be considered and even encouraged. Thus, the North Glendale Community Plan serves as a guide to development within the City’s neighborhoods. While new projects need not copy existing development, mass and scale should respect adjacent building context.

The Plan suggests that new development (even if larger than existing context) should relate to existing adjacent buildings through use of proportion, transition, or other design features. The building’s massing is broken up by recessed building forms, breaks in the roof line and walls, fenestration and varied cladding materials. Applying these features appropriately avoids long, blank horizontal facades as it creates an interesting design element and minimizes a boxy outline as recommended by the Guidelines. The majority of the DRB agreed the building’s massing and articulation reflects the development pattern of the neighborhood and provides appropriate massing relief especially at the facade facing Honolulu Avenue as recommended in the North Glendale Community Plan. Overall, the Board determined that the building’s massing was well-articulated by using various techniques, such as rhythm and variety of forms, recesses, and use of colors and cladding material to accentuate building elements as suggested by the Design Guidelines.

According to the North Glendale Community Plan, detailing and choice of materials should reinforce the overall project design. Architectural design elements, details and materials should be consistent throughout a project, recognizing that a building is 3-dimensional and must be well designed on all sides. Based on the above, the Board agreed that the design of the project and design detailing was appropriate and complementary to the neighborhood, and also imposed conditions to the project to further enhance its design. Based on the foregoing, the Board determined that the proposed design and detailing complemented the contemporary style of the new building and was consistent with the North Glendale Community Plan and Design Guidelines.

SUMMARY

Based on the analysis of the appeal and the reasoning above, staff recommends that the City Council uphold the DRB decision to approve the project. The Board members took into account the project's site planning, massing, scale, landscaping, open space, window placement, use of materials, color and other architectural design elements in determining compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood context without conflicting with the density bonus and concessions approved for the project. The majority of the Design Review Board determined that the proposed project, as conditioned, appears to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and is an appropriate design with quality materials and details.

To reiterate the basis of the DRB's decision, the Record of Decision includes the following:

Site Planning:

- The project is designed as a single structure with a rectangular building footprint, which is consistent with the shape of the lot and appropriately setback from the front, rear and side property lines in accordance with the R-1250 residential standards.
- The project is consistent with the recommendations outlined in the North Glendale Community Plan for projects located in the Verdugo City Village Center. This area has a variety of building types with varied relationships to the street. The proposed residential development strengthens the street edge and provides a landscaped area at the front of the lot facing Honolulu Avenue.
- The proposed open and landscaped front setback facing Honolulu Avenue is consistent with the North Glendale Community Plan because it provides landscaped open space at the front to break up the building massing as viewed from the street.

- The proposed landscape plan is complementary to the building design and includes drought tolerant landscaping. It is appropriately integrated into the design and consists of level and low raised planters especially at the front facing Honolulu Avenue, consistent with the North Glendale Community Plans where it recommends maximizing the amount of landscaping on site, especially close to the street and providing landscape design complementary to the overall site design in all open spaces on site.
- The project complies with the required open space standards for common open space, exceeds the required 40 SF minimum for private open space per unit, and meets the required 25% landscape requirement per the R-1250 standards. The project's common open space is appropriately spread out throughout the property including in the rear area which helps push the building mass away from the single-family residential uses across the alley. Additional open space areas are proposed along the sides and the building's roof deck. Amenities (benches, barbeque and shade structures) and landscaped areas are designed appropriately within the outdoor common space.
- Vehicular access to the semi-subterranean parking garage is provided off Honolulu Avenue, away from residential development across the alley to the north.
- All equipment and trash areas are appropriately screened from view.
- Concessions (Incentives Pursuant to GMC Section 30.36.070 A) from the R-1250 standards were approved by the Director of CDD to increase the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) to 1.4, increase the maximum height and stories to 42'-3" and three stories and reduce required parking – seven space shortfall. The project will require 30 spaces total by utilizing the Density Bonus Law automatic parking concession under Government Code 5691(p). The project will provide 23 parking spaces total. The project will result in a parking shortfall of seven (7) spaces.
- Conditions included are: submit lighting cutsheets and exterior lighting plans on the building (or landscape plan for site lighting) for review and staff approval; paint the gutters/downspouts to match the adjacent wall color; introduce tall vertical landscaping in the planters adjacent to the rear boundary wall in order to screen and soften the tall wall adjacent to the alley and clearly depict planters in the City's parkway in the public right-of-way; and introduce new street trees in this area to the satisfaction of the City's Urban Forestry section.

Mass and Scale:

- The project is consistent with the North Glendale Community Plan because it fits well with the surrounding building fabric. The Plan suggests that new

development (even if larger than existing context) should relate to existing adjacent buildings through use of proportion, transition, or other design features.

- The new structure will provide appropriate setbacks given their location on the site and its relationship to surrounding buildings.
- The massing is broken up by recessed building forms, breaks in roof and walls, fenestration and cladding material. Applying these features appropriately avoids long, blank horizontal facades as it creates an interesting design element and minimizes a boxy outline as recommended by the Guidelines.
- The combination of materials (e.g., siding, stucco, and iron treatment) and colors help to reinforce the reading of different volumes, and articulates the building. Conditions were imposed by the DRB to further mitigate the overall mass and scale of the building including: 1) Move the trellis further back; 2) Apply smooth-faced horizontal cementitious siding; 3) Use earth-toned colors; 4) Redesign the upper level at the four building corners; and 5) Provide greater articulation at the roofline. Additional conditions were imposed by the Board to further reduce the mass and scale of the building in order to help provide appropriate massing relief especially at the front facing Honolulu Avenue as recommended in the North Glendale Community Plan as listed in the DRB Record of Decision (Exhibit 4).

Building Design and Detailing:

- The project features a streamlined, contemporary design that includes an emphasis on rectangular shapes, offsets or recesses, clean lines, modern finishes, and transparent elements, which is complementary to the style of the building and other buildings in the neighborhood. Conditions are imposed by the Board, which are: 1) to move the trellis at the roof deck further back from the front façade to limit its visibility from the street; 2) increase the amount of cladding employed at all facades to reduce the overall amount of stucco; and 3) consider emphasizing the building corners with additional cladding.
- The Board imposed conditions include: 1) Revise the color palette to incorporate earth-toned colors; and 2) use smooth-faced horizontal cementitious siding to be more compatible with materials traditionally employed in the neighborhood. The combination of materials and color will complement the building's contemporary style. An additional condition is included to submit details of all junctions where different materials intersect, including corner details where materials turn the corners.
- Fiberglass windows are proposed throughout. The windows are appropriate to the building's style and the neighborhood in terms of their material, operation and overall appearance. A condition is included to submit window sections depicting a typical opening in a stucco-clad wall and siding-clad wall and to submit a complete window schedule consistent with the City's window handout.

- Ground floor units and private patios are appropriately separated from the common areas through the use of planters and landscaping. Also, landscaping along the perimeter of the site provides an appropriate buffer and privacy from adjacent properties and the alley to the north.
- Board imposed conditions include: 1) pushing the building down to a lower elevation to allow for street-level access without requiring a lift or ramp (If the City Attorney determines that implementing this condition conflicts with the SB-1818 Density Bonus previously approved by the City, an ADA-accessible ramp, rather than a lift, may be utilized); and 2) redesign the front entry to make it more prominent and establish the focal point of the front façade facing Honolulu Avenue that will appropriately complement the building.
- Overall, the building proposes many of the character-defining features associated with modern-style architecture including a combination of materials (stucco and horizontal siding), fiberglass windows, metal railings, rectangular shapes, recesses, etc., all complementary to the chosen style and the neighborhood.

FISCAL IMPACT

There will be no fiscal impact.

ALTERNATIVES

The City Council has the following alternatives to consider:

Alternative 1: The City Council may approve the attached motion to sustain the Design Review Board’s decision to approve Case No. PDR 2004976.

Alternative 2: The City Council may continue the case, directing City Attorney to draft findings supporting denial of the Design Review Board application.

Alternative 3: The City Council may make a motion to remand the case to the Design Review Board for further consideration.

CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE

In accordance with Council direction pursuant to the recently adopted City Campaign Finance Ordinance, the names and business addresses of the members of the board of directors, the chairperson, CEO, COO, CFO, subcontractors and any person or entity with 10% interest or more in the company proposed for contract in this Agenda Item Report is attached as Exhibit 7.

EXHIBITS

1. Location Map
2. Photos of Existing Site
3. Project Site Plans, Floor Plans, Elevations
4. Staff Report (without attachments) and Record of Decision for Case No. PDR 2004976 for DRB Meeting held on July 23, 2020
5. Environmental Exemption Documents
6. Appeal Application of DRB's Decision to City Council dated August 7, 2020
7. Campaign Disclosure Form