



CITY OF GLENDALE, CA

DESIGN REVIEW STAFF REPORT – HILLSIDE SINGLE FAMILY

January 12, 2023 <i>Hearing Date</i>	924 Old Phillips Road <i>Address</i>
Design Review Board (DRB) <i>Review Type</i>	5649-002-039 <i>APN</i>
PDR2111714-B <i>Case Number</i>	Nareg Khodadadi <i>Applicant</i>
Vista Ezzati <i>Case Planner</i>	Takui Aivazian <i>Owner</i>

Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing 2,243 square-foot, one-story, single-family dwelling and attached two-car garage (built in 1967) and to construct a new 3,499 square-foot, two-story, single-family dwelling with an attached 440 square-foot, two-car garage on a 9,250 square-foot property located in the R1R (Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II) Zone. This is a second submittal for Final Review; on April 14, 2022, the DRB voted to "Return for Redesign".

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 involves the demolition and development of a new single-family dwelling.

Existing Property/Background

The project site is a 9,250 square-foot interior lot on the southwestern side of Old Phillips Road, located in the R1R-II (Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II) Zone. The rectangular lot has a relatively flat terrain and was originally developed in 1967 with a one-story, 2,243 square-foot, single-family house and an attached two-car garage designed in the Mansard/Hollywood Regency style.

A Historical Evaluation was prepared for the property by Sapphos Environmental, Inc., dated January 21, 2022 (Attachment #8). The evaluation concluded that the existing building does not meet any criteria for designation at the national, state, or local level. The existing building is not a distinctive or exemplary representative of its architectural style, type, or period, and no evidence was found indicating the site is associated with important events or people in history. Therefore, the property does not appear to meet any criteria

for listing on any National, State, or local register for historic resources, and is not considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

On August 6, 2020, Building Permit No. BB2008158 was issued for an interior remodel and 680 square-foot addition (95 square-foot front porch enclosure visible from the street and 585 square-foot addition at the rear) to the existing dwelling. This project was exempt from DRB. During the construction process, the project exceeded the permitted scope of work which resulted in demolition of more than 50% of outside wall and roof area and the property owner was required to file for DRB review for a new single-family residence. In accordance with GMC 30.60.040, as a new residence, all non-conforming rights (e.g., setbacks, parking, etc.) are forfeited and the project must comply with all development standards for a new single-family residence in the R1R zone. Currently, the dwelling has been demolished and the new house has been partially framed. The project does not include any new grading and will comply with all current Zoning Code requirements and the City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines.

Staff Recommendation

Approve with Conditions

Last Date Reviewed / Decision

This project was last reviewed by the DRB on April 14, 2022. Decision: Return for Redesign with conditions. Vote: 4-0 (1 absent). The Record of Decision and project plans are included with this report as Attachment #3.

Zone: RIR 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.

Site Slope and Grading

None proposed.

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	17,132 sq. ft.	7,830 sq. ft. – 54,014 sq. ft.	9,250 sq. ft.
Setback	27 ft.	15 ft. – 100 ft.	15 ft. 4 in.
House size	2,483 sq. ft.	1,550 sq. ft. – 3,846 sq. ft.	3,499 sq. ft.
Floor Area Ratio	0.14	0.03 – 0.36	0.38
Number of stories	10 homes are 1-story & 3 homes are 2-stories	1 to 2-stories	2-stories

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

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:

- Overall, the project site planning remains relatively unchanged with the new building footprint sited on the lot similarly to the previous condition. The proposed building footprint complies with all zoning regulations, including setbacks, parking, and landscaping.
- The surrounding neighborhood features primarily attached two-car garages that directly face the street. The new attached, two-car garage will be consistent with this neighborhood pattern, with access taken from the existing curb cut.
- The driveway will be modified to accommodate the required interior setback of the entire dwelling.
- The landscaping plan features new drought tolerant landscaping and the plant palette is complementary to the development of the site and complies with the minimum landscaping requirements for the zone.
- There is an existing retaining wall that is approximately three feet tall and located in the rear yard area that the applicant will have to legalize as part of the building permit process. Extending the height of this existing wall is also part of the applicant's request, and it will have an overall height of approximately five feet. The plans identify that the block wall will be finished with a stone veneer.

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

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

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:

- Overall, the mass and scale of the redesigned two-story project is appropriate to the contemporary design concept and the neighborhood context.
- The predominant neighborhood pattern consists of one-story homes with a few two-story homes scattered among them. The project site is located between a one-story, single family home to the northeast (left) and a two-story, single-family home to the southwest (right).
- The project’s massing is broken up using a number of architectural devices, including changes in façade planes, varied roof heights, and upper-floor setbacks.
 - The location of the second floor is integrated into the overall design and has shifted towards the center of the house, resulting in significant setbacks at the second-floor along the visible façades (street-front and side elevations).
- The design features a hipped-roof design that complements the contemporary style of the residence and the use of a 3.5:12 roof pitch is consistent throughout.

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
- ☐ Appropriate solid/void relationships

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 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:

- The surrounding neighborhood features a mix of architectural styles and the proposed style, materials, and color palette are appropriate and will add to the eclectic mix of architectural styles in the area.
- The proposed entryway has been redesigned to address the board’s conditions and is appropriately integrated into the design with a covered porch, and entry doors that are setback from the street. The column pier heights have also been reduced, creating a less heavy appearance.
- The front doors are depicted as steel with geometric scoring patterns and vertical lights with textured glass.
- The new windows will be black, fiberglass, nail on frames with recessed placement. They will be an appropriate combination of casement, fixed, slider, and awning windows with stucco sills.
- The project has been redesigned to feature a 217 square-foot second-floor balcony at the rear (north elevation) that is open to the sky. The original design featured a balcony at the street-front and a larger balcony at the rear. The minimal design of the balcony complements the overall style of the new dwelling and is well-integrated.
- The proposed materials include light-colored smooth stucco, manufactured stone veneer cladding, and slate roof tiles, which are suitable for the proposed design.

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

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

Conditions from DRB meeting on April 14, 2022 (Case No. PDR 2111714):

- 1. Reduce the height of the roof at the entry porch to align its fascia with that of the one-story portion of the house. Lower the front door height correspondingly.**

The height of the entry porch was lowered by one foot and the fascia is aligned with the one-story portion of the house. The column pier heights have also been reduced. The height of the front door was reduced from nine feet to eight feet.

- 2. Restudy the design of the stair tower area at the front façade, possible creating a break between the first and second levels, revising the window pattern and/or shifting the location of the stairs, to provide better integration of the two sides of the primary façades.**

The stairs have been relocated so that they are within the interior space of the house, and setback from the street-façade. This relocation has resulted in the omission of the stair tower from the design, and at the second floor there is now a break between the two levels.

- 3. Shift the second floor mass to the southwest to soften the overall building mass and provide some massing relief to the adjoining property.**

The second floor has shifted towards the center of the house, and the layout has been modified. The new second floor features significant setbacks along the building façades to provide massing relief. The second-floor setbacks range from 19'-3" to 23'-2" along the westerly interior property line that is shared with the adjoining property (1751 Royal Boulevard). In the original proposal, the second-floor massing was located much closer to this adjoining property and with minimal upper-floor setbacks.

- 4. Revise the roof design to create better integrated roof forms, particularly at the stair tower, second level, and the entry to avoid the appearance of multiple independent roof forms. This may, at least in part, be accomplished through the implementation of conditions 1 to 3.**

The revised design has implemented the first three conditions by lowering the entry porch height, relocating the stairs, and shifting the second floor away from the adjacent neighbor and providing upper floor setbacks. Also see responses to conditions 1 thru 3 above.

- 5. That the driveway and entry walkway be repaved with a decorative material consistent with the design, with consideration given to a permeable paving materials.**

The plans have been revised so that the driveway and entry walkway feature a decorative paving material. The proposed material satisfies this condition, and the gray blend color proposed is appropriate.

- 6. Revise the balcony railing designs to be more compatible with the traditional features of the design.**

The design of the balcony railings remains the same as the original proposal which featured a balcony along the street-front elevation and a larger balcony towards the rear. The revised project has omitted the balcony at the front of the building that directly faces the street, and the balcony in the rear yard has been significantly reduced in size. Based on the discussion during the last hearing this condition was related to architectural compatibility for the project's visible features. Maintaining the same railing design is acceptable because the rear balcony will have limited, if any, visibility from the public right-of-way.

7. Clarify the final design of the front doors. If they will not be simple single-light glazed doors, drawings and/or cut sheets must be submitted for staff review and approval.

The design of the front doors has been clarified for the redesigned project. They are depicted as steel double-doors with geometric scoring patterns and vertical lights with textured glass. The applicant has included product imagery with the submitted material board, included with the project plans (Attachment #1). The proposed design of the entry doors is appropriate to the contemporary style of the new residence.

8. Use opaque, non-reflective panels at the garage door.

The garage door has been redesigned to omit the reflective panels, and now features frosted glass panels.

9. Eliminate or significantly reduce the size of the second-floor balcony at the rear façade from the proposal and redesign it to enhance privacy of adjacent properties. Applicant is to provide with the resubmittal for the board's review sight line studies, site section drawings, and photos that illustrate the potential privacy impacts of the front and rear balconies at the second floor.

The project has been redesigned to omit the front balcony entirely, and the rear balcony has been reduced in size by 188 square-feet. The original proposal featured a 405 square-foot balcony that extended the majority of the length of the rear façade. The current proposal features a 217 square-foot balcony to be accessed from one of the bedrooms. Additionally, to address the concern related to potential privacy impacts, the drawings have been revised to include site section drawings, photos, and a sight line study for the DRB to consider.

10. Indicate exterior lighting locations on the elevation drawings and provide cut sheets of the proposed fixtures for staff review and approval. Avoid over-lighting the building façades and specify fixtures that will avoid light spillover onto adjoining properties.

The elevation drawings identify the locations of the exterior light fixtures, and the applicant has provided product imagery illustrating the proposed design for the new wall sconces. The design and placement of the light fixtures is appropriate to the overall design and based off the fixture and quantity it is not anticipated that there will be any light spillover onto adjoining properties.

11. Work with Building and Safety and Planning staff to obtain all necessary permits and approvals to legalize, modify, or rebuild the existing unpermitted retaining wall at the rear of the property.

The drawings have been identified to show the location of the existing wall, as well as a proposed height extension for this wall. During the plan check process, the applicant will work with Planning and Building and Safety staff to obtain the necessary approvals and applicable permits.

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

Conditions

None.

Attachments

1. Reduced Plans for Current Proposal
2. Applicant's Write-up for Current Proposal
3. Record of Decision and Reduced Plans – April 14, 2022 DRB Meeting
The staff report and exhibits are available online, Item 7c:
<https://glendaleca.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?meetingTemplateId=32690>
4. Photos of Existing Property
5. Location Map
6. Neighborhood Survey
7. Departmental Comments
8. Historic Evaluation, dated January 21, 2022
9. Correspondence