glendale california

City of Glendale
Community Development
Planning & Neighborhood Services

633 E. Broadway, Room 103
Glendale, CA 91206-4311
Tel 818.548.2140 Tel 818.548.2115
Fax 818.240.0392 ci.glendale.ca.us

August 21, 2015

Aram Alajajian
Alajajian – Marcoosi Architects
320 West Arden Avenue - Suite 120
Glendale, CA 91203

RE: 1100-1108 NORTH BRAND BOULEVARD
VARIANCE CASE NO. PVAR 1504277

Dear Mr. Alajajian:

On July 15, 2015, the Planning Hearing Officer conducted and closed a public hearing, pursuant to the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.43, on your application for variances to allow for the construction of a new five-story mixed use project consisting of eighteen (18) residential dwelling units (seven 2-bedroom and 11 3-bedroom units), 3,000 square feet of restaurant space on the ground floor, and 81 on-site parking spaces on a 15,500 square-foot corner lot, zoned C3. Per GMC 30.12.020, multiple residential dwelling units are permitted in the C3 zone in compliance with the R-1250 development standards; the project requires approval of variances to allow for an increase in height, number of stories, density, floor area ratio, and lot coverage, and a reduction in setbacks and additional open space for the residential portion of the project, located at **1100-1108 NORTH BRAND BOULEVARD,** in the "C3" - (Height District III) – Commercial Service Zone, described as Lots 4 and 5 of Sobey Tract, in the City of Glendale, County of Los Angeles.

<u>CODE REQUIRES</u>
<u>(the following R-1250 standards for residential development in the C3 zone)</u>

(1) Height: Maximum of 3 stories and a maximum of 36 feet.
(2) Density: One dwelling unit for each 1,250 SF of lot area, except for lots having a width of 90 feet or greater, where there shall not be more than one dwelling unit for each 1,000 SF of lot area.
(3) FAR: 1.2 maximum floor area ratio allowed.
(4) Lot coverage: 50% maximum lot coverage allowed.

(5) Setbacks
   a. Front Street: 23' minimum and 26' average for the second and third residential floors;
   b. Street Side: 8' minimum and 11' average for the second residential floor and 11' minimum and 14' average for the third residential floor;
   c. Interior: 8' minimum and 11' average for the second residential floor and 11' minimum and 14' average for the third residential floor.

(6) Additional Open Space: On a lot with a minimum of 90' and with a density exceeding the maximum density permitted by code, an additional 900 SF open space area shall be provided contiguous to a street front/side setback area, with additional 3' setbacks for the second and 6' setbacks for the third residential floors above this additional open space area (GMC 30.31.020.7).

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

(1) Height: 5 stories and 62 feet in overall height.
(2) Density: 18 units are proposed.
(3) FAR: 1.9 proposed.
(4) Lot Coverage: 85% proposed.

(5) Setbacks
   a. Front Street: 4" minimum and 2'-7" average for the 2nd, 3rd (and 4th) residential floors;
   b. Street Side: 3" minimum and 4'-½" average for the 2nd, 3rd (and 4th) residential floors;
   c. Interior: 1" minimum and 4'-¾" average for the 2nd, 3rd (and 4th) residential floor.

(6) Additional Open Space: No additional open space contiguous to the street and no additional setbacks on the residential floors above are proposed.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Planning Division, after having conducted an Initial Study identified above, has prepared a Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project

The environmental document has been considered, but has not been adopted because environmental review is not applicable when a project is denied.

REQUIRED/MANDATED FINDINGS

After thorough consideration of the statements contained in the application, the plans submitted therewith, the report by the Community Development Department staff thereon, and the statements made at the public hearing with respect to this application, the Planning Hearing Officer was unable to make the required findings

to grant the requested variances primarily because this mixed use project on a regularly-shaped lot is oversize for the zone and the design is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and has **DENIED** your application based on the following:

Findings are provided for each requested variance. The required variances are each identified by letter and are in bold. A summary of the findings for each requested variance are as follows:

A. That the strict application of the provisions of any such ordinance would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinances.

1. Height requested is 5 stories and 62 feet overall where the C3 III zone allows residential uses subject to the R-1250 standards that allow a maximum of 3 stories and a maximum of 36 feet in height (GMC Table 30.12-A and GMC Table 30.11-B).

   The applicant states that applying restrictive R-1250 standards to the mixed use project, rather than more permissive commercial standards is inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the C3 zone because a building with all commercial uses could have more stories, more height and fewer setbacks. The applicant also states that standards of the C3 zone are inadequate to allow mixed use development and contradict General Plan policy and the City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines which encourage mixed use development. The applicant states that strict application of C3 zone development standards block implementation of mixed use development policies, thereby creating practical difficulties and unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance.

   The General Plan Land Use Map designates the subject site Community Services Commercial not Mixed Use which is a different land use designation. The C3 zone implements the Community Services Commercial land use designation whereas Mixed Use is implemented by different zones. That a large-scale mixed use project such as the one proposed is permitted in areas designated Mixed Use or Downtown Specific Plan has no relevance to this project because this property carries a different land use designation and zoning. C3 III zone standards that incentivize commercial uses by allowing up to 90 feet height and up to 6 stories for commercial buildings, but do not incentivize residential or mixed uses by limiting allowable height and stories are consistent with the Community Services Commercial designation on this property. It is the very purpose and function of zoning to provide meaningful differentiation in development standards among zones in order to implement different General Plan land use designations. Providing standards that incentivize commercial construction does not create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship if an

applicant choses to pursue a mixed use or residential development where similar incentives are not provided.

The applicant states that standards of the C3 zone prohibit the development of mixed use projects without the granting of variances and that creates an unnecessary hardship. The Commercial Districts and Permit Requirements table (GMC Table 30-12 –A) allows "multiple residential dwellings subject to the provisions of the R-1250 Zone and provided further that the ground floor level is occupied with permitted commercial uses." While the words "mixed use" do not appear in this table, the zoning code defines mixed use development as a combination of uses which include dwelling units with other uses, where the dwelling units are above the other uses. Under the rules of interpretation (GMC 30.03.030) where any portion of this title imposes a greater restriction or regulation on buildings or uses, the most restrictive provisions shall apply. Thus, C3 zone standards are consistent with the intent of the C3 zone to allow modest mixed use development in areas designated Community Services Commercial at a lower density, height, and number of stories than commercial development. More intensive mixed use development is allowed in areas of the City designated Mixed Use where taller mixed use projects with higher densities, such as this one, are anticipated and encouraged by the General Plan.

At the public hearing the applicant stated that C3 zone III height limits of 90 feet and 6 stories demonstrate Council's intent for the 1100 block of North Brand to serve as an extension of downtown, because the C3 III allows for the most intensive commercial development outside of downtown. The Community Services Commercial land use designation and C3 III zone affirm that it is the intent to encourage larger commercial buildings for commercial uses in the 1100 block of North Brand, but not similarly sized mixed use buildings. Testimony from several residents stated that Council confirmed that Downtown Glendale would stop at Glenoaks Boulevard. Since the northern boundary of the Downtown Specific Plan ends at Glenoaks Boulevard and does not include the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard, the subject site was not intended to be subject to DSP standards, including those for height, density and mixed uses. The Downtown Specific Plan itself (Goal 1.1.10) states that growth is to be concentrated downtown in order to relieve development pressures on existing residential neighborhoods outside downtown. Although the C3 III zone does permit taller commercial structures with more stories than other permitted uses in the C3 III zone, proximity to the DSP area does not set a precedent for, nor support additional height or floors to accommodate expanded development outside the DSP. The goal of focusing dense development in the DSP is to prevent similarly sized developments from occurring outside the DSP and affecting residential neighborhoods such as this one, a situation that many at the public hearing referred to as "development creep".

The applicant states that the existing 4-story commercial building, 5-story commercial building and 9-story Verdugo Towers on the west side of the 1100

block of North Brand Boulevard, as well as variances granted to mixed use buildings elsewhere in the City set a precedent for allowing additional height and stories for a mixed use building on this property. The subject property and all the properties adjacent to it on the east side of the 1100 block of North Brand are zoned C3 III and are regularly-shaped rectangular lots developed with commercial and residential uses with 3-stories or less. The 1100 block of North Maryland that borders the subject property to the east is zoned R-1250 and is developed with various multiple family residential uses at or less than 3-stories where 3-stories are permissible. The 4- and 5-story commercial buildings on the west side of the 1100 block of North Brand are code-compliant commercial buildings for height and stories and does not set a precedent for mixed use buildings.

The 1960s 9-story mixed-use building (Verdugo Towers) does not set a precedent for new mixed use buildings in the C3 zone because this building is non-conforming for height and stories. The Verdugo Towers was approved in the 1960s under C3 zone standards, but subsequently Council amended C3 zoning to the current code that limits allowable heights and stories for new residential and mixed use projects. The applicant states in his application that "one of the justifications for the increase in height and stories is related to good urban planning principles, which encourage denser, taller buildings to be located on street corners," but the applicant does not identify where such a principle advocates deviation from zoning or neighborhood compatibility.

At the hearing the applicant cited taller church towers, spires and crosses in the 1000-1100 blocks of North Brand as precedent supporting taller structures, but these are incidental architectural features on otherwise low-scale buildings. These architectural features have little mass, little or no floor area and do not set a precedent for additional height, floors and building mass across an entire lot, or in this case two lots. Mixed use developments on Isabel St. and Colorado St. cited in the staff report as examples of mixed use projects with variances are miles from the subject site and therefore cannot properly serve as a basis for establishing compatibility with the neighborhood surrounding this project.

As noted in the Comprehensive Design Guidelines "managing mass and scale to respect adjacent development" is necessary for neighborhood compatibility (Mass and Scale 1.7.2). The statement of purpose for the C3 zone notes that commercial uses and building heights shall be restricted to assure compatibility with surrounding areas (GMC 30.12.010C). Testimony from neighborhood residents and property owners note that the excessive height and stories add inappropriate mass that is incompatible with the surrounding areas, particularly the commercial buildings and St. Marks Church on Brand Blvd. south of Dryden St. and the residential neighborhood directly east of the subject site. The proposed additional two stories and 26 foot height above the permitted maximum in the zone are inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the C3 zone to restrict building heights to assure compatibility with surrounding areas and also with

direction provided in the Comprehensive Design Guidelines for considering how mass and scale should relate appropriately to the overall scale of the neighborhood, street and adjacent buildings. Design guidelines encourage a corner presence that is compatible from both streets (Street Frontage 1.6.6) and the applicant has not established that compliance with this guideline creates a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship justifying two additional floors and 26 additional feet in height. For the reasons stated above, the strict application of the provisions of the C3 III zone would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance. The strict application of the provisions of the zoning ordinance will not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship for the applicant that are inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance. There is nothing about the applicant's property that places it at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other properties in the same zoning district or neighborhood. There do not exist physical disparities between this property and others in the zone that warrant granting the requested variances, which variance if granted will amount to a development privilege as opposed to allowing the property to enjoy the same benefits as others in the zone.

2. Density requested is 18 units where 15 units are permitted on lots having a width of 90 feet or greater on the 15,500 square foot lot, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The applicant stated that this area carries the C3 III zoning that allows commercial uses up to 90 feet and 6 stories because this block is in proximity to downtown where higher density mixed use is permitted. The applicant stated that a hardship is created by the code because C3 III standards for mixed uses are more restrictive than for commercial uses and "the design and concept for this building were derived from following the spirt of the Mixed Use development standards adopted by the City Council - in other urban areas". The applicant stated that the density of 18 units, instead of 15 units, is a minor increase and is also appropriate for the location and for a mixed use project due to the proximity to the Downtown area where mixed uses are permitted based on floor area maximums within a building envelope. However, this project is not located Downtown and DSP zoning standards do not apply to this property or surrounding ones.

   Zoning establishes different standards for various uses in order to implement the General Plan. The C3 III zone implements the Community Services Commercial land use designation and incentivizes commercial development with additional height and stories for commercial uses, but limits residential and mixed use densities because those uses are encouraged in other zones. The Commercial Districts and Permit Requirements table (GMC Table 30-12 –A) allows "multiple residential dwellings subject to the provisions of the R-1250 Zone and provided further than the ground floor level is occupied with permitted commercial uses." Thus, it is the intent and purpose of the C3 zone to limit buildings with residential uses to R-1250 standards, regardless of height district. With 15,500 square feet

and over 90 feet of frontage, this site has a maximum density of 15 units with the density bonus for lot width. The density bonus for lot width also requires compliance with additional open space and setback requirements. The requested 18 units are 3 units above the maximum density with the density bonus for lot width.

To grant higher densities for mixed use buildings on this site would be contrary to the intent of the C3 III zone because it would reduce the incentive to build commercial uses and would allow for an expansion of mixed use development into areas that were expressly not designated for it. The project requests several variances including additional height, stories and FAR which create an oversized building for the allowable residential density. The applicant has not provided evidence why the strict application of the density requirements of the C3 zone causes an unnecessary hardship or practical difficulty inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the code. The hardship stated by the applicant is not created by the strict application of the zoning requirements, or physical constraints of the lot, but is created by the building design. The variance for additional height and stories would be unnecessary were variances not also requested for height, stories and FAR. Therefore, the strict application of the provisions of any such ordinance requiring compliance with R-1250 density would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinances.

3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requested is 1.9 FAR where a maximum FAR of 1.2 is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   While the C3 III zone has no FAR standards, the proposed multiple residential units in this project are subject to an FAR of 1.2, consistent with FAR requirements in the R-1250 zone. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow four stories of residential uses, where the code limits projects with residential uses to three stories. If the applicant complied with the code and constructed three stories (first story commercial and two stories residential), then the FAR for the residential portion would be 1.15 FAR based on two residential floors and would be code compliant. This hardship is created by the design of the project which exceeds the code standards and would be unnecessary were variances not also requested for height and stories. Therefore, the strict application of the provisions of the zoning code would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinances.

4. Lot coverage of 85% is requested where the maximum lot coverage of 50% is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The applicant is requesting lot coverage of 85% on this regularly shaped lot with frontage on Brand Boulevard and Dryden. There is no lot coverage standard for commercial uses and the maximum lot coverage for residential uses is 50% in the C3 zone. The 50% lot coverage standard may provide a practical difficulty

and unnecessary hardship for mixed use development in general because the ground floor use is commercial which would have no minimum lot coverage were residential units not provided on upper floors. However, a variance for lot coverage has to be considered in light of the entire mixed use development proposal, including variance requests for additional height, stories, FAR, setbacks, density and open space. Were the applicant to comply with density bonus requirements (1 unit per 1,000 sf of lot area) and provide the required open space to receive the density bonus units, then there may be no need to grant a variance for up to 85% lot coverage. The applicant has not proven that the variance for lot coverage is not the result of other variances requested for the design, nor has the applicant proven that a lot coverage of 85% is the minimum necessary to comply with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance. Therefore, the applicant has not demonstrated that the strict application of provisions of any such ordinance would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinances related to lot coverage.

5. Residential Setback Requests
    a. Street front setback 4-inches minimum and 2 feet 7 inches average for the second, third, and fourth residential floors is requested where a street front setback of 23 feet minimum and 26 feet average is required for the second and third residential floors, subject to R-1250 standards.
    b. Street side setback 3-inches minimum and 4 feet 6-inch average for the second, third, and fourth residential floors is requested where a street side setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet averages is required for the second residential floor and an 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.
    c. Interior setback of 1-inch minimum and 4.75-inch average for the second and third, and fourth residential floors is requested where an interior setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet average for the second residential floor and 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.

The strict application of street front setbacks, street side setbacks and interior setbacks for the second, third and fourth residential floors would result in no practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance. Setbacks are not identified in R-1250 standards above the third story because three stories are the maximum number of stories permitted. However, application of street front, street side and interior setbacks to the fourth residential floor would be consistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance. This property is regularly shaped, as are surrounding lots on North Brand Boulevard and Maryland Avenue, and there are no unique lot characteristics that limit the property from compliance with code-required street front or street side setbacks for the second, third and fourth residential floors.

6. No additional open space contiguous to the street and no additional setbacks on the residential floors above are proposed where a lot with a minimum of 90 feet width and with a density exceeding the maximum density permitted by code [15 units] is required to provide an additional 900 square feet of open space area contiguous to a street front/side setback area, with an additional three foot setback for the second and six foot setback for the third residential floors above this additional open space area. (GMC 30.31.020.7)

   The strict application of code requirements for additional open space adjacent to the street and on the second and third floors would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the ordinances. The requirement for additional open space is the result of the applicant's request for a density bonus and is, therefore, a self-induced hardship.

B. That there are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood.

1. Height requested is 5 stories and 62 feet overall where the C3 zone allows residential uses subject to the R-1250 standards that allow a maximum of 3 stories and a maximum of 36 feet in height (GMC Table 30.12-A and GMC Table 30.11-B).

   The subject property is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand Blvd. As noted in Finding A, surrounding residential and commercial uses are 3-stories or less and other taller structures on the west side 1100 block of North Brand do not set a precedent for additional height and stories. That the subject property is a corner lot is not an exceptional circumstance or condition since every street intersection in the city has corner lots. There are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended mixed use development of the property that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood.

2. Density requested is 18 units where 15 units are permitted on lots having a width of 90 feet or greater on the 15,500 square foot lot, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand. The lot does have over 90 feet of frontage. There are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property in the C3 III zone related to providing additional density that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood. As established in Finding A, proximity to the Downtown Specific Plan area does not establish a precedent for additional density. Likewise, mixed use development standards in areas

designated Mixed Use in the General Plan do not establish a precedent for similar-sized, over-density mixed uses in areas designated Community Services Commercial, such as the subject property, where lower density mixed uses are permitted to the maximum allowable R-1250 density or to the maximum allowable with a lot density bonus where additional open space and setbacks are provided.

3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requested is 1.9 FAR where a maximum FAR of 1.2 is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand. The C3 III zone allows mixed use development at a modest scale which includes an FAR requirement of 1.2 per R-1250 standards. The applicant's request includes other standards variances for additional floors, height, density, reduced setbacks, and elimination of the open space requirement for density bonus and result in a building that is over FAR. One variance, or series of variances, is not justification for another. The applicant states the lot is unique because it is a corner lot. Flat, regularly shaped corner lots in the C3 zone exist throughout the City and in this neighborhood; they are not a unique condition or an exceptional circumstance. Accordingly, the granting of additional FAR for this project would result in an unfair benefit not applicable to other corner lots in the C3 III zone and the neighborhood. As described above and in Finding A, there are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that do not apply generally to other property in the same C3 III zone or neighborhood.

4. Lot coverage of 85% is requested where the maximum lot coverage of 50% is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand. The C3 III zone allows mixed use development at a modest scale which includes a maximum 50% lot coverage per R-1250 standards. While there is no lot coverage requirement for commercial uses, there is one applicable to all mixed use and residential development in C3 zones. The applicant states the lot is unique because it is a corner lot. Corner lots in the C3 zone exist throughout the City and in this neighborhood; they are not a unique condition or an exceptional circumstance justifying additional lot coverage. The granting of additional FAR for this project would result in an unfair benefit not applicable to other lots in the C3 III zone and the neighborhood. As described above and in Finding A, there are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other property in the same C3 III zone or neighborhood.

5. Residential Setback Requests
    a. Street front setback 4-inches minimum and 2 feet 7 inches average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where a street front setback of 23 feet minimum and 26 feet average is required for the second and third residential floors, subject to R-1250 standards.
    b. Street side setback 3-inches minimum and 4 feet 6-inch average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where a street side setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet averages is required for the second residential floor and an 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.
    c. Interior setback of 1-inch minimum and 4.75-inch average for the second, third, and fourth residential floors is requested where an interior setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet average for the second residential floor and 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.

The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard. There are no unique lot characteristics applicable to this property that limit the development from compliance with code-required street front and street side setbacks for the second, third and fourth residential floors. The applicant states the lot is unique because it is a corner lot. Corner lots in the C3 zone exist throughout the City and in this neighborhood; they are not a unique condition or an exceptional circumstance justifying reduced street front and street side setbacks. Verdugo Towers, another corner mixed use project in the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard at Stocker, does provide some setbacks for residential floors. The applicant failed to demonstrate why the subject site is different from other regularly-shaped C3 zone properties, including corner properties, and why the project could not also provide second, third and fourth residential story setbacks. There are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood that would affect the street front and street side setbacks for the second and third residential floors.

There is a three-story commercial building along the northerly property line which is a condition that may affect the proposed mixed use development. Maintaining a code-required interior setback for residential uses from the northern property line could be problematic because the neighboring use blocks opportunities for light and air. There is an exceptional circumstance or condition applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that does not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood that would affect the interior setback from the northerly property line.

6. No additional open space contiguous to the street and no additional setbacks on the residential floors above are proposed for a project on a lot with a minimum of 90 feet width and with a density exceeding the maximum density permitted by code [15 units] where an additional 900 square feet of open space area contiguous to a street front/side setback area, with an additional three foot setback for the second and six foot setback for the third residential floors above this additional open space area are required (GMC 30.31.020.7).

   The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontages, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard. There are no unique lot characteristics applicable to this property that limit the development from compliance with additional open space and additional setback requirements. There are no exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone or neighborhood. Any proposed residential use which includes additional density bonus units for lot frontage is subject to a requirement for additional open space contiguous with the street and additional setbacks from the open space. The applicant states the lot is unique because it is a corner lot. Corner lots in the C3 zone exist throughout the City and in this neighborhood; they are not a unique condition or an exceptional circumstance justifying elimination of the open space requirement and additional setbacks. As noted in testimony, St. Marks Church is developed on the opposite corner and provides open space and setbacks from North Brand Boulevard and Dryden Street. Therefore, provision of some open space along one or both streets would be consistent with this neighborhood. The applicant has not demonstrated why the open space and additional setbacks were not provided, although the requirement for such additional open space and setbacks is the result of the applicant's request for additional density bonus.

C. That the granting of the variance will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located.

1. Height requested is 5 stories and 62 feet overall where the C3 zone allows residential uses subject to the R-1250 standards that allow a maximum of three stories and a maximum of 36 feet in height (GMC Table 30.12-A and GMC Table 30.11-B).

   The applicant justified the variance request for additional height and stories by stating C3 III standards would allow a six-story, 90 foot tall commercial building on the project site. The applicant uses the C3 III standards as the basis for concluding that the proposed mixed use development will have a lesser height, number of stories and parking demand than the maximum potential for the site were a commercial building proposed. While this argument seems logical, the argument is based on a false premise and is an inappropriate comparison. The proper inquiry is not whether the project is better than an as-yet proposed

project, but whether the project will have negative impacts to the zone or surrounding neighborhood.

The project application says that the project will establish an identity for the area, encourage investment and enable residents to walk to local destinations, but that conclusion could be drawn for virtually any new project developed at the site. The existing restaurant already has an identity, and attracts patrons who walk to and from the site for meals. The applicant did not provide information about the differing nature of mixed use, rather than commercial use, and the impacts this mixed use project will have on the community. The applicant's powerpoint presentation at the public hearing showed various development scenarios for the property with code-compliant uses and compared parking differences. However, other than parking demand, the applicant did not demonstrate – as it is his burden to do - why the variance for a 62 foot height and 5 stories for the mixed use project would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in this zone and neighborhood, particularly in light of the fact that project as designed reduces code-required buffering elements such as setbacks, lot coverage and open space.

"In order to maintain the health, safety and general welfare and assure compatibility with surrounding areas, commercial uses and building heights shall be restricted and buffering techniques incorporated into the development design" in the C3 zone (GMC 30.12.010C). As noted in Finding A, surrounding residential and commercial uses are three stories or less and other taller structures on the west side 1100 block of North Brand do not set a precedent for additional height and stories for mixed use development because the four and five story buildings are commercial uses and the 1960s Verdugo Towers is non-conforming for height and stories. C3 zoning standards were modified after construction of the Verdugo Towers to present standards for mixed use with allowable height and stories based on the R-1250 zone.

The testimony from the Rossmoyne Homeowners Association, from a number of neighboring residents and from some property owners expressed concern that the proposed 62 foot height, massing of five stories directly adjacent to the street, lack of street setbacks on upper floors, additional residential density and floor area, and lack of open space along the street front make the scale of this mixed use project incompatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood and the existing lower scale development on the east side of the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard. In contrast, the applicant's testimony about impacts of height and stories focused on how the proposed mixed use project would not have exceeded development standards if this was a commercial building, how the mixed use building is similar to standards used for other mixed use buildings elsewhere in the City, and how future residents in the building would experience the neighborhood. Neighbors expressed concern about how the project would be detrimental or injurious to the immediate neighborhood due to the added height and stories and lack of setback which create privacy issues. Further the

neighbors expressed concern about the project's lack of transition between a commercial and residential neighborhood, the lack of on-street parking, lack of neighborhood compatibility because of the building massing along the street frontages. The applicant did not provide substantial evidence addressing these concerns and showing how the project would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the immediate neighborhood due to these concerns.

Many comments made at the hearing and in correspondence expressed concern that this project is an extension of downtown development. The applicant's argument states proximity to downtown is justification for creating a project "in the spirit of the Mixed Use development standards" adopted elsewhere by Council. The General Plan designation of the property is Community Services Commercial and not DSP or Mixed Use which allow for higher density mixed use development. Testimony at the hearing and correspondence received noted the proposal is outside the borders of the DSP and the project is inconsistent with DSP Goal 1.1.10 to reduce development pressures in residential neighborhoods outside the DSP, such as this one. Thus, the applicant was unable to prove how granting a variance for 5 stories and 62 feet would not have the potential to be materially detrimental to the public or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood where the property is located.

2. Density requested is 18 units where 15 units are permitted on lots having a width of 90 feet or greater on the 15,500 square foot lot, subject to R-1250 standards.

   With 15,500 square feet and over 90 feet of frontage, this site has a maximum density of 15 units with the density bonus for lot width, while the applicant is proposing 18 units. The applicant stated that a larger building could be constructed for commercial uses and in his application makes the argument that the project's density should be considered in light of the potential "building envelope" for a commercial building such as that used in the DSP for mixed use projects. As noted above, this is an inappropriate comparison based on a false premise that the project should be compared against the DSP zoning envelop instead of the existing applicable zoning requirements. The applicant also notes that the additional density would fit within the "building envelope" and would not increase mass and scale of the project. However, the "Building Envelope envisioned for the project" identified by the applicant is imaginary. Consideration of a density variance must be based on the R-1250 density standards applicable in the C3 zone, with additional density for lot width available if additional open space and setbacks are provided. A statement that the additional units could be placed within a building footprint smaller than one which could be allowed by code were this a commercial building sets up a false comparison that avoids addressing why exceeding permitted density in the zone would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the neighborhood. See Finding A.

Testimony received from neighbors shows a concern with "development creep", characterized in part by increasing densities and larger buildings adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Residents expressed concern that the density of the mixed use development would impact the character of their neighborhood which is predominately low scale with three stories or less, with residential uses set back with a landscaped buffer from the street edge. The character of commercial development on the east side of the 1100 block of North Brand is similarly low scale with all buildings at or less than three stories, many with landscaping along the Brand street edge. Compliance with R-1250 density would reduce the requested additional floors, height and other requested variances and be compatible with existing development on surrounding lots. The applicant stated in his application that the additional density could be accommodated without an impact to mass and scale. However, at 62 feet in height where a 36 foot maximum is permitted and 5 stories instead of the 3 allowed by code the design of the project nearly doubles the allowable mass and scale to accommodate the increased density. The impact of additional density upon mass and scale is multiplied by other variance requests necessary to accommodate it, such as elimination of open space on the street, elimination of street front and street side setbacks for residential floors, elimination of setbacks from required open space and increased FAR. The applicant noted that parking would be provided for all 18 residential units, but has not proven that other impacts to the building design to accommodate the increased density and resulting increase to mass and scale would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the surrounding neighborhood.

The applicant stated that 18 units (a 35% density bonus) would be allowable and would have a lesser parking requirement than if the project were affordable. Again, the applicant is using a false comparison; the analysis of impacts should be based on an examination of project variances from existing zoning standards, not a comparison with a hypothetical affordable housing project. While the applicant's presentation implied that the City would approve a similar density and mixed use building design if this were an affordable housing project and that the affordable housing project would have fewer impacts, that implication is based on the false premise and is untrue. If a 35% density bonus for affordable housing was part of the entitlement request, the number of code variations requested exceeds the three concessions or incentives authorized by the state for affordable housing projects and any additional code variations may or may not be approved. For the reasons listed, the granting of the variance for additional density will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located.

3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requested is 1.9 FAR where a maximum FAR of 1.2 is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   Neighborhood testimony mentioned concerns that the proposed 1.9 FAR, resulting in part from the request for additional height and stories, and the design of the building were out-of-scale and incompatible with the surrounding residential uses and lower-scale commercial uses on the east side of 1100 North Brand Boulevard. FAR is traditionally used as a tool to control building mass in relationship to the size of the lot and surrounding development. As stated in Finding A, the applicant noted that taller steeples, towers and crosses exist in the neighborhood and stated that these taller features justify additional height and mass for this project. But, these architectural features are limited in mass and generally do not count toward FAR, unlike the additional floors, stories, and building square footage in this proposal. The FAR limit based on R-1250 standards is applicable for limiting the size of buildings with residential uses in and adjacent to the C3 zone. The applicant explained that larger building mass was desirable at the corner, but the Comprehensive Design Guidelines note that corner lots must be designed for compatibility with *both* streets which in this case feature lower scale development with less mass. Thus, the granting of the variance for additional FAR for this mixed use project design will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located because the project's requested FAR increase is incompatible with the existing neighborhood density.

4. Lot coverage of 85% is requested where the maximum lot coverage of 50% is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   The subject site serves as an entrance to the residential neighborhoods off Dryden Street, east of Brand Boulevard, which have landscaped street setbacks, as does St. Marks Church across the street from this project. As noted by residents during the hearing, the project's building mass focuses on the street edge, with no upper floor street and street side setbacks, thereby resulting in an urban feel that is unrelieved by open space and landscaping, except for small planters. The increased lot coverage only allows for limited landscaped planters along the street edge for the restaurant and by the driveway and parking lot. Additional landscaped open space could be provided if a variance was not also requested to eliminate open space along the street edge. The increase in lot coverage intensifies the incompatibility of the building with the neighborhood by giving the building a height and mass at the street edge that is more appropriate for downtown development, not as a building that transitions between commercial and residential uses and commercial and residential neighborhoods. Increased lot coverage reduces opportunities for open space, landscaping and setbacks to soften the street edge, to define entrances to the residential neighborhood, and to promote neighborhood compatibility. Rather, increased lot coverage runs counter to the purpose of C3 zoning regulations to provide buffering for neighborhood compatibility. Therefore, the granting of the variance

for lot coverage will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located.

5. Residential Setback Requests:
    a. Street front setback 4-inches minimum and 2 feet 7 inches average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where a street front setback of 23 feet minimum and 26 feet average is required for the second and third residential floors, subject to R-1250 standards.
    b. Street side setback 3-inches minimum and 4 feet 6-inch average for the second, third, and fourth residential floors is requested where a street side setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet averages is required for the second residential floor and an 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.
    c. Interior setback of 1-inch minimum and 4.75-inch average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where an interior setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet average for the second residential floor and 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.

The purpose of providing street front, street side and interior setbacks on the second and third residential floors is to ensure adequate light and air for future residents. No setbacks are established by the code above the third story because additional stories are not permitted in the R-1250 zone. Street front, street side and interior setbacks also reduce the mass of the building. Second- and third-story setbacks are designed to allow a building design that serves as a transition between neighboring uses. Granting the variance for street front, street side and interior setbacks on the second, third and fourth residential floors would allow greater massing at the street edge, which is a characteristic of higher density mixed use development in the DSP, and inconsistent with the current zone, the surrounding residential neighborhood and lower scale commercial development. The granting of the variance for street front setbacks, street side setbacks and interior setbacks for the second, third and fourth residential floors will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located because lack of setbacks intensifies the incompatibility of the building with the neighborhood by giving the building a mass at the street edge that is more appropriate for downtown development, not as a building that transitions between commercial and residential uses and commercial and residential neighborhoods. Lack of setbacks reduces privacy for neighboring residential and religious uses and eliminates an opportunity to plant trees or other large plants along the street edge, particularly on Dryden Street where street trees would complement similar landscaping on St Marks Church, buffer the proposed building and promote neighborhood compatibility.

6. No additional open space contiguous to the street and no additional setbacks on the residential floors above are proposed for a project on a lot with a minimum of 90 feet width and with a density exceeding the maximum density permitted by code [15 units], where an additional 900 square feet of open space area contiguous to a street front/side setback area, with an additional 3 foot setback for the second, and 6 foot setback for the third residential floors above this additional open space area are required (GMC 30.31.020.7).

   The site serves as an entrance to the residential neighborhoods off Dryden Street, east of Brand Boulevard, which have landscaped street setbacks, as does St. Marks Church across the street from this project. As noted by residents during the hearing and in correspondence, the mass of the building is essentially built out to the street property lines, creating an urban feel that is unrelieved by open space and landscaping and is inconsistent with neighboring development. The applicant has requested additional density for lot width which comes with a requirement for greater open space on the street and residential setbacks above it; but does not want to provide the additional open space. The requirement for additional landscaped open space adjacent to the street edge is to offset the impact to the neighborhood from the reduced setbacks, additional height, and additional stories necessary to accommodate the density increase. Additional open space at the street edge, along with landscaping and setbacks are some traditional methods for buffering new development from existing neighborhoods. These buffering requirements are particularly important to incorporate into this design in light of the other requested variances for increased height, stories and FAR in order to prevent erecting a structure that is incompatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood and religious use. Therefore, granting of the variance for lot coverage will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or neighborhood in which the property is located.

D. That the granting of the variance will be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

1. Height requested is 5 stories and 62 feet overall where the C3 zone allows residential uses subject to the R-1250 standards that allow a maximum of 3 stories and a maximum of 36 feet in height (GMC Table 30.12-A and GMC Table 30.11-B).

   The purpose for granting a variance is to assure that no property, because of the special circumstances applicable to it, shall be deprived of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone and vicinity. The subject property is comprised of two regularly-shaped lots in the C3 III zone and both lots have street access, same as other commercial and residential lots in the surrounding neighborhood. The applicant states that a special circumstance for this property is that it is a corner lot; however, corner lots in the C3 zone exist citywide, including several on the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard, so that is not a special circumstance applicable to this property.

The applicant states that the C3 III height district permits taller commercial structures with up to 6 stories and that it would be consistent with the intent of the code to permit taller mixed use structures like the one proposed. As stated in Finding A, just because an incentive for additional height and stories is provided for commercial office buildings in an area designated by the General Plan for Community Services Commercial uses does not mean that it is the intent of the General Plan or C3 zone to permit a similar incentive for mixed use development in that area. Land designated as Mixed Use and with mixed use zoning, not C3 zoning, is available elsewhere in the City. Likewise, proximity to the Downtown Specific Plan area that permits mixed use development does not confer additional building rights or assumptions on this property other than that conferred by the Community Services Commercial designation and C3 III zone. As stated in Finding A, the C3 zone does allow for mixed use development, but at a modest scale with a maximum height of 36 feet and 3 stories. The granting of the variance for 5 stories and 62 feet would convey a special privilege to this property that would not be enjoyed by other properties in the same zone and vicinity. Therefore, the granting of a variance for additional height and stories for this mixed use project would be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

2. Density requested is 18 units where 15 units are permitted on lots having a width of 90 feet or greater on the 15,500 square foot lot, subject to R-1250 standards.

   See Finding A. The Commercial Districts and Permit Requirements table (GMC Table 30-12 –A) allows "multiple residential dwellings subject to the provisions of the R-1250 Zone and provides further that the ground floor level is occupied with permitted commercial uses." Thus, it is consistent with the intent and purpose of the C3 III zone to limit any building with residential uses to R-1250 standards. With 15,500 square feet and over 90 feet of frontage located on two regularly-shaped lots with access on North Brand Boulevard and Dryden Street, this site has a maximum density of 15 units with the density bonus for lot width. The granting of a density bonus for lot width is predicated on a project also including additional open space along the street and additional residential setbacks on upper levels from that open space. The granting of higher densities for a mixed use building as requested would reduce the value of the C3 zone incentive to encourage new commercial office buildings and would attract larger mixed use development away from areas properly designated for it in the General Plan, such as in the DSP and the San Fernando Road Corridor. Additionally, granting of additional residential density would constitute a special privilege for this property that is not available to other property in the vicinity. Therefore, the variance for increasing density to 18 units, particularly in light of the requested elimination of the additional open space and setback requirements, is contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requested is 1.9 FAR where a maximum FAR of 1.2 is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   See Findings A, B and C. The granting of the variance for additional FAR will be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance because this is a regularly-shaped parcel and there are no special circumstances related to the property that are not applicable to other properties in the vicinity. As mentioned in other findings, there is nothing unique about a corner property in the C3 zone in the vicinity of this project. The C3 III zone has no FAR standards, but the proposed multiple residential units in this project are subject to an FAR of 1.2, consistent with FAR requirements in the R-1250 zone. Each variance is considered independently and is analyzed in light of the overall project, which in this case includes numerous variances. If the applicant complied with the code requirements for height and stories by limiting construction to three stories (first story commercial and two stories residential), then the FAR for the residential portion would be 1.15 FAR and would be code compliant. The applicant has stated that additional FAR is needed for the project, but has not demonstrated why the additional stories that exacerbate non-conformity with floor area limits are consistent with the intent of the ordinance. Also, the applicant has not demonstrated why a 1.9 FAR is the minimum additional FAR necessary to be consistent with the intent of the ordinance for this property, since the C3 zone does allow for modest mixed use development with a maximum 1.2 FAR. The granting of the variance for additional FAR for this project would constitute a special privilege for this property that is not generally available to surrounding properties in the C3 zone. Therefore, the variance for FAR is not consistent with the intent of the ordinance.

4. Lot coverage of 85% is requested where the maximum lot coverage of 50% is allowed, subject to R-1250 standards.

   See Findings A, B and C. The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontage, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand. The subject lot has no special characteristics compared to other C3 lots. C3 standards limit multiple residential projects and mixed use projects with residential units to a maximum lot coverage of 50% based on R-1250 standards, regardless of height district. The objective of limiting lot coverage for residential uses is to ensure opportunities for landscaping and open space while also limiting floor area of buildings with residential uses. The applicant has not demonstrated that there are special conditions on the subject property not applicable to others in the C3 zone or vicinity, nor how increasing lot coverage addresses the objectives of the ordinance. Contrary to the intent of a variance to ensure a development standard is applied equally to property with special characteristics, allowing additional lot coverage induces or supports other code deviations such as the elimination of open space and additional FAR, which is contrary to the objective of the ordinance. Therefore, the granting of additional lot coverage for this project would result in an unfair benefit not applicable to other lots in the C3 III zone and is contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

5. Residential Setback Requests
    a. Street front setback 4-inches minimum and 2 feet 7 inches average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where a street front setback of 23 feet minimum and 26 feet average is required for the second and third residential floors, subject to R-1250 standards.
    b. Street side setback 3-inches minimum and 4 feet 6-inch average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where a street side setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet averages is required for the second residential floor and an 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.
    c. Interior setback of 1-inch minimum and 4.75-inch average for the second, third and fourth residential floors is requested where an interior setback of 8 feet minimum and 11 feet average for the second residential floor and 11 foot minimum and 14 foot average is required for the third residential floor, subject to R-1250 standards.

The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontage, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard. There are no unique lot characteristics applicable to this property that limit the development from compliance with code-required street front, street side and interior setbacks for the second, third and fourth residential floors. The applicant states the lot is unique because it is a corner lot. Corner lots in the C3 zone exist throughout the City and in this neighborhood and are not a special circumstance for eliminating second and third floor street front and street side setbacks. Setback variances must be considered in light of the entire development proposal. The intent of code-required setback minimums and averages on residential floors is to ensure a building design has variations in the building plane, to vary massing of the structure, and to provide light and air for residential units. However, this design has nearly no residential setback from the street front and street side and puts the building mass at the street, contrary to the purpose of minimum setbacks and setback averaging. The applicant has not proven that the granting of setback variances is consistent with the intent of setback requirements for the residential floors.

The granting of the requested setback variances for this mixed use building will be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance because such a grant would enable an overlarge, mixed use project that is inconsistent with intent of the Community Services Commercial General Plan designation and contrary to the purpose of the C3 zone standards as described in Findings A, B and C. Granting setback variances would promote neighborhood incompatibility because the mixed use building is too tall, has too much massing along the street edge, has too many stories, is over density, has inadequate street setbacks for upper residential floors, and lacks adequate open space, landscaping and setbacks to adequately buffer surrounding residential and religious uses to ensure compatibility as stated by many speakers at the public hearing and in correspondence received. Therefore, the granting of a variance for street front, street side and interior setbacks will be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

6. No additional open space contiguous to the street and no additional setbacks on the residential floors above are proposed for a project on a lot with a minimum of 90 feet width and with a density exceeding the maximum density permitted by code [15 units], where an additional 900 square feet of open space area contiguous to a street front/side setback area, with an additional 3 foot setback for the second and 6 foot setback for the third residential floors above this additional open space area are required (GMC 30.31.020.7).

   See Findings A, B and C. The subject lot is zoned C3 III and has a regular shape, size and frontage, similar to other lots in the 1100 block of North Brand Boulevard. This requirement is based on the applicant's request for additional density. The objective for requiring additional landscaped open space is to balance the higher density of the project, to provide an amenity for residents, and placement of the open space at the street edge encourages compatibility of higher density residential and mixed use buildings with adjacent residential neighborhoods. C3 zones across the City are frequently located adjacent to multi-family residential zoning, as is the case with this proposal.

   The additional setbacks also increase opportunities for light and air for residents. The applicant has not explained why the elimination of open space and setbacks from the project is not contrary to the purpose of C3 zone standards which require incorporation of buffering techniques to assure compatibility with surrounding areas (GMC 30.12.010 C). Thus, granting a variance to eliminate open space along the street and eliminating setbacks from the open space would be contrary to the objectives of the ordinance.

SUMMARY

The Planning Hearing Officer was unable to make the required findings to grant the requested variances primarily because this mixed use project on a regularly-shaped lot is oversize for the zone and the design is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and has denied application.

The environmental document has been considered, but has not been adopted because environmental review is not applicable when a project is denied.

APPEAL PERIOD

Under the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.62, any person affected by the above decision has the right to appeal said decision to the Planning Commission if it is believed that the decision is in error or that

procedural errors have occurred, or if there is substantial new evidence which could not have been reasonably presented. It is strongly advised that appeals be filed early during the appeal period and in person so that imperfections/incompleteness may be corrected before the appeal period expires.

Any appeal must be filed on the prescribed forms within fifteen (15) days following the actual date of the decision. Information regarding appeals and appeal forms will be provided by the Permit Services Center (PSC) or the Community Development Department (COD) upon request and must be filed with the prescribed fee prior to expiration of the 15-day period, on or before **SEPTEMBER 8, 2015**, at the Permit Services Center (PSC), 633 East Broadway, Room 101, Monday thru Friday 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., or at the Community Development Department (COD), 633 East Broadway, Room 103, Monday thru Friday 12:00 p.m. to 5 p.m.

APPEAL FORMS available on-line: http://www.glendaleca.gov/appeals

To save you time and a trip - please note that some of our FORMS are available on-line and may be downloaded.

NOTICE – subsequent contacts with this office

The applicant is further advised that all subsequent contacts with this office regarding this determination must be with the Case Planner (*Vilia Zemaitaitis at 818-937-8154*) first and then, the Planning Hearing Officer who acted on this case. This would include clarification, verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished **By Appointment Only**, in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

Sincerely,

Laura Stotler

Laura Stotler
Planning Hearing Officer

LS:sm

CC: City Clerk (K.Cruz); Police Dept. (Lt.S.Bickle/Z.Avila); City Attorney's Dept. (G. van Muyden/Y.Neukian); Fire Prevention Engineering Section-(D.Nickles); Dir. Of Public Works (R.Golanian); Traffic & Transportation Section (W. Ko/S. Vartanian); General Manager for Glendale Water and

Power (S.Zurn); Glendale Water & Power--Water Section (G. Tom/S. Boghosian); Glendale Water & Power--Electric Section (V. Avedian/B. Ortiz); Parks, Recreation and Community Services Dept. (T. Aleksanian); Neighborhood Services Division (A. Jimenez); Integrated Waste Management Admin. (D. Hartwell); Maintenance Services Section Admin. (D. Hardgrove); Street and Field Services Admin.; Environmental Management (M. Oillataguerra); Rodney Khan-consultant on the project; sent to all who sent emails and letters; and case planner – Vilia Zemaitaitis.