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

October 26, 2015

Artem Golestian
Cenmill Inc.
1230 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205

RE: ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1520197
950 Burchett Street

Dear Mr. Golestian,

On August 5, 2015, the Director of Community Development, pursuant to the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.47, **APPROVED** your design review application to to add an 837 sq.ft. single-story addition (two new bedrooms, one bathroom and one recreation room) attached to the two-car garage on the street side of an existing 2,050 sq.ft., single-story house on an 11,650 sq.ft., corner lot in the R1 (FAR District I) zone, located at **950 Burchett Street**.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL

1. All new windows to have exterior grids only (no interior grids to be permitted). The sizes and proportions of the proposed windows facing the street shall be approved by staff.
2. The project is an addition to a single family house; it may not have a kitchen and may not be rented out (not a second dwelling unit). Such notations must be included on the permit plans.

SUMMARY OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT'S DECISION

Site Planning - The proposed site planning is appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 837 SF addition is located to the side of the existing, attached two-car garage and features the required street and interior setbacks.
- The house is larger than others in the immediate area, but its increased mass and larger building footprint are mitigated by the large corner lot, helping it remain compatible with adjoining and nearby properties.
- No changes to the garage or landscaped street setbacks are proposed.
- There are no changes proposed to the existing walls and fences on-site or along the perimeter.

Mass and Scale - The proposed massing and scale are appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The one-story addition is lower than the existing height of the one-story residence. The overall height remains at 14'-7", consistent with the scale of the surrounding one-story residences.
- The design of the addition's mansard roof is proposed to be complementary to the existing hipped roof design of the house, while being subordinate in terms of overall scale and massing.

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 addition has been designed to match and be complementary to the existing residence in terms of its design details, colors and materials (including stucco, laminate roof shingles and vinyl windows).
- The mansard roof will allow the addition to be compatible with the existing hipped roof forms and existing building height, while also disguising the flat roof from all vantage points.
- All new windows will be vinyl, nail-in windows to match the existing vinyl windows. The existing windows were approved with interior grids, while the new windows on the addition are conditioned to have exterior grids only (no interior grids will be permitted). The sizes and proportions of the windows facing the street shall be approved by staff.

This approval is for the project design only. Administrative Design Review approval of a project does not constitute compliance with the Zoning Code and/or Building Code requirements. Please refer to the end of this letter for information regarding plan check submittal. If there are any questions, please contact the case planner, Vilia Zemaitaitis, at 818-937-8154 or via email at VZemaitaitis@glendaleca.gov.

APPEAL PERIOD (effective date), TIME LIMIT, LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES, TIME EXTENSION

The applicant's attention is called to the fact that this grant is not a permit or license and that any permits and licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper City and public agency.

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 Design Review Board 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 (CDD) upon request and must be filed with the prescribed fee prior to expiration of the 15-day period, on or before **November 9, 2015** at the Permit Services Center (PSC), 633 East Broadway, Room 101, Monday thru Friday 7:00 am to 12:00 pm, or at the Community Development Department (CDD), 633 East Broadway, Room 103, Monday thru Friday 12:00 pm to 5 pm.

APPEAL FORMS available on-line: 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. AGENDAS and other NOTICES are also posted on our website. Visit us online.

TRANSFERABILITY

This authorization runs with the land or the use for which it was intended for and approved. In the event the property is to be leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them regarding the conditions and/or limitations of this grant.

EXTENSION: An extension of the design review approval may be requested one time and extended for up to a maximum of one (1) additional year upon receipt of a written request from the applicant and demonstration that a reasonable effort to act on such right and privilege has commenced within the two (2) years of the approval date. In granting such extension the applicable review authority shall make a written finding that neighborhood conditions have not substantially changed since the granting of the design review approval.

NOTICE – subsequent contacts with this office

The applicant is further advised that all subsequent contact with this office regarding this determination must be with the case planner, **Vilia Zemaitaitis**, who acted on this case. This would include clarification and 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.

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the decision, plans may be submitted for Building and Safety Division plan check. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, approved plans must be stamped approved by Planning Division staff. **Any** changes to the approved plans will require resubmittal of revised plans for approval. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, **all** changes to approved plans must be on file with the Planning Division.

An appointment must be made with the case planner, Vilia Zemaitaitis, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Vilia Zemaitaitis directly at 818-937-8154 or via email at VZemaitaitis@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME
Director of Community Development

Urban Design Studio Staff

TF:JP:vz

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

Meeting/Decision Date: October 12, 2015	**Address:** 950 Burchett Street
Review Authority: ☐DRB ☒ADR ☐HPC ☐CC	**APN:** 5628-034-039
Case Number: PDR 1520197	**Applicant:** Artem Golestian
Prepared By: Vilia Zemaitaitis, AICP	**Owner:** Norik Nazari and Michael Nazari

Project Summary
The applicant is proposing to add an 837 sq.ft. single-story addition (two new bedrooms, one bathroom and one recreation room) attached to the two-car garage on the street side of an existing 2,050 sq.ft., single-story house on an 11,650 sq.ft., corner lot in the R1 (FAR District I) zone. The addition will match the existing house in terms of architectural style and materials.

Existing Property/Background
The existing site is an irregularly-shaped, flat corner lot on the south-east corner of Pelanconi Avenue and Burchett Street. The existing one-story residence was originally constructed in 1948 and added to in 1963. The house is attached to the two-car garage facing Burchett Street by a breezeway. The applicant is proposing to maintain the existing house and garage footprint, and to add an 837 SF addition to side of the garage facing Burchett. Because the garage and addition are attached to the primary residence by the existing breezeway, the project is considered an expansion of the existing house. The residence is oriented towards Burchett Street, though by Code, Pelanconi Avenue is considered the front street and Burchett the side street. The house is currently setback approximately 25' from both Pelanconi Avenue and Burchett Street, and the new addition will also maintain a 25' setback from Burchett Street; this is in compliance with the special setback provision based on the original 1936 subdivision map applicable to this property.

Staff Recommendation
☐ Approve ☒ Approve with Conditions ☐ Return for Redesign ☐ Deny

---

Last Date Reviewed / Decision
☒ First time submittal for final review.
☐ Other:

Zone: R1 **FAR District:** II
Although this design review does not convey final zoning approval, the project has been reviewed for consistency with the applicable Codes and no inconsistencies have been identified.

Active/Pending Permits and Approvals
☒ None
☐ Other:

CEQA Status:
☒ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 1 "Existing Facilities" exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
☐ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 3 "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures" exemption pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
☐ Other:

Site Slope and Grading
☒ None proposed
☐ Less than 50% current average slope and less than 1500 cubic yards of earth movement (cut and/or fill); no additional review required.

☐ 1500 cubic yards or greater of earth movement:

☐ 50% or greater current average slope:

Comparison of Neighborhood Survey:

	Average of Properties within 300 linear feet of subject property	Range of Properties within 300 linear feet of subject property	Subject Property Proposal
Lot size	7,888 SF	6,535 - 12,860 SF	11,650 SF
Setback	24'	20 - 25'	25'
House size	1,544 SF	1,045 - 2,132 SF	2,887 SF
Floor Area Ratio	0.18	0.12 - 0.27	0.26
Number of stories	1	All 1-story	1

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
☐Equipment location and screening

Garage Location and Driveway

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐Predominant pattern on block
☐Compatible with primary structure
☐Permeable paving material
☐Decorative paving

No change to existing garage.

Landscape Design

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐Complementary to building design
☐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

Determination of Compatibility: Site Planning

The proposed site planning is appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 837 SF addition is located to the side of the existing, attached two-car garage and features the required street and interior setbacks.
- The house is larger than others in the immediate area, but its increased mass and larger building footprint are mitigated by the large corner lot, helping it remain compatible with adjoining and nearby properties.
- No changes to the garage or landscaped street setbacks are proposed.

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
☐Relates to predominant pattern
☐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:

- The one-story addition is lower than the existing height of the one-story residence. The overall height remains at 14'-7", consistent with the scale of the surrounding one-story residences.
- The design of the addition's mansard roof is proposed to be complementary to the existing hipped roof design of the house, while being subordinate in terms of overall scale and massing.

Design and Detailing

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

Overall Design and Detailing

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

Entryway

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐Well integrated into design

☐Avoids sense of monumentality

☐Design provides appropriate focal point

☐Doors appropriate to design

Windows

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☒ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐Appropriate to overall design

☒Placement appropriate to style

☐Recessed in wall, when appropriate

☐Articulation appropriate to style

The proposed nail-in windows at the addition will match the windows that were installed in the existing residence as part of project approved in 2005 (Design Review Case 1-PDR-2005-204-A). To confirm with current design review policy, however, the new windows must have exterior grids. In addition, the proposed size and proportions of the windows facing the street shall be approved by staff.

Privacy

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐Consideration of views from "public" rooms and balconies/decks

☐Avoid windows facing adjacent windows

Finish Materials and Color

☒ **yes** ☐ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:

☐ Textures and colors reinforce design

☐ High-quality, especially facing the street
☐Respect articulation and façade hierarchy
☐Wrap corners and terminate appropriately
☐Natural colors used in hillside areas

Paving Materials
☐ **yes** ☒ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐Decorative material at entries/driveways
☐Permeable paving when possible
☐Material and color related to design

Equipment, Trash, and Drainage
☐ **yes** ☒ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐Equipment screened and well located
☐Trash storage out of public view
☐Downspouts appropriately located
☐Vents, utility connections integrated with design, avoid primary facades

Ancillary Structures
☐ **yes** ☒ **n/a** ☐ **no**

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐Design consistent with primary structure
☐Design and materials of gates complement primary structure

Determination of Compatibility: Design and Detailing

The proposed design and detailing are appropriate, as modified by any proposed conditions, to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The addition has been designed to match and be complementary to the existing residence in terms of its design details, colors and materials (including stucco, laminate roof shingles and vinyl windows).
- The mansard roof will allow the addition to be compatible with the existing hipped roof forms and existing building height, while also disguising the flat roof from all vantage points.
- All new windows will be vinyl, nail-in windows to match the existing vinyl windows. The existing windows were approved with interior grids, while the new windows on the addition are conditioned to have exterior grids only (no interior grids will be permitted). The sizes and proportions of the windows facing the street shall be approved by staff.

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

Based on the above analysis, staff recommends **approval** of the project with one **condition**, as follow:

Conditions

1. All new windows to have exterior grids only (no interior grids to be permitted). The sizes and proportions of the proposed windows facing the street shall be approved by staff.
2. The project is an addition to a single family house; it may not have a kitchen and may not be rented out (not a second dwelling unit). Such notations must be included on the permit plans.

Attachments

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