June 11, 2018

Robert Longuryan
610 South Broadway # 608
Los Angeles, CA 90014

RE: 354 WEST WILSON AVENUE
DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1726268

Dear Mr. Longuryan:

The Director of Community Development will render a final decision on or after June 21, 2018, for the following project:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: To demolish the existing single-family Craftsman Style residence and the existing detached garage (built in 1920), and construct an approximately 7,780 square-foot, two-story, multi-family residential building on an approximately 9,772 square-foot lot in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone. The proposed building will feature two three-bedroom units (townhouse style) and four two-bedroom units with a subterranean parking garage for 15 spaces.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

For more information or to submit comments, please contact the case planner, Aileen Babakhani, at 818-937-8331 or ababakhani@glendaleca.gov.

Comments must be received prior to June 21, 2018, in order to be considered by the Director.

DECISION: A decision letter will be posted on or after the date listed above and may be accessed online at: http://www.glendaleca.gov/planning/decisions

You may also request notification of the decision when the decision is rendered. Should you wish to file an appeal of the decision, the appeal must be filed within 15 days of the date of the decision as shown on the decision letter. Appeal applications are available in Permit Services, 633 E. Broadway, Room 101, Glendale, CA 91206.

Sincerely,

Aileen Babakhani
Planning Assistant
City of Glendale  
Community Development Department  
Design Review Staff Report – Multi-Family

Meeting/Decision Date: June 21, 2018  
Address: 354 W. Wilson Avenue  
Review Authority: ☐ DRB ☐ ADR ☐ HPC ☐ CC  
APN: 5637-009-019  
Case Number: PDR 1726268  
Applicant: Robert Longuryan  
Prepared By: Aileen Babakhani, Planning Assistant  
Owner: My West LLC

Project Summary
The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing single-family Craftsman style residence and the existing detached garage (built in 1920), and construct an approximately 7,780 square-foot, two-story, multi-family residential building on an approximately 9,772 square-foot lot in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone. The proposed building will feature two three-bedroom units (townhouse style) and four two-bedroom units with a subterranean parking garage for 15 spaces.

The proposed work includes:
- Demolition of the existing single-family residence and the existing detached garage.
- Construction of a new 7,760 square-foot two-story, multi-family building with a total of six units designed in the Contemporary Modern Style.
- Construction of a new subterranean garage with 15 parking stalls, including two guest parking spaces.

Existing Property/Background
The subject property is an interior lot, developed in 1920 and located on the south side of Wilson Avenue, in a high-density multi-family residential area with predominantly multi-family development. The rectangular shaped lot is relatively flat and similar to other lots in the neighborhood. The existing 1,158 square-foot single-family residence (designed in the Craftsman style) and the detached garage will be demolished as part of this project.

A historical resource evaluation (dated September 7, 2016) was prepared for the existing residence by a consulting firm that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in the fields of History and Architectural History. The evaluation concluded that the existing building does not possess sufficient historical or architectural significance to merit listing in the Local or State Register of Historic Resources. Therefore, the subject property is not considered a "historical resource" as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of CEQA guidelines. The historical resource evaluation is attached to this report.

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

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

Zone: R1250 - High Density Residential
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 because
☐ 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 is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 32 "Infill Development" exemption pursuant to Section 15332 of the State CEQA Guidelines because the project meets all the conditions for an in-fill development project.
☐ 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:

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

Yards and Usable Open Space
☒ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Outdoor space integrated into site design and acknowledges adjacent development
☐ Common space easily accessible from all units
☐ Appropriate separation/screening from residential units
☐ Discrete seating and amenity areas allow for multiple users

Garage Location and Driveway
☒ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Garage fully integrated into overall structure
☐ Driveway and curb-cut widths minimized
☐ Grade-level garages and parking, if allowed, are appropriately screened from the street
☐ Decorative paving complements building design
☐ Stairs and lifts to subterranean garages incorporated into the design of the project

Landscape Design
☒ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Complementary to building design
Maintain existing trees when possible
- Provide landscaping adjacent to driveways and garages
- 20% of planting at above-grade common spaces is within 9 inches of finish floor
- Above-grade tree wells are at least 6 inches higher than box size of tree

The proposed landscape plan is complementary to the building design and includes drought tolerant landscaping. However, conditions of approval are recommended to provide a licensed landscaped architect certification on the landscape plan and state the compliance with the State Water Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WMELO), update the landscape plans to remove any ornamental trees that are proposed to be planted within the dripline of the street tree and include protection details of the street tree on the plans in compliance with the Urban Forestry requirements.

Walls and Fences
- yes □ n/a □ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
- Appropriate style/color/material for building design
- Perimeter walls treated at both sides
- Retaining walls minimized
- Appropriately sized and located

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
- All screening integrated with overall building and/or landscape design
- Downspouts appropriately located
- Vents, utility connections integrated with design, avoid primary facades

Lighting
- yes □ n/a □ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
- Light fixtures are appropriate to the building and/or landscape design
- Avoid over-lit facades; consider ambient light conditions when developing lighting scheme
- Utilize shielded fixtures to avoid light spill over onto adjacent properties

The proposed light fixtures are appropriately located adjacent to the main entries and balconies at the side elevations; however, no light fixtures are shown on the front and rear elevations. If any are proposed, a condition of approval is recommended to show exterior light fixtures at the front and rear elevations complementary to the overall design.

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 site planning of the proposed building is appropriate to the site and its neighboring properties consist of single-family and multi-family residential buildings.
- The new building will face Wilson Avenue and will maintain the prevailing street front setback of adjacent properties along Wilson Avenue.
- The proposed two stairways at the front and rear of the proposed building are incorporated to the site appropriately and provide pedestrian accesses to the underground parking. An elevator access
is also incorporated into the overall design of the front entrance to provide access from the parking level to the street and to the first level of the building.

- The proposed outdoor common space, at the rear of the building, is well integrated into the site planning and is accessible easily from all units. Amenities and landscaped area are designed appropriately within the outdoor common space.
- The proposed landscape plan is complementary to the building design and includes drought tolerant landscaping. However, a condition of approval is added to require the landscape plan to be certified by a licensed landscaped architect and to include the statement and requirements to comply with the State Water Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WMELO).
- There is one street tree (mature Camphor) located in the pathway at front of the property, which is proposed to remain. A condition of approval is recommended that the street tree protection details be included on the plans to comply with the Urban Forestry requirements. The Urban Forestry also requires that the landscape plan to be modified to remove any ornamental trees that are proposed to be planted within the drip line of the street tree.
- The proposed perimeter walls will be a combination of split-face concrete walls with horizontal metal railings, located along property lines at sides and rear of the new building. The proposed walls are appropriately set back from the street front property line.
- The proposed rooftop equipment is integrated with the design and will be screened from public view with galvanized steel panels to be painted to match the stucco color of the exterior walls.
- The proposed light fixtures are appropriately located adjacent to the main entries and balconies at the side elevations; however, no light fixtures are shown on the front and rear elevations. If any are proposed, a condition of approval is recommended to show exterior light fixtures at the front and rear elevations complementary to the overall design.

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:
☐ Relates to predominant pattern through 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:

• The mass and scale of the proposed building are compatible with the development pattern in the neighborhood, which consists of single-family residential and two-story, multi-family residential buildings in a variety of architectural styles.
• The proposed two-story building is well-articulated with the mass being broken up by projecting and receding volumes, varied window openings, and different cladding materials and colors.
• The flat roof design with parapet walls reinforces the proposed design concept of the Modern architectural style.

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:
☐ Design is compatible with neighborhood context
☐ Design is stylistically consistent
☐ Employs consistent vocabulary of forms and materials while expressing architectural variety
☐ Cladding materials and

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
☐ Overall window pattern appropriate to style
☐ Window operation appropriate to style
☐ Recessed/flush window appropriate to style and/or location
☐ Openings are well detailed
Privacy
☒ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Consideration of views from "public" rooms and balconies/roofs 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 materials, especially facing the street
☐ Materials appropriately enhance articulation and façade hierarchies
☐ Wrap corners and terminate appropriately
☐ Cladding is well detailed, especially at junctures between materials
☐ Foam trim, finished on site, is prohibited

The design of the front facade would be enhanced if the stone cladding, as proposed over the driveway, were incorporated at the front facade such as the lift enclosure and stairway wall. A condition to this effect is recommended.

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

Ancillary Structures
☒ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

If "no" select from below and explain:
☐ Design consistent with primary structure
☐ Design and materials of gates, fences, and/or walls complement primary structure

Determinaton 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 proposed architectural details, color, and materials including smooth stucco finish, metal siding, stone cladding, primary wood and glass door, garage door, iron gates, balconies railings, metal awnings, stucco finish planters, and aluminum windows reinforce the proposed Contemporary Modern architectural style and are consistent with the neighborhood context of variety architectural styles.
- A condition of approval is recommended for adding additional stone cladding at the front facade to enhance the overall design at the front facade.
- The proposed front wrought iron gates are located in appropriate locations and are consistent with the proposed design concept.
- All windows will be aluminum and flush with the walls with projected sills (stucco finish). The fixed and casements windows will have clear glass without grids. The style of the proposed windows is compatible with the Contemporary Modern architectural style.
• The private outdoor spaces and balconies are appropriately located to avoid views to the adjacent properties.
• The proposed setbacks at the sides and rear of the new building and the proposed landscaping at the project site provide buffers to enhance the privacy of the adjacent buildings.
• The proposed driveway and walkways at the front of the building will have decorative paving (Oslen Paving Stone).

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision
Based on the above analysis, staff recommends approval of the project with conditions, as follow:

Conditions
1. Show exterior light fixtures at the front and rear elevations complementary to the overall design.
2. Incorporate additional stone cladding at the front facade, such as the lift enclosure and stairway wall, to provide a more balanced composition and enhance the appearance of the front facade.
3. Provide a licensed landscape architect certification on the landscape plan. The landscape plan must comply with the State Water Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WMELO).
4. Update the landscape plans to remove any ornamental trees that are proposed to be planted within the dripline of the street tree.
5. Include protection details of the street tree on the plans in compliance with the Urban Forestry requirements.

Attachments
1. Location Map
2. Neighborhood Survey
3. Photos of Existing Property
4. Reduced Plans
7. 330 W. WILSON AVE

8. 326 W. WILSON AVE
13. 357 W. WILSON AVE

14. 361 W. WILSON AVE
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 7, 2016

TO: Jean-Pierre Boladian

FROM: Casey Tibbet, M.A., Senior Cultural Resources Manager/Architectural Historian

SUBJECT: Historic Resources Evaluation for the Property at 354 West Wilson Avenue, City of Glendale, California (LSA Project Number BLD1601)

LSA is under contract to complete a historic resources evaluation for the property at 354 West Wilson Avenue (Assessor’s Identification Number 5637-009-019) in the City of Glendale (City), Los Angeles County, California. Because the building on the property is 50 years of age or older, the City, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required that it be evaluated for historical significance as part of the development review process.

LSA’s evaluation included property specific research, an intensive-level field survey, review of the City’s Reconnaissance Survey and Historic Context Statement of Craftsman Style Architecture 2007, and an evaluation under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria and the City’s Historic Preservation ordinance (Chapter 15.20 of the Municipal Code) criteria. The property was documented and evaluated on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 525 forms (attached).

Information reviewed as part of the property specific research included building permits, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, City Directories, newspaper articles, historic aerial photographs, and the Glendale Register of Historic Resources. The field visit took place on August 18, 2016 and included photographing the property from the public right-of-way, making notations regarding the architectural style and features of the buildings, and a reconnaissance survey of the immediate area for comparison purposes, as well as to determine whether the property could be part of a potential historic district.

As a result of these efforts, it was determined that this altered 1920 Craftsman style residence does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under any criteria and is not eligible for local designation. It has sustained alterations (enclosed porch, modern fenestration, and setting), is a modest example of a common type and style, and no evidence was found indicating it is associated with important events or people in history. For these reasons, the residence at 354 West Wilson Avenue does not qualify as a “historical resource” as defined by the CEQA and, for purposes of this project, the City may make a finding of “no impact” with regard to historical resources.
P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location: (a) Not for Publication (b) Unrestricted: "a. County: Los Angeles" and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
   a. USGS 7.5' Quad: Burbank, CA Date: 1966 PR-1972. T.14N; R.13W; unsectioned S.B.B.M.
   c. Address: 364 West Wilson Avenue City: Burbank Zip: 91103
   d. UTM: Zone: 11; Meters: 155n (G.P.S.)
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) APN. 5637-009-019

*P3b. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
   This property is located on the south side of West Wilson Street on a block developed with historic-period one-story residences and newer two-story apartment buildings. It is irregular in plan and rests on a raised foundation. The low-pitched, cross-gabled roof is sheathed with composition shingles and has moderate eaves with exposed, notched rafter tails. The roof also includes a front-facing, centered hip-on-gable element flanked by smaller hip-on-gable dormers. The exterior walls are clad with clapboard siding. The north-facing, symmetrical façade is dominated by a full-width porch featuring large square posts with crown molding, narrow wood balustrades, and metal railings. These features appear to be modern alterations. The entrance is comprised of a centered wood-paneled door flanked by sidelights and large, vinyl-framed, sliding windows, which are non-original. The residence is in good condition, but has sustained alterations (porch supports, balustrades, railings, and fenestration), which have compromised its integrity, and is a common type and style.

*P5a. Photo or Drawing: (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

*P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) façade, view to the south (8/18/16)

*P6. Date Constructed/Alterations and Sources:
   Historic
   Prehistoric
   Both
   1520 (Los Angeles County Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:
   Unknown

*P8. Recorded by:
   Name, affiliation, and address
   Elisa Bocchel, M. Lit.
   LSA Associates, Inc.
   1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 205
   Riverside, CA 92507

*P9. Date Recorded: August 2016

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive-level CEQA compliance

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none"). None.

*Required Information
Historic Context: Located approximately 10 miles north of downtown Los Angeles at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains, Glendale was organized in 1887 on property that had previously been part of the Verdugo family’s Rancho San Rafael. The town grew rapidly after the 1904 extension of the Los Angeles interurban railroad along Brand Boulevard, becoming a prosperous bedroom community with a busy downtown shopping district near the rail line. In the 1920s and 1930s, Glendale referred to itself as the Fastest Growing City in America as its ranchland and orange groves gave way to commuters’ bungalows (The Glendale Historical Society 2001). Because the Craftsman style was gaining popularity during those years, Glendale developed a large collection of single-family Craftsman houses in the core areas of the City between 1900 and 1925 (Galvin Preservation Associates 2007). During and immediately after the Second World War, Glendale and the entire Los Angeles region experienced tremendous economic and population growth. More than 300,000 GIs, plus wartime shipyard and aircraft factory workers, became permanent residents of California after the war. By 1950, California had become the nation’s most populous state (Rolle 1987:452–453). Much of this development took the architectural vocabulary of the pre-war years and combined it into simplified styles suitable for mass developments and small-scale apartments (City of Los Angeles 2011). Many of the pre-WWII Craftsman neighborhoods that are located in multi-family zoned residential areas have lost their historic fabric due to the subsequent development of large apartment buildings, whose construction began primarily during the 1950s and continue today (Galvin Preservation Associates 2007).

Architectural Context: The Craftsman style has its roots in the Arts and Crafts Movement that originated in England in the 1850s in reaction to industrialization. The father of the movement, designer William Morris, espoused a return to the supposed simplicity of pre-industrial times when handicrafts displayed personal involvement in the products of a laborer’s work. In the early 20th century, Morris’ ideas were popularized in the United States by Arts and Crafts and William Morris societies (Survey LA 2016). This nostalgia for a pre-industrial past resonated with many Americans who were experiencing a transition to a more urban, technologically-oriented age. See Continuation Sheet

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:


Date of Evaluation: September 2016
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

CONTINUATION SHEET
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*Recorded by: LSA Associates, Inc.
*Date: September 2016
*Location: 354 West Wilson Avenue

HRI #____
Trinomial

*Required Information

*B10. Significance: (continued from page 2)

Character defining features of Craftsman architecture include: an irregular plan; low-pitched gable or hipped roof with wide eaves and exposed rafters; decorative beams or brackets under the gables; and covered porches with the roof typically supported by tapered, square posts. Fenestration often consists of wood-framed double- or single-hung windows with multi-paned upper sashes and large fixed windows. The most common wall cladding is wood clapboard followed by wood shingles, but stone, brick, concrete block, and stucco are also used. Variants include Asian (most commonly Japanese) roof forms, Tudor false half-timbering, and Swiss chalet styles. One-story or one-and-a-half story residences in this style are commonly referred to as Craftsman bungalows.

People Associated with this Property: No original building permits were found; therefore the original owner, architect, and builder are unknown. Historic city directories listed one primary resident from 1923 until 1965. R.M. Storms (Ancestry.com var). Information from the 1940 Census revealed that Robert M. Storms was born circa 1889 in New Jersey and was married to Emmy A. Storms, originally from Colorado. Mr. Storms' occupation is listed as a mechanical engineer (bid.). The couple had four children: Robert M., Jr., Emmy L., Benjamin D., and Mary E. Storms (bid.). No further information was found on the residents.

Significance Evaluation: In compliance with CEQA, this property is being evaluated under the California Register and local ordinance criteria.

California Register Criterion 1 - Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. This residence was built during a period (1900-1930) of significant growth in the City of Glendale. Many of the new homes built during this period were Craftsman bungalows like the residence at 354 West Wilson Avenue, as such there are numerous examples of the style in the City from this period. The residence has been altered and its setting has changed from a neighborhood dominated by historic-period single-family or small multi-family homes to an area filled with modern high density housing. For these reasons, the integrity of this residence and its setting has been compromised and the residence is no longer a good representation of that early period of growth.

California Register Criterion 2 - Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history. Based on the research discussed above, the residence does not appear to be associated with persons important in history.

California Register Criterion 3 - Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. This residence is an unremarkable example of an altered Craftsman bungalow. There is no indication that it is the work of a master and it does not possess high artistic values. There are hundreds of examples in the City and many are more articulated and retain a higher degree of integrity both architecturally and with regard to their historic settings. Therefore, this residence is not significant under this criterion.

California Register Criterion 4 - Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation. This residence was built in 1900 using common materials and construction practices. It does not have the potential to yield information important to the history or prehistory of the local area, California, or the nation.

City of Glendale Municipal Code. In addition to being evaluated using the California Register criteria, the property is being evaluated under the City's criteria for cultural resources.

Local Criterion 1 - Identified with Important events in national, state, or city history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, political, economic, social, or historic heritage of the nation, state, or city. As discussed under California Register Criterion 1, the subject property has lost its historic integrity due to alterations and radical changes to its setting. It is therefore unable to convey an association with the significant shift toward single-family bungalow development that occurred between 1900 and 1925.

Local Criterion 2 - Associated with a person, persons, or groups who significantly contributed to the history of the nation, state, region, or city. As discussed above under California Register Criterion 2, the residence does not appear to be associated with a person, persons, or groups who significantly contributed to the history of the nation, state, region, or city.

Local Criterion 3 - Embodies the distinctive and exemplary characteristics of an architectural style, architectural type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder or architect whose genius influenced his or her profession; or possesses high artistic values. As discussed above under California Register Criterion 3, this Craftsman-style residence has sustained alterations that have compromised its integrity. Furthermore, it was constructed using common materials and methods of construction; does not represent a notable work of a master designer, builder or architect; and does not possess high artistic values. See Continuation Sheet.
**B10. Significance:** (continued from page 3)

Local Criterion 4 - Yields, or has the potential to yield, information important to archaeological pre-history or history of the nation, state, region, or city. As discussed above under California Register Sriterion 4, this 1920 residence does not have the potential to yield information important to archaeological pre-history or history of the nation, state, region, or city.

Local Criterion 5 - Exemplifies the early heritage of the City. Due to its loss of integrity of setting, materials, design, and workmanship, the residence does not adequately convey an association with the early history of the City.

For the reasons stated above, the property is not significant under any of the aforementioned criteria and is therefore not a historical resource under CEQA.

**B12. References:** (continued from page 2)

- Ancestry.com
  - Var. A variety of records were accessed online in August 2016 at: [http://home.ancestry.com](http://home.ancestry.com). These include city directories, voter registration records, and United States Census Data.

- City of Los Angeles

- Galvin Preservation Associates

- Glendale Historical Society

- Historicaerials.com

- Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor

- Rolle, Andrew

- SurveyLA