

July 6, 2015

OEI Investments LLC
Attn: Joshua Tree
2805 Washington Blvd.
Ogden, UT 84401

**RE: ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW
CASE NO. PDR 1506368
701 Concord Street**

Dear Mr. Tree,

On July 6, 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 add 383 square feet of floor area to an existing one-story single-family residence in the R1 Zone, Floor Area District II, located at **701 Concord Street**. The staff report is attached.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Landscape plans shall be submitted to staff for review and approval.
2. Windows/doors shall be fiberglass or higher quality.
3. Plans for the addition shall be reviewed by the City Arborist and any conditions regarding this review shall be complied with.

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 project does not alter the site planning of the lot significantly and is consistent with the existing neighborhood pattern.
- As conditioned, the landscaping plans will be submitted to staff for review and approval and improve the appearance of the existing site.

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 addition maintains the one-story massing of the existing residence and is consistent with the entire one-story neighborhood.
- The addition maintains the modest scale of the existing residence.

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:

- Windows are inset, as is typical in Spanish-style houses and, as conditioned, will be of fiberglass or higher quality.
- Colors and materials of the addition match the existing house.

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, Roger Kiesel, at 818-937-8152 or via email at rkiesel@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 **JULY 21, 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.

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, **Roger Kiesel**, 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, Roger Kiesel, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Roger Kiesel directly at 818-937-8152 or via email at RKiesel@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME
Interim Director of Community Development


Urban Design Studio Staff

RK:rk

Attach: staff report

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

Meeting/Decision Date: July 6, 2015	Address: 701 Concord Street
Review Authority: <input type="checkbox"/> DRB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADR <input type="checkbox"/> HPC <input type="checkbox"/> CC	APN: 5635-021-029
Case Number: 1506368	Applicant: OEI Investments LLC
Prepared By: Roger Kiesel	Owner: OEI Investments LLC

Project Summary

The applicant is requesting approval to allow the construction of a 383 square-foot addition to an existing single family residence. The residence is one story and approximately 1,477 square feet. The front door of the residence faces Concord Street. The garage faces Omar Street, which adjacent to the subject site is a narrow driveway as a result of construction of the Verdugo Wash. The addition is proposed in the southeastern portion of the site.

The proposed work includes:

- Adding a 383 square-foot “great room” to the existing residence.

Existing Property/Background

The existing property includes a 1,477 square-foot single-family residence.

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: A variance was recently approved to allow the proposed addition within the street-front setback.

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	5,261 sq.ft.	3,710 sq.ft. - 38,459sq.ft.	5,800 sq.ft.
Setback	16 ft.	7 ft. - 25ft.	14.5 ft.
House size	1,179 sq.ft.	400 sq.ft. - 1,702 sq.ft.	1,860 sq.ft.
Floor Area Ratio	22%	8% - 51%	32%
Number of stories	1	1	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

As previously mentioned, a setback variance was recently granted, allowing the proposed addition to be located within the 25-foot minimum street front setback. The variance allowed the addition to have a minimum street-front setback of 14.5 feet. Street-front setback variances for neighboring property have also been granted recently.

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

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

After the proposed addition, the adjacent yard should be re-landscaped. Landscape plans for this area should utilize drought-tolerant plants and be submitted to planning staff for their review and approval.

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 project does not alter the site planning of the lot significantly and is consistent with the existing neighborhood pattern.
- As conditioned, the landscaping plans will be submitted to staff for review and approval and improve the appearance of the existing site.

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 addition maintains the one-story massing of the existing residence and is consistent with the entire one-story neighborhood.
- The addition maintains the modest scale of the existing residence.

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
- Windows shall be of fiberglass or higher quality.

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
- Downspouts appropriately located

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:

- Windows are inset, as is typical in Spanish-style houses and, as conditioned, will be of fiberglass or higher quality.
- Colors and materials of the addition match the existing house.

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

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

Conditions

1. Landscape plans shall be submitted to staff for review and approval.
2. Windows/doors shall be fiberglass or higher quality.

Attachments

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