

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

Meeting Date February 11, 2016 DRB Case No. PDR 1525898  
 Address 440 Palm Drive  
 Applicant Anet Minasian

### Design Review

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Benlian			X			
Charchian		X	X			
Malekian					X	
Simonian			X			
Mardian	X		X			
Totals			4	0		
<b>DRB Decision</b>		Approve with Conditions				

### Condition(s):

1. Raise parapets at west elevation to be six inches higher than the proposed rooftop equipment to meet code-required screening.
2. Break up massing of the two-story wall sections at the west and east elevations by means of an architectural feature such as a horizontal reglet or raised band.
3. Revise proposed paint palette at all walls to reflect the colors previously depicted for the various cladding materials.
4. Revise color of entry doors to better harmonize with the revised paint palette of the walls.
5. Increase the height of the parapet caps to provide more architectural presence. Consider painting them to contrast with the adjacent wall color.
6. Removal of the originally-proposed green screen is acceptable.

### Analysis:

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

- *The proposed townhouse style multi-family building will be centrally located on the lot and meets all setback requirements. The original site planning will remain and is consistent with other multi-family development in the neighborhood.*
- *The proposal will not alter the site plan or footprint of the multi-family residential development as it was previously approved by the Design Review Board.*
- *The applicant addressed privacy concerns for Unit D at the rear by raising the height of the rear windows and placing them higher on the wall since this unit abuts the common open space. This was a condition of approval for the previous Design Review Board approval.*
- *Except as conditioned, the applicant's proposal to raise the parapets to screen the mechanical equipment is appropriately integrated into the building design.*

- *Except as conditioned, the landscaping plan and palette previously approved by DRB is not proposed to be modified as part of the applicant's request. The removal of the originally proposed green-screen at the rear will be acceptable.*

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

- *Except as conditioned, the proposed exterior modifications to the previously approved cladding materials are appropriate for the small-scale development of the site, four units. A condition of approval will require the applicant to revise the proposed paint palette at all walls to reflect the colors previously depicted for the various cladding materials.*
- *The project's massing is broken up by recessed building forms and geometric volumes which is especially appropriate along the east and west façades as it breaks up the mass and accentuates the design to help minimize the boxy profile. A condition of approval will require the massing of the two-story wall sections at the west and east elevations to be broken up by means of an architectural feature such as a horizontal reglet or a raised band.*
- *The proposed two-story townhouse style multi-family residential development will be consistent with other two-story buildings on this street, and the proposed overall height of 26'-0" is similar to existing development in the neighborhood.*

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

- *As conditioned, the building shape, clean lines, and colors will be reflective of the contemporary aesthetic of the building. The homogeneity of the proposed finish materials, as modified by the approved conditions, will reinforce the contemporary style of the building.*
- *The entries to all units are located on the east elevation and each entrance is recessed to achieve a covered entry area. The design of the entry is proportional with the roofed area in which it is located. A condition of approval will require the color of the entry doors to be revised to be harmonious with the revised paint palette of the stucco walls.*
- *The proposed windows and doors are consistent with the original DRB approval. The applicant addressed privacy concerns for Unit D at the rear by raising the height of the rear windows and placing them higher on the wall since this unit abuts the common open space. This was a condition of approval for the previous Design Review Board approval.*
- *The applicant has revised the driveway to have a score line in the concrete that run parallel to the street. This was a condition of approval for the previous Design Review Board approval.*

**The Design Review Board approves the design of projects only. Approval of a project by the Design Review Board does not constitute an approval of compliance with the Zoning Code and/or Building Code requirements.**

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the Design Review Board decision, plans may be submitted for Building and Safety Division plan check. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, Design Review Board approved plans must be stamped approved by Design Review Board staff. **Any** changes to the approved plans may constitute returning to the Design Review Board for approval. **Prior** to Building and Safety Division plan check submittal, **all** changes in substantial conformance with approved plans by the Design Review Board must be on file with the Planning Division.

Please make an appointment with the case planner for DRB stamp/sign-off prior to submitting for Building plan check.

DRB Staff Member           Vista Ezzati