



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
Director of Community Development

633 East Broadway, Room 103  
Glendale, California 91206-4386  
(818) 548-2144 Fax (818) 240-0392  
www.ci.glendale.ca.us

December 12, 2012

Lilit Davtyan  
5301 Balboa Boulevard  
Encino, CA 91316

**RE: 1113 SOUTH CENTRAL AVENUE  
PARKING REDUCTION PERMIT CASE NO. PPRP 1227790  
(Kid's Playland)**

Dear Ms. Davtyan:

On November 14, 2012, the Planning Hearing Officer conducted and closed a public hearing, pursuant to the provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 30, Chapter 30.50 on your application for a Parking Reduction Permit to change the use from a medical lab to a children's indoor playground without providing eleven (11) additional parking spaces. A Parking Reduction Permit is required due to the change in use from a medical lab (without patient visitation) to a children's indoor playground use, which requires an additional eleven (11) parking spaces that cannot be provided on site, located at **1113 South Central Avenue**, in the "C3" - Commercial Service Zone, Height District I, described as Portion of Lot 17, Watts Subdivision, in the City of Glendale, County of Los Angeles.

**APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL**

**Parking Reduction Permit:**

- (1) To allow a proposed children's indoor playground school while not providing the required eleven (11) additional parking spaces as a result of the change in use from a medical lab (without patient visitation) to a children's indoor playground.

**CODE REQUIRES**

**Parking Reduction Permit:**

- (1) A parking reduction permit is required when a use cannot provide the necessary parking on-site.

**ENVIRONMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:** Exempt.

**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 necessary findings and has **DENIED** your application for a parking reduction permit because evidence provided does not demonstrate that a reduction is justified based on the characteristics of the existing uses and proposed use, based on the following:

#### REQUIRED/MANDATED FINDINGS

Pursuant to Section 30.50.040A of the Glendale Municipal Code, a request for a parking reduction permit may be granted for mixed use projects where the review authority determines that a reduction is justified based on characteristics of the uses, an hourly parking demand studies published by the Urban Land Institute (ULI), or other appropriate source as determined by the Director of Community Development. The Planning Hearing Officer considered the facts and was unable to make the required findings.

The applicant proposes to change the use from a medical lab to a children's indoor playground without providing eleven (11) additional parking spaces required by code for this use. The site is 58,841 square feet and was developed in 1960 with an approximately 19,646 square foot one-story commercial building with 69 on-site parking spaces. Additionally, there are two 450 square foot residential dwelling units with attached private garages fronting Chevy Chase Drive. There are eight commercial tenant spaces including the subject 1,500 square foot tenant space. Tenants include a variety of land uses, including medical and dental offices, billiards, retail and financial.

In the past, several parking reductions and an administrative exception have been approved for this commercial center for dental offices, a medical lab and billiard hall resulting in an existing shortfall in code required parking for the uses in this center, including a previous parking reduction for the tenant space where the children's indoor playground is proposed, previously part of a 7,000 square foot medical lab. A Parking Reduction Permit was granted in 2010 to allow 5,500 square feet of the previous medical lab to become a billiard establishment without providing all code required parking, at that time providing a deficit of ten (10) spaces in code required parking in the center for the shopping center uses at that time. The remaining 1,500 square foot medical lab space was later occupied by an unpermitted travel agency and now is the subject of this request.

The applicant has provided a parking analysis for land uses in the shopping center showing that 85 parking spaces would be required to serve this shopping center including the proposed indoor children's playground. Although the requested parking reduction for an indoor children's playground is for eleven (11) parking spaces, the total shortfall proposed for this shopping center would be sixteen (16) parking spaces due to previous reductions and based on existing uses. An expansion of the billiard hall to serve alcohol and provide more seating is currently in process through separate entitlements, including a parking reduction.

The proposed children's indoor playground would cater to children ages 2 to 12 and would be open Tuesday through Sunday between 11am and 5pm. The applicant proposes to have three employees and hold two parties per day. Parties would have a maximum of 30 children, and parents. The applicant argued that the parking demand won't actually be 15 spaces because

some parents will drop off children and others will carpool to parties, however no evidence has been provided to support that statement. While drop off and carpooling may be true for older children or for those attending day care or youth classes, that is untrue for preschoolers and other younger school age school children attending private parties of a two hour or less duration where parents will park and stay for the event. Thus, the characteristics of the use described by the applicant are inaccurate in regards to parking demand and not reflective of a typical weekday scenario when parking demand for other daytime uses in the center is at peak. Comments from Neighborhood Services Section note that parking is needed for local businesses. Lack of parking impacts Glendale streets and businesses.

The applicant did not provide a parking study in accordance with ULI standards based on parking demand for the actual uses within the center; rather the applicant's parking analysis identifies minimum parking code requirements by use based on hours of operation. Minimum zoning code parking standards already assume a degree of shared spaces and are generally applicable. The purpose of allowing a parking reduction is to allow specific exceptions where it can be shown that actual demand based on the host of uses is less. The applicant did not furnish actual hourly parking counts during the proposed hours of operation so the actual existing parking demand has not been established. The applicant's argument for shared parking is based on the fact that since the billiard hall hours of operation begin at 6pm and the indoor children's playground which will close at 5pm, these two uses can share their parking. The billiard hall was granted an exception precisely because it operates at night and would not have an impact on daytime parking. However, just because the billiard establishment is closed during the day does not provide justification for further parking reductions for a parking intensive daytime use, when parking demand in the shopping center is at its highest.

The applicant's parking analysis, is not an analysis but rather a catalog of minimum parking code requirements. No information was provided concerning other uses in the shopping center which may also have an increased demand for parking during or after school hours, such as medical and dental offices which also serve school age children.

The proposed children's indoor playground use characteristics, particularly with regard to actual parking impacts, would be greater than that stated by the applicant given the age of participants and hours proposed for the use. Based on the evidence provided, the applicant has not established the parking demand for the uses in the shopping center, but merely identified code minimum parking standards which already assume a degree of shared spaces. The applicant's argument that a nighttime use (that received a parking reduction) that is closed during the day provides sole justification for a further parking reduction for a new daytime use is unsupported by any actual evidence of hourly parking demand. Minimum code standards are required precisely when actual parking demand evidence is not provided and, therefore, this request for parking reduction is not approved.

#### **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 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 Building and Safety Division upon request and must be filed with the prescribed fee prior to expiration of the 15-day period, on or before **December 27, 2012**, in the Building and Safety Division, 633 E. Broadway, Room 101.

**APPEAL FORMS available on-line:**  
<http://www.ci.glendale.ca.us/planning/SubmittingAProject.asp>

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.

**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 (Milca Toledo @ 818.937.8181) 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.

Sincerely,



Laura Stotler  
Planning Hearing Officer

LS:sm

CC: City Clerk (K.Cortes); Police Dept. (Tim Feeley/Z.Avila); City Attorney's Dept. (G. van Muyden/M.Yun); Fire Prevention Engineering Section-(D.Nickles); City Engineer and Traffic & Transportation Section (Roubik Golanian/ G.Tom); Director of Public Works and General Manager for Glendale Water and Power (Stephen Zurn); Glendale Water & Power--Water Section (R.Takidin); Glendale Water & Power--Electric Section (M.Kelley/M.Jackson); Parks, Recreation and Community Services Dept. (Emil Tatevosian); Neighborhood Services (A.Jimenez); Integrated Waste Management Admin. (D.Hartwell); Maintenance Services Section Admin. (D.Hardgrove); Street and Field Services Admin.; Environmental Management (M.Oillataguerra); Rafi Nazaryan-representing the applicant; and case planner – Milca Toledo.