



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

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
 RECORD OF DECISION**

Meeting Date January 19, 2012 DRB Case No. 2-PDR 2011-025-B
 Address 1535 Cleveland Road
 Applicant Alajajian and Marcoosi

Design Review

| Board Member | Motion | Second | Yes | No | Absent | Abstain |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------|-----|----|--------|---------|
| Keuroghelian | | | x | | | |
| Geragos | x | | x | | | |
| Malekian | | | x | | | |
| Sakai | | x | x | | | |
| Zarifian | | | x | | | |
| Totals | | | 5 | 0 | | |
| DRB Decision | Deny with comments | | | | | |

Board Comments:

The project has not sufficiently addressed the concerns expressed by the Board at the August 18 2011 meeting. In addition, the applicant should look at historical precedent and other homes in the neighborhood.

Site Planning

1. The site appears to be too narrow for the circular driveway and should be eliminated. Recommend expanding the motor court while eliminating the circular driveway.
2. Landscape design appears appropriate in the front. Provide additional landscape to buffer north and south sides.

Massing

3. The building appears too big for its site, particularly on the side yards. While there is not an issue with the overall square footage, the building and massing appear tight on the site.
4. Consideration should be given to reducing the square footage to allow the a 2-car garage rather than 3-car garage required.
5. Building appears to relate more to the neighboring buildings on larger sites. This site is a smaller site. Consider providing a better transition to the neighbors on smaller properties.
6. The roof of the structure is too homogenous and needs variation
7. The floor to floor may be too high for minimal side yard dimension and lead to a monumental appearance.
8. North elevation is too monumental and needs 3 dimensionality.
9. The entry appears too monumental. If the entry has its own roof, the roof should be lowered to provide variation. Otherwise the entry could be more fully integrated into the rest of the building.
10. Consider eliminating the balcony to the north to help reduce the privacy concerns as well as provide a break in the roofline.
11. Consider stepping back the second floor from the north and south property lines.

Design and Detailing



12. Design of fence is appropriate with its placement set back from the street. Railings should be more consistent with design of the fence.
13. Windows on the front that are tall and thin with arches on top are appropriate for the traditional design of the building. Other windows appear to have a modern feel; some are too large, such as the windows for the entry. Modify all fenestration to be consistent with the traditional design and properly proportioned.
14. Materials shown are appropriate. However, the details are generally too heavy. For example, the detail around the entry appears too heavy and adds to the monumental feel. The eave details are also too heavy.
15. The openings at the rear should be consistent in terms of its shape. Both opening should either be rectangular or arched.

Summary

- **Site Planning:** The proposed placement of the new 2-story house is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and appears to be generally appropriate for the site in terms of front and rear setbacks, however it should be further setback from the interior sides due to its two-story nature. Additional landscaping should also be provided between the north and south properties for additional buffer and privacy. Circular driveway should be eliminated and additional landscaping should be provided at the front.
- **Mass and Scale:** The proposed two-story house has been redesigned and additional breaks in the roof lines and roof forms have been introduced, especially at the front, to help break up the overall massing. However, it does not appear to be sufficient to properly fit the site. The massing should be redesigned to provide appropriate transition between properties to the north and south.
- **Designing and Detailing:** The design and details should be refined to be more consistent with the style of the house. For example, the eave details the trim around the entry should be lighter as they are too heavy.

***Contact the case planner for an appointment for a DRB stamp. DRB Plans will no longer be stamped over the counter without an appointment.**

If an appeal is not filed within the 15-day appeal period of the Design Review Board decision, plans may be submitted for Building Department plan check. Prior to Building Department 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 plan check submittal, all changes in substantial conformance with approved plans by the Design Review Board must be on file with the Planning Department.

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

DRB Staff Member

Gevorg Nazaryan