

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECORD OF DECISION

(Page 1 of 2)

Meeting Date January 27, 2011 DRB Case No. 1-PDR 2010-043- A

Address 1640 Oakengate Drive

Applicant Hovhannes Samuelian

Design Review

Board Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain
Aliano	X		X			
Palmer		X	X			
Insua			X			
Simonian			X			
Yoo					X	
Totals			4	0	1	0
DRB Decision		Return for redesign with conditions and comments				

Conditions

1. The proposed architectural style lacks character and uniformity. Restudy the hierarchy of windows, doors (front and back), roof forms (hip vs. gable), materials and textures to provide more architectural interest and consistency.
2. Select an authentic architectural style and study the architectural language and massing of other homes in the neighborhood. The selected style is not successfully integrated. It appears to be a combination of architecture features and materials.
3. The proposed design needs more refinement and composition of the surfaces. The existing Mid-Century house is more interesting and more successful than the proposed one. For example, if a Mid-Century Modern house design is proposed, than provide more materials and craftsmanship that are uniform and integrated with each other.
4. Restudy the design, proportion and character of windows throughout the house. For example, the window above the living room window could be smaller and the two punched windows next to it could reflect the grand stair. Also, the massing and uniformity of the windows at the rear of the house provides a different character from those on the other elevations.
5. Restudy the mixture of shed roofs at the ground level and hipped roofs at the second level. For example the existing house uses a gable theme successfully. It also includes eaves that are a little thicker, wider and longer.
6. The rear elevation is too homogeneous and lacks hierarchy of uses. For example, there is no distinction between the dining room and the family room windows and doors.
7. Restudy the design of the garage door and the front door, particularly since the front of the house is near to the street.
8. A landscape plan shall be prepared using plants listed in the bewaterwise.com plant palette. Some of the existing planting may remain; however, the new drought-tolerant plant palette needs to be simplified to complement with the new house design.
9. Impermeable paving surfaces for the driveway and walkways shall be reduced in size in the front, side and rear yards. The reduced paving surfaces shall be permeable.

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
RECORD OF DECISION**
(Page 2 of 2)

Meeting Date	<u>January 27, 2011</u>	DRB Case No.	<u>1-PDR 2010-043- A</u>
		Address	<u>1640 Oakengate Drive</u>
		Applicant	<u>Hovhannes Samuelian</u>

10. Consider providing more wall articulation at both the east and west elevations because the design is still large and boxy, particularly at the rear elevation and the two side elevations.
11. The rear second story balcony needs to be reduced in size and massing.
12. Windows may be either aluminum or fiberglass, but not vinyl. Either nail-on or block frame windows are acceptable, but no z-bar is allowed.
13. Submit construction details for staff's review including: permeable surface materials, stucco finish, doors, windows including installation details, railings, lighting and roof material to ensure the construction will be consistent with the quality of the plans submitted and approved by the Board.

Analysis

Site Planning: As conditioned to require a drought-tolerant landscape plan and impermeable paving surfaces, the project's site planning will be consistent with the homes in the neighborhood and the Guidelines.

Mass and Scale: Conditions have been added to reduce the new house's large and box-like appearance. Additional articulation and reduction in wall and balcony massing is required. Restudy the use of the roof forms and fenestration to be consistent with the selected architectural style. The Guidelines would encourage a design that is a low-profile two-story house with a horizontal form consistent with other homes in the neighborhood.

Design: The proposed design lacks architectural interest and character. The existing design is more interesting and successful. Conditions have been added to restudy the use of materials, textures and fenestration so all the design elements will be integrated and internally consistent to the selected architectural style and with the intent of the Guidelines.

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 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 Christopher E. Baxter