633 E. Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386

Tel (818) 548-2140 or (818) 548-2115

Fax (818) 240-0392 www.glendaleca.gov

June 2, 2017

Darren Wong 1827 Hillside Drive Glendale, CA 91208

RE: 1827 HILLSIDE DRIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1705926

Dear Mr. Wong:

On June 2, 2017, 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 a one-story, 894 square-foot addition to the rear of an existing one-story, 1,414 square-foot single-family house, originally constructed in 1952, on an approximately 6,804 square-foot lot in the R1R Zone, Floor Area District II, located at **1827 Hillside Drive.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1. That the trash storage area be identified on the plans and out of public view.
- 2. That the elevation drawings be revised to identify the downspouts and gutters for staff review and approval.
- 3. That a vertical window section detail be provided for staff review and approval that identifies the window recess, sill, and frame.
- That the applicant will adhere to all of the recommendations identified in the Urban Forestry Department Comments dated May 5, 2017, and obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit as necessary.

SUMMARY OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT'S DECISION

Site Planning – The proposed site planning is appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 894 square-foot addition is sited at the rear of the existing house, and modifies the original building footprint in an appropriate manner. The addition will extend the rear of the existing house into the backyard and maintain an L-shaped footprint.
- The existing attached two-car garage and driveway will remain unchanged, and all walls and fences on-site will be maintained.
- The addition will infill a portion of the landscaping in the backyard. While some landscaping at the rear will be removed for the addition, there are no significant alterations being proposed to the existing landscaping on-site. The project will maintain 44% landscaping which exceeds the minimum zoning code requirement.

 There is an existing Oak tree located to the north on the abutting neighbor's property, with a portion of the drip line located on the project site. A condition of approval will require the applicant to adhere to all of the recommendations made by the Urban Forestry Department in their comments dated May 5, 2017.

Mass and Scale – The proposed massing and scale are appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- The proposed 894 square-foot, one-story addition is located at the rear of the existing one-story single-family house. The addition's height is appropriate and in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The project site features a nominal uphill slope from west to east that follows the topography of Hillside Drive. There are no alterations proposed to the existing topography, and the addition at the rear is on a relatively flat pad.
- The overall height of the existing one-story home remains at 14'-7", where the maximum height allowed in this zone is 35'-0" for a house with a pitched roof. The addition is only one-story in height, and will not be visible from the street.
- The existing house features primarily hipped roof forms with a 4:12 roof pitch throughout.
 The proposal includes a hipped-roof with a 4:12 pitch, consistent with the existing development.

Building Design and Detailing – The proposed design and detailing are appropriate to the site and its surroundings for the following reasons:

- Overall, the addition's design and detailing is appropriate and is consistent with the
 existing style of the residence through the use of the same materials, windows, and
 colors.
- The existing entryway will remain unchanged as part of the proposal.
- The existing board and batten siding, and brick base at the front will be maintained.
- The windows of the addition will be white vinyl with clear glass sliders that are consistent with the style of the home. The new windows will be recessed in the opening with a wood frame and sill to match the details of the existing home. A condition of approval will require the applicant to provide a window section detail for staff review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
- The addition has a smooth stucco finish to match the existing house in both color and texture.
- The roof of the addition will be composition shingle to match the existing house.
- The gutters, downspouts, and location of the trash storage area are not identified on the plans. A condition of approval will require the drawings to be revised to identify these.

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, Vista Ezzati, at 818-937-8180 or via email at VEzzati@glendaleca.gov.

RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY INPUT RECEIVED DURING COMMENT PERIOD

1. There is a mature Oak Tree located at 1824 Rosita Drive, the adjacent property to the north, with a large canopy that extends on to the subject property at 1827 Hillside Drive. The adjacent property owner is concerned with its health and appearance and requesting that any work done to this Oak tree be done by a licensed professional. In

addition, the property owner of 1824 Rosita Drive requests to be on-site during any scheduled and/or required trimming of this Oak tree.

The application was routed to the City's Urban Forestry Department and comments were received. As a condition of approval, the property owner will be required to adhere to all of the recommendations from the City's Urban Forestry Department, dated May 5, 2017, and attached to this decision letter. This Oak tree will not be removed, and it will be maintained and trimmed as needed to accommodate the proposed addition. As detailed in the Urban Forestry Department comments, an Indigenous Tree Permit will be required for this project which will require the work to be performed by a licensed professional prior to the start of construction and will prohibit the construction crew from trimming the tree.

Although the City does not get involved in the coordination of tree trimming between neighbors (a civil matter), the applicant is requested to work with the neighbor to address scheduling issues.

2. The proposed addition is setback 13'-0" from the rear property line shared with the neighbor to the north at 1824 Rosita Drive. This neighbor is concerned with privacy and is requesting that a taller fence be installed between the properties and that the proposed addition be decreased in the length towards the property to the north to keep a reasonably sized backyard, a good land to footprint ratio, and to maintain privacy for both properties.

The 1-story addition to the existing single-story residence will be set back 13 feet from the rear property line abutting the neighbor at 1824 Rosita Drive, which is still much greater than the minimum four foot interior setback required by Code in the R1R zone. The project also complies with R1R standards for floor area ratio, lot coverage, landscaping, and minimum interior setbacks:

- The maximum floor area ratio allowed is 40% (2,721 sq. ft.) and the project proposal will have a floor area ratio of 34% (2,308 sq. ft.);
- The maximum lot coverage allowed is 40% (2,721 sq. ft.) and the project proposal will have a lot coverage of 39.88% (2,714 sq. ft.);
- The minimum interior setback required for additions to an existing home is 4'-0" and the project proposal will have a 13'-0" minimum setback at the north, a 4'-0" minimum setback at the east, and a 21'-10" minimum setback at the west;
- The minimum landscaping required is 40% (2,721 sq. ft.) and the project proposal will have 44.08% (3,000 sq. ft.).

Such standards allow for suitable enlargement of the residence, ensuring a reasonably sized backyard area and a proper land to building footprint ratio, while prohibiting massive development from encroaching onto neighboring properties.

Furthermore, the provisions of GMC 30.47.030 dictate that privacy be judged by the view from the living room, den, study, family room, great room, library, dining room, or balconies greater than 25 square feet of the new development into the buildings and backyard outdoor space of existing buildings. The subject proposal features two new bedrooms with bathrooms at the northerly most part of the addition that faces the rear adjacent neighbor at 1824 Rosita Drive. Given the Zoning Code standard, privacy is not judged from private rooms such as bedrooms and bathrooms, so the proposed one-story addition with the 13 foot setback does not constitute a violation of privacy by Code. At this time, the existing

fence between the two properties and the Eucalyptus tree between the addition and the rear property line are to remain, providing screening and separation.

3. The plans identify a large mature Eucalyptus tree at the rear of the property as existing. The same neighbor at 1824 Rosita Drive is requesting that the tree be maintained and not be removed as it provides shade to the subject property and the northerly neighbor, and that any trimming of this tree that may be required during construction be supervised by an arborist, similar to the Oak tree.

In accordance with GMC 30.47.030, preservation of mature trees, such as the large Eucalyptus tree at the rear, should be considered in site planning. As indicated on the plans, this tree is slated to remain as part of the overall proposal for the addition. While consideration is given to the preservation of these trees for site planning and construction, the City does not have the authority to require that this tree be maintained on-site unless it is an indigenous tree as outlined in Chapter 12.44 of the Glendale Municipal Code.

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 JUNE 19, 2017 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, **Vista Ezzati**, 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, Vista Ezzati, for stamp and signature prior to submitting for Building plan check. Please contact Vista Ezzati directly at 818-937-8180 or via email at VEzzati@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LANZAFAME
Director of Community Development

Urban Design Studio Staff

EK:ve

CITY OF GLENDALE

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

Community Development Department Request for Comments Form (RFC)

DATE: April 27, 2017	DUE DATE: May 11, 2017
FROM: Vista Ezzati, Planning Assistan	Tel. # Ext. 8180
PROJECT ADDRESS: 1827 Hillside I	Drive
Applicant: Darren Wong	
Property Owner: Darren Wo	ong and Amy T. Wang
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Addition of 89 dwelling.	94 square-feet to the rear of an existing single-family
PLEASE CHECK:	
A. CITY ATTORNEY	G. INFORMATION SERVICES (Wireless Telecom)
B. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: • (1) Building & Safety	H. PUBLIC WORKS (ADMINISTRATION): (1) Engineering & Environmental Management
• (2) Economic Development	• (2) Traffic & Transportation
• (3) Housing	(3) Facilities (city projects only)
(4) Neighborhood Services	(4) Integrated Waste
(5) Planning & Urban Design EIF/Historic District	 (5) Maintenance Services/Urban Forester
D. COMMUNITY SERVICES/PARKS:	J. GLENDALE POLICE
E. FIRE ENGINEERING (PSC)	K. OTHER:
F. GLENDALE WATER & POWER:	• (1) STATE-Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC)
• (1) Water	• (2) CO Health dept.
• (2) Electric	• (3) City Clerk's Office
ENTITLEMENT(S) REQUESTED	
Variance Case No.:	Tentative Tract/Parcel Map No.:
CUP Case No.:	Zone Change/GPA:
ADR Case No.: PDR 1705926	Other

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION PROJECT CONDITIONS AND COMMENTS

Project Project
Address:1827 Hillside Drive Case No.: PDR 1705926

NOTE: Your comments should address, within your area of authority, concerns and potentially significant adverse physical changes to the environment regarding the project. You may also identify code requirements specific to the project, above and beyond your normal requirements. Applicant will be informed early in the development process.

You may review complete plans, maps and exhibits in our office, MSB Room 103. We appreciate your consideration and look forward to your timely comments. Please do not recommend APPROVAL or DENIAL. For any questions, please contact the Case Planner ASAP, so as not to delay the case processing.

COMMENTS:

☐ This office <u>DOES NOT</u> have any comment.

★ This office HAS the following comments/conditions.
 □ (See attached Dept. Master List)

Date: 05/05/2017

Print Name: Jeremy Cawn

Title: Arborist Technician Dept. PW/MS Tel.: 3402

a. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

1. This is a proposed addition to an existing home located on the Eastern side of the Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood. The property is located in a developed section of the Verdugo Woodlands and there remains very little of the original Oak woodlands in the immediate surroundings. The open spaces on the property are landscaped with a well maintained mix of turf and ornamental plants with several non-native trees. Forestry's comments are based on a review of the submitted plans and several site visits.

Indigenous Tree Ordinance

There are no protected indigenous trees on the property, however there is a large mature Coast Live Oak tree located on the neighboring property to the North, near the property line. The tree has a very widespread crown and a significant portion overhangs the rear of the property and is within the foot print of the proposed addition.

- There is a significant portion of the crown of the protected Oak tree that overhangs the proposed addition at 12 feet or lower; approximately 10-15% of the live canopy, including several large diameter branches (over 2" in diameter) will need to be removed in order to clear the proposed structure plus 5'. This is acceptable on the condition that the work must be performed by a qualified tree trimmer and completed prior to the start of construction.
- The footprint of the proposed addition lies within the dripline of the nearby protected Oak tree. There is the potential that large tree roots may be impacted by the construction of the addition. However, the concern for significant root loss or damage is tempered by the fact that the footprint for the proposed addition is currently occupied by a level, raised pad covered with turf and pavers. The top of the raised pad is at least 6" above the natural soil level around the base of the tree. The original root system, including the large structural roots, was buried when the patio was built and the tree has likely reestablished roots elsewhere on this property and the adjacent property. Forestry is assuming that excavation for the foundation of the addition will not uncover the same amount and quality of roots that would be found in undisturbed soil, and supports the proposed footprint on the condition that any roots that are 2" in diameter or greater are preserved by bridging the foundation over the root.

b. CASE SPECIFIC CODE REQUIREMENTS: (these are not standard code requirements) 1.	
c. SUGGESTED CONDITIONS: (may or may not be adopted by the Hearing Officer)	
1 .	

in an inaccessible location behind an existing fence.

As part of our approval of the project, Forestry will require that the property owner complete an indigenous tree permit application and an indigenous tree protection measure sheet. Forestry does not require an indigenous tree report; the impacts to the tree from construction are relatively few and the majority of the tree trunk and crown is

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

Meeting/Decision Date: May 25, 2017	Address: 1827 Hillside Drive
Review Authority: ☐DRB ☑ADR ☐HPC ☐CC	APN: 5652-022-006
Case Number: PDR 1705926	Applicant: Darren Wong
Prepared By: Vista Ezzati, Planning Assistant	Owner: Darren Wong & Amy T. Wang
Project Summary The applicant is proposing to add a one-story, 894 squal,414 square-foot single-family house (originally construct located in the R1R (FAR District II) zone.	
The proposed work includes:	
 Addition of 894 square-feet of floor area to include 	de two new bedrooms and a family room.
Existing Property/Background Originally developed in 1952, the project site is an appron Hillside Drive. The site is currently developed with a an attached two-car garage. The project site is accessed project site is a rectangular shaped lot with a nominal upaddition will be located on the relatively flat portion of the	1,414 square-foot, one-story single-family house with ed from Hillside Drive via an existing driveway. The phill slope from west to east. The existing house and
Staff Recommendation ☐ Approve ☐ Approve with Conditions ☐	Return for Redesign
Last Date Reviewed / Decision ☐ First time submittal for final review. ☐ Other:	*
Zone: R1R FAR District: II Although this design review does not convey final zonir consistency with the applicable Codes and no inconsist	
Active/Pending Permits and Approvals ☑ None ☐ Other:	
CEQA Status: ☐ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. ☐ The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class Structures" exemption pursuant to Section 15303 of Other:	s 3 "New Construction or Conversion of Small
Site Slope and Grading ☑ None proposed ☐ Less than 50% current average slope and less than and/or fill); no additional review required. ☐ 1500 cubic yards or greater of earth movement:	1500 cubic yards of earth movement (cut

П	50%	or	greater	current	average	slope:
	00 /0	O.	grouter	Curront	avoidge	SIUPU.

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	7,311 sq. ft.	5,136 sq. ft 14,302 sq. ft.	6,804 sq. ft.
Setback	33'-2"	15'-0" to 52'-0"	34'-0"
House size	1,822 sq. ft.	1,089 sq. ft 3,747 sq. ft.	2,308 sq. ft.
Floor Area Ratio	0.25	0.14 - 0.42	0.34
Number of stories	19 out of 23 homes surveyed are one-story	1 to 2 stories	1-story

DESIGN ANALYSIS

DESIGN ANAL 1313
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 □Alteration of landform minimized
Yards and Usable Open Space ☐ yes ⊠ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain: □ Avoid altering landform to create flat yards □ Outdoor areas integrated into open space □ Use of retaining walls minimized □ Provide landscaping to reduce visual impact of retaining walls □ Decorative material used for retaining walls to blend into landscape and/or complement the building design
Garage Location and Driveway ☐ yes ☑ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain: □Consistent with predominant pattern on street □Compatible with primary structure □Permeable paving material □Decorative paving

If "no" select from below and explain:

Landscape/Hardscape Design ⊠ yes ☐ n/a ☐ no

☐ Complementary to building design and surrounding site ☐ Maintain existing trees when possible
□Appropriately sized and located
☐ Maximize permeable surfaces
□Stormwater runoff minimized
Walls and Fences ☐ yes ⊠ n/a ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain: □ Front yard maintains sense of openness □ Appropriate style/color/material □ 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 894 square-foot addition is sited at the rear of the existing house, and modifies the original building footprint in an appropriate manner. The addition will extend the rear of the existing house into the backyard and maintain an L-shaped footprint. The existing attached two-car garage and driveway will remain unchanged, and all walls and fences on-site will be maintained.
 The addition will infill a portion of the landscaping in the backyard. While some landscaping at the rear will be removed for the addition, there are no significant alterations being proposed to the existing landscaping on-site. The project will maintain 44% landscaping which exceeds the minimum zoning code requirement.
 There is an existing Oak tree located to the north on the abutting neighbor's property, with a portion of the drip line located on the project site. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the applicant adhere to all of the recommendations made by the Urban Forestry Department in their comments dated May 5, 2017 (Attachment #5).
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 □ Impact of larger building minimized
Building Relates to Existing Topography ☐ yes ☐ no
If "no" select from below and explain: □Form and profile follow topography □Alteration of existing landform 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 proposed 894 square-foot, one-story addition is located at the rear of the existing one-story single-family house. The addition's height is appropriate and in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. The project site features a nominal uphill slope from west to east that follows the topography of Hillside Drive. There are no alterations proposed to the existing topography, and the addition at the rear is on a relatively flat pad. The overall height of the existing one-story home remains at 14'-7", where the maximum height allowed in this zone is 35'-0" for a house with a pitched roof. The addition is only one-story in height, and will not be visible from the street. The existing house features primarily hipped roof forms with a 4:12 roof pitch throughout. The proposal includes a hipped-roof with a 4:12 pitch, consistent with the existing development.
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
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 The trash storage area, downspouts, and gutters are not shown on the drawings. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the drawings be revised to identify these.
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
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:

- Overall, the addition's design and detailing is appropriate and is consistent with the existing style of the residence through the use of the same materials, windows, and colors.
- The existing entryway will remain unchanged as part of the proposal.
- The existing board and batten siding, and brick base at the front will be maintained.
- The windows of the addition will be white vinyl with clear glass sliders that are consistent with the style of the home. The new windows will be recessed in the opening with a wood frame and sill to match the details of the existing home. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the applicant provide a window section detail for staff review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
- The addition has a smooth stucco finish to match the existing house in both color and texture.
- The roof of the addition will be composition shingle to match the existing house.
- The gutters, downspounts, and location of the trash storage area are not identified on the plans. Staff
 is recommending a condition of approval that the drawings be revised to identify these.

Recommendation / Draft Record of Decision

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

Conditions

- 1. That the trash storage area be identified on the plans and located out of public view.
- 2. That the elevation drawings be revised to identify the downspouts and gutters for staff review and approval.
- 3. That a vertical window section detail be provided for staff review and approval that identifies the window recess, sill, and frame.

Attachments

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Neighborhood Survey
- 3. Photos of Existing Property
- 4. Reduced Plans
- 5. Urban Forestry Departmental Comments dated May 5, 2017