



November 7, 2017

Sarkis & Lusina Yaralian
345 West Kenneth Road
Glendale, CA 91202

**RE: 345 WEST KENNETH ROAD
ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW CASE NO. PDR 1707193**

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Yaralian:

On November 7, 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 construct a new, detached, one-story, 495 square-foot pool house with an attached trellis patio at the northwest portion of an existing 12,680 square-foot corner lot located in the R1 Zone, FAR District I. The project site is a contributor in the Brockmont Park Historic District, is currently developed with an existing 1,836 square-foot two-story house with a detached two-car garage that was originally constructed in 1950, and is located at **345 West Kenneth Road**.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the drawings shall be revised to show board-and-batten siding to match the dimensions and profiles of the siding on the house, and that a detail drawing be provided indicating all dimensions.
2. That the drawings shall be revised to identify the location of the gutters and downspouts.
3. That the window section detail shall be revised to indicate that the windows will be clear glass.
4. That the roof plate height shall be lowered by one foot to reduce the overall height of the structure by one foot and more closely align the roof eaves with those of the nearby garage.

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 495 square-foot pool house with a trellis-covered patio is appropriately sited towards the northwest portion of the lot facing Merriman Drive. The patio will be attached to the pool house along the east elevation, facing the interior of the lot.

- The setback of the pool house from Merriman Drive will range from 25'-3" to 29'-0". This conforms with the existing staggered arrangement of the house and garage that results from the angle of the street.
- The location of the detached pool house is consistent with the Historic District Guidelines because it is behind the existing house and detached garage, towards the rear of the lot. The siting relates to the surrounding context, and maintains existing sightlines towards the main house and allowing it to remain the dominant structure on the site and preserving its integrity and historic character.
- There are no changes being proposed to the existing house, garage, or driveway currently on the property.

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

- The mass, height, proportions, and architectural concept of the proposed pool house are consistent with main house and detached garage.
- The new pool house will have an overall height of 13'-7", where the Zoning Code allows a maximum height of 15'-0" for accessory structures with a pitched roof. The new trellis will have an overall height of 9'-0". A condition of approval requires the overall height of the new pool house be reduced by one foot by lowering the roof plate height in order to closely align the roof eaves with those of the nearby garage.
- The proposed hipped roof form for the new pool house with a 4:12 pitch is consistent with the style and is compatible to the existing house and detached garage.

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

- Overall, the design and materials for the proposed pool house are consistent with the Modern style and, as conditioned to include appropriate board-and-batten siding, will be compatible with the existing house.
- The façade will feature board and batten wood siding to the existing texture and color of the main house. The attached trellis will be wood with stucco finished columns.
- The gutters and downspouts are not identified on the drawings. A condition of approval requires that the drawings be revised to identify their location.
- The hipped roof will be a flat tile and the proposed color is "Coastal Blend" which is compatible with the existing house.
- The exterior doors will be metal framed with glazing, and the patio will feature a folding door that opens out on to the patio.
- The windows are proposed to be primarily casement with one hung window proposed along the east elevation facing the back yard. The new windows will be metal with detailing to match the main house. A condition of approval requires that the section detail be revised to indicate that the new windows will be clear glass to be consistent with the windows of the main house.

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. **Administrative Design Review (ADR) versus Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Review**

This concern is raised in letters from The Glendale Historical Society, Lee W. Smith, Catherine Jurca, Kathy Buckley, Rebecca and Chester Maxwell, Robert and Mae Snyder, and Elizabeth Morris.

Staff determined the ADR process to be appropriate because the proposal is consistent with Glendale's Historic District Design Guidelines, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and represents a higher level of design review than required by the Zoning Code. To address the last point, the code clearly allows for staff-level review in the form of an exemption for accessory structures in historic districts that are visible from the street if they are consistent with the Historic District Design Guidelines:

Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) Chapter 30.47.020: Design Review – Applicability; Section G – Exemptions, Subsection 4c:

Accessory buildings that do not exceed five hundred (500) square feet that are compatible with any existing dwelling(s) on the same lot through use of colors and materials, roof style and general architectural style and treatment or, **in an adopted historic district overlay zone, accessory buildings that do not exceed five hundred (500) square feet that can or will be seen from the public street or sidewalk immediately adjacent the subject property that are compatible with the historic district design guidelines.**

This code section would allow an over-the-counter staff approval of a project like the proposed pool house in the form of an exemption. Staff determined that greater public input should be obtained because of the project's visibility from the street and therefore opted for the ADR process. Staff is confident that the pool house at 345 W. Kenneth Road meets both the Standards and the Guidelines. It will not be visible in the context of the front façade of the house, is located at a distance from the house and behind the existing detached garage, and is compatible with the massing, style, and material palette of the existing house and garage. The proposal is also consistent with the Historic District Design Guidelines section for accessory structures as it is: located to the rear of the lot, while allowing the future pool to be visible from the house; similar in character to other outbuildings in the district; subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of mass, size, and height; features a basic rectangular form with a hipped roof that does not compete with that of the primary structure; and features building materials that draw on the range of materials used for the primary structure's architectural style. The two final sections of this response include further discussion regarding the project's compliance with the Historic District Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

For these reasons, the ADR process is appropriate for this project.

2. **Categorical Exemption under CEQA is Not Appropriate**

This concern is raised in letters from Lee W. Smith, Kathy Buckley, Rebecca and Chester Maxwell, Robert and Mae Snyder, Pamela and Christian Bodden, and Elizabeth Morris.

Staff strongly disagrees with the comments on this issue. The project is exempt from CEQA review as a Class 3 "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures" exemption pursuant to Section 15303 (e) of the State CEQA Guidelines because the proposal is to construct accessory structures (pool house with attached patio, and swimming pool) on the site. Additionally, the proposal qualifies for an additional categorical exemption under CEQA for a historic resource, Class 31, in accordance with Section 15331 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The proposal clearly meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (as discussed in the final section of this response) and would also be eligible for a categorical exemption under CEQA, as indicated in Article 19, Section 15300 ("Categorical Exemptions") of the State of California's CEQA guidelines:

15331. Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation.

Class 31 consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer.

3. Mitigation via Inclusion of Conditions of Approval

This concern is raised by Lee W. Smith.

The conditions added as part of the proposed project approval are minor and consist of design changes and/or clarifications that will allow the project be more compatible with the overall site and district. Mitigation measures are only necessary to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Since the project does not result in any impacts, it was determined to be exempt from CEQA. Only three conditions of approval were included in the staff recommendation:

1. That the drawings shall be revised to show board-and-batten siding to match the dimensions and profiles of the siding on the house, and that a detail drawing be provided indicating all dimensions.
2. That the drawings shall be revised to identify the location of the gutters and downspouts.
3. That the window section detail shall be revised to indicate that the windows will be clear glass.

Each of these conditions of approval is minor, calling for clarifications of the submittal materials (1 and 3) or the inclusion of a minor design feature omitted from the drawings (2). Based on the public comment regarding the proposal, staff will add a fourth condition of approval to the project: "4. That the roof plate height shall be lowered by one foot to reduce the overall height of the structure by one foot and more closely align the roof eaves with those of the nearby garage." This added condition of approval is also a relatively minor change to a project design feature.

4. CEQA Piecemealing

This concern is raised by Lee W. Smith, Kathy Buckley, Rebecca and Chester Maxwell, Robert and Mae Snyder, and Elizabeth Morris.

The comments contend that the proposal calls for construction of a pool house without also depicting construction of a swimming pool, and that the "whole of the project" is therefore

not being considered as required under CEQA. Staff disagrees with this interpretation. The pool house is considered an accessory structure in the Glendale Zoning Code. Its use, whether as a pool house or, for example, a guest house or storage shed, is not under review. Pools in Glendale are always constructed under a separate building permit than the structure with which they are affiliated. The Design Review Board commonly reviews and approves the construction of new homes, also deemed categorically exempt under CEQA, with drawings indicating the pool will be built “under separate permit.”

Staff is confident that the “whole of the project” is the construction of the accessory structure and that the claim of “piecemealing” is inaccurate.

5. Design

Various concerns about aspects of the proposed design are raised by Lee W. Smith, The Glendale Historical Society, Catherine Jurca, Kathy Buckley, Rebecca and Chester Maxwell, Robert and Mae Snyder, Sivert Glarum, Suzanne and Don Zachary, and Elizabeth Morris. The following responses are broken down according to the specific topics of concern expressed by one or more commentator.

Size and Height

Several commentators expressed concern about the new structure’s height. **Staff agrees that lowering the height will help it better relate to the nearby garage and therefore will add a Condition of Approval calling for the roof plate of the pool house to be dropped by one foot.** This will reduce the overall height while still allowing for an eight foot interior ceiling height (rather than the nine-foot height proposed). The lowered plate height will also more closely align the new roof eaves with the eaves of the garage, addressing several comments. The new building will still be somewhat taller than the garage due to the roof spanning the larger footprint. Concern was also raised about the overall size of the structure. The proposal for 495 square feet is just below the maximum allowed for accessory structures and does not impact any Zoning Code requirements for lot coverage or landscape coverage. Though larger than the detached garage, the new structure remains deferential to the main house and complementary to the garage; staff continues to find the square footage appropriate for the project.

Setbacks and Location on the Lot

The pool house will be located to the north of the garage along the property’s street-side setback fronting onto Merriman Drive. The minimum street- side setback in the R1 zone is 6 feet and the new structure will be setback between approximately 25 and 29 feet from the property line. All properties on the east side of Merriman Drive between West Kenneth Road and Cumberland Road, each also on a corner lot, have their street side frontages facing Merriman. Because of this, every house, some two-stories high, along with their garages and privacy wall and fences, are set quite close to the street. Several commentators suggest the pool house will be closer to the street than “the other buildings,” but the structure will actually have, by far, the largest setback of any property on the east side of Merriman Drive (with the exception of the primary house on the site). Its setback will be comparable to that of the existing garage. The placement of the pool house on the lot is appropriate to both the property and the overall district. Some commentators suggest that the locations of the pool and the pool house be swapped, with the new structure placed toward the northeast corner of the property, further from the street. This would lead to a portion of the pool being placed behind the garage, without a direct line of sight from the

house. This change will not meet the owners' programmatic needs or safety concerns and staff continues to support the proposed location.

Historic District Design Guidelines

Mr. Lee W. Smith provides an assessment regarding the proposal's conformance with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Five points are raised regarding the setback, several incorrectly asserting that the point of reference should be the front setbacks of properties on the west side of Merriman Drive. These concerns are addressed in the section above. Another point is raised about maintaining the alignment of horizontal elements, such as windows sills and roof eaves, along the block. Given the north-south slope of the lots along Merriman Drive, this is not a desirable goal. The new windows do, however, relate to the heights of many historic windows found at the main house and the drawings clearly show the sills appropriately located three feet above the floor level (with the exception of the small bathroom window facing Merriman). Staff agrees that the eave line of the pool house should be more closely aligned with that of the nearby garage and has added a condition of approval to reduce the height of the pool house by one foot. The appearance of the windows themselves is also called into question. The new windows will be constructed of either steel or aluminum and are noted on the drawings and shown in section as matching the historic steel casement windows used at the main house. Per standard staff practice for all design review, the application will not proceed to Building & Safety plan check unless all aspects of the design, including the windows, are reviewed and approved by Planning staff; the new windows will closely match the historic windows at the house in terms of materials, dimensions, operation, and finish. A final concern is raised about stucco, which is only proposed at the trellis columns, with only one column being somewhat visible from the street. As noted on the drawing, the new stucco will appropriately match the texture of the stucco on the garage. The pool house itself will be clad with board-and-batten siding.

Consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

Several commentators suggest that the project does not meet the Standards for Rehabilitation. Lee W. Smith finds the project does not meet 5 of the 10 Standards, specifically 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10. Catherine Jurca finds the project does not meet Standard 9 because it is not differentiated from the existing structures on the site. Staff disagrees with all of these comments and finds that the project clearly meets all of the Standards as discussed below.

Standard 1

A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The property was built as a single-family residence and remains as such. The commentator has misinterpreted this Standard, which is not applicable to this project.

Standard 2

The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The historic character of the property will be retained, as will its status as a contributor to the historic district. The unbuilt area behind the garage at the northwest corner of the lot is not a character-defining feature of the property and new construction there is appropriate. The proposal will not alter any existing spatial relationship that exists between the house and the garage. Mention is made of the previous removal of a wood fence but this work is not included in the current proposal. Staff will work with the

property owner to remedy the removal of the fence. The existing metal and wire fence between the garage and the house that was installed without permit will be removed as part of the current proposal.

Standard 3

Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

The commentator suggests that placing the pool house toward the street “negates the record of the property’s 1950s period of significance” and “entirely changes the open, wooded sense of original place,” therefore producing a false sense of historic development. This is an incorrect reading of this Standard, which focuses on alterations that confuse a historic property’s historic timeline, particularly through the addition of features that “might” have existed or were taken from other sites and incorporated into the new design. As interpreted by the commentator, this Standard would preclude practically any rear-yard addition to a historic property, which is clearly not the intent of the Standards for Rehabilitation. The concern about the loss of the backyard’s “open, wooded” character is unfounded. Landscape features are not protected in Glendale’s historic districts unless they are trees officially protected by the City or are specifically identified as “historic” in the district survey. None of the trees previously removed by the applicant are known to fall into these categories.

Standard 9

New additions, exterior alteration, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Mr. Smith suggests that the pool house will destroy existing spatial relationships on the site. As noted for Standard 3, staff cannot find the empty rear-yard space behind the garage to be a characteristic feature of the property and therefore concludes that this part of Standard 9 will be met. He goes on to mention that the project will alter the connection between the “open rear and side yard” with the four properties to the north (along the east side of Merriman Drive). Each of these houses has its rear yard completely closed off from the street by tall walls and fences set at or near the street-side setback line. The pool house will be open on each side, providing visual access into the area at the rear of the property, rather than being walled-off like the neighbors to the north, and maintaining open space between the pool house and the adjoining neighbor. Ms. Jurca finds that the design of the pool house is not differentiated from that of the main house or garage. Staff disagrees, finding that the use of board-and-batten siding at all four facades, rather than in select locations at the main house and not at all at the garage, will clearly differentiate the new structure from the older ones while also making it compatible with the historic design and material palette.

Standard 10

New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Mr. Smith raises the issue of the removal of the wood fence between the house and the garage. This apparently occurred prior to the submission of the current proposal. It will be addressed through an open Neighborhood Services citation and staff plans to work with the applicant concurrently with the processing of the pool house permit. This concern would be better raised under Standard 9, because Standard 10 focuses on ensuring that new additions and construction, if removed in the future, will allow the former characteristics of the property to remain. Regardless, the removal of the wood fence will be further investigated and remedied.

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 Historic Preservation 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 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 **November 22, 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

JP:ve