



## PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

### STAFF REPORT

**DATE:** APRIL 14, 2026

**TO:** DESIGN COMMISSION

**FROM:** JENNIFER PAIGE, AICP, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**ADDRESS:** 600 N. ROSEMEAD BOULEVARD

**SUBJECT:** APPLICATION FOR CONSOLIDATED DESIGN REVIEW (DHP2026-00073) NEW FIVE-STORY, 110,593 SQUARE-FOOT, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING WITH 82 DWELLING UNITS AND CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING TWO-STORY, 56,828 SQUARE-FOOT OFFICE BUILDING TO 51 DWELLING UNITS FOR A TOTAL OF 131 AFFORDABLE UNITS AND TWO MANAGER UNITS.

---

### RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Commission:

#### Environmental Determination

1. Find that the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation, with the General Plan goals and policies for the site, and with the applicable zoning designation and regulations; and that the project site has no value as habitat for endangered or threatened species, and can be served by utilities and public services;
2. Find that approval of the project will not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, water quality or cultural resources; and
3. Conclude, therefore, that the project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under §15332, (Class 32) "in-fill development projects" and that there are no features that distinguish this project from others in the exempt class and, therefore, there are no unusual circumstances.

### **Findings for Compliance with the Tree Protection Ordinance**

1. Acknowledge that a tree inventory (Attachment B) identifies removal of five protected specimen trees (trees no. 22, 23, 33, 34, and 35) and two protected mature trees (trees no. 36 and 37);
2. Find that the removal of trees no. 33 and 34 meets finding no. 2 of the Tree Protection Ordinance: “The present condition of the trees is such that they are not reasonably likely to survive;”
3. Find that the removal of trees no. 22, 23, 35, 36, and 37 meets finding no. 6 of the Tree Protection Ordinance: “The project, as defined in Section 17.80.020, includes a landscape design plan, which will result in a tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed, within a reasonable time after completion of the project;” and, therefore,

Approve the removal of five protected specimen trees and two protected mature trees.

### **Findings for Consolidated Design Approval**

Find that the project, upon implementation of the conditions of approval, will comply with the purposes of design review, the design-related goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the Design Guidelines in the East Pasadena Specific Plan (EPSP) and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Districts; and

Based on these findings, approve the application for Consolidated Design Review subject to the conditions in Attachment A, which shall be subject to staff review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit, unless otherwise stated.

### **BACKGROUND:**

#### **Project Overview**

- General Plan Designation: Low Commercial (0.00-1.00 FAR).
- Zoning: EPSP-d2-CO-D-2 (East Pasadena Specific Plan, Subarea d2 Commercial Office District, subarea D-2).
- Design Guidelines: The applicable design guidelines are the design-related goals and policies in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the Design Guidelines in the EPSP and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Districts.
- Site: The project site is an interior lot of approximately 2.15 acres (93,759) square feet in area that is located on the east side of Rosemead Boulevard, between Sierra Madre Villa Avenue and Greenhill Road. The site is currently developed with a two-story office building with a semi-subterranean parking structure and a two-story parking structure that is attached to the southern end of the existing building. Access into the site is from Rosemead Boulevard through three entry portals: a pedestrian passageway that leads to the lobby of

the existing building and two driveways that serve the two parking lots. The site has a sloping topography in the north-south and east-west directions. The portions of the lot where the existing buildings and parking structure are located have been previously graded; however, the areas immediately behind the building and parking structure feature a significant upslope with dense landscape and mature trees.

- **Surroundings:** Surrounding properties include a mix of two- to three-story professional office and research and development buildings, three-story multi-family residential developments and one-story single-family residences. The office buildings and multi-family residential developments front Rosemead Boulevard and are located to the north, west, and south of the project site, respectively. The single-family residential development is in the Lower Hastings Ranch Neighborhood located east of the project site at the top of the hill behind the existing buildings on the site. The only nearby designated historic resource is the Stuart Pharmaceuticals building, approximately one-half mile south of the site at 3360 E. Foothill Boulevard.
- **Project Description:** The project involves the conversion of an existing two-story, 56,828 square-foot office building (Building A) into a 51-unit multi-family residential building and construction of a new five-story, 110,593 square-foot, 82-unit multi-family residential building above a one-story parking garage (Building B). The combined project will accommodate 133 units comprising of 131 affordable units and two manager units. The composition of the units includes 8 studio units, 57 one-bedroom units, 34 2-bedroom units, and 34 3-bedroom units. Although onsite parking spaces are not required by the State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) due to the project’s proximity within one-half mile of a major transit stop, the project will provide a total of 55 parking spaces located under the buildings. Additionally, onsite amenities will be provided including residential lobbies, community room and conference rooms, general and leasing offices, and shared outdoor spaces including patios, a central courtyard, and children’s and teen’s play areas. Additional shared open spaces will be located on the fifth floor designed as roof decks. All outdoor spaces will be programmed to enhance the quality and usability of the spaces.

The application for the project includes utilization of SDBL, will utilize incentives and requests concessions. As a 100% affordable housing project (exclusive of the manager’s units) within one-half mile of a major transit stop, under SDBL, the project automatically receives incentives to allow unlimited density, three additional stories (or 33 additional feet) above the height limit, and no minimum parking requirement. The table below outlines what is permitted under the City’s Zoning Code and SDBL and what is proposed for the project:

	<b>City’s Zoning Code</b>	<b>SDBL</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>
Maximum Density	103 units (or 48 units/acre)	No maximum	133 units (or 62 units/acre)
Maximum Height	38 feet	71 feet	68 feet
Minimum Parking	201 spaces for units + 14 guest spaces = 215 spaces	No minimum	55 spaces

Under SDBL, the project is also eligible for up to five concessions from the development standards of the EPSP; the applicant is requesting five concessions to:

1. **Front Yard Reduction:** A 10-foot front yard setback reduction in lieu of the average blockface requirement, with a minimum of 20 feet required, pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.070.B.
  2. **Street Façade Length Increase:** A 140-foot increase in the length of the street façade in lieu of the 60-foot maximum allowed, pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.070.E.1.
  3. **Exemption from Garden Requirements:** The exemption from the RM-48 Garden Requirements for a multi-family residential use in the EPSP-d2-CO-D-2 Zone pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.080.
  4. **Alternative Open Space:** The ability to utilize the Adaptive Reuse open space development standards in lieu of the required RM-48 zoning district garden standards for multifamily projects, pursuant to PMC Section 17.50.030.F.
  5. **Parking Location Deviation:** The ability to provide a parking structure that is not located within the 40% rear of the site in lieu of the parking location requirement for podium buildings, pursuant to PMC Section 17.46.020.K.4.
- **Trees:** The project site includes 41 existing private trees, 27 of which are protected under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, and seven public street trees along the frontage of the property. A total of 14 private trees are proposed to be removed, seven of which are protected trees including five specimen trees (tree no. 22, 23, 33, 34, and 35) that include two Sugar Gum, two London Plane, and one Jacaranda Trees and two mature trees (tree no. 36 and 37) which are Mexican Fan Palm Trees. Twenty-seven on-site protected and non-protected trees are proposed to be retained in conjunction with the project. All seven existing public street trees will be retained.
  - **Site Design:** The project site has street frontage that is significantly wider than it is deep. The proposed building (Building B) will be situated in the southern section of the site with a generally rectangular footprint that surrounds a central courtyard that is connected to a pedestrian passageway that leads to the street. The existing building (Building A) is located in the northern portion of the site with a long and linear footprint. The buildings will be detached, resulting in a secondary passageway between them. Another existing secondary pathway is located north of the existing building and leads to the outdoor patios at the rear of the building.

Both buildings will be oriented toward Rosemead Boulevard and express complementary footprints, setback distances, and site design. Each building will feature a central pedestrian passageway that is connected to the public right-of-way and leads to its respective residential lobby where access to the units is provided. Similarly, the entrance to the parking garage in each building will be provided through a driveway directly from Rosemead Boulevard that will be located south of the pedestrian path. The existing 15'-0" front setback, 14'-11" side setback and 49'-8" rear setback of the existing building will not be modified, since this building will be retained. The new building will be set back ten feet from the front property line, while the side and rear setbacks are 10 feet and 25 feet, respectively, which are compliant with the Zoning Code. Two parking garages are proposed and will be located under the buildings in the front section of the site.

- **Architectural Style:** Contemporary
- **Developer:** Elysian Housing, LLC

- Architects: FSY Architects
- Landscape Architect: [ place ]

**ANALYSIS:**

**Design Commission Comments from Preliminary Consultation**

On January 27, 2026, the Design Commission reviewed an application for Preliminary Consultation for this project. The Commission’s comments from that meeting, with excerpts from the design team’s responses, and staff’s comments, are detailed in the table below. The design team’s full responses are incorporated into the set of plans in Attachment C. At the conclusion of the January 27, 2026 meeting, a Design Commission Subcommittee was created to assist the applicant and provide guidance on ways to revise the design of the project to address the Commission’s comments. The Subcommittee met on February 9, 2026 and provided feedback on the revisions proposed by the applicant. It should be noted that, although not subject to compliance with the draft Objective Design Standards, the building has been designed to comply with these standards to the extent feasible.

<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 1</b>
Consider drawing and incorporating influences from the mid-century design of the existing office building into the proposed building to strengthen the architectural concept between the two buildings.
<b>Applicant Response</b>
“The Project has incorporated additional influences from the mid-century design of the original wing of the existing office building such as the horizontal projecting roof plane, use of brick materials, and an emphasis on vertical fenestration patterns. The original wing of the existing building was designed to articulate its concrete structure, notably by extending columns and floor plates past the exterior wall, creating a feeling of horizontal “movement” across its main façade. While the proposed building will be constructed primarily of wood framing, care was taken to place horizontal stucco control joints aligned with the floor plates at each level, identifying the location of the structure. The proposed building See Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, and G2.09.”
<b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i>
The applicant has incorporated some design influences of the existing building into the proposed building notably by incorporating the deep roof plane and brick finish to establish a design connection between the two buildings, although the mass/scale, height, and overall volumes of both buildings are different. The horizontal bandings, albeit subtle that are created through the use of control joints between the different levels, communicate the prominent horizontal banding of the existing building. These design approaches create differentiation between the existing and new buildings while also introducing subtle visual continuity between them.
<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 2</b>
Explore an alternative location for the children’s play area so that is not located under the building, but open to the sky.
<b>Applicant Response</b>
“Due to site limitations, alternative locations for the children’s play area would result in a significant loss of affordable units. The play area has been pushed to the east of the project, and partially extends past the face of the building. Additionally, the building mass has been broken to provide a 6’-8” to 10’-0” wide area open-to-sky, allowing light down into the center of the play area. See Sheets B-A2.02, B-A2.03, B-A2.04, B-A2.05, B-A2.06, B-A4.26, B-L2.02, B-L2.05, B-L3.02, B-L3.05, B-L4.02, and B-L4.05.”
<b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i>

<p>Further exploration of the site design was pursued by the applicant in order to find an alternative location for the children’s and teen’s play areas. However, due to the project’s scope, programmatic requirements and site characteristics, such as the upslope at the rear of the building and shallow lot depth, an alternative location could not be achieved other than the proposed location underneath the building. However, this area adjoins the courtyard and the landscaped area at the rear of the lot which will be partially exposed to natural sunlight throughout the day.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 3</b></p>
<p>Continue to study how the massing and architectural character of the development is compatible with the surrounding context and legacy of Pasadena, especially the east side facade since it is long and could be further improved through additional modulation or stepping of the upper levels to minimize potential massing concerns and achieve a sensitive relationship to the single-family residential development at the rear (east) of the project site.”</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“The compatibility of the Project’s massing and architectural character of development with the surrounding context and legacy of Pasadena has been studied, as indicated on Sheet G2.00. The architect examined the adjacent office to the north of the project site, the Hastings Ranch Library and other surrounding mid-century era buildings. With regard to the east side façade and its relationship to the single-family residential development at the rear east of the project site, Sheet G2.21 demonstrates how the Project has been designed to not impede views for the three neighbors east of the proposed building, at 605, 625, and 635 Rim Road. Additional modulation across 625 Rim Road has been incorporated to break up the massing as seen on Building B’s East Elevation on Sheet B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
<p>The applicant has further studied the surrounding developments, including nearby office buildings and single-family residences east of the proposed building to achieve a more cohesive and complementary design and sensitivity to the single-family residences. The revised design doesn’t include stepped upper floors as suggested since it has the potential to reduce unit count and size. However, the long eastern façade has been broken up to create two separate volumes that are joined by exterior pedestrian corridors. This treatment reduces the appearance of mass. The drawings provided on Sheet G2.21 identify three single-family residential properties that are located directly behind the proposed building located at 605, 625, and 635 Rim Road. The section drawings through the site and buildings illustrate the differences in topography, elevation points, and relationship between the proposed project and adjoining single-family residences. While the proposed building will be taller, its location at the bottom of the slope will not impinge on the views of the properties at the top of the slope since it will be below the sightline. Additionally, the single-family residences will be separated approximately 135 feet to 175 feet from the proposed building.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 4</b></p>
<p>Continue to study how the roofline along the rear (east) elevation can be broken up or stepped to achieve a similar treatment to the west, north and south elevations.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“The building façade and roofline along the rear (east) elevation has been broken up to achieve a similar treatment to the other elevations. The top level of all facades has been adjusted to receive similar materials as the main façade. See Building B’s East Elevation on Sheet B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
<p>The roofline of the east (rear) elevation has been broken up to coincide with the two building volumes as illustrated on Sheet B-A4.01. The roofline maintains a continuous height throughout the building and has not been stepped to achieve visual and design variation in order to maintain a consistent, clean, and simple design treatment as the west (front) elevation.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 5</b></p>
<p>Explore opportunities to increase/deepen the recess of the modulation in the northern section of the front (west) elevation and include an additional complete physical break in the façade to achieve closer</p>

<p>consistency to the ODS. Consider varying the building height further to achieve variations in the roofline and reposition square footage that would be affected by creation of more significant building breaks.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“A visual break and modulation, differentiated by a color and material change, is provided at the entry of and above the Manager’s Unit. The design team reviewed increasing the recess at this location and it was not possible to increase this recess without a loss of affordable units. An additional façade break at the main entrance, has been incorporated at the front (west) elevation to further break down the length of the façade, resulting in a varied roofline. The façade break at the main entrance is greater than 15 ft in length and 10 ft in depth, and extends through to the main courtyard. This is unable to extend open to sky without a loss of affordable units. However, the break is repeated at levels 1, 2, and 5, providing a visual break between two sides of the mass. This façade break further breaks down the length of the façade and achieves closer consistency to the ODS. See Sheets G2.07, G2.08, B-A4.01, and B-A5.26.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p>The applicant has further studied the possibility of creating a physical break in the front façade, which would achieve compliance with the draft Objective Design Standards as well as the possibility of introducing a deeper and more meaningful recess in the northern section of the front elevation and concluded that this would result in the loss of dwelling units due to impact to the floor plans. As such, the proposed recess is approximately two feet deep and seven feet wide that will be created in the second through fourth floors. This break in the wall plane is highlighted by a different and darker color to create the appearance of two separate building volumes while also breaking down the length of the façade into smaller sections and resulting in an improved mass as depicted on Sheet B-A4.01.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 6</b></p> <p>Restudy east and north elevations and explore ways that the top section of the building along the Rosemead Boulevard façade can be carried across all facades to achieve a consistent treatment throughout the building.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“The top section of the building along the Rosemead Boulevard façade now carries across all facades to achieve a consistent treatment throughout the building. See Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, and B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p>The revised elevations depict a consistent treatment of the Top section of the building that is expressed along all facades to achieve a cohesive design treatment throughout the building.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 7</b></p> <p>Since the top floor is differentiated from the floors below, a projecting band should be placed at the top of the fourth floor.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“The fifth floor is set back by 24” at the west elevation and control joints have been introduced at the floor plates to achieve this effect without introducing a projecting band. See Sheets B-A5.25 and B-A5.27.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval nos. 2 and 3.</i></p> <p>Although a projecting band is a typical treatment to signify the termination of the Middle section and beginning of the Top section of the building, an alternative treatment is proposed by the applicant. In lieu of a projecting band, the fifth floor is set back about 24 inches from the fourth floor to differentiate the Middle from the Top sections and is further highlighted by a horizontal band that is created by control joints. This design approach appears to be a sensible alternative; however, this treatment would not result in a dimensional appearance since it will be a flat surface and is not likely to be visible. As such, staff recommends that a projecting band be introduced to better define the Top section of the building as specified by condition no. 2. Additionally, staff recommends that this condition specify that this band be constructed of stone or pre-cast concrete, which may have a high-density foam interior.</p>

<p>The 24-inch setback at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor only occurs along the west (front) façade, while the east (rear), north, and south facades are flushed with the lower floors and are reliant on the banding created by control joints only. For this reason, condition no. 3 is recommended to require all facades to be treated with a recessed fifth floor.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 8</b></p>
<p>The façades on either side of the breaks should be differentiated from each other by at least two of the following methods: fenestration patterning, materiality, detailing/banding, balcony design, and height by at least one floor.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>"The facades on each side of the break at the main entry are differentiated from each other with different colored banding between the ground floor and second floor, as well as slight changes to the fenestration patterning. See Sheet B-A4.01."</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
<p>Two design features are incorporated into the revised design to differentiate the facades on either side of the breaks that include a different brick banding color between the first and second floors and deviation in the fenestration patterns. These design approaches appear appropriate and maintain consistent and cohesive design treatment, while also introducing a subtle differentiation among the facades.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 9</b></p>
<p>Consider incorporating design features and architectural treatments that are sensitive to and achieve an appropriate human scale at the ground plane and are inviting to the pedestrian experience, such as introduction of awnings or canopies above entrances, entry stoops for units facing the street, balconies, lighting/wall sconces, enhanced hardscape design and similar design features.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>"A canopy overhang has been introduced near the main entry to identify the manager/ leasing office, and the hardscape design by the main entry on the ground plane has been revised, with the ramp wall height reduced, the planter cut down, and a planter seat introduced to achieve a more appropriate human scale. Entry stoop has been provided outside manager unit 102. Lighting is proximate to the main entry and along Rosemead Boulevard to further foster an inviting pedestrian experience. See sheets G2.08, B-A4.01, and B-L4.02."</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 4.</i></p>
<p>A number of design features have been introduced along the street-facing façade to create and support a more pedestrian friendly experience along the public right-of-way while also helping the project achieve a more residential character. For example, the manager's unit features an entry stoop with a canopy that offers direct access from the street and connects to the pedestrian realm. The height of the planter wall and wall enclosing the accessibility ramp has also been reduced to achieve an improved human scale along the sidewalk. The planter wall has been broken into a tiered design in order to reduce its overall height and is integrated with a bench along the sidewalk. Based on the front elevation depicted on Sheet B-A4.01, the height of the wall along the accessibility ramp at its highest is about 10 feet high above the sidewalk. As such, recommended condition no. 4 requires the applicant to continue to explore ways to reduce the height of this wall to the extent possible.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 10</b></p>
<p>Use high quality materials and finishes throughout the project. A simple design can be attractive and elegant, but must be supported by high quality materials/finishes along with an appropriate color palette. Consideration to the texture of the material is also important, such as the texture of the proposed stucco finish. The color scheme should also complement the color of other building features, such as windows and doors and their color and if accent color is employed, it should complement the primary color and be strategically applied to building features or façades to achieve the necessary and appropriate highlight. Windows and doors are also important components of the building and should be high quality and the material, style/operation, and installation method should be carefully considered to</p>

<p>complement the building design. Additionally, all exterior finishes should not have reflective quality and changes in materials and colors should not create in-plane transitions, but terminate at or along inside corners or similar stopping points.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“The Project utilizes a variety of high-quality materials and finishes, including but not limited to steel door frames, flush wood doors, and long-lasting 3-part stucco finish. The typical off-white stucco color is proposed with a smooth texture, while the top floor and bridge stuccos are proposed with 20/30 sand texture for some variety. Exterior finishes will not have a reflective quality and changes in materials and colors terminate at inside corners. See Sheet B-A11.01 for the Product Cut Sheets of the proposed materials, and finishes, as well as the physical Material Board.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 17.</i></p>
<p>The proposed project incorporates a simple and quality material palette comprising of stucco and brick veneer. The stucco will be applied in smooth and sand texture finishes in complementary integral colors to highlight different features of the building. The brick veneer is introduced at the base to help ground the building to the site due to its heavy appearance and dark color. Black aluminum panels will also be used to wrap the fascia of the overhang. All windows will be vinyl in a bronze color. Other finishes are proposed, such as metal railings, a metal garage entry gate, and a decorative metal pedestrian entry gate. Although the entry gate is shown in a Marigold/yellow color on Sheet B-A5.26, it is unclear whether this color is a place holder as it was not identified. On the other hand, the material board specified Bannister Brown. If a different color is intended for the entry gate, it shall be complementary to the overall color scheme, including the color of the brick. Otherwise, the color of all metal finishes shall be consistent to maintain a cohesive appearance as recommended by condition no. 17.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 11</b></p>
<p>Carefully study the design of the facades along the interior of the site, including elevations facing the interior courtyard and children’s play area to ensure a consistent and holistic design treatment throughout the building while also addressing the fenestration and solid-to-void relationship consistent with the exterior facades. Interior elevations shall be provided and their design should achieve an attractive relationship between the open space and the building.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“The interior courtyard has a consistent and holistic design treatment as the exterior facades of the building. Sheets G2.03, G2.04, G2.05, and G2.06, show how the interior of the site, including the interior courtyard and children’s play area, addresses the fenestration and maintains a consistent solid-to-void relationship with consistent breaks, colors, and materials as the exterior facades. The base, middle, and top, hardscaping, and landscaping are also consistent.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
<p>The interior facades facing the central courtyard are shown on Sheets G2.05 and G2.06 and illustrate stacked units on repeated floor plates with an appropriate fenestration pattern that achieves a balanced solid-to-void ratio. Each entry door is highlighted by an unspecified accent color and flanked by a sidelight and window on either side of the door to create a focal point and a defined entrance for each unit. The overall design treatment, while different from the approach employed on the exterior facades, reflects a cohesive design that is consistent with the contemporary style.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 12</b></p>
<p>Incorporate at least two building/craftsmanship elements, which may include: cornices or banding, roofline dentils, plaster relief panels or medallions, building corner profiles, rooftop finials, engaged pilasters, roof edge balustrades or balconies.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>“The two building/craftsmanship elements include the banding at top of base material (brick) as well as the main entry fence/gate which is proposed as CNC patterned steel inspired by roses. See Sheets G2.07, G2.08, B-A5.25, B-A5.26, B-A5.27.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>

<p>The features identified as acceptable building/craftsmanship elements are recommended in the draft ODS. The proposed project does not include any of those elements and based on the contemporary style of the building, the specified features may not be appropriate or consistent with the proposed design. The only element that would be consistent with the proposed design is the brick banding that staff has recommended to be rowlock brick that will cap the brick base on the ground floor. However, the applicant has included a custom-designed fence/gate at the entry portal and masonry stairs with closed risers which are typically acceptable building and/or craftsmanship elements for City of Garden projects.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 13</b></p>
<p>Ensure windows are recessed at least two inches from the façade plane. If control joints are proposed, carefully study and show their arrangement on the facades to correspond with the fenestration pattern.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“Noted. Windows are recessed at least two inches from the façade plane. Additionally, the lower level window designs have been revised, and control joints have been introduced for the floor plates. See fenestration pattern expressed on Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, and B-A4.01. Typical recessed window details are included on Sheet B-A6.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval nos. 15, 8 and 26.</i></p>
<p>The window details illustrated on Sheet B-A6.01 show the construction and installation methods for various window types including awning, casement, sliding, and fixed windows which are proposed for the project. These details depict recess conditions, but the depth of the recess is not specified. To ensure that the windows are recessed at least two inches from the exterior facade, recommended condition of approval no. 15 has been included to require the depth of the recess to be specified in the drawings that will be submitted for plan check to be verified by Design and Historic Preservation (DHP) staff. The submittal also provided contradicting information on the material of the windows as vinyl while the material board specified aluminum windows. Condition no. 26 requires the applicant to clarify the material of the windows for consistency. Control joints will be incorporated along the exterior façades that will align with the top and bottom of the windows resulting in a horizontal pattern. A single vertical control joint is shown on the west elevation on Sheet B-A4.01 but does not exist anywhere else on the building and should be removed if it is determined to be unnecessary. If control joints are proposed along the interior facades, the same pattern shall be followed. All reglets shall be the smallest size possible and painted to match the color of the adjoining stucco finish as recommended by condition no. 8.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 14</b></p>
<p>Consider continuing the application of the brick base throughout the ground floor.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“The application of the brick base is now consistent throughout the ground floor. See Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, and B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
<p>Brick veneer is introduced across the base of the front (west) elevation and continues onto the north and south elevation to achieve a natural termination point. The application ensures a clear and cohesive design and wrapping the base of the front building form onto the side facades strengthens the design further.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 15</b></p>
<p>Reconsider brick in lieu of the proposed stucco finish at the ground floor of the managers’ units facing the street to achieve a continuous base treatment.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“The Manager’s Unit facing the street now achieves a continuous base treatment with brick in lieu of a stucco finish. See Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, and B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>

<p>The ground floor has been modified to provide a continuous brick base along the west (front) façade to achieve a consistent treatment throughout this elevation.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 16</b></p>
<p>Carefully study how the brick base is capped and transitions to stucco. For example, in the ODS, a projecting rowlock-course brick band would be required at the top of the brick base.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“A projecting rowlock-course brick band has been added to the top of the brick base as seen in the wall sections on Sheets B-A5.25, B-A5.26, and B-A5.27.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 11.</i></p>
<p>The transition between the brick and stucco at the top of the base has been addressed. Although a projecting rowlock course brick is an appropriate and preferred treatment, the plans show a soldier course brick not a projecting rowlock course brick. Condition no. 11 is recommended to require the drawings and detail to reflect projecting rowlock course brick. Similarly, condition no. 11 requires the applicant to consider an appropriate treatment to cap the transition between brick and concrete at the entrance into the garage on the west elevation, such as a concrete cap or similar.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 17</b></p>
<p>Explore opportunities to reduce the height of the walls along the primary entry, ramp and sidewalk to achieve a more pedestrian friendly scale and further reveal and highlight the leasing office as viewed from the public right-of-way.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“The height of the ramp wall near the main entry, as well as the wall height of the planters in front of the leasing office, have been reduced to foster a more pedestrian-friendly scale along the primary entry and sidewalk. See Sheet B-A4.01.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 4.</i></p>
<p>The height of the planter wall has been reduced to include a tiered/stepped design in order to achieve a lower planter wall height and is more sensitive to the human scale. The wall enclosing the ramp has also been reduced and at its highest point is 10 feet tall along the sidewalk. As recommended by condition no. 4, the applicant should continue to look for opportunities to lower the height of the wall in this section further, such as reducing the height of the freestanding wall portion above the ramp, or converting it to an open railing.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 18</b></p>
<p>If proposed, carefully consider the line of security at the primary entrance and the entrance into the parking garage and consider a location that will not impact or interfere with the building and/or landscape design.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“A decorative gate to the main entry and a gate for the parking garage have been added. These gates do not impact or interfere with the building and/or landscape design. See Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, B-A4.01, B-A5.26.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 16.</i></p>
<p>A decorative fence/gate is proposed across the double-height entrance along the west elevation that provides controlled access into the courtyard, leasing office, vertical circulation, and residential units. The custom-designed fence/gate will be constructed of metal panels that depict a rose pattern; however, the final design has not been determined and could change during plan check. The location of the fence/gate at the top of the stairs appears appropriate and does not negatively impact or interfere with the building’s features. A similar gate is proposed across the driveway and will be located approximately 25 feet from the front property line. Its location is also appropriate as it is set back from the face of the building and will not be readily visible from the public right-of-way. The design of this gate has also not been finalized and will be reviewed during the plan check similar to the fence/gate at the entry. For reasons discussed above, recommended condition of approval no. 16 has been included to require the design of the entry fence/gate and driveway gate to be complementary and cohesive with</p>

the building design, constructed of high-quality materials and with a light/porous appearance that permits visibility into and out of the courtyard.
<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 19</b>
Explore design opportunities to define/articulate the unit entries to enhance and create a focal point for the entries.
<b>Applicant Response</b>
“Interior courtyard perspective renderings on Sheets G2.03, G2.04, G2.05, and G2.06 show the articulated unit entries and stoop conditions for units on the ground floor.”
<b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i>
Each entrance is designed with a sidelight and/or windows that help create a focal point and further define the entry point to each unit and create a welcoming experience. Since the units on each level are accessed from single-loaded and covered corridors, each unit entrance will be shaded by the either by the roof overhang at the fifth floor or the pedestrian corridor above it.
<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 20</b>
Explore ways to conceal the rooftop mechanical equipment with a material and design that are consistent with and complementary to the design of the building.
<b>Applicant Response</b>
“Rooftop mechanical equipment screening options that are consistent with and complementary to the design of the building are currently being considered and TBD. Locations have been adjusted to limit impact on the neighbors to the east, see B-A2.06.”
<b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 5.</i>
As required by Code, rooftop mechanical equipment shall be sufficiently screened from view of the public right-of-way. The locations of the rooftop equipment have been identified on the roof plan (Sheet B-A2.06); however, the design, height, and materiality of the screening are being studied and have not been identified at this time. As such, condition of approval no. 5 is included to require the screening of the rooftop equipment and that the material and design of the screen shall be compatible to and consistent with the design of the building to be reviewed and approved by DHP staff during plan check. The height of the screen shall be the minimum necessary to screen the equipment.
<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 21</b>
Carefully consider the interior layout, design, and placement/orientation of units, particularly units that are in close proximity or located next to amenity spaces or common outdoor areas so that they appear integrated to enhance the building design or outdoor space while also improving the livability of the units by providing direct connections to these spaces.
<b>Applicant Response</b>
“The interior layout, design, and placement/orientation of units, especially those in close proximity to amenity spaces or common outdoor areas have been thoroughly considered to improve the livability of those units. See B-A2.02, B-A2.03, B-A2.04, B-A2.05.”
<b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i>
The units surround a central courtyard that serves as a shared outdoor space which is connected to the children’s and teen’s play areas. Situated around the courtyard are other amenities including a community room, laundry room, mailroom, and leasing office. The fifth floor offers two roof decks that overlook the street or provide views toward the mountains. Similarly, the existing building provides similar amenity spaces on the ground floor and in lieu of a courtyard, the existing patios behind the building will provide shared outdoor spaces. The units in both buildings are either configured or oriented toward these amenity spaces and/or are within easy access to them.
<b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 22</b>
Carefully consider the landscape and hardscape design at the ground floor and fifth floor roof decks to achieve a complementary relationship with the adjoining spaces and ensure they are fully and

<p>appropriately programmed to encourage use. Landscaping should also complement and reinforce the building's architecture and achieve a seamless transition between the public and private realms.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>"The proposed Landscape Plans on Sheets A-L0.00 through B-L3.05, and the hardscape design shown on Sheets G2.02, G2.07, G2.08, G2.09, and B-A4.01, complement one another and are appropriately programmed to encourage maximized use. The landscape complements the building's architecture by adding visual interest to the façade and throughout the project, fostering a pedestrian-friendly scale, and utilizing a consistent tree and plant palette as well as furniture that transition smoothly between both buildings as well as public and private spaces overall."</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b></p> <p>All outdoor spaces, particularly for the new building, are sited and designed to achieve a visual connection and/or integration with the residential units. Each outdoor space will be adequately programmed to enhance its usability and sustain year-round use, such as an outdoor cooking/BBQ area in the courtyard and a variety of outdoor seating opportunities, such as built-in planter benches, movable tables and chairs in various arrangements throughout the common open spaces. The majority of the shared outdoor spaces for the existing building are located behind the building, which will be refreshed with new landscaping and seating areas to achieve similar design quality with the outdoor spaces of the proposed building. The existing landscape that is located along the slope behind the existing building will be retained in its existing condition, which consists of mature shrubs and trees. Additionally, new landscape will also be provided along the front of each building that will create a cohesive residential appearance along the public right-of-way.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 23</b></p> <p>Due to the location of the project and its adjacency to the single-family residences and low-scale multi-family residential buildings located to the east and at the rear of the site, consider providing landscape planters with appropriate trees/plant species along the rear property line to create a buffer.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>"The Project's adjacency to the residences to the south and rear (east) of the site have been strongly considered in the preliminary Landscape Plans. Sheets A-L0.00 through B-L3.05 show the proposed landscape planters and appropriate California Native and/or drought-tolerant trees/plant species along the rear property line to not only create a buffer but also enhance existing conditions and provide more visual interest."</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p> <p>The existing mature trees that are located behind both buildings along the slope will be maintained in their existing condition that will help retain the character of the site and maintain the existing buffer between the project and the adjoining single-family residential building on top of the slope. Where possible, new trees will be provided to enhance the existing character of the site while also increasing the buffer along the rear of the buildings. Similarly, the setback area along the south property line will be landscaped and planted with a row of African Fern Pine trees that extends the depth of the proposed building and will create a significant buffer between the proposed project and the existing and adjoining multi-family residential development.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 24</b></p> <p>Study and achieve a design that integrates the residential units adjoining the courtyard at the ground floor and fifth floor decks such that the private and public realm communicate with each other and create a seamless transition, such as a secondary entry or windows that provide access or views to/from the unit to the common outdoor spaces to create a visual and/or spatial relationship.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p> <p>"Additional windows have been provided to view to/from the units on the ground floor and fifth floor to the common outdoor spaces to foster a visual relationship. See Sheets G2.03, G2.04, G2.05, and G2.06."</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>

<p>All shared outdoor amenity spaces have been appropriately designed to provide attractive and usable areas that are easily accessible to all residents. The courtyard, due to its central location and adjacency to the building entrance and children’s and teen’s play areas, will be the most visible, largest, and impactful space. As such, the central courtyard has been carefully integrated into the site design to achieve visual connection to all dwelling units, particularly the units on the ground floor facing the courtyard. Both roof decks on the fifth floor achieve a similar design quality and connection to the surrounding dwelling units. The outdoor spaces behind the existing building offer minimal opportunity for additional changes, since they are existing and will be retained. Nonetheless, these spaces will be enhanced with new landscape and outdoor furnishings to achieve greater integration with the building than the existing condition.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 25</b></p>
<p>Solar Orientation – As the project evolves, carefully consider the building’s solar orientation to inform the building’s internal programming and further enhance the quality and livability of the units, fenestration, location of common outdoor spaces and its landscape design, and other design features such as shading devices.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“Noted.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 19.</i></p>
<p>Consideration of solar orientation has been addressed through the building design, such as the addition of metal canopies along the west (front) façade of the new building and deep overhang above the fifth floor at the roofline. Given that both roof decks are located at the southern and western edges of the building, the applicant should consider incorporating shade structures, such as pergolas within these spaces as recommended by condition no. 19. The courtyard will be provided with numerous shade trees.</p>
<p><b>Preliminary Consultation Comment 26</b></p>
<p>Signs – Although early in the design review process, consider the location, design and type of signs that will be necessary to identify the building. The location should respond to and respect the building design and surrounding context.</p>
<p><b>Applicant Response</b></p>
<p>“Noted.”</p>
<p><b>Staff Analysis:</b> <i>Comment to be addressed through condition of approval no. 14.</i></p>
<p>Although signs are shown in some of the renderings, they are not proposed or included in the design submittal for review and approval. New signs will be subject to standard Zoning Code requirements and if more than six non-exempt signs are proposed, a Master Sign Plan will be required, which will address all design parameters for all signs on the property as recommended in condition no.14.</p>

**Programming and Circulation**

The proposed housing project is comprised of two buildings: an existing office building that will be converted into a residential building and a new five-story building. Due to the site’s wide frontage along the street and shallow depth and sloping rear yard, both buildings will be located close to the front property line with direct access from the street. All shared outdoor spaces between the two buildings will be located at the rear of the existing building, in a central courtyard or as two rooftop decks on the new building. Additional amenity spaces, such as a community room, leasing offices, conference room, and general offices, mail room, and a laundry room, will be located on the ground floor of both buildings. The units will be stacked at each floor in order to achieve efficient layouts in both buildings. The existing building will maintain its existing pedestrian pathway that leads to a primary residential lobby (which was the

main office lobby) and a driveway that serves the existing semi-subterranean garage that is located south of the pedestrian pathway.

Within the residential lobby are stairs and an elevator that provide access to all floors. A second set of stairs will be located at the southern end of the building also provides access to all levels as well as the rooftop. Since the existing common outdoor spaces are located behind the building, access to them is provided on the second floor through a door located east of the lobby. The residential units within the existing building will face each other and will be served by double-loaded corridors. Similar to the existing building, the primary access into the proposed building will be through a flight of stairs that adjoins the sidewalk and through a double-height entry portal that opens to the central courtyard. A fence/gate at the pedestrian entry portal will provide controlled access into the building. A separate driveway is proposed south of the pedestrian entry that will provide access into the parking garage. Inside the courtyard are two exterior stairs located on opposite ends of the building that provide access to the residential units on the upper levels and rooftop. Located within the center of the courtyard will be two elevators and, unlike the stairs, will serve all residential levels, parking garage, and roof level. Access into the units will be provided by single-loaded exterior walkways that line the open courtyard while also connecting to the vertical circulation. This design allows all units to face the courtyard and have greater access to light and air. Unlike the existing building, the proposed building also includes a manager's unit that fronts the street with direct access from the public right-of-way.

As proposed, the programming of both buildings is consistent with the applicable design guidelines and appropriate based on the unique site characteristics and the adjoining context while also complementing the existing building to achieve a cohesive and unified development. The programming and circulation of the buildings fully engage the project site, pedestrian realm and activate the street through a seamless transition. Furthermore, the placement and design of the entrances and vertical circulation support an ease of accessibility to all onsite amenities, and shared outdoor spaces throughout the site.

## **Orientation**

The existing and proposed buildings are sited to achieve a strong orientation towards Rosemead Boulevard by way of their design treatment, long façades, defined entrances into the buildings, and dedicated pedestrian and vehicular access points that face and connect to the public right-of-way. The existing building has a pedestrian pathway that leads to a clearly differentiated residential lobby that is located midway along the façade. The lobby is designed as a slightly taller volume than the adjoining north and south wings. A separate driveway is located south of the pedestrian pathway that provides vehicular access into the existing semi-subterranean garage.

The new building is designed similarly to the existing building, particularly in relation to its orientation and connection to the sidewalk and street. Like the existing building, the new building features a wide pedestrian pathway as well as a separate accessibility ramp that leads to a generous double-height opening in front of the building that exposes the central courtyard and beyond to view from the public right-of-way. Additionally, a rooftop deck on the fifth floor is also proposed and located directly above the entry that overlooks the street and reinforces the building's connection to the public realm. The placement of the new building close to the front property line maintains a consistent development pattern with existing nearby buildings and

helps activate the streetscape. Furthermore, the design of the ground floor addresses the street through appropriate fenestration and transparency by way of expansive windows, location of entrances along the facades, including a direct access from the street for the manager's unit, and the appropriate use of materials to create a clear base, middle and top to support a human scale.

### **Height, Massing and Modulation**

The proposed five-story building is approximately 68 feet high. While taller than the existing and surrounding buildings in the neighborhood, the proposed height is allowed through a SDBL incentive. The elevations of the new building depict a simple and clear building mass consisting of a strong base treated with brick veneer and punctuated by a wide pedestrian entry that is set within a double-height opening that allows visibility into the courtyard. This design approach creates the appearance of lightness and porosity into the building by creating visibility into spaces that are located beyond the front entry. Although there are no complete physical breaks, the long façade is broken up to create the appearance of four separate and smaller volumes facing the street by recessing the wall planes, resulting in a friendlier street presence. Similarly to the brick base that helps ground the building to its site, the integral stucco finish in different colors, fenestration pattern, and wide overhang at the roofline assist in creating middle and top sections of the buildings. The creation of a clear base, middle section (between the second and fourth floors), and top section (at the fifth floor) is consistent with the draft Objective Design Standards. The proportion of the base, middle, and top sections along with their differentiated treatment through materiality, color, and fenestration pattern reduce the perceived height and mass of the building further by taking a larger form and visually breaking it down into multiple smaller components that are joined together to form a cohesive whole.

Additionally, the fifth floor is pulled back from the floors below and terminates in a flat roof with a wide overhang to further delineate and modulate the top level. The fenestration pattern, including the size, proportion, and arrangement of the windows, is slightly differentiated at the base, middle and top sections, while also achieving a balanced solid-to-void ratio. The roofline along the front (west) façade is also broken up to create a roof deck on the fifth floor that overlooks the street. A similar break is introduced on the rear (east) elevation to coincide with the slightly canted and modulated volumes of the rear façade that are connected by covered walkways. The north and south elevations also offer a break in the roofline and the design of the exterior stairs and walkway introduce additional modulation and lightness to the side facades. Together, these design techniques are effective and appropriately reduce the perceived height, massing, and scale of the proposed building. Furthermore, the design approaches employed for the new building are complementary to the treatment of the existing building as seen through its stepped and articulated flat roofline, defined entry tower, wide and prominent overhang, and fenestration pattern.

### **Architectural Style and Detailing**

The proposed building is a contemporary design that is composed of a simple, clean rectilinear form that is expressed in brick, smooth stucco and a complementary color palette. The overall design is clear and devoid of extraneous features or design treatments. The front façade is broken up into different volumes through recessed wall planes and a double-height entry portal. The roof is flat throughout but modulated with breaks on all sides and further interrupted by two exterior stairs and connecting walkways along the north and south elevations. The ground floor

is intentionally different due to its brick finish to achieve a base across the front façade and continues onto and wraps both sides. Although finished in stucco, the upper floors are also differentiated by different colors to create a middle section between the second and fourth floors and a top section at the fifth floor that is also recessed from the floors below to achieve greater articulation and capped with a deep overhang. The facades are further differentiated through their fenestration pattern that is similar, but slightly varied between the base, middle, and top sections while appearing logical and cohesive throughout and maintaining a balanced solid-to-void ratio. The design approaches described above are executed along all elevations with the exception of the brick veneer, which is limited to the front street-facing façade, but terminates at an appropriate and logical location along the side elevations. However, the applicant should consider if the remainder of the side facades that are exposed to view should be treated similarly to extend the base to achieve the same or similar appearance as the front façade whether by brick or a brick color as recommended by condition no. 20.

Also proposed are control joints along the facades which will align with the top and bottom of the windows, creating a banding appearance across the façades while also adding a horizontal emphasis to the building. Staff recommends that the size of the reglets be the smallest necessary and that they be painted to match the adjoining stucco color as specified by condition no. 8.

In general, the overall architectural concept appears to be successfully executed to achieve a cohesive design throughout the building. However, staff recommends that additional details on the design and installation of the metal sunshade along the front elevation and a finalized design of the entry portal fence and gate shall be provided for review and approval by staff during the plan check phase. Similarly, as previously discussed by recommended condition no. 16, the design of the fence and gate in the entry portal shall be porous with a transparent appearance so that visibility into and out of the courtyard to maintain a friendly and inviting appearance from the public right-of-way. As for the brick base, recommended condition no. 18 requires corner brick to be used to treat all corners where brick is utilized and the brick shall wrap into the openings.

The proposed building incorporates design elements of the existing building such as the use of brick, deep overhang at the roofline, and a control joint pattern that references the horizontal banding of the existing building to achieve a cohesive and compatible design between the two buildings. As demonstrated in the submittal, the overall design expression, execution, and detailing of the project are clear, logical, and consistent with the proposed architectural concept, design precedents, and Pasadena's architectural legacy.

### **Compatibility**

Although larger and taller than nearby office and residential buildings in the vicinity, the proposed height, size, and density of the project are allowed through SDBL incentives. The proposed contemporary building is compatible with the design precedents located within proximity of the project site, including the office buildings that are also located within the EPSP. Under the existing and future proposed regulations of the EPSP, coupled with SDBL, it is anticipated that the surrounding area will undergo development changes. In time, the proposed project's massing and scale will be compatible and consistent with its immediate surroundings based on future development anticipated in the draft Specific Plan.

## **Materials and Colors**

The proposed project will be supported by a simple palette of high-quality materials and muted earthtone colors including brick veneer in Red Flashed (by Pacific Clay), stucco in 20/30 texture, aluminum storefront system (by Arcadia), aluminum (or vinyl) windows (by WinDor), metal window sunshades that will be painted in Buffalo Herd, DE6056 (a brown color by Dunn-Edwards), and black (Jet, DE6378 (by Dunn Edwards) metal fascia for the roof overhang. The integral stucco colors (by La Habra) are complementary and in muted tones that include Belle Glade (a shade of dark brown), Meadowbrook (a shade of light grey) and Morning Side (a shade of dark grey). Accent materials, such as the metal railings and metal fascia for the overhang will be painted Lunar Landing (DE6241, a light grey color) and Jet, which is a black color by Dunn-Edwards, respectively. Additionally, the metal entry gate will be painted in Bannister Brown (DE6069) while the planters and walkway at the front of the building will be finished in natural grey concrete.

As recommended by condition no. 17, all metal finishes, such as railings, entry gates, exterior lighting/wall sconces, and garage gate shall maintain a consistent color to achieve a cohesive and unified appearance. In addition to the brick cap proposed by the applicant, staff also recommends condition no. 18 that requires traditional brick detailing be employed for the installation of the brick veneer along the storefront, such as wrapping the brick into openings as well as using corner bricks to treat and finish the corners. Similarly, any soffits in the recessed area on the ground floor should be painted to match the wall surface above and the underside of the entry portal, the children's and teen's play areas, and similar condition should be treated with a dropped soffit to conceal the exposed pipes and conduits that serve the units above, painted to match the adjoining wall surface as recommended in condition no. 13. The entrance to the garage will be provided with a gate; however, the design, color and/or manufacturer of the gate has not been specified and shall be complementary to the building design as recommended by condition no. 16. Additionally, the windows that are proposed for the residential units need further clarification since vinyl is specified in the submitted plans, while aluminum is specified on the material board as required by condition of approval no. 26.

With incorporation of the recommended conditions of approval, additional refinements will be implemented that will help the building achieve an elevated design consistent with the design guidelines. Overall, the materials and colors are compatible with the architectural concept and help reinforce the building design.

## **Mechanical Screening**

The mechanical units serving the project will be located on the roof of both buildings as shown on Sheet A-A1.00. Although all units will be enclosed, the screening material, design and height of the enclosure(s) are still under consideration. As such, condition no. 5 is recommended for the applicant to provide the final design and details of the roof top equipment screen to be reviewed during plan check. Similarly, mechanical rooms for the new building, such as the electrical room, F.C.C and MPOE rooms will be located in the parking level. The locations of the transformer(s), FDC, water and gas meters have not been identified. Aside from the rooftop equipment, no information for the mechanical rooms of the existing building has been provided. As such, recommended conditions of approval nos. 6 and 7 require the identification of all mechanical units for both buildings; additionally, transformers shall be located in underground vaults in the driveway and not on concrete pads to minimize visual clutter and interference to

the landscape design. All other mechanical features, such as FDC, backflow preventer, water and gas meters shall be located in a least visible location and/or screened from view of the public right-of-way to the extent possible as recommended by condition no. 6. Furthermore, the roof plan and elevations do not show how drainage will be addressed. Staff recommends that all drainage shall be routed internally within the walls to avoid the use of scuppers and downspouts as specified by condition no. 10 in order to maintain an uninterrupted and clean design throughout the building. This condition also specifies that if internal drainage is not feasible, the downspouts shall be painted to match the building wall to which they are attached.

While the mechanical venting will not be routed to the roof, mechanical vents/vent caps are shown along all facades. The elevations on Sheets B-A4.01 and B-A4.02 identify the location and arrangement of the vents and vent caps. While the location of these features on the side and rear facades appears appropriate since they are not street-facing, the applicant should reconsider introducing vents on the front (west) elevation since this is a prominent and highly visible façade. Instead, consider relocating them to the interior façade facing the courtyard or side facades as recommended by condition no. 21 in order to maintain an attractive, clean, and uninterrupted design. Additionally, manufacturer's specifications of the vent caps shall be provided for review and approval by staff as recommended in condition of approval no. 9.

## **Landscaping**

The proposed landscape plans identify new landscaping along the front façade of both buildings, at the rear of the existing building and in the courtyard of the proposed building that will occur in natural soil and raised planters. Existing landscape at the rear of the buildings and along the slope that consists of mature trees and shrubs will be retained to maintain a buffer between the existing and proposed buildings with its neighbors to the east of the project site. The new landscape at the front will be planted in ground that will enhance the street-facing facades while also creating a residential character to the development. The existing outdoor spaces located behind the existing building will be maintained, but will be refreshed with new landscaping. Finally, the proposed landscape in the courtyard and roof decks of the new building will occur in metal planters.

The landscape palette includes a variety of accent and shade trees, shrubs and groundcover as illustrated on Sheet A-L0.20 through B-L3.05. The proposed palette and their placement within each landscape area and outdoor spaces will create a layered design and visual interest that will enhance the building and quality of the shared common spaces. Additionally, all shared common outdoor spaces are sufficiently programmed with a variety of seating configurations and enhanced hardscape design to elevate the quality and usability of these spaces. The children's and teens' play areas include a variety of play structures. To ensure the high quality of the outdoor furniture and benches, planters, and hardscape material, manufacturer's specifications shall be provided for review and approval during the plan check as recommended by condition no. 12. Overall, the proposed landscape design is appropriate and consistent throughout the project site and is comprised of a variety of trees and other drought-tolerant plants that will help enhance the design and quality of all shared outdoor spaces and overall project site.

## **Protected Tree Removal**

The project site contains a total of 41 existing private trees, 27 of which are protected under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. A total of 14 private trees are proposed to be removed, seven of which are protected trees. The proposed project necessitates the removal of five protected specimen trees: tree no. 22 and 23 (Sugar Gum, DBH 30"), tree no. 33 (London Plane, DBH 18"), and tree no. 35 (Jacaranda, DBH 16") and two mature trees: tree no. 36 and 37 (Mexican Fan Palm, DBH 20" and 29"). These trees are either in fair or poor condition and are located within the building footprint of the proposed development and need to be removed to accommodate the project. The removal of tree no. 33 and 34 can be approved under finding #2 of the Tree Protection Ordinance, which states, "the present condition of the trees is such that they are not reasonably likely to survive" over time as a result of a number of factors, including widespread canopy desiccation and leaf scorch caused by general drought stress, reflective heat, and chronic soil compaction, as noted by the project Arborist. Tree no. 22, 23, 35, 36, and 37 meet finding #6 of the Tree Protection Ordinance, which states, "the project, as defined in Section 17.80.020, includes a landscape design plan that emphasizes a tree canopy that is sustainable over the long term by adhering to the replacement matrix prepared by the city manager and included in the associated administrative guidelines."

The tree replacement matrix requires a total of 32 24-inch box or 16 36-inch box trees, or a combination thereof, which can be satisfied by species included on either the specimen or protected native tree lists. The landscape plans include 33 24-inch box and eight 36-inch box trees all of which are species from the specimen tree list. This proposal complies with the sizes, species and quantities of new trees required by the Tree Replacement Matrix. The proposed landscape design is appropriate and complementary to the architectural style and will create visual interest throughout the year as demonstrated by the plant palette. The design, selection and placement of plant materials are cohesive and consistent throughout all landscape areas. The existing and proposed trees will provide sufficient canopy coverage and shade throughout the site.

It should also be noted that in addition to new trees to be planted, all existing public streets, which are all Liquid Amber Trees, will be retained.

## **Lighting**

The submittal includes lighting plans for the landscape areas and are provided on Sheets A-L4.03, A-L4.04, B-L4.02 and B-L4.05, which depict installation of tree uprights and shrub, path, and step lights in all accessible and usable outdoor areas with the exception of the two roof decks. As such, staff recommends condition of approval no. 23 to identify a lighting plan for these areas. Exterior lighting and wall sconces on the building are not shown on the elevation drawings. If exterior lighting is proposed, such as at main entry and entrances to the residential units, it shall be shown on the elevations and manufacturer's specifications for all lights fixtures shall be for review during plan check as recommended by condition no. 22. Additionally, staff recommends condition no. 24 requiring the exterior lighting temperature not rise above 3,000 kelvin to avoid harsh lighting conditions. The proposed locations and amount of exterior lighting in the common and landscape areas appear adequate and will enhance the landscape design, while the lighting on the building will be reviewed during plan check to ensure the same quality and attractiveness as specified by the recommended condition.

### **COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS:**

Staff routed the project for comment to several City departments, as well as other divisions of the Planning & Community Development Department, including the Public Works, Transportation, Fire and Housing Departments and the Building, Current Planning and Cultural Affairs Divisions of the Planning & Community Development Department. Recommended conditions from all reviewing City Departments are included in Attachment A. The Local Mobility Analysis that is the basis for the Department of Transportation's recommended conditions is included in Attachment F.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

This project has been determined to be exempt from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), §15332, Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects. Based on the technical studies prepared by Impact Sciences and Iteris (Attachment E), environmental consulting firms under contract to the City, the project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to air quality, noise or traffic. The project will adhere to applicable regulations and permitting requirements by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ordinance and will not have impacts to water quality. The project is consistent with the General Plan, EPSP and Zoning designation. The project site is 93,759 square feet (less than five acres) and surrounded by other commercial and residential uses. The site is currently developed with a two-story office building above a semi-subterranean parking garage that is attached to a two-story parking structure. The project site is located in an urban area where utilities and public services can be adequately served. Furthermore, there are no unusual circumstances that distinguish this project from others in the exempt class and none of the exceptions to Categorical Exemptions in CEQA §15300.2 apply to the project.

Separately from the CEQA traffic analysis, a Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) (Attachment F) was also conducted. The LMA is not a study conducted pursuant to CEQA and is used to determine if local improvements are needed and available to address localized traffic conditions associated with the project. The LMA concluded that the proposed project will not have a negative impact on the existing active transportation system within a 0.25-mile radius, per the City's guidelines.

**CONCLUSION:**

The project design has satisfactorily addressed the comments provided during Preliminary Consultation and is consistent with the design guidelines in the EPSP and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-Family Residential Districts. Staff recommends approval of the application for Consolidated Design Review for the project with the conditions of approval described above and included in Attachment A, which will be reviewed by staff during the plan check phase.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Jennifer Paige, AICP  
Director of Planning and  
Community Development

Prepared by:



---

Rathar Duong  
Senior Planner

Reviewed by:



---

Kevin Johnson  
Principal Planner

Attachments:

- A. Recommended Conditions of Approval
- B. Tree Inventory
- C. Current Plans & Elevations
- D. Responses to Preliminary Consultation Comments
- E. Environmental Documentation
- F. Local Mobility Analysis
- G. Tree Protection Guidelines
- H. Tree Protection Certification Form