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LETTER OF DETERMINATION

MAILING DATE: JAN 1 8 2018

Case No.: DIR-2017-2204-COA-1A
CEQA: ENV-2017-2205-CE
Plan Area: Wilshire

Project Site: 6400 West Hayes Drive

Applicant/Appellant: Stephane Guy Taieb
Representative: George Taylor Louden AIA, GTL/HA

At its meeting of January 9, 2018, the Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission took the actions below in conjunction with the approval of the following project:

The construction of a two-story 873 square-foot addition to a one-story 1,370 square-foot Contributing Structure on a corner lot in the Carthay Circle Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). Restoration of features altered without approval including the front bay window, front door, wood wainscot, front yard, chimney and roof vents. Window and door replacement. New roof form over front door and new hedge and fence surrounding property. Normal maintenance and repair, including painting and gutter installation.

1. Determined based on the whole of the administrative record, that the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15300, Class 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and Article III, Section 1, Class 1 Category 1 and Class 1 Category 5 of the City CEQA Guidelines, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 applies;
2. Granted the appeal in part, and sustained in part the Planning Director’s determination to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project in the Carthay Circle Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ);
3. Adopted the attached Conditions of Approval as modified by the Commission; and
4. Adopted the attached Findings as amended by the Commission.

This action was taken by the following vote:

Moved: DelGado
Seconded: Mendez
Ayes: Barraza
Absent: Chung Kim

Vote: 3 – 0
Fiscal Impact Statement: There is no General Fund impact as administrative costs are recovered through fees.

Effective Date/Appeals: The decision of the Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission is final upon the mailing date of this determination letter, and it is not further appealable.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City’s decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Attachments: Modified Conditions of Approval, Amended Findings

c: Naomi Guth, City Planner
Blair Smith, City Planning Associate
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
(As modified by the Central Area Planning Commission on January 9, 2018)

1. The use and development of the subject property shall be in substantial conformance with this approval and the plans submitted by the applicant, signed and dated by staff and attached to the case file as Exhibit A. Any changes to the project or these plans shall be approved by the Director of Planning and may require additional review by the HPOZ Board. Each change shall be identified and justified in writing. Modified plans shall be signed and dated by staff and attached to the case file as Modified Exhibit A, etc.

2. The project shall be executed with the following architectural features:
   a. All windows on the addition shall be wood dual-glazed with true-divided-lites.
   b. Stone wainscot shall be removed in the least invasive method possible.
   c. No new stone wainscot shall be installed.
   d. Stone cladding on chimney shall be removed and brick on chimney shall be exposed.
   e. Wood wainscot shall be restored on the existing structure as shown in 1996 photo Figure 2 in Exhibit A.
   f. Front bay window (windows 4, 5, and 6 as shown in Exhibit A) shall be restored to match the historic form including wood moldings per the photograph in Exhibit A. The center (window 5) shall be a fixed 12-lite true-divided-lite sash and the side (windows 4 and 6) windows shall have four-lite true-divided-lite sashes. Frame to match the frame profile of window 19.
   g. Front door shall be restored to a solid wood door.
   h. Flagstone shall be removed from the front yard and stair landing and original concrete walkway and stairs shall be restored; ground cover shall be installed.
   i. West dormer shall have squared corners (with 90 degree angles) and shall be reduced by approximately 20 square feet.
   j. The roof line of the addition shall be stepped in one-foot on the west façade.
   k. Gate shall be no taller than 42-inches
   l. All street fronting hedges shall comply with LAMC section 12.22.C.20(f)(2) and 12.22.C.20(f)(3).
   m. No fencing shall be installed between the north lot line and the front façade, this includes no fencing along the approximately 20 feet of the east lot line from the northeast corner of the lot.
   n. The east side yard fence shall be reduced to comply with LAMC section 12.22.C.20(f)(3), and shall be either wood vertical picket fencing or darkly colored wrought iron.
   o. The existing roof shall maintain the existing roof height.
   p. New or replacement appurtenances shall not be visible from the street, appurtenances not mounted to the structure shall be located in the rear or interior side yard.
   q. New dormer vents shall be galvanized and painted.
   r. Roof over dormer shall be cool roof to match the new second floor roof surface in color.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit the two final sets of architectural/construction drawings that have been reviewed by LADBS plan check engineers, as well as two additional sets of architectural drawings for final review and approval by Department of City Planning staff (four sets of plans total). Final drawings shall substantially resemble the Approved Exhibit (or any subsequent Modified Exhibits) and shall be stamped and dated by staff and attached to the case file as Final Plans.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, The following statement shall be imprinted on the site plan, floor plan, elevations and any architectural detail sheets of any construction drawings submitted to the Department of Building and Safety:
NOTE TO PLAN CHECKER AND BUILDING INSPECTOR - These plans, including conditions of approval, shall be complied with and the height, size, shape, location, texture, color, or material shall not differ from what the Director of Planning has approved under DIR-2017-2204-COA. Any change to the project shall require review by the Director of Planning and recommendation by the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) Board. A request for variation shall be submitted in writing and include a specific notation of the variation(s) requested. Should any change be required by a public agency then such requirement shall be documented in writing.

5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, these Conditions of Approval shall be printed on the cover sheet of all four sets of drawings submitted for review as Final Exhibits.

6. The granting of this determination by the Director of Planning does not in any way indicate compliance with applicable provisions of LAMC Chapter IX (Building Code). Any corrections and/or modifications to plans made subsequent to this determination by a Department of Building and Safety Plan Check Engineer that affect any part of the exterior design or appearance of the project as approved by the Director, and which are deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety for Building Code compliance, shall require a referral of the revised plans back to the Department of City Planning for additional review and sign-off prior to the issuance of any permit in connection with those plans.

7. Approval, Verification and Submittals. Copies of any approvals, guarantees or verification of consultations, review or approval, plans, etc., as may be required by the subject conditions, shall be provided to the Department of City Planning for placement in the subject file.

8. Code Compliance. All area, height and use regulations of the zone classification for the subject property shall be complied with.

9. Definition. Any agencies, public officials or legislation referenced in these conditions shall mean those agencies, public officials, legislation or their successors, designees or amendment to any legislation.

10. Enforcement. Compliance with these conditions and the intent of these conditions shall be to the satisfaction of the Planning Department and any designated agency, or the agency’s successor and in accordance with any stated laws or regulations, or any amendment thereto.

11. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs.
Applicant shall do all of the following:

(i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of the City’s processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.

(ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of the City’s processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney’s fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney’s fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
(iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City’s litigation costs to the City within 10 days’ notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney’s Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than $25,000. The City’s failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).

(iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City’s interests. The City’s failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).

(v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City’s interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney’s office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

“City” shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

“Action” shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

Observance of Conditions – Time Limits

All terms and conditions of this Certificate of Appropriateness shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditional upon the privileges being utilized within three years after the effective date of this determination and if such privileges are not utilized within said time, the authorization shall terminate and become null and void. Privileges shall be considered utilized when a valid permit from the Department of Building and Safety has been issued and construction work has begun and been carried out without substantial suspension or abandonment of work. An approval not requiring permits for construction or alteration from the Department of Building and Safety shall be considered utilized when
operations of the use authorized by the approval have commenced.

Transferability

This determination runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them regarding the conditions of this grant.

Violation of These Conditions is a Misdemeanor

Section 11.00 M of the Los Angeles Municipal Code states in part: "It shall be unlawful to violate any provision or fail to comply with any of the requirements of this Code. Any person violating any of the provisions or failing to comply with any of the mandatory requirements of this Code shall be guilty of a misdemeanor unless that violation or failure is declared in that section to be an infraction. An infraction shall be tried and be punishable as provided in Section 19.6 of the Penal Code and the provisions of this section. Any violation of this Code that is designated as a misdemeanor may be in charged by the City Attorney as either a misdemeanor or an infraction." Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.
FINDINGS
(As amended by the Central Area Planning Commission on January 9, 2018)

A. 12.20.3.K.3.(a) and 12.20.3.M – Recommendations from the Carthay Circle HPOZ Board and the Cultural Heritage Commission, and Notice and Public Hearing:

Section 12.20.3.K. of the LAMC requires that Department of City Planning staff refer applications for Certificates of Appropriateness to both the HPOZ Board and the Cultural Heritage Commission (or its designee) within a 30-day period of the application having been deemed complete. The purpose of this requirement is to allow the subject application to be discussed in a public meeting with both public and expert testimony (in the case of the HPOZ Board meeting), and to gather an expert opinion with reference to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (in the case of the Cultural Heritage Commission).

Section 12.20.3.M of the LAMC requires that before making its recommendation to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove an application pursuant to this section for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Board shall hold a public hearing on the matter. The applicant shall notify the Owners and occupants of all properties abutting, across the street or alley from, or having a common corner with the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the hearing, and notice of the public hearing shall be posted by the applicant in a conspicuous place on the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the public hearing.

The subject application was deemed complete on August 1, 2017. Department of City Planning staff sent copies of the application with relevant materials to the HPOZ Board on August 3, 2017. Notice was posted for the meeting at the site, and at City Hall, and mailed to abutting property owners on August 7, 2017. After ten (10) days of public notice, the Carthay Circle HPOZ Board met on August 17, 2017 and conducted a public hearing on the proposed project, pursuant to LAMC Section 12.20.3.M: Notice and Public Hearing. The HPOZ Board, with a four-member quorum, recommended approval of the project, subject to the following changes: New attic roof vents should be galvanized metal; new front yard gate should be no greater than 42-inches in height; the fence should be removed from front yard; allow fence in side yard; allow hedge per code; remove pavers in the front yard and restore the front walkway. On a 3-1 vote, the board also voted to retroactively approve the stone cladding and altered roof.

Department of City Planning staff sent copies of the application with relevant materials to the Cultural Heritage Commission’s designee on August 3, 2017. The Cultural Heritage Commission designee recommended approval of the project, subject to the following changes: remove stone, restore front door, new windows should be wood not clad, restore front yard, square off west façade dormer and minimize size, restore wood wainscot on the facade.

The expert opinions of the HPOZ Board and the CHC have both recommended approval with conditions of the subject application. Approval of the subject application is therefore consistent with 12.20.3.K of the LAMC.

B. 12.20.3.K.4.(c) – Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for Construction, Addition, Alteration, or Reconstruction as it relates with the adopted Preservation Plan.

The proposed project, as conditioned in this Determination, substantially complies with LAMC Section 12.20.3.K.4 because the proposed project complies with and is consistent with the adopted Preservation Plan.
7.2. Setting
7.2.1. Mature trees and hedges, particularly street trees in the public planting strip, should be retained whenever possible, or alternately replaced with in-kind materials. Special attention should be paid to historic tree planting patterns and species and efforts should be made to re-introduce similar landscape elements on new plantings.

One rear yard mature trees will be removed, all remaining mature trees will be maintained. There are six mature palm trees on the site, two in the front yard, and four in the rear yard. Only one of the trees at the rear façade will be removed for the proposed rear addition.

7.2.4. Historic sidewalks, walkways and other hardscape features should be preserved. If these elements are replaced, they should be replaced with materials similar to those historically present in the area. Special attention should be paid to replicating score patterns, pavement texture, swirl patterns and coloration.

7.2.7. When original site features have been lost and must be replaced, designs should be based on historic photographic evidence. If no such evidence exists, the design of replacement details should be based on a combination of physical evidence and evidence of similar elements found at similar properties in the HPOZ.

7.2.8. The traditional character of residential front and side yards should be preserved. These areas should be reserved for planting materials and lawn, and non-porous ground coverings should be minimized. Excessive pavement within the front yard area is inappropriate.

The project proposes to retain flagstones that were installed in place of the historic walkway in the front yard and on the front steps without approval. As historic walkways and the traditional character of the front yard should be preserved, the removal of these features for the installation of a large flagstone paved area in the front yard is inappropriate. As conditioned, the traditional character of the residential front and side yard shall be restored through the removal of flagstones from the front yard. The flagstones will be replaced with groundcover plantings to re-establish the landscaped progression between public and private space, and the original poured concrete walkway and steps will be restored with the historic material score patterns, pavement texture, swirl patterns and coloration.

7.2.11. Fencing and walls, where appropriate, should be comprised of simple materials that are consistent with the Period of Significance. In most cases, front yard fencing is inappropriate, but low garden walls that do not obstruct views of the home or the streetscape may be appropriate in some locations. Rear yard fencing should be visually unobtrusive to the general public. Materials such as unfinished concrete block or overly ornate wrought iron are inappropriate.

7.2.12. Landscaping should not be so lush or massive that public views of the house or streetscape are significantly obstructed.

7.2.13. Gates and fences that enclose a rear yard should not completely block views of building architectural details nor should they completely enclose a porte-cochere or similar driveway feature.

The project proposes to retain an existing hedge and fence in the front and street facing side yard area at its current height of approximately eight feet. As this lot is a corner lot, LAMC section 12.22.C.20.f.2 requires that all fences or hedges located on the primary street fronting lot line have a maximum height of three and one-half feet and LAMC section 12.22.C.20.f.3 requires that all side yard fences or hedges not exceed six feet. As conditioned, per LAMC section 12.22.C.20.f.2 and 12.22.C.20.f.3 fences or hedges in
the yard shall not exceed allowable height above the natural ground level adjacent to the feature. Therefore, the existing primary fronting hedges shall be reduced to three and one-half feet and secondary fronting hedges and fencing shall be reduced to six feet.

As front yard fences are not typical of the development of the street, the installation of a front yard fence is inappropriate. Per the recommendation of the HPOZ Board and CHC Designee the front yard fence is conditioned to be removed. A six-foot fence may be installed in the side yard along the lot line, beginning approximately 20 feet of the east from the northeast corner of the lot. The side yard fence may be either a simple vertical picket fence or darkly colored wrought iron. A 42-inch wood gate will be installed in the front yard.

7.3. Windows
7.3.1. Repair windows and window hardware whenever possible instead of replacing them. Special attention should be paid to materials, hardware, method of construction and profile.
7.3.2. When the replacement of windows is necessary, replacement windows should match the historic windows in size, shape, arrangement of panes, materials, hardware, method of construction and profile.
7.3.5. Conjectural elements such as new decorative windows or window ornamentation should be avoided if such features were not originally part of the structure.
7.3.7. If a window is missing entirely, replace it with a new window in the same design as the original if the original design is known. If the design is not known, the design of the new window should be compatible with the size of the opening, and the style of the building.

The project proposes to maintain six of the window sashes on structure that have been replaced without approval. These new windows maintain the size, shape, arrangement of panes, materials, hardware, method of construction and profile of the historic windows; however, they vary in glazing (dual glazed) and do not have the lug horns which were there historically. As scope of work includes larger restoration of the structure, the HPOZ Board and CHC Designee, recommended maintaining these minor alterations as they minimally vary from the historic openings.

The bay window on the north (front) façade with a fixed 12-lite center sash and 4-lite side sashes was replaced with French doors and enlarged single lite side lites. The project proposes to replace the French doors (W:5) with a double hung window with six-lites per sash, retain the simplified side lites, and add a decorative stone wainscot at the base of the window. As the historic window was a wood fixed single glazed 12-lite true-divided-lite window with wood moldings, the installation of a hung window with conjectural decorative elements is inappropriate and should be avoided. As the design of the historic window is known, the replacement window should match the historic window in size, shape, arrangement of panes, materials, hardware, method of construction and profile. As conditioned, the front bay window (W: 4, 5, 6) shall be restored to match the historic form including wood moldings as pictured in Exhibit A; with a center (W :5) fixed 12-lite true-divided-lite sash and 4-lite side (W: 4, 6) true-divided-lite sashes. The restored frame will match the frame profile of window 19.

7.3.3. The historic pattern of windows on a façade, and the placement of individual windows should be maintained. Fenestration patterns on historic houses are generally most evident on front-facing facades, secondary and non-visible facades may have less defined fenestration patterns.
7.3.4. Adding new windows, filling-in historic windows, or altering the size of historic windows on a street-visible facade is inappropriate.

7.3.6. When altering window sizes or placement on non-street-visible facades is of a minimal scope and can be found appropriate, care should be taken so that new windows on historic facades should match the rhythm and scale of the existing windows on the facade.

As no existing openings will be altered, the pattern of windows will be maintained.

7.4 Doors
7.4.1. The materials and design of historic doors and their surrounding trim should be preserved.
7.4.2. The size, scale, and proportions of historic doors on a façade should be maintained.
7.4.3. Filling in or altering the size of historic doors on primary facades is generally inappropriate.
7.4.5. When replacement of doors on the front and side facades is necessary, replacement doors should match the historic doors in size, shape, Gated arcades with decorative grilles and scale, glazing, materials, method of construction, and profile.
7.4.9. When original doors have been lost and must be replaced, designs should be based on historic photographic evidence. If no such evidence exists, the design of replacement doors should be based on a combination of physical evidence (indications in the structure of the house itself) and evidence of similar doors on houses of the same architectural style in the neighborhood.

The original solid wood front door was replaced without approval with a door with a single lite with wrought-iron detailing within the lite. The project proposes to maintain the replaced door. The proposed replacement door is not consistent with the architectural style of the house or historic doors within the community. As evidence exists of the original appearance of the historic door, replacement with a more decorative door would be inappropriate. As conditioned, the front door will be restored to its original form with a simple solid wood door. The size of the historic opening was not affected when the door was replaced; the opening size will remain the same.

7.4.8. Replacement doors on the rear façade may vary in materials and method of construction from the historic doors, although the arrangement of panes, size, and shape should be similar.

No door replacements are proposed on the rear façade.

7.6. Roofs
7.6.1. Historic roof forms on both the house and the garage should be preserved. For instance, a complex roof plan with many gables should not be simplified.
7.6.2. Historic eave depth and configuration should be preserved.

Historic roof forms, configurations, and depths shall be preserved. In Exhibit A, the indicated existing roof heights and lines vary between plan sheets. To ensure that there will be no alteration to existing roof heights, existing roof heights are conditioned to be maintained.
7.6.3. Roof and eave details, such as rafter tails, vents, corbels, built-in gutters and other architectural features should be preserved. If these elements are deteriorated, they should be repaired if possible. If these elements cannot be repaired, the design, materials, and details should match the original to the extent possible.

7.6.4. When original details have been lost and are proposed to be replaced, designs should be based on historic photographic evidence. If no such evidence exists, the design of replacement details should be based on a combination of physical evidence (indications in the structure of the house itself) and evidence of similar elements on houses of the same architectural style in the neighborhood.

7.6.12. Existing roof dormers should not be removed on visible facades. New roof dormers should not be added to visible facades.

One roof vent was removed from the roof at the front façade without approval. The project proposes to restore this lost architectural detail to match the one remaining vent. The HPOZ Board recommended that the vent be galvanized to reduce the reflective impact of the new vent. As conditioned, new dormer vents shall be galvanized and painted. Three new dormer vents will also be added to the existing structure for ventilation, one at the east, west, and south facades.

On the front façade, the plaster roof element above the front door was removed without approval and replaced twice. Originally the roof element consisted of decorative plaster parapet with an attached circular awning. Google images show that in 2011 a circular roof form had been installed. Today, a triangular gabled element is installed over the front door. As it is difficult to discern from the Historic Resources Survey the exact profile of the historic roof element due to the obscurity of the photo and the mounted awning, it is not possible to reconstruct the lost element. Although the current roof form is not original to the structure, the form is consistent with the roof style of the home and is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. As such, the altered roof form can be maintained without compromising the architectural integrity of the structure.

7.6.9. New skylights or solar panels should be designed and placed in such a way that they are not visible from the public right of way. If skylights are desired, flat skylights, flush with the roof, are encouraged.

The three proposed skylights are designed and placed in such a way that they are not visible from the public right of way. They are flat and flush with the roof and are located on the flat portion of the roof to reduce their visibility from the front of the house.

7.6.10. Existing chimney massing, details, and finishes should be retained. If replacement is necessary (e.g. due to earthquake damage), the new chimney should look identical to the original in location, massing, and form.

Permit records show that the chimney was replaced in 1994 due to damage from the Northridge earthquake. Records also show an earthquake inspection in 1996. The 1996 Historic Resources Survey shows the historic chimney, which indicates that the replacement had not been completed at the time of the survey. However, the replacement chimney, a simplified brick chimney, is visible in 2007 Google street view images. As the replacement of the chimney likely occurred prior to the adoption of the HPOZ in 1998, the simplification of the chimney is exempt from review. However, subsequent to the reconstruction of the chimney, a stone applique was applied to the chimney. The introduction of a material not found historically on the structure is inappropriate. As conditioned, stone cladding will be removed from the chimney in the
least invasive method possible.

7.6.13. Rooftop additions should be located to the rear of the house and designed so as to minimize their impact on visible roof form. See Chapter 8 for additional guidelines pertaining to residential additions.

The proposed rooftop addition is located to the rear of the house away from the primary architectural façade and has been designed to minimize its impact on the visible roof form.

7.7 Architectural Details
7.7.1. Preserve original architectural features. Deteriorated materials or features should be repaired in place, if possible. For instance, deteriorated wood details can be repaired with wood filler or epoxy in many cases.
7.7.2. When it is necessary to replace materials or features due to deterioration, replacement should be in kind, matching materials, texture and design.
7.7.3. When original details have been lost and must be replaced, designs should be based on historic photographic evidence. If no such evidence exists, the design of replacement details should be based on a combination of physical evidence (indications in the structure of the house itself) and evidence of similar elements on houses of the same architectural style in the neighborhood.
7.7.4. Materials, such as masonry, which were not originally painted or sealed, should remain unpainted.
7.7.5. Original building materials and details should not be covered with inappropriate materials such as stucco, vinyl siding, or other materials.
7.7.6. Architectural detail that did not originally appear on a structure should not be added to a structure.
7.7.7. Decorative detail that is expressed through the pattern of materials used in the construction of the house, such as decorative shingles or masonry patterns, should be preserved or replaced in kind. Covering or painting these details in a manner that obscures these patterns is inappropriate.

7.8 Building Materials and Finishes
7.8.1. Original building materials should be preserved whenever possible.
7.8.2. Repairs through consolidation or “patching in” are preferred to replacement.
7.8.3. If replacement is necessary, replacement materials should match the original in material, scale, finish, details, profile, and texture.
7.8.4. Building materials not originally painted should not be painted.
7.8.5. Original building materials should not be covered with vinyl, stucco, or other finishes.

The project proposes to retain a stone cladding that was installed on the structure without approval over original building materials. The Carthay Circle HPOZ Board recommended retention of the stone cladding, due to the financial impact of removal, while the CHC Designee recommended the removal of stone cladding and the restoration of the historic wood cladding. While financial burden is considered within a scope of a project, covering original building materials with a new material (stone) is inappropriate. The removal of character defining features such as wood cladding and the front bay windows would detrimentally impact the historic significance of the structure and cannot be approved. As such, the stone is conditioned to be removed. As conditioned, the stone will be removed from the chimney and wall cladding using the least invasive methods possible. The original wood wainscot will be re-installed, as shown in the 1996 Carthay Circle Historic Resources Survey, restoring the historic materials and architectural features on
the structure.

On the front façade the plaster roof element above the front door was removed without approval and replaced twice. Originally the roof element consisted of decorative plaster parapet with an attached circular awning. Google images show that in 2011 a circular roof form had been installed. Today a triangular gabled element is installed over the front door. As it is difficult to discern from the Historic Resources Survey the exact profile of the historic roof element due to the obscurity of the photo and the attached awning, it is not possible to reconstruct the lost element. Although the current roof form is not original to the structure, the form is consistent with the roof styles of the home and is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. As such, the altered roof form can be maintained without compromising the architectural integrity of the structure.

7.8 Building Materials and Finishes
7.8.6. If resurfacing of a stucco surface is necessary, the surface applied should match the original in texture and finish.
7.8.7. In choosing paint or stain colors, one should reference the Architectural Styles Chapter to learn more about appropriate paint colors and application. Stain or paint color choices should be selected appropriate to the architectural period or style and care should be taken to address how various elements of the structure, for instance the body, trim, and accents will be painted.

No resurfacing of stucco is proposed, however stucco patching in may be needed. Patched in stucco will match the texture and finish of the historic stucco. Late French Influence structures are typically painted with a light base and contrasting trim color to highlight the timbering details common to the style. The home will be painted with Dunn Edwards paints, the body will be painted “Almond” DEC 753 (off beige); the trim will be “cocoa” DEC 755 (light chocolate brown); and the fence rail and roof flashing will be “Grange Hall” DET 695 (dark gray).

7.9 Mechanicals
7.9.1. Satellite television dishes and other mechanical appurtenances should be located in the rear yard, in a location not visible from the public way. Small dishes or other appurtenances (under 2’ in diameter) may be located on lower rear roof surfaces, on rear yard accessory structures, on rear facades, or in the rear yard.
7.9.3. Mechanical apparatus not mounted on the structure should be located in rear or side yard areas not visible from the public way. In addition, consider placing such apparatus out of sight and sound of neighboring homes, if at all possible.

The location of existing or replacement mechanical appurtenance is not identified. As conditioned, new or replacement appurtenances will not be visible from the street, and appurtenances not mounted to the structure will be located in the rear or interior side yard.

8.2. Additions
8.2.1. Additions should be located at the rear of the structure, away from the street-facing architectural façade.
8.2.2. Additions that break the plane established by the existing roofline or side facades of the house are discouraged.
8.2.3. Additions that comprise a new floor (for instance a new second floor on a single-story house) where the remainder of the street is predominantly single-story are
discouraged.

8.2.5. Additions should utilize roof forms that are consistent with the existing house to the greatest extent possible, but should be differentiated by virtue of scale and volume. Attention should be paid to eave depth and roof pitch replicating these to the greatest extent possible.

8.2.6. The original rooflines of the front facade of a structure should remain readable and not be obscured by an addition.

8.2.11. Additions that extend the existing side facades rearward are discouraged. Additions should be stepped-in from the side facade.

The project consists of a new second floor addition on a single-story residence. The addition will be built on the west (side), south (rear) and east (street facing side) facades of the structure. Due to the unique triangular shape of the lot, the addition will be visible from both street-facing architectural facades, but will be set back 25-feet behind the primary architectural facade. The addition does not break the plane established by the existing roofline or side facades of the house, as the addition will begin at the rear of the house, will be stepped in on the sides, and new roof dormers will be incorporated into existing roof forms.

The project is located at a five inlet intersection, adjacent to four single-story Contributing Structures, and two two-story Non-Contributing Structures. Although a second-story addition on a single-story residence is usually deemed inappropriate, the existing structure’s unique roof forms accommodate an additional story without a visible impact on the neighborhood. The existing structure has a large sloping roof that can house the second story without an increase in the height of the existing residence. Because of this, the original rooflines of the front façade will remain readable.

The two-story rear addition uses roof forms and massing that are compatible with the historic street scape and the existing structure. The addition will utilize a mansard roof with a 12/12 slope consistent with the existing 12/12 sloped mansard roof. The addition will be stepped in approximately two feet on the east façade and will be differentiated on the first floor of the west façade with a building recession. The applicant has proposed to extend the roofline of the west (side) façade rearward by continuing the roofline on the addition. As additions should be stepped in on the side facades and should not break the plane of the established rooflines, continuing the roofline is inappropriate. As such, the west roofline is conditioned to be stepped-in one foot. The condition will ensure the original corners of the structure remain readable, and further differentiate the addition as new construction.

Three shed roofed dormers will be installed on the west (side), south (rear) and east (street facing side) facades of the structure. The dormers will be set back from the primary façade, with shed roofs and fenestration to match the existing structure. The west (side) façade dormer includes a diagonal wall on its north (street facing) façade. The angled façade follows the original slope of the roof. While referencing the original roof form helps differentiate the addition as new construction, the diagonal wall is atypical for the style and does not integrate into the building. Per the recommendation of the CHC Designee that the corners of the dormer be squared and the size be reduced, the west dormer is conditioned to have corners with 90 degree angles and shall be reduced by approximately 20 square feet. This condition will help integrate the dormer into the roofline, and the condition to step in the west roofline by one-foot will ensure that the original rooflines of the structure remain readable.
8.2.4. Additions should use similar finish materials and fenestration patterns as the original structure. A stucco addition to a wood clapboard house, for example, would be inappropriate.

The addition will use similar materials and fenestration patterns as the original structure. The addition will be clad in stucco to match the stucco finish on the existing structure. The project proposes to install stone cladding on the addition to match the stone installed without approval on the historic structure. As introducing new materials is inappropriate, installing additional stone wainscot would not be consistent with the historic structure. As conditioned, no new stone wainscot will be installed.

The proposed windows on the addition will be wood dual glazed windows with multiple lights to match the fenestration pattern on the original building. As the window schedule does not note whether lites are to be simulated or true-divided, all windows on the addition are conditioned to be wood dual-glazed with true-divided-lites. The new windows will have similar lite patterns and configurations to the existing windows.

New copper dormer vents are proposed to be installed on the addition and existing structure. Per the recommendation of the HPOZ Board, copper roof vents are not consistent with the area and more diminutive galvanized vents should be installed. As conditioned, new dormer vents shall be galvanized and painted.

The new mansard roof forms and dormer vents will have composite asphalt shingles in a dark brown color “weathered wood”. As introducing new materials is inappropriate, installing standing seam copper roofs on the new shed roof dormers would not be consistent with the historic structure. As conditioned, shed roof dormers will be cool roof to match the new second floor roof surface in color.

8.2.7. Additions should distinguish themselves from the original structure through the simplified use of architectural detail, or through building massing or subtle variations of exterior finishes to communicate that the addition is new construction.

8.2.9. Additions should utilize fenestration patterns that are consistent with the existing house to the greatest extent possible, though simplified window types may be an appropriate means to differentiate the addition from the original structure. For instance, if windows on the original structure are multi-pane 8-over-1 light windows, simple 1-over-1 light windows may be appropriate.

The addition is distinguished from the original structure through the roof form (dormers), architectural detail, and through massing (roof stepped down and side facades stepped in from the existing structure). As described in 8.2.5 and 8.2.6. above, the addition’s roof forms, massing and slope are referential to the existing structure but clearly differentiated.

The addition will have similar architectural details and materials to the existing structure. The historic structure is modestly clad in stucco with few ornaments beyond the decorative wood wainscot and multi-lite windows. The addition will continue the stucco base from the existing structure, but will not have a wood wainscot, to clearly differentiate the addition as new construction.

Window openings are similar to the double-hung openings found on the east and west (side) facades, but are differentiated by their small opening sizes, and dual-glazing. The
new windows on the addition will be dual-glazed hung windows with true-divided multi-lite windows. By incorporating elements from the existing hung windows into the new openings, but altering their proportion and glazing, the addition accomplishes both the maintenance of the existing architectural style and a differentiation of the new openings on the addition.

8.2.10. Additions should be subordinate in scale and volume to the existing house. Additions that involve more than a 50% increase in the ground floor plate are generally inappropriate.

The project consists of an 873 square-foot two-story addition to a one-story 1,370 square-foot Contributing Structure on a triangular shaped corner lot. The addition will increase the ground floor plate by 660 square feet resulting in 48.2% increase to the ground floor plate and a 63.7% increase in the square footage of the structure. The location, massing, and rooflines of the addition ensure that the addition is subordinate in scale and volume to the existing house and is thus appropriate.

8.2.12. Decorative architectural features established on the existing house should be repeated with less detail on the addition. Exact replicas of features such as corbels, pilasters, decorative windows, etc. are inappropriate.

As explained in 8.2.7 and 8.2.9, decorative architectural features such as multi-lite windows and cladding material will be repeated with less detail on the addition.

8.2.13. Additions that would necessitate the elimination of significant architectural features such as chimneys, decorative windows, architectural symmetry or other impacts to the existing house are not appropriate.

The addition does not necessitate the elimination of significant architectural features such as chimneys, decorative windows, architectural symmetry or other impacts to the existing house, and thus the addition is appropriate.

8.2.15. Additions that would require the location of designated parking areas within the front yard area are inappropriate.

The location of the designated parking area will remain in the rear yard in the existing two-car garage.

C. The proposed addition and rehabilitation of the site is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15300, Class 31, Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation of the State CEQA Guidelines because it is 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.

The proposed project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article III, Section 1, Class 1 Category 1 of the City California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines because the project consists of an interior or exterior alteration involving remodeling or minor construction.
The proposed addition is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article III, Section 1, Class 1 Category 5 of the City California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines because the project consists of an addition to existing facilities that will not result in an increase of more than 50 percent of the floor area of the structures before the addition; and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

Notice of Exemption No. ENV-2017-2205-CE was prepared on October 23, 2017.