

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

CD 5 Staff
20-0062 II 10
Conditions of Approval

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. *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**.
3. *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-2019-3828-COA. Any change to the project shall require review by the Director of Planning and may require additional review 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.

4. *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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Code Compliance. All area, height and use regulations of the zone classification for the subject property shall be complied with.
8. 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.

9. **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.
10. **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, in whole or in part, 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, in whole or in part, 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 \$50,000. 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

A. 12.20.3 K.3 and 12.20.3 M - Recommendations from the Carthay 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 the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Preservation Plan (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 July 22, 2019. Department of City Planning staff sent copies of the application with relevant materials to the HPOZ Board on August 1, 2019. Notice was posted for the meeting at the site, and at City Planning offices at 221 N. Figueroa, and mailed to abutting property owners on August 1, 2019. After thirteen (14) days of public notice, the Carthay HPOZ Board met on August 15, 2019 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 seven-member quorum, unanimously recommended denial of the project, citing non-compliance with Guideline 8.2.3, which states, "Additions that comprise a new floor (for instance a new second floor on a single-story house) are not appropriate." Citing similar concerns, several members of the public spoke in opposition of the proposed project, while several members of the public spoke in support of it.

Department of City Planning staff sent copies of the application with relevant materials to the Cultural Heritage Commission's designee on August 1. The Cultural Heritage Commission recommended denial of the project, citing non-compliance with the adopted Preservation Plan and commenting, "Preservation Plan discourages 2nd Story additions to one-story houses. Addition should only be one story."

Notwithstanding the recommendations of the HPOZ Board and the CHC, the proposed project substantially complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.

B. 12.20.3 K.4(b) – Protection and Preservation of Characteristics which Make the Structure a Contributing Element of the Preservation Zone.

In accordance with LAMC Section 12.20.3 K.4(b), the Project protects and preserves the Historic and architectural qualities and the physical characteristics which make the building, structure, landscape, or Natural Feature a Contributing Element of the Preservation Zone.

The proposed project would preserve the overall character of the primary (north), east, and west façades of 6500 Olympic Place, thereby avoiding the destruction of important character-

defining features, materials, and ornamentation. All windows and rooflines on these three façades would also be preserved. In terms of the primary façade, the new addition would not affect or damage the historic materials and features of the façade itself. Furthermore, the addition would not destroy spatial relationships because it would be confined to the rear of the property, behind the primary façade ridgeline, be kept as low as possible, extending only 4 feet 6 inches feet above the ridgeline, would be compatible in terms of massing and scale, and would read as a separate volume distinguishable from the original.

The project would only remove and alter materials, features, and spaces that are character-defining features of low importance. The proposed project would, on the east façade, enclose the recessed service entrance as interior space while preserving the raised surround. The proposed project would on the rear (south) façade: 1) remove and replace the French doors, a single door, and two pairs of windows, with two new wood French doors with 8-lites, each set flanked by wood hung four-over-four windows, and 2) would enclose the recessed porch as interior space and extend it by 4 feet, 8 inches to be in line with the existing west section of the rear façade. The proposed project would also remove 895 square feet of existing roof material and create an addition set behind the existing gable ridge of the primary façade side gable and behind the ridge of the east façade side gable.

Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property will also be preserved. On the exterior, the proposed project would retain most of the distinctive materials, features, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property and its distinctive, intact Spanish Colonial Revival style. Among these are the contoured rafter tails, contoured bargeboards, colonnettes, corbels piers, and pilasters with raised banding. The primary (north) façade would be entirely preserved.

The proposed project would demolish and replace a portion of the rear roof, would change some of the rear façade fenestration, would enclose and extend the recessed rear porch, and would enclose the recessed service entrance on the east façade. The rear façade, fenestration, rear roof, and east façade recessed service entrance are not of high importance as character-defining features. The rafter tails and decorative bargeboards are extant on all other façades including the primary façade.

C. 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.

In accordance with LAMC Section 12.20.3 K.4(c), the proposed project substantially complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.

8.2 Additions to Primary Structures

8.2.1 Additions should be located at the rear of the structure, away from the street facing architectural façade.

The proposed project entails an addition that would be situated entirely behind and within the rear half of the dwelling and horizontally 5 ft. 5 in. behind the gable ridge of the primary/north façade.

8.2.2 Additions that break the plane established by the existing roofline or side facades of the house are discouraged.

The proposed addition would be situated entirely behind and within the rear half of the dwelling and horizontally 5 ft. 5 in. behind the gable ridge of the primary/north façade. It would be situated behind the ridge of the east façade side gable and would be inset 3 ft., 8 in. from the entire west façade roofline. The addition preserves the entire roofline on the primary/north, east, and west façades.

8.2.3 Additions that comprise a new floor (for instance a new second floor on a single-story house) are not appropriate.

The proposed project would add an addition above a rear portion of the subject dwelling. The addition would rise 4 ft. 6 in. above the primary façade ridgeline and would be horizontally set back from that ridgeline 5 ft. 5 in. The addition would also be situated behind the ridgeline of the east façade, and on the west façade it would be stepped-in 3 ft. 8 in. from the edge of the roof. The combination of low height and setbacks would allow the residence to retain the primary/north façade and the secondary east and west facades, thus "preserving the look and scale" of the original dwelling, as exemplified by the photo of a white Spanish colonial revival with second-story addition associated with Guideline 8.2.

Along the primary façade, the proposed project would retain the overall character of residence. The project would only remove and alter materials, features, and spaces that are character-defining features of low importance (e.g., recessed service entrance, sections of rear façade including recessed covered porch, and rear roofs). The proposed project would, on the east façade, enclose the recessed service entrance as interior space while preserving the raised surround. The proposed project would on the rear (south) façade: 1) remove and replace the French doors, a single door, and two pairs of windows, with two new wood French doors with 8-lites, each set flanked by wood hung four-over-four windows, and 2) would enclose the recessed porch as interior space and extend it by 4 ft. 8 in. to be in line with the existing west section of the rear façade. The proposed project would also remove 895 square feet of existing roof material and create an addition set behind the existing gable ridge of the primary façade and behind the east façade side gable. The project retains the character-defining features of high importance and removes only those of low and medium importance.

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 subject property is clad entirely in stucco and is capped by a roof finished with Spanish-style clay tile. The proposed project would be clad in similar stucco with a roof finished in similar Spanish-style tile. Fenestration would be similar to the existing with wood doors and hung windows, all with divided lites.

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.

The proposed project entails an addition built into the rear portion of the attic. The addition would have a combination hipped and flat roof. The flat center portion of the roof would not be visible from the ground and would be surrounded by a hipped roof with a 4: 12 pitch, matching existing. The eave depth, 12 inches, will also match existing.

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

The proposed project would entail an addition to the rear of the dwelling, situated horizontally 5 ft. 5 in. behind the existing gable ridge of the primary façade.

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.

The proposed project would introduce a new addition in the attic. As previously discussed, the footprint of the addition would be stepped-in from both the east and west secondary façades and situated entirely at the rear of the dwelling. To distinguish themselves from the originals, only simplified versions of rafter tails, corbels, and piers would be used in the project. These details would lack the decorative contours and banding of the original character-defining features.

8.2.8 The enclosure of rear porches, when found to be appropriate, should preserve the overall look of the porch to the greatest extent possible with respect to railings, balusters, openings, and roofs.

The proposed project would enclose the rear recessed porch and extend that enclosure 4 ft. 8 in. to align with the existing left third of the rear façade. As the porch is small, recessed, and covered by the primary roof, it lacks the presence and massing of a projected porch under its own roof. The porch consists of a concrete floor accessed by three concrete steps. The porch lacks any vertical supports such as the piers and pilasters exhibited in the entrance arcade on the primary/north façade. The sole "detail" specific to the porch is a common and simple metal railing with a repeated shield-like element as its only embellishment. The railing, concrete floor and steps are neither distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance. The east façade recessed service entrance consists of concrete steps, landing, low wall and tubular metal railing. None of these elements are distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance. The raised surround mimicking the archway would be preserved to keep the architectural detail.

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 subject property features a generally irregular fenestration pattern with symmetry exhibited within specific window groupings. Examples of this are the tripartite window on the primary/north façade, the bay windows on the east and west façades, on the west façade the windows flanking the chimney, and on the rear/south façade the French doors flanked by the matching windows and in the recessed porch the single door flanked by matching windows. Fenestration consists of wood fixed and double-hung windows of various configurations: two-over-two, four-over-four, and six over-six, most with simple wood sills. In keeping with this variety, the proposed project would feature wood windows and French doors with divided lites, in a variety of sizes. The arrangement would asymmetrical on all facades but the rear (south) façade, which would borrow from the existing symmetrical window/door pairings previously discussed. Furthermore, windows would not be exact replicas in dimension to any existing.

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 subject property consists of a 2,481 square foot dwelling. The proposed project would 1) enclose a 28 square foot recessed service entrance and 2) enclose and extend the rear recessed porch creating 150 square feet. The total proposed enclosed ground floor increase would be 178 square feet, or .07%.

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

The proposed project entails an addition built into the existing attic. As previously discussed, the addition would be stepped-in from both the east and west secondary façades. The addition, which would span only the left two thirds of the rear/south façade, would extend only 4 ft. 6 in. beyond the existing west façade.

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.

The subject property exhibits numerous decorative details that qualify as character-defining features. Included among these are the contoured arches of the front arcade, rafter tails, contoured bargeboards, turned window divides, corbels, piers and pilasters with raised banding. To distinguish themselves from the originals, only simplified versions of rafter tails, corbels, and piers would be used in the project. These details would lack the decorative contours and banding of the original character-defining features.

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 subject property is defined by a predominantly asymmetrical primary façade, secondary façades, and rear façade. Symmetry is exhibited within specific window groupings and not as an overall pattern of fenestration. The existing chimney and all windows on the primary and secondary (east and west) facades will be preserved. All character-defining features of high importance would be preserved.

8.2.14 Additions that would involve the removal or diminishment of open areas on Multi-family properties, such as the infill of a courtyard to be used as floor area, are inappropriate.

The proposed project entails a single-family and therefore Guideline 8.2.14 does not apply.

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

The proposed project entails no parking in the front yard. Existing parking consisting of the driveway and garage in the rear southeast corner of the property will be retained.

7.5 Porches

7.5.1 Historic porches, especially on the front and side facades, should be preserved in place. The removal of historic porches is inappropriate.

The proposed project would enclose the rear recessed porch and extend that enclosure 4 ft. 8 in. to align with the existing left third of the rear façade. As the porch is small, recessed, and covered by the primary roof, it lacks the presence and massing of a projected porch under its own roof. The porch consists of a concrete floor accessed by three concrete steps. The porch lacks any vertical supports such as the piers and pilasters exhibited in the entrance arcade on the primary/north façade. The sole "detail" specific to the porch is a common and simple metal railing with a repeated shield-like element as its only embellishment. The railing, concrete floor and steps are neither distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance.

The east façade recessed service entrance consists of concrete steps, landing, low wall and tubular metal railing. None of these elements are distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance. The raised surround mimicking the archway would be preserved to keep the architectural detail.

No removal of historic porches is proposed.

7.5.2 Decorative details that help define an historic porch should be preserved. These include balusters, balustrades, columns, and brackets. The State Historic Building Code allows balustrades and railings that do not meet current building code heights to remain if they do not pose a safety hazard.

The rear recessed porch lacks the presence and massing of a projected porch under its own roof. In addition, the porch lacks any vertical supports such as the piers and pilasters exhibited in the entrance arcade on the primary/north façade. The sole "detail" specific to the porch is a common and simple metal railing with a repeated shield-like element as its only embellishment. The railing and concrete floor are neither distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance.

The east façade recessed service entrance consists of concrete steps, landing, low wall and tubular metal railing. None of these elements are distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance. The raised surround mimicking the archway would be preserved to keep the architectural detail.

7.5.3 If elements of the porch, such as decorative brackets or columns, must be replaced, replacement materials should exactly match the originals in design, profile, and materials.

The rear façade recessed porch and the east façade recessed service entrance do not have any decorative elements such as brackets or columns. The raised surround mimicking the archway of the east façade recessed service entrance would be preserved.

7.5.4 If porch elements are damaged, they should be repaired in place wherever possible, instead of being removed and replaced.

No porch elements are damaged and therefore Guideline 7.5.4 does not apply.

7.5.5 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.

No original details have been lost or are being replaced. Therefore Guideline 7.5.5 does not apply.

7.5.6 Additional porch elements should not be added if they did not exist historically. For instance, classical columns or balustrades on a Spanish Colonial porch, patio or balcony would be inappropriate.

The new porch at the rear façade is created by utilizing the approximately 4 ft. 8 in. deep overhang of the addition. It measures 28 ft. long and is supported by three simplified square piers, with flagstone steps and deck. There are no other additional porch elements which would not have existed historically.

7.5.7 The addition of a porch which would not have existed on a house historically, such as an elaborate, highly detailed porch to the rear of an historic structure, is strongly discouraged.

The new porch at the rear façade is created by utilizing the approximately 4 ft. 8 in. deep overhang of the addition. It measures 28 ft. long and is supported by three simplified square piers, with flagstone steps and deck. There are no other additional porch elements. There are no elaborate, highly detailed features to the porch addition.

7.5.8 Enclosure of part or all of an historic porch is inappropriate, especially when located on the primary facade or visible from the public right of way.

The proposed project would enclose the rear recessed porch and extend that enclosure 4 ft. 8 in. to align with the existing left third of the rear façade. As the porch is small, recessed, and covered by the primary roof, it lacks the presence and massing of a projected porch under its own roof. The porch consists of a concrete floor accessed by three concrete steps. The porch lacks any vertical supports such as the piers and pilasters exhibited in the entrance arcade on the primary/north façade. The sole "detail" specific to the porch is a common and simple metal railing with a repeated shield-like element as its only embellishment. The railing, concrete floor and steps are neither distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance.

The east façade recessed service entrance consists of concrete steps, landing, low wall and tubular metal railing. None of these elements are distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance. The raised surround mimicking the archway would be preserved to keep the architectural detail.

See also the discussion under Guideline 8.2.3.

7.5.9 Enclosure of a porch at the side or rear of the house, for instance a sleeping porch, may be appropriate if the porch form is preserved and the porch openings are fitted with windows in a manner that they can be removed in the future without damage to the original structure.

The proposed project would enclose the rear recessed porch and extend that enclosure 4 ft. 8 in. to align with the existing left third of the rear façade. As the porch is small, recessed, and covered by the primary roof, it lacks the presence and massing of a projected porch under its own roof (i.e., the existing porch is not a sleeping porch). There is no porch form. The porch consists of a concrete floor accessed by three concrete steps. The porch lacks any vertical supports such as the piers and pilasters exhibited in the entrance arcade on the primary/north façade. The sole "detail" specific to the porch is a common and simple metal railing with a repeated shield-like element as its only embellishment. The railing, concrete floor and steps are neither distinctive nor are they character-defining features of high importance.

7.5.10 Alterations for handicapped access should be done at a side or rear entrance whenever feasible, and should be designed and built in the least intrusive manner possible. Such alteration should be reversible.

No alterations for handicapped access proposed. Therefore Guideline 7.5.10 does not apply.

7.5.11 Addition of a handrail on the front steps of a house for safety or handicapped access reasons may be appropriate, if the handrail is compatible in scale, material and detail with the design of the structure.

No addition of handrail on front steps is proposed. Therefore Guideline 7.5.11 does not apply.

7.5.12 If a new garden wall is to be constructed effort should be made to ensure that it is similarly configured to original walls with respect to height, materials, spacing of openings etc.

No garden wall is proposed. Therefore Guideline 7.5.12 does not apply.

7.5.13 Arcades, gates and other such openings should always be kept as open voids. Appropriate gates on Spanish Colonial houses are typically wrought iron or to a lesser extent wood, and allow for a high degree of transparency. Styles such as Colonial or Monterey will typically use wood gate elements.

All arcades, gates, and other opening will be kept as open voids.

C. The proposed project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Class 3, Section 15303, of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The proposed project consists of a second story addition and other small additions, totaling 1,297 square feet, to an existing 2,481 square foot single-family dwelling. The project qualifies for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption, pursuant to CEQA guidelines Section 15303, and no exceptions to the exemption are applicable.

The site is in a developed urban area, and a lot already developed with a single-family dwelling. The site is not in a fault zone, Very High Fire Hazard zone, a Special Grading Area, or any other sensitive environmental area. Therefore, the site will not have a significant impact to any sensitive environment. There are currently no other second story additions approved in the immediate area, and so there will be no significant cumulative impact. As stated above, the site is already developed with a single-family home, in a developed urban area on flat land, and therefore the project will have no significant effect on the environment. The project is not located on a scenic highway, and will not impact any nearby scenic resources. According to the state EnviroStor database, the site is not a hazardous waste site, nor is it in close proximity to any hazardous waste sites. While the project involves a historic property, the proposed addition will not impact the existing dwelling or its facade, and is in keeping with the historic character of the adopted preservation plan for the South Carthay Historic Preservation Overlay Zone. Therefore, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change to a historic resource.